

JOURNAL
OF THE
GENERAL CONVENTION

OF THE
Protestant Episcopal Church

IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OTHERWISE KNOWN AS

The Episcopal Church

Held in Seattle, Washington,
From September Seventeenth to Twenty-Seventh,
inclusive, in the Year of Our Lord

1967

WITH APPENDICES AND SUPPLEMENTS

PRINTED FOR THE CONVENTION

1967

APPENDIX 9.**REPORT OF THE
JOINT COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS****CONTENTS**

Introduction	9.3
Members of the Joint Commission	9.4
Structure of the Joint Commission	9.6
The Report	9.7
1. Relations with the Eastern Churches	9.7
2. Relations with the Roman Catholic Church	9.12
3. Consultation on Church Union	9.15
4. Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches	9.21
5. World and National Councils of Churches	9.22
6. Jewish-Christian Dialogue	9.23
7. Theological Concerns	9.23
8. The Wider Episcopal Fellowship	9.24
9. The West Indies	9.27
10. Ecumenical Relations of the Executive Council	9.27
11. Inter-Anglican Relations	9.28
Summary	9.30
Resolutions	9.31
Annexes	9.36
A. Interim Guide-Lines for Anglican-Orthodox Relationships	9.36
B. Resolution of the Belgrade Conference	9.38
C. Interim Guide-Lines for Relations with the Roman Catholic Church	9.42
D. <i>Principles of Church Union</i>	9.45
E. Episcopal Delegates to Ecumenical Gatherings	9.46
F. Statement on Communion Discipline	9.54
G. Financial Report	9.55

In Memoriam

Whereas, Ralph W. Black served as a faithful member of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations from 1961 until his death on August 22, 1966; and

Whereas, He is mourned, not only by his family and by the Missionary District of North Dakota, but by his friends and fellow-workers throughout the Church; therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Minute, in thanksgiving for the life and work of the late Ralph M. Black, adopted by the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations at its meeting in New York, at the Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine, January 3-5, 1967, be included in the Triennial Report, and that copies be sent to his family and his Bishop.

INTRODUCTION

It works. It is not unmanageable. No one of its responsibilities has been neglected. In fact, they have been carried out more effectively.

The new Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, set up by the 1964 General Convention, has continued and furthered the work of the former Joint Commissions which were merged to create it. Nothing has been lost in the areas of Approaches to Unity, Co-operation with Eastern and Old Catholic Churches, and Ecumenical Relations proper. In addition, new work has been added, such as Relations with the Roman Catholic Church, Relations with Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches, and Jewish-Christian Dialogue.

Since its inception in 1964, the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations has had four full-scale meetings and has settled into a remarkably smooth operating group. Dividing up its many responsibilities among seven committees and one council, its thirty members (ten Bishops, ten Presbyters, and ten lay persons, with additional members *ex officio*, staff, and co-opted members of sub-committees) have severally and collectively discharged the tasks laid upon the Commission by the Sixty-first General Convention.

Charter of the Commission

The Commission has functioned under the following charter from the General Convention:

"(The) Joint Commission, by means of special units or otherwise, shall continue the work of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, the Joint Commission on Approaches to Unity, and the Joint Commission on Co-operation with the Eastern and Old Catholic Churches, and shall be charged also with relations with inter-Church organizations; with the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, and the Ancient Eastern Churches; with other parts of the Anglican Communion and the Wider Episcopal Fellowship; and with consultations on and approaches toward unity.

"... the task of the new Joint Commission (shall) be to develop a comprehensive and co-ordinated policy and strategy on relations with other Churches, confirming, interpreting, or making fresh, definitions, in harmony with the faith and canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church, thus involving (a) statements on Faith and Order, (b) theological discussions with other Churches, separately or in ecumenical gatherings, and (c) questions of Church law, tradition, and worship, arising in relationships with other Churches.

"... such responsibilities of the new Joint Commission as relate to the Orthodox (shall) be committed to a special section, consisting of members particularly qualified therefor."

Summary of Current Work

Under this charter, the Joint Commission has sought to examine and develop the relationships of the Episcopal Church with other Churches, and has tried to bring all of these relationships into an integrated, balanced, and comprehensive policy for this Church. The sharing and discussion of the reports from its several committees by the full Commission has helped to avert undue emphasis in any one direction and to construct a policy which takes account of contemporary strivings for unity while adhering to the basic faith and polity of this Church. The Joint Commission has

- Begun deeply significant *dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church*, reinforcing the many contacts begun as a result of the Second Vatican Council.
- Approved with thanksgiving a statement clarifying the grounds for *Anglican-Orthodox Relationships*, looking forward to the forthcoming meeting of the Pan-Orthodox and Pan-Anglican Joint Doctrinal Commission.
- Made new plans for the enhancement of *Episcopal ties with the Polish National Catholic Church*.
- Exercised responsibility for organizing and co-ordinating *this Church's participation in both the National and World Councils of Churches*.
- Continued *contacts with the Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches*.
- Heard reports of negotiations looking toward reunion from many of the nineteen self-governing *Churches of the Anglican Communion* and, helped in its participation by the leadership of the Church of England in the latter's conversations with the Methodists, and by the Anglican Church of Canada in its consultations with the United Church, received with warmth the development of areas of agreement with the nine other Churches in the *Consultation on Church Union*.

MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMISSION

Rt. Rev. John M. Allin (Mississippi)
 Rt. Rev. G. Francis Burrill (Chicago)
 Rt. Rev. Richard S. M. Emrich (Michigan)
 Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson (Virginia), *Chairman**
 Rt. Rev. Donald H. V. Hallock (Milwaukee)

Rt. Rev. John S. Higgins (Rhode Island)
 Rt. Rev. Cedric E. Mills (Virgin Islands)
 Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley (Delaware)*
 Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife (Western New York)*
 Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles (West Missouri)

Very Rev. Gray M. Blandy (Texas)
 Rev. John V. Butler (New York), *Vice-Chairman**
 Very Rev. John B. Coburn (Massachusetts)
 Rev. Edward R. Hardy (Connecticut)
 Rev. James W. Kennedy (Southern Ohio), *Secretary**
 Rev. Robert B. MacDonald (Pennsylvania)
 Rev. Albert T. Mollegen (Virginia)
 Rev. Canon Enrico C. S. Molnar (Los Angeles)
 Rev. Arthur A. Vogel (Milwaukee)
 Rev. William J. Wolf (Massachusetts)

Paul B. Anderson (New York), *Treasurer**
 Ralph W. Black (North Dakota), *Deceased*
 John Nicholas Brown (Rhode Island)
 N. Hamner Cobbs (Alabama)
 Mrs. Penrose W. Hirst (Texas)
 Mrs. Sherman E. Johnson (California)
 Harry W. Osborne (Colorado)
 J. L. Pierson (Missouri)
 George A. Shipman (Olympia)
 Mrs. David S. Tappan (Rochester)

Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (Presiding Bishop), *Ex officio**
 Clifford P. Morehouse (New York), *Ex officio*

Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr. (Vice-President, Executive
 Council), *Consultant**
 Peter Day (Ecumenical Officer, Executive Council), *Staff
 Officer and Consultant**

Rev. Canon R. Latimer (Anglican Church of Canada),
Observer

* Indicates members of the Executive Committee; namely, the officers, plus two members-at-large, with the Presiding Bishop, Bishop Bayne, and Dr. Day as members *ex officio*. Other members may be co-opted, as needed, for any special item on the agenda.

STRUCTURE OF THE JOINT COMMISSION

The special work done by the Joint Commission over the past triennium is being reported through the several committees and the council into which it has been organized. All reports have been reviewed and approved by the entire Commission.

The make-up of the committees and the council is as follows:

1. *Council on Relations with Eastern Churches*
Bishop Scaife, *Chairman*; Rev. Mr. MacDonald, *Secretary*; Dr. Anderson, Dr. Brown, Rev. Dr. Hardy, and Mr. Osborne. Co-opted Members: Rt. Rev. Francis W. Lickfield (Quincy) and Ven. J. Ralph Deppen (Chicago).
2. *Committee on Relations with the Roman Catholic Church*
Bishop Hallock, *Chairman*; Rev. Dr. Vogel, *Secretary*; Bishop Higgins, Bishop Welles, Rev. Dr. Wolf, Dr. Morehouse, Dr. Shipman, and, as a newly appointed consultant, Rev. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. (California).
3. *Committee on Unity Consultations*
Bishop Gibson, *Chairman*; Mr. Pierson, *Secretary*; Bishop Bayne, Bishop Burrill, Bishop Emrich, Bishop Mills, Rev. Dr. Mollegen, Rev. Dr. Molnar, Rev. Dr. Wolf, Dr. Day, and Rev. Dr. Vogel.
4. *Committee on Relations with Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches*
Bishop Welles, *Chairman*; Dr. Day, *Secretary*.
5. *Committee on Councils of Churches*
Bishop Mosley, *Chairman*; Rev. Dr. Kennedy, *Secretary*; Bishop Allin, Dean Blandy, Dean Coburn, Mr. Cobbs, and Mrs. Hirst.
6. *Committee on Jewish-Christian Dialogue*
Rev. Dr. Butler, *Chairman*; Mrs. Johnson, *Secretary*. Co-opted Member: Rt. Rev. Jonathan G. Sherman (Long Island).
7. *Theological Committee*
Dean Coburn, *Chairman*; Rev. Dr. Hardy, *Secretary*; Bishop Bayne, Rev. Dr. Mollegen, Dr. Shipman, and Rev. Dr. Vogel.
8. *Committee on the Wider Episcopal Fellowship*
Bishop Higgins, *Chairman*; Bishop Bayne, Bishop Scaife, Rev. Dr. Butler, and Dr. Day.
9. *The Executive Committee*
Bishop Gibson, *Chairman*; Rev. Dr. Kennedy, *Secretary*; Bishop Bayne, Bishop Scaife, Bishop Mosley, Rev. Dr. Butler, Dr. Anderson, and Dr. Day.

THE REPORT

1. Relations with Eastern Churches

Contemporary Orthodoxy

Between 1886, when the General Convention signaled its desire for closer relations with the Orthodox by establishing a Russo-Greek Committee, to the middle of the 20th Century, the Episcopal Church was largely concerned with helping the Eastern Churches to domesticate themselves in American life. Nearly all of the Orthodox faithful and most of the Bishops and other clergymen are now Americans. From worshipping in barracks or borrowed churches, the Orthodox and the Armenians have moved into scores of new edifices which usually combine homeland architecture with American functional interiors.

In youthful spirit and vitality they outstrip many Episcopal and Protestant Churches. They are caught up in a mood of spiritual renewal, not unlike the *aggiornamento* characterizing post-Vatican-II Roman Catholics, although there is but little connection between the two. It is highly significant, however, that Pope Paul and Patriarch Athenagoras embraced in Jerusalem, and, in 1964, that they reciprocally consigned to oblivion the mutual excommunications of 1054 A.D. between Rome and Constantinople.

Renewal, rejuvenation, restoration of youth and vigor—such internal changes may, in part, be results of the new environment. Instead of being enclosed in the former Russian and Turkish empires, Eastern Christians are now scattered over the world—three hundred thousand in Western Europe, a quarter of a million in Australia, reportedly five million in North America. This is the modern *diaspora*, with which we have increasing relationships. Yet their spiritual, theological, and canonical, ties are bound up with the Mother Churches, the fourteen Autocephalic Orthodox Churches in communion with Constantinople and the five ancient Eastern Churches that rejected the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon.

Other Ancient Eastern Churches

The five ancient Eastern Churches developed cohesion at a meeting in Addis Ababa in 1964. Official delegates of the Armenian, Syrian Antiochian, Coptic, Ethiopian, and Indian Syrians, produced a report that gives fresh insight into the modern life of these ancient Churches. Although their theologians and those of the Orthodox came to many common conclusions at a conference in Aarhus, Denmark, in 1963, the Chalcedon decisions still divide them.

New Trends Overseas

A striking development is to be seen in the most ancient Patriarchate of all, that of Antioch. In Syria and Lebanon, an Orthodox Youth Movement, although only approximately twenty years old, is credited by many with stirring up new life and with leading to the election of progressive young Bishops for the strategic sees of Latakia in Syria and New York in the U.S.A. Even more impressive was the Synod's determination to establish a college-grade theological seminary in Lebanon, which will be the first such Orthodox institution in the Middle East, and which will parallel the Armenian College at Antelias, near Beirut.

Another evidence of renewal is to be seen in a movement in the Moscow Patriarchate, much publicized abroad, but muted in the Soviet Union. At considerable risk to themselves, two young priests, in December, 1965, addressed carefully prepared documents to Mr. Podgorny, Head of State, and to Patriarch Alexei, Head of the Church, calling the attention of the former to actions by the State's Council on Orthodox Church Affairs which were claimed to be more restrictive than Soviet constitution and law require, and urging the Patriarch to summon a new Church Council to so adjust the constitution of the Church as to restore clergymen to their canonically rightful places in the parish councils, from which they had been removed by a hastily called Council in 1961.

In both the Middle East and in the Soviet Union the strength of these movements for spiritual and structural renewal is due in large measure to the strong support, if not the initiative, of the laity, and especially of the Orthodox intelligentsia. Here we see the working out of the historic role that both mind and soul play in Orthodoxy, such as was characteristic of the great Fathers of the Church in the formative period of Creeds and Councils upon which all Christendom depends. Western Christians can now similarly profit from the modern experience of these ancient Churches.

St. Sergius' Institute

Of special interest to Western non-Orthodox Christians, and especially to the Episcopal Church, is the fact that both the Syrian Orthodox Youth Movement and the Orthodox priests in Moscow claim the great Russian theologians of St. Sergius' Institute in Paris and the Russian Student Christian Movement Abroad as their intellectual and spiritual sources and mentors. The new Bishop of Latakia was trained at St. Sergius', and the newly elected Metropolitan Philip Saliba in New York studied at St. Vladimir's Seminary, which is itself an extension of St. Sergius' in both leadership

and purpose. The Moscow documents refer specifically to the works of Bulgakoff, Berdyaev, and Lossky, men who, exiled in 1922 by the Soviet Government, were sponsored by the Church of England, the Episcopal Church, and the American YMCA, men who set the astonishing record of producing a Theological Institute, an Orthodox student movement, and a fund of modern literature on theology and philosophy which has influenced Catholics and Protestants, as well as Orthodox, in all parts of the world.

The Orthodox Theological Institute of St. Sergius in Paris has completed forty years of productive effort. It is now experiencing important changes. Founded for the purpose of training priests and theologians for the Russian Church in the homeland and abroad, the student body is now comprehensively international. In fact, Russians are in the minority, the main body being Greeks and Yugoslavs, with individual students from Germany, England, Switzerland, and France. Sixty scholars attending the 15th annual "Litururgical Week", at the Institute, in June, 1966, heard eleven Roman Catholic, two Anglican, three Protestant, and four Orthodox, theologians reading papers and discussing varied topics in an extraordinarily ecumenical atmosphere. The Institute is creating an effective, co-operative, spiritual basis among the fourteen autocephalic (namely, independent) Churches.

Faculty members continue to produce Orthodox contributions to theology. A recent brochure listing the writings of professors at the Institute shows 43 books and 415 articles published during the ten-year period, 1955-1965. Most of them are in European languages. Archbishop Georges, the faculty, and the students, often express appreciation to the Episcopal Church for the close collaboration and financial support provided by this Church through the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.

Accomplishments in This Triennium

The Council on Relations with the Eastern Churches has had four meetings during the triennium. On each occasion, a full review was had of the activities of the Council, in line with the responsibilities assigned by the Commission, and of the individual activities of its members, through which, to a great extent, the Council maintains co-operation with Orthodox Churches across the nation and around the world.

The increasing strength of the Orthodox Churches in the United States has been reflected in the work of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas, which is becoming increasingly strong and influential. There is no doubt but that this

development in co-operation and consolidation among the Orthodox Churches presages for the Council a more responsible and demanding role as it seeks new ways of co-operation between the Episcopal Church and the Eastern Churches in the United States, thus enriching the life of this Church. The Council notes, also, that the current ecumenical interest, common to all parts of Christianity, has led to a greater participation of the Orthodox Church in the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. A series of consultations between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholics has begun and an Ecumenical Committee has been formed, under the authority of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas: The Council calls attention to the increasing use of English in the services of many jurisdictions.

During the triennium, the Council's series of Orthodox-Anglican consultations was continued, two per year, with an emphasis on co-operation at the practical level. A paper was produced for the guidance of the clergy, entitled, "Interim Guide-lines for Anglican-Orthodox Relationships", drafted at the Orthodox-Anglican Consultation held at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, September 28, 1965. This document (*Annex A*), in a form slightly amended and approved by the Standing Conference, was received by the House of Bishops in October, 1966 and ordered distributed to members of the House. It is expected that it will become the norm of procedure and that it will help in avoiding situations which might prove offensive. The Standing Conference has published a brochure on ecumenical practices which elaborates on the guide-lines.

At the Consultation held at St. Vladimir's Seminary, Tuckahoe, N. Y., May 27, 1966, there was a full discussion of the role of the Episcopal Church in the Consultation on Church Union, and of the unity proposals under study as between the United Church and the Anglican Church of Canada, with the hope of allaying the fears of the Orthodox, who share the hesitation of the Old Catholics and the Polish National Catholics about this Church's entering into any plan which is merely North American, because they feel it may veer away from traditional Church concepts.

International Conversations

The Joint Commission has received with interest the Report of the Inter-Orthodox Theological Commission for Dialogue with Anglicans, which met at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, September 1-15, 1966. In accordance with a decision of the Third Pan-Orthodox Conference (Rhodes, 1964), that Commission is preparing for

the resumption of Orthodox-Anglican Conversations, such as were last held on a Pan-Orthodox and Pan-Anglican basis at Lambeth in 1931, and which will now be made even more significant by the participation of the Patriarchate of Moscow. The Commission's Resolution divides the topics involved into those on which various Orthodox-Anglican Conferences have arrived at agreed statements (e.g. Rumania, 1935), those on which the Orthodox Churches corporately should now come to a common mind, and others on which discussion should be carried further or begun. Some of these last seem to mark a movement away from more technical questions to questions raised by more recent developments in the ecumenical dialogue. (*Full text of the Resolution in Annex B.*)

One of the Council's major aims in the Consultations has been to supply material for the forthcoming Pan-Anglican/Pan-Orthodox Joint Commission. Here, our experiences in North America will prove useful, because the American situation, where Anglicans live side by side with a thousand Orthodox parishes, is not paralleled in Europe.

The Council notes with pleasure that during the triennium the Armenian Church has grown in health and strength and in stable leadership, with the building of several new churches; there is an Armenian Cathedral complex that will soon be completed in New York City. The Council also maintains contact with the North American Diocese of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch (Jacobite) and with the Church of the East and of the Assyrians.

Directory of Parishes and Clergy

The Council on Eastern Churches has carried on an active program of co-operation with the Eastern Churches, administering the use of 15% of the Good Friday Offering, primarily in regular grants to St. Sergius' Orthodox Theological Institute and related undertakings in Paris. Program items also include emergency grants to certain needy students in Orthodox seminaries; travel grants for professors of Halki Seminary (Istanbul); publication of the Symposium, *Orthodox Thought* (in French), by professors of St. Sergius'; and the publication of two issues of the *Directory of Eastern Parishes and Clergy in North America*. The Directory goes to all Episcopal Bishops, to all Orthodox Patriarchs abroad, and to all Orthodox Bishops in North America. It is sold to many interested institutions and persons. It is the only Directory which lists all of the authentic Orthodox and Ancient Eastern Churches in the U.S.A., those in communion with the See of Constantinople, the non-Chalcedonian Churches, and the modern *diaspora*.

2. Relations with the Roman Catholic Church

Through its Committee on Relations with the Roman Catholic Church, the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations has had three official consultations with delegates of that Church, the first of their kind in history. A planned fourth consultation will be held too late for coverage in this Report. The first meeting was held on June 22, 1965, in Washington, D.C.; the second in Kansas City, Missouri, February 2-4, 1966; and the third in Providence, Rhode Island, October 10-12, 1966. The fourth meeting is scheduled for May 24-26, 1967, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Delegates attending the Washington meeting were quickly caught up in a warm, cordial atmosphere; the lack of tension was specifically noted at the meeting before the day was over. Because of the ease and honesty of the atmosphere, it was possible quickly to get to major issues.

Agreement on Baptism

The subject of Baptism was raised, and an already-existing theological consensus became immediately evident. Representatives of the Episcopal Church stated that the conditional baptism of Episcopalians by the Roman Catholic Church was an irritant in relations between the two Churches. The Roman Catholics present assented at once to the theological inconsistency of such actions by Roman Catholic clergymen and pointed out that Roman Catholic theory and practice have frequently diverged on this point. The need to improve communications both within and between Churches is most obvious in instances such as this. Evidently, there are some Episcopal Bishops who, when receiving Roman Catholics into the Episcopal Church, conditionally confirm them. The impropriety of that practice was also quickly acknowledged by all.

Another irritant in relations between the two Churches is the present Roman Catholic requirements about mixed marriages. A report from the meeting was sent to the Secretariat for Christian Unity in Rome stating Anglican objections to current Roman Catholic regulations.

Eucharist and Unity

The second meeting was of longer duration than the first, so that the delegates could get to know one another better as persons. The first full day of the consultation opened with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist at Grace and Holy Trinity Episcopal Cathedral. Bishop Welles was the celebrant, and all the consultants attended,

although only the Episcopalians received the Sacrament. Two papers with one title, "The Eucharist, Sign and Cause of Unity: the Church as a Eucharistic Fellowship", were read by the Rev. Bernard J. Cooke, S.J., and the Rev. Dr. Arthur A. Vogel.

Fr. Cooke approached the subject from a biblical and patristic point of view. The role of the Bishop in the Eucharistic community, although not clear in the New Testament Church, was recognized as a complicating factor in present Roman-Catholic/Anglican eucharistic relations. Noting that "the Baptism of any Christian involves a right to Eucharistic fulfillment", and that "we cannot expect Christian unity to take place apart from the influence of the Eucharist", Fr. Cooke asked, "Why cannot we, in the private and controlled situation that is ours in this conference, celebrate together the Eucharist? If we can, such common celebration will help immeasurably in establishing the consensus of faith we seek. If we cannot, let us delineate the precise barriers that exist—these barriers it would seem to me would tell us rather definitely the agenda that lies before us in future meetings."

The Rev. Dr. Vogel approached the Eucharist from a biblical-contemporary point of view. He contended that many of the most recent insights of the human sciences enlighten and deepen biblical insights. Presupposing that there is actually in existence a community of faith unified by the Sacrament of Baptism and the baptismal creed, Dr. Vogel asked, "If the nature of the Eucharist, the fact of Christ's presence in it, and the means of effecting that presence, can be essentially agreed upon by members of the Mystical Body, might not their common reception at the Table of the Lord—with the selflessness such participation involves—be the primary means by which God wills to bring about ever-increasing unity among his people? God's Food is the means of growth in unity: 'Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf.' (*I Corinthians* 10:17)." Nevertheless, the consultation as a whole concluded that it could not take such a step on its own.

On the evening of the second day a group of Roman Catholic and Episcopal pastors joined the consultants for dinner. The guests had been meeting together in Kansas City for a two-year period, with discussions centering primarily upon the theological and pastoral problems of mixed marriages. Their findings were gratefully received, and, after examination and discussion, forwarded to appropriate agencies in Rome and Canterbury.

The last day of the consultation began with a con-celebrated Eucharist conducted by the Roman Catholic clergy at the Roman Catholic Cathedral. The Episcopal delegates were seated in the sanctuary for this service and received the kiss of peace, but did

not, of course, receive Holy Communion. In its final session, the consultation decided to keep, as much as possible, the context of the Eucharist for all of its succeeding topics. The delegates decided to designate the consultations by the initials ARC—standing for Anglican, Roman Catholic.

Minister of Eucharist

The third meeting of the consultation followed the previously-agreed-upon form, with a celebration of the Holy Eucharist each day. For the first time, however, a representative of the National Council of Churches, the Rev. W. Jackson Jarman, acted as an observer.

The Rev. George H. Tavard, A. A., presented a paper entitled, "The Functions of the Minister in the Eucharistic Celebration". The Rev. Dr. William J. Wolf presented a paper entitled, "The Minister of the Eucharist".

Fr. Tavard considered the role of the priest in the Eucharistic celebration from the points of view of an initiator into the mystery of Christ's passion, a preacher of the Gospel, a teacher of the Word, and the president of an eschatological meal. The Rev. Dr. Wolf pointed out that the minister of the Eucharist has a three-fold representation: he represents Christ, the apostolic ministry (now continued especially in the historic episcopate), and the congregation. Dr. Wolf went on to say that there is also a sense in which the layman is a co-offerer and co-minister in the celebration.

Fr. Tavard's paper concluded by asking specific questions of the Anglican Communion. His primary concern was, whether or not the Anglican Church taught "the traditional Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist and the Sacrament of Orders". While he acknowledged that the Anglican Church has always defended episcopal polity, he wondered if it has defended "equally well the sacramental concept of the priesthood".

Most of the discussion centered around Fr. Tavard's questions, and, in the course of the two days, he was thanked a number of times by the Episcopalians for his frankness.

Episcopalians tried to explain the relation of Morning Prayer to the Holy Eucharist in this Church and the relation of the Ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer (the "Form for Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons") to the Articles of Religion. It was pointed out that the Articles do not have the status of the Ordinal in the Anglican Church and that, throughout the Book of Common Prayer, the role of a "priest" is consistently distinguished from that of a "minister".

On the evening of October 11, members of the Episcopal and Roman Catholic diocesan ecumenical commissions of Rhode Island joined the national Commission members for dinner and discussion. Members of the national Commission were gratified to learn how far relations have progressed at the local level in Rhode Island and each group was able to ask specific questions of the other.

At the time of the next consultation, in Milwaukee, a consensus statement on the Eucharist, representing the mind of the consultation members, will be written. The co-chairmen of the two delegations, Bishop Helmsing and Bishop Hallock, will make short introductory presentations, based on the Eucharistic statements of Vatican II, the first Anglican Congress, and the Lambeth Conference of 1958.

International Relationships

The Committee took note also of the wider Anglican/Roman-Catholic relationships—of the visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Pope Paul and the developments which have resulted from it; the establishment, especially, of the Anglican Center in Rome, with its considerable library of Anglican historical and theological works; and the joint appointment by the Archbishop and the Pope of a world-wide Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission, which had its first meeting in January, 1967.

It is a source of much satisfaction that the Episcopal Church has been able to give considerable financial support to the Anglican Center and that the Rev. Professor Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., has been appointed as one of the Anglican members of the above-named Commission. Attention is also called to the Interim Guidelines for Relations with the Roman Catholic Church, produced by the Joint Commission (*Annex C*).

3. Consultation on Church Union

The Episcopal Church has continued to participate fully in the Consultation on Church Union during the past triennium.* Three more plenary meetings have been held—in Lexington, Kentucky, in 1965; in Dallas, Texas, in 1966; and in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1967 (the last-named having been held too recently to be included in this Report). Four Churches, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S., the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, have joined the Consultation during the same

* As authorized by General Convention, 1961.

period, bringing the total of participating bodies to ten.** The Forward Movement has published two books which have been very helpful in communicating the work of the Consultation, at this stage to the constituencies of the Churches: *COCU* (which presents the reports of the first four meetings), and *Principles of Church Union* (the report of the Dallas meeting).

Principles of Church Union

Principles of Church Union, which is by reference made a part of this Report (see *Annex D*), undoubtedly represents the most significant achievement of the Consultation thus far. The "principles" consist of a Preamble and four chapters, dealing, respectively, with the Church's Faith, Worship, Sacraments, and Ministry, all carefully studied by the Consultation at Dallas and approved "for transmission to the constituencies of the participating churches for study and comment". Study has indeed begun; and the Joint Commission wants, even at this early date, to express appreciation for the comments that have been received. As the Consultation continues its work, it will be essential that its members be guided and supported by the informed judgment of the Churches they represent. The Commission is, therefore, asking this General Convention to provide for thorough and systematic study in every Diocese. But the Commission is grateful for what has already been undertaken in this regard, and the help many have already given.

Such study will make plain the notable and unexpected degree of common affirmation even now possible to the delegates of the Churches in the Consultation. The ten Churches represent a broad spectrum of Christian traditions unprecedented in modern ecumenical unity discussions. To some, the recitation of a creed is customary practice; to others, creeds are almost unknown. In one Church, formal liturgical worship is the norm; in another, it hardly exists.

** The Churches now participating in the Consultation are the following:

The original four Churches

- The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
- The Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.
- The Methodist Church
- The United Church of Christ

Added at the second meeting (1963)

- The International Convention of Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ)
- The Evangelical United Brethren Church

Added at the fifth meeting (1966)

- The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
- The African Methodist Episcopal Church

Added since the fifth meeting

- The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
- The Christian Methodist Episcopal Church

Infant Baptism presents no problem to some, while it seems utterly anomalous to others. Bishops are seen in widely different lights in different Churches. "Priesthood" is a commonplace word on some lips, and, on others, a word to be used only with the greatest gentleness, to describe him who is the universal priest. So it goes, in every sensitive area of the Church's life.

Noteworthy Agreements

Against this background, it is remarkable that the Consultation was able to make the unitive and fundamental affirmations to be found in *Principles*. A few are quoted, to illustrate this point.

- About the Holy Communion, the Consultation says, "The action of the Church in the eucharistic celebration is at once an act of remembrance, an act of present communion, an act of proclamation of God's redemption in Christ for all men, and an act of hope anticipating the future consummation. . . . The past is remembered, recalled as past events, but also remembered by the way of being re-presented in the present as now operative and powerful. . . . In the Lord's Supper, symbols and symbolic actions are used. However, the Eucharist is an effective sign; the action of the Church becomes the effective means whereby God in Christ acts and Christ is present with his people" (pages 41-42).*

- The Apostles Creed, it is affirmed, is "one of the cardinal embodiments of classical Christian faith" and "the united church will use this confession as a corporate act of praise and allegiance which binds it to the apostolic gospel and to the faith of the one Church in all centuries and continents". Again, "Still another ancient symbol, the Nicene Creed, will be used by the united church in its duties as guardian of the truth of the Gospel" (page 23).

- Presbyters "are appointed particularly to preach the Word, celebrate the Sacraments, conduct the worship of the congregation, lead the congregation in its obedience to mission, watch over the flock of Christ, teach the faith, administer the Church's discipline in the name of the congregation, take their rightful place in the Church's government, set an example in their personal life of the standards expected of every Christian, bear in their prayers the congregation, the Church, and the world, and prepare themselves through prayer and study for their ministry, as circumstances allow" (page 51).

* Page numbers in this and the three following sections refer to that edition of *Principles of Church Union* published as a "Miniature Book" by Forward Movement Publications in 1966, which is, by reference, an integral part of this Report.

- In ordination, “the historic episcopate commends itself as personifying the continuity of churchly authority. In the united church the historic episcopate, constitutionally defined, will serve, in union with other appropriate agents, in authorizing the ministry of Word and Sacrament.” (page 48)
- As to Baptism, the Consultation agrees that it is “a decisive work of God leading to continuing life in God. We are baptized but once.” (page 38)
- Of worship, it is affirmed that “The forms and practices of worship are of decisive importance with respect to the Church’s unity, its faithfulness to the divine initiative in revelation, and its steadfast witness to God in word and deed. They express, guard, and transmit the Church’s faith . . .” (page 30).

Unsettled Problems

Such citations illustrate what we call “a notable and unexpected degree of common affirmation”; and this unanimity is a fact of great importance. It is also a fact that many areas of importance in the life of the Church have not yet been explored by the Consultation. Confirmation, although mentioned in connection with Baptism (page 40 *et al*), has not yet been considered by the Consultation, nor has there been discussion of Matrimony, Absolution, or Unction, among the Church’s sacramental rites. There is mention of “a corporate act in which and through which all would offer our existing ministries to Almighty God, asking him to receive our offering through Jesus Christ, to complete and perfect what is amiss or incomplete in our ministries and to give us whatever of his authority and grace we need to serve in the united ministry” (page 47); but, beyond that, no attempt has so far been made to set forth the way in which the ministry of the Church would be reconciled and united. A draft chapter dealing with a possible structure for a united Church was not adopted at Dallas, since it had not been widely discussed, and was circulated with the *Principles* only to elicit such discussion.

So, one could continue to list the many areas not yet explored. So, might also be mentioned the areas of agreement which seem to the Commission to call for extensive, further, discussion. What is to be the “statement of the meaning and structure of ministry” which will make possible a united ministry “representing the whole household of faith” (page 47)? What is the meaning of “office” as applied to the Orders of the Ministry (page 48 *et al*)? What participation by unbaptized persons is “appropriate” in the Church (page 20)? How is the Nicene Creed to be “used by the united Church in its duties as guardian of the truth of the gospel” (page 23)?

How are forms of worship to be chosen "by the united church as a whole" (page 31)? Such examples illustrate the extent of the dialogue still on the Consultation's agenda.

Union Before "Merger"

To this may be added another, and crucial, area of discussion—that of "intensive study of the central necessities of the Church's life in mission and ministry, and agreement about them", which will be required before the first great steps in union can be taken (page 83). The Consultation, in the critically important time-schedule approved at Dallas, agreed that the first goal of the journey toward a United Church should not be a final, detailed constitution, but an agreement on essentials adequate to permit the unifying of ministry and membership and the establishment of a "provisional council" through which the Churches could plan all their future work together. The final step of constitution-writing might well be deferred for a generation or more, if, in the meantime, the separate Churches could share in full communion with one another and do all their planning as one. Indeed, the final constitution would be all the richer and wiser for the mutual knowledge and confidence which would be given in the intermediate years of unity amid diversity. But, if this first step of unification is to be possible, "there must be no uncertainty in anyone's mind about the faith and order of the united church" (page 83). The exploration of this area again still lies ahead of the Consultation.

Status of "Principles"

Thus, it should be clear that *Principles of Church Union* is not a "plan", nor even a complete outline of essential elements needed for a plan; certainly not a constitution. To read those chapters expecting to find what is not in them, indeed what they were not intended to supply, is to miss the point of them altogether. The Preamble and the four chapters are the high-water mark of agreement already reached in the six years of the Consultation's history. As such, they seem to the Commission to give assurance that the essential concerns of the Episcopal Church (as measured by the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral) are being fairly represented and respected, that the dialogue of the Consultation is trustworthy and productive, that the ground so far cleared gives hope for the future, that the obstacles so far exposed are not more than a proper challenge to Christian ecumenical thought, and that the goal before the consulting Churches is clearly not a Protestant super-Church, but nothing less than the visible unity of the one Church of Christ. "The

separate churches desire not merely to form a new and larger denomination, but to embark upon a pilgrimage whose only ultimate goal can be the unity of the whole Body" (page 17).

Because the goal of the Consultation is so great, the dialogue must be painstaking, often slow, patient, eager to learn, and earnest in keeping every door open for going out to Christian Churches in the common search. Because the goal is so great, the Consultation must be vigilant to distinguish the essentials from the non-essentials, to guard every opportunity for mutual enrichment, and to turn aside from anything that would leave the Churches, together, with less than they have now separately. What has been most clearly tested, thus far, is the procedure—the very possibility itself—of so wide a dialogue. The consultants are confident that it is a viable and productive way, that the first steps that have been taken have been significant and in the right direction, and that, as the Consultation comes nearer to a time when we can begin to think together about a plan, there is assurance that in this pilgrimage there is hope of reaching the goal of a unity, richer than can be known by any of the separate Churches in isolation, and which can be true and deep enough to include every fellow Christian.

The Process of Dialogue

The Commission's support of the Consultation, and the recommendations with regard to it, therefore, arise not from any exaggerated claims as to what *Principles of Church Union* represents, but rather from deep gratitude for what the dialogue has so far accomplished and an equally deep confidence in the process of the dialogue itself. The Commission believes that the agreements so far reached should be commended as a significant advance toward Christian unity, that they should be given systematic and responsible study, and that this Church's participation in the Consultation should continue, looking toward the development, when such development is possible, of a plan of union that could then be brought to the constituent Churches for their consideration. To ask more than this would be to go beyond the point the Consultation itself has reached. To ask less than this would be, the Commission believes, faithless to what God has already led the Consultation to find.

Unity Is Indivisible

Finally, the Commission reminds itself and the Church that the Consultation is this Church's way of engaging in the same pilgrimage toward unity in which every Church of the Anglican Communion is involved. Many of them are further ahead than is the

Episcopal Church; for example, in Nigeria, Ceylon, England, and India, developed plans for united Churches are already in existence. But the fact of this ecumenical engagement throughout the Anglican Communion makes it important that the closest possible communication be maintained among the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the Wider Episcopal Fellowship. Discussion at a Lambeth Conference is, no doubt, an element in this. But the steady flow of information and the steady exchange of experience is an even more essential ingredient, if worldwide unity is to keep pace with national and regional ecumenical action.

Equally, is it important that all phases of this Church's ecumenical engagement be kept within a single frame of reference. Nothing has so strengthened and invigorated this Church's participation in the ecumenical movement, during the triennium, as the fact that, in the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, are brought together all who are engaged on the major frontier of ecumenism—with the Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, as well as with the Churches in the Consultation and the National Council. Fuller reference to this new phase of the Commission's life is found elsewhere in this Report; but it must be said that this Church's participation in the Consultation on Church Union has reflected the new inner unity most happily.

4. Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches

During the 1961-1964 triennium, an informal committee appointed by Bishop Lichtenberger held a series of discussions with the Executive Presbyters of the Assemblies of God, the largest of the Pentecostal Churches in the United States. The discussion centered around the spirituality of the two Churches, the one emphasizing the sacramental life and the continuity of the Church through the ages, the other emphasizing the immediacy of spiritual experience and the rediscovery of the New Testament *charismata* (gifts of the Spirit), particularly "speaking with tongues".

A strong sense of deeper understanding was the result of the discussions, with a genuine recognition by representatives of each Church that the Holy Spirit was at work in a form of Church life that was unfamiliar to the other.

During the present triennium, there have been no further meetings, but Bishop Welles, Chairman of the Committee on Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches, has maintained warm and friendly contact. On one occasion, he visited Central Bible College in Springfield, Missouri, taught a class, and preached in the college chapel. Afterwards, the student paper of the college noted that the

Ecumenical Movement had touched Pentecostals, too—a bold statement in a denomination that has regarded ecumenism as a sign of loss of faith.

Plans are being made to continue and intensify such contacts, and to open them with other Churches of the conservative-evangelical type. Union is undoubtedly far in the future, but opportunities for increased understanding and cross-fertilization exist and should be used.

5. World and National Councils of Churches

One of the major tasks of the Commission during the past triennium has been the selection and nomination of Episcopal delegates for various ecumenical gatherings. The strong emphasis on broad representation from all domestic Provinces of the Episcopal Church in the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, required by the 1964 General Convention, led to excellent results in the 1966 General Assembly of the National Council. A well-balanced group, including many able clergymen and lay people who had not previously served, played an active part in the life of the Assembly. The Episcopal Church was adequately represented in all phases of the Council's work during the past triennium with more than 200 Episcopalians serving faithfully on committees and commissions.

Other important meetings for which delegations were approved, as Episcopalians in good standing, or selected and nominated to the Presiding Bishop and Executive Council, were the World Conference on Church and Society, held in Geneva, Switzerland in the Summer of 1966; the World-Order Study Conference; the North American Conference on the Laity; the United States Conference on Church and Society; and, most recently, the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, to be held in Uppsala, Sweden, 1968, to which eleven delegates have been named (*see Annex E*).

The Episcopal Church continues to carry its fair share of the expenses of the World Council and some 60% of its share of the expenses of the National Council. It will be recommended in this Report that this Church's contribution to the National Council be increased during the next triennium.

Since many Episcopalians are involved in ecumenical meetings of one kind or another all over the world, an attempt has been made to list the important ones (*see Annex E*). However, it has been impossible to list all of the innumerable ecumenical gatherings where Episcopalians have been officially present.

6. Jewish-Christian Dialogue

The General Convention of 1964 adopted a Resolution dealing with "Deicide and the Jews." Two paragraphs of that Resolution read as follows:

Resolved, . . . That the General Convention condemn unchristian accusations against the Jews; and that this Church seek positive dialogue with appropriate representative bodies of the Jewish Faith; and be it further

Resolved, . . . That the substance of this Resolution be referred to the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations for continuing study and suggested implementation.

A Committee of the Commission was appointed, with the Rev. Dr. Butler as Chairman, together with Mrs. Sherman Johnson and Dr. Peter Day. Subsequently, the Bishop of Long Island was co-opted. The Committee established contact at once with the Synagogue Council of America, which is the co-ordinating arm of the Jewish religious community, comprising the three rabbinic and three congregational bodies, and representing the Reform, Orthodox, and Conservative branches of Judaism.

After many meetings, it was decided to hold a conference under the mutual sponsorship of the Synagogue Council of America and the Episcopal Church's Committee on Jewish-Christian Dialogue. Because of varying viewpoints within the Jewish Faith Community, it was necessary to choose a subject which would be non-theological in nature.

On March 5 and 6, 1967, at the Community House of Temple Emanu-El, New York City, the first of three hoped-for conferences with the Jewish Community on the subject, "The Family: Tradition and Transition", was held. The New York Conference was an almost unqualified success, and represented a real break-through. It is hoped to have similar conferences on the same subject in the near future—one, perhaps, in Chicago, and one in San Francisco.

7. Theological Concerns

A major theological concern dealt with during the past triennium was the referral from the House of Bishops of a Resolution on Admission to Communion.

A Resolution on Admission to Communion, welcoming to the altars of the Episcopal Church all baptized members of other Churches entitled to receive the Sacrament in their own Churches, was adopted by the House of Bishops at the 1964 General Convention. The House of Deputies, however, substituted for the Bishops' Resolution one which referred the subject, with related matters, to

the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations for study and report to the 1967 General Convention. The House of Bishops did not concur with the substitute, reconsidered their action of non-concurrence, and again did not concur. Then the House of Bishops adopted a Resolution of that House alone to "refer the subject matter of the House's original Message" to the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.

On recommendation of its Theological Committee, the Joint Commission adopted a *Statement on Communion Discipline* as its reply to the House of Bishops (*Annex F*).

8. The Wider Episcopal Fellowship

The Wider Episcopal Fellowship comprises fifteen Churches "possessing the historic episcopate, with which Churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion are in full communion or in a relation of inter-communion". They are listed in the *Episcopal Church Annual 1967*, page 231.

Philippine Church

While the degree of relationship naturally varies according to circumstances; its closest current expression is perhaps the full communion and close working partnership that exists between the Episcopal Church and the *Philippine Independent Church*. Seminarians of both Churches are trained at St. Andrew's, Manila, and a Joint Council plans and administers much of the educational work and much of the new work of both Churches. The Philippine Independent Church, under the able and farsighted leadership of its Supreme Bishop, Isabelo de los Reyes, is growing rapidly in its sense of stewardship and missionary outreach; its new cathedral center is being built in Manila to replace the one destroyed in the war, and the funds have been raised largely by its own members. In October, 1965, Bishop de los Reyes, accompanied by Bishop Scaife, representing the Joint Commission's Committee on the Wider Episcopal Fellowship, visited the Old Catholic Congress at Vienna, at which the Old Catholic Bishops ratified an agreement of full communion between the Philippine Independent Church and the Old Catholic Communion. The Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church and others have made official visits to the Philippine Church during the triennium and Bishop de los Reyes has close ties with the Episcopal Church. It is fitting to record great gratitude to the Missionary Bishop of the Philippines, the Rt. Rev. Lyman C. Ogilby, as he concludes his years of wise leadership in the tradition of Bishops Brent, Mosher, and Binsted.

Spain and Portugal

In Europe, the *Spanish Reformed Church* suffered grievous loss in the death of its Bishop and notable leader, the Rt. Rev. Santos M. Molina, a man of steadfast courage and wisdom. The Very Rev. Ramon Taibo has been elected as Bishop Molina's successor and the consecration is planned for the Spring of 1967. It is hoped that the government's continuing restrictions on religious liberty will be so modified that this Church can live and grow without crippling obstructions.

The *Lusitanian Church (of Portugal)* not only continues its witness to the Reformed Catholic Faith under its Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Luis C. R. Pereira, but is now, also, entering into a new and significant relationship by the election of one of its leading priests, the Rev. Daniel Cabral, as assistant bishop of the (Anglican) Diocese of Lebombo, of the Church of the Province of South Africa. This step taken by the South African Church establishes an overseas ecumenical link that illustrates the richness of the Wider Episcopal Fellowship, and opens new horizons of overseas mission to both Lusitanian and Anglican Churchmen.

Old Catholics in Europe and U.S.A.

The *Old Catholic Churches* of Holland, Germany, and Switzerland, sent a distinguished delegation of Bishops, priests, and laymen, to a conference at Oxford in July, 1966. Representatives of Anglican Churches from the British Isles, the United States, and Africa, shared fully in their several liturgies and also explained their many-sided ecumenical activities to one another.

Of special significance was the service held at St. Gertrude's Old Catholic Cathedral in Utrecht, November 7, 1966, when Archbishop Rinkel of Utrecht and Roman Catholic Cardinal Alfrink, together with other dignitaries and lay people of both Old Catholic and Roman Catholic Churches, joined in an ecumenical service of praise and thanksgiving. Regrettably, the service was widely and erroneously reported as having been a con-celebration of the Eucharist. A joint commission for official and continuing dialogue between the two Churches is now functioning with Vatican approval.

The *Polish National Catholic Church* in the United States continues to have a cordial relationship with the Episcopal Church, both on parochial and diocesan levels. A conference of leaders from both Churches is planned for 1967, at which shared worship at the Eucharist and common counsel may, it is hoped, open new ways in which both Churches can be of greater service to one another.

Working Together

Over and beyond the growing web of official relationships within the Fellowship, there is an increasing sharing of human and financial resources. For instance, the Episcopal Church supports appointed Missionaries in the Church of South India, the Lusitanian Church, and the Philippine Independent Church; it also aids the Spanish Reformed Church and other Old Catholic Churches in Europe. On the other hand, European Old Catholics support Anglican work in South Africa, and the Philippine Independent Church has some of its priests working in Borneo. This steadily widening pattern of relationships illustrates the meaning of "The Wider Episcopal Fellowship" as a vivid expression of the unity and interdependence of a sizable part of Christ's Body.

Schism in Kerala

At the request of the Joint Commission, the Rev. Dr. Butler visited the *Church of South India* in late February, 1967, to take fraternal greetings and to inquire concerning the schism in the Diocese of Madhya Kerala. He talked with leaders of the Anglican Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, as well as with key persons in the Church of South India. There is general agreement that a Commission of the latter Church, especially appointed to study the matter, has written a valuable and objective account of the unhappy schism.

The defection involves only one priest (a certain Mr. Stephen who was consecrated Bishop in 1966 by the Rev. James P. Dees, formerly of the Diocese of North Carolina, and now self-styled "Presiding Bishop of the Anglican Orthodox Church"). Dees' own consecration is irregular,* as is his consecration of Mr. Stephen.

The schism is wholly in the lay order. It involves a group variously estimated as numbering between two and ten thousand disaffected members of the "Backward Classes" who have found life insupportable in the Church of South India because of the continued discrimination they must face from the more highly educated Syrian castes in the Diocese. The entire schism is "non-theological" in nature, and is taking place in an area that is wholly Anglican. Kerala was a monochrome Church Missionary Society Anglican Diocese before the formation of CSI, and has remained so since the union.

It is regrettable in the extreme that such social, economic, and educational problems could not have been solved within the context of the united Church. The schism cannot be justified, but it was

* His consecrators have not been traced to any Bishops known to be in the historic episcopate.

the result of long-standing discrimination and unbrotherly actions, condoned in practice, though deplored in principle.

For a present indication of the strengths and weaknesses of the Church of South India, perhaps required reading should be *Unity is Not Enough* by the Rev. Mark Gibbard, SSJE.

9. The West Indies

The work of the Joint Commission touched another Province of the Anglican Communion when, in April, 1966, Bishop Mills of the Missionary District of the Virgin Islands was invited to attend formal unity discussions between the Methodist Church and the Anglican Church in the Province of the West Indies. The Rev. Dr. Arthur A. Vogel was also invited to the discussions, held in Jamaica, as a theological consultant, and has been asked to continue in that capacity by Bishop Vaughan of Mandeville. The Rev. Dr. Vogel has received additional requests to speak about Church Unity throughout the Province of the West Indies. Anglicans and Methodists are preparing for their fourth consultation as this Report goes to press. In addition to this activity, Bishop Gibson was asked by Bishop Mills to represent the Joint Commission at a special conference between the Episcopal and Moravian Churches, held in the Virgin Islands during February, 1967.

10. Ecumenical Relations of the Executive Council

The Joint Commission maintains liaison with the Executive Council through the latter's Committee on Ecumenical Relations. The chairman of the Commission, usually represented by the chairman of its Committee on Councils of Churches, the Secretary, and the Ecumenical Officer, serve on both bodies.

The Executive Council carries the main load of program-relationships with other Churches through the National Council of Churches and through an ever-increasing network of Church-to-Church co-operative activities. On nomination of the Presiding Bishop and the Joint Commission, it elects this Church's delegations to the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches, as well as to such major conferences as the World-Order Study Conference of 1965 and the North American Conference on the Laity of 1966.

Improvement of communication with Dioceses and parishes has taken place over the triennium as the result of the appointment of Mr. Carroll Greene as Assistant Ecumenical Officer and the appointment of diocesan representatives, committees, and commis-

sions. Two representatives from each Diocese are invited to a meeting once a year for information, training, and inspiration. The resumption of publication of the *Ecumenical Bulletin* is once again furnishing a channel for communication of ecumenical information to Dioceses and parishes.

The Executive Council, through its Departments and General Divisions, has played an important part in making the Commission's work in the Consultation on Church Union known to the clergy and laity of the Church.

11. Inter-Anglican Relations

Inter-Anglican relations are undergoing extensive development, particularly under the impact of the movement for Mutual Responsibility and Inter-dependence in the Body of Christ. The Lambeth Conference of Bishops, and the Anglican Congress (with representation of Bishops, priests, and laymen), have become vital features of Anglican life. Most inter-Anglican consultation and mutual planning is co-ordinated in a body—usually identified simply as “the Metropolitans”—which acts both as the Lambeth Consultative Body and the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy. The Episcopal Church is represented in this group by the Presiding Bishop and the Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr. The Church of England and the Australian and Canadian Churches are also represented by two Bishops or Metropolitans. Other Anglican Provinces and Councils have one episcopal representative. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the chairman and presides at the biennial meetings, the last of which was held in Jerusalem in 1966. The agenda for the meetings is largely prepared by the Anglican Executive Officer, the Rt. Rev. Ralph S. Dean, Bishop of Cariboo.

Within the Episcopal Church, there is scarcely any activity which is not involved in deepening inter-Anglican relationships. Under the stimulus of Mutual Responsibility, new channels have been opened in most parts of the world, ranging from projects and Companion-Diocese relationships to the Forward Movement's important devotional manual, *Our Response to God—Far and Near*; from the co-ordinating activities of “consultants” in liturgical or ecumenical affairs to the establishment of an Anglican Council in Europe.

No single Commission could possibly take cognizance of so wide a variety of relationships. Since the responsibility of the Presiding Bishop's Advisory Committee on Anglican Relations was transferred to this Commission, attention has been mainly directed to the co-ordination of ecumenical activities, unity negotiations, and the like, with the parallel agencies in other Anglican Churches, leaving

to the Executive Council and other bodies directly concerned the multitude of other channels and activities.

Some important Anglican ecumenical developments may be noted as follows:

- An Inter-Anglican Committee was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to hold unity discussions with an Eastern Orthodox Committee appointed by the Ecumenical Patriarch. Similar committees have been appointed for discussions on an international level between Anglicans and Roman Catholics.
- Representation of Anglican observers at the Vatican Council was a project of the Anglican Communion as a whole.
- A conference was held at Oxford, England, in the Summer of 1966, between Anglicans and Old Catholics, to exchange information on ecumenical developments in their respective Churches.
- Annual meetings have been held of representatives of the Anglican Church of Canada and the Episcopal Church, to discuss and take counsel together on ecumenical matters.
- In January, 1966, Bishop Gibson and Dr. Day attended as observers a meeting in Edinburgh, Scotland, of representatives of the Church of England, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, the Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of England.
- There is a steady flow of information between and among Anglican Provinces, principally routed through the office of Bishop Dean, including copies of reports and documents concerning Anglican unity discussions and other ecumenical matters. Unity consultations are in progress in most Anglican Provinces.

SUMMARY

It is quite obvious from this triennial Report, along with the Resolutions and Annexes, that the work of the Joint Commission has embraced comprehensively all areas of the responsibilities formerly held by three separate Joint Commissions. Those who have been involved over the triennium in the work of this Joint Commission believe that the merger brought about an effective integration and co-ordination of all the Episcopal Church's concerns and responsibilities in these several areas, a more efficient handling of the ever-enlarging work of ecumenical relations, and a more balanced response to the many imperatives of Church unity.

Because of this experience, and because the Commission has continuing responsibilities which are difficult to carry out if it must be reconstituted at each General Convention, the Commission is requesting that it be made a Standing Commission on the pattern of the Standing Liturgical Commission and the Joint Commission on Education for Holy Orders.

The Joint Committee submits, as a summary of its intent in all it does, the New Delhi statement approved by General Convention, 1964, and commended to the Church for use in ecumenical study and dialogue. That Statement reads,

We believe that the unity which is both God's will and his gift to his Church is being made visible as all in each place who are baptized into Jesus Christ and confess him as Lord and Saviour are brought by the Holy Spirit into one fully committed fellowship, holding the one Apostolic Faith, preaching the one gospel, breaking the one bread, joining in common prayer, and having a corporate life reaching out to witness and service to all; and who at the same time are united with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and members are accepted by all and that all can act and speak together as occasion requires for the tasks to which God calls his people.

It is for such unity that we believe we must pray and work.

RESOLUTIONS

To implement this Report, the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations offers the following Resolutions:

1. Continuing the Commission

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That a new Canon, to be known as Canon 8, be adopted as follows:

CANON 8**Of Ecumenical Relations**

Sec. 1 (a). There shall be a Standing Joint Commission of the General Convention on Ecumenical Relations. It shall be charged with initiating, conducting, and reviewing, relationships with other Christian bodies and inter-Church organizations and making recommendations to the General Convention thereon, with a view to the development of a comprehensive and co-ordinated policy and strategy on inter-Church co-operation and Church unity.

(b). In harmony with the formularies and canons of this Church, the Commission shall conduct discussions with representatives of other Churches, separately or in ecumenical gatherings, on questions of Faith and Order, theology, Church law, tradition, and worship, and other matters of common concern.

(c). The Commission shall, from time to time, nominate to the Executive Council representatives of this Church to serve on the Assembly of the World Council of Churches, on the General Assembly and General Board of the National Council of Churches, and in such other national or international ecumenical gatherings as shall require a broadly representative delegation from this Church.

(d). The Commission shall maintain contact with other Provinces and regional Churches of the Anglican Communion on matters of ecumenical relations and on such other matters of inter-Anglican concern as may be referred to it, from time to time, by the Presiding Bishop, the House of Bishops, or the General Convention.

(e). In addition to its work of ecumenical relations (namely, relations among Christians) the Commission may, in its discretion, undertake dialogue with representatives of other religions, for the enhancement of inter-religious understanding and co-operation, and make recommendations to the General Convention thereon.

Sec. 2 (a). The Commission shall consist of 34 members, as follows: ten Bishops appointed by the Presiding Bishop, and ten Presbyters and ten Lay Persons appointed by the President of the

House of Deputies, plus four members *ex officio*, namely, the Presiding Bishop, the President of the House of Deputies, the Director of the Overseas Department of the Executive Council, and the Ecumenical Officer of the Executive Council.

Five Bishops, five Presbyters, and five Lay Persons shall be appointed for six-year terms and the remainder for three-year terms during the first triennium; thereafter, all appointments shall be for six years, beginning on the first day of January of the appropriate year.

(b). The Commission shall elect its own Chairman, Secretary, and such other officers as it shall require, and shall have power to constitute committees for the carrying on of its work. Such committees may include non-members of the Commission, who shall not thereby be entitled to seats on the Commission itself. The Ecumenical Officer of the Executive Council shall serve as staff officer of the Commission.

(c). Vacancies in the appointed membership shall be filled by the presiding officer of the appropriate House.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the Commission shall be met by appropriations from the Budget of the General Convention.

2. Expenses of the Commission

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the sum of \$55,000.00, for the triennium 1968-1970, be appropriated for the expenses of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, and the work of its council and several committees.

3. Consultation on Church Union

Whereas, The Consultation on Church Union, at Dallas in 1966, unanimously approved "the document *Principles of Church Union* for transmission to the constituencies of the participating Churches for study and comment, the transmission to be made through the appropriate channels as determined by each participating Church, with the understanding that this document, together with the suggestions received from the participating Churches, and which are in due course approved by the Consultation, shall be the basis upon which to formulate a plan of union"; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That *Principles of Church Union* be commended as a significant advance toward Christian unity in matters of doctrine, worship, sacraments, and ministry, which have long divided loyal followers of Jesus Christ; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That *Principles of Church Union* be made a subject for study and recommendations by an official committee in each Diocese; which committee shall report its findings to the Diocesan Convention, as well as to the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations for its consideration and use; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations be authorized to participate, in due course, in the development, by the Consultation on Church Union, of a plan of union, for consideration by governing bodies of the Churches concerned; and be it finally

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations prepare a report on the Consultation for the Lambeth Conference of 1968, and that a full report be made at the next General Convention, together with any recommendations.

4. Ecumenical Study and Prayer

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That Church people in parishes and Dioceses be encouraged to study the reports and documents of the Consultation on Church Union, together with such significant ecumenical developments as Vatican II, Anglican-Orthodox Relations, and other movements toward understanding, co-operation, and unity among Christian people; that such studies be undertaken in concert with members of other Churches as much as possible; and that the Executive Council be authorized to provide designs and materials for such programs of study; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That members of this Church be asked to keep the cause of Christian unity constantly in their hearts and minds and to make it the subject of daily intercessions, both public and private.

5. Roman Catholic Relations

Whereas, The conversations of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations with the official representatives of the Roman Catholic Church have moved significantly toward theological understanding and common Christian witness; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this dialogue be strongly endorsed and that the Joint Commission be instructed to continue explorations toward theological agreement and effective working relationships with the Roman Catholic Church; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Commission relate the conversations in the United States to the worldwide dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion and include in its Report and recommendations to the next General Convention the developments from this wider consultation.

6. The Goal of Christian Unity

Whereas, This Church has, in the statement of the House of Bishops in Chicago, 1886, and in subsequent affirmations thereof, expressed its commitment to Church unity in the following terms:

(1) Our earnest desire that the Saviour's prayer "that we all may be one", may, in its deepest and truest sense, be speedily fulfilled;

(2) That we believe that all who have been duly baptized with water in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, are members of the Holy Catholic Church;

(3) That in all things of human ordering or human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline, or to traditional customs, this Church is ready in the spirit of love and humility to forego all preferences of her own;

(4) That this Church does not seek to absorb other Communion, but rather, co-operating with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world;

and

Whereas, The Consultation on Church Union, in *Principles of Church Union*, adopted in 1966, has declared: "The people of God exist as one people, and only one, of every nationality and race and tongue. They have been made so in Christ; and he wills that they make this unity evident."; and, in its Open Letter to the Churches, has said, "We recognize also that the united body proposed will still be far from the wholeness of the body of Christ . . . We have imagined this structure as best we could, to keep it open to all others who with ourselves seek a wider unity of catholic and evangelical traditions, alike reformed by every true obedience to God"; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this General Convention affirm that the object of this Church's ecumenical policy is to press toward the visible unity of the whole Christian fellowship in the faith and truth of Jesus Christ, developing and sharing in its various dialogues and consultations in such a way that the goal be neither obscured nor compromised and that each separate activity be a step toward the fullness of unity for which our Saviour prayed.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert F. Gibson
John M. Allin
G. Francis Burrill
Richard S. M. Emrich
Donald H. V. Hallock
John Seville Higgins
Cedric E. Mills
J. Brooke Mosley
Lauriston L. Scaife
Edward R. Welles

Gray M. Blandy
John V. Butler
John B. Coburn
Edward R. Hardy
James W. Kennedy
Robert B. MacDonald
Albert T. Mollegen
Enrico C. S. Molnar
Arthur A. Vogel
William J. Wolf

Paul B. Anderson
John Nicholas Brown
N. Hamner Cobbs
Eleanor Q. Hirst
Jean H. R. Johnson
Harry W. Osborne
J. L. Pierson
George A. Shipman
Shirley H. Tappan

John E. Hines
Clifford P. Morehouse

Stephen F. Bayne, Jr.
Peter Day

ANNEXES

ANNEX A

Interim Guide-Lines for Anglican-Orthodox Relationships*

Relations between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy have been increasingly cordial for over a century, and have, in recent years, been characterized by serious efforts to arrive at full dogmatic unity, which is the necessary basis for sacramental, liturgical, and ecclesiastical unity. The highest significance, accordingly, is attached to the forthcoming theological conversations between officially appointed representatives of the entire Orthodox Church and the entire Anglican Communion which is now being arranged by the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

In this atmosphere of increasing warmth, frequent collaboration, and high hopes for even closer relationships, the participants in the Orthodox-Anglican conversations, which have been going on for four years between the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., believe that it is appropriate both to encourage the development of friendly relations between the clergy of the two Churches and among the parishioners, and to utter a word of caution against practices which would hinder any effort towards unity.

The deeper warmth of relationships between Orthodox and Anglicans does not mean that Orthodox and Anglicans in the U.S.A. have achieved unity. The Orthodox faithful in the U.S. are not permitted to receive the Holy Communion or other Sacraments in Anglican Churches, nor are Anglicans permitted to receive the Sacraments in Orthodox Churches. However, at this time, when formal conversations between Orthodox and Anglicans are taking place, there are some steps that can be taken to maintain and strengthen mutual relationships.

- *We should pray for each other.* From time to time, but particularly upon important occasions in the life of one Church, members of the other should "rejoice with them that rejoice and weep with them that weep", by remembering each other in their prayers. On such occasions, with the permission of the respective Bishops, it is appropriate for each Church to invite representatives of the other Church and to give an honored place to them. It is not, however, appropriate for Bishops, priests, or deacons of one Church to perform in the other Church liturgical functions which can be per-

* Drafted at the Orthodox-Anglican Consultation, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, September 28, 1965.

formed only by the ordained clergy. Discretion must be employed in the wearing of vestments. Anglicans, when invited to do so by the Orthodox, may wear the vestments that are appropriate in choir or in procession, but not eucharistic vestments. The Orthodox, when similarly invited, may wear cassocks, bishop's pectoral emblem, or cross, according to their clergy rank.

There has been a practice whereby individual members of either Church who are far removed from the services of their own Church have been present at the worship of the other Church, although they have not received sacramental ministrations. Improved transportation facilities tend to reduce this practice.

- *We should hold ecumenical conversation with each other* in appropriately arranged meetings at all levels, in order to increase knowledge, understanding, and friendship. Care should be taken to see that the Faith, as each Church understands it, is presented and expounded accurately, and that the spirituality characteristic of each tradition is understood sympathetically. Where, however, members of both Churches may be at a liturgical rite of either, it is not desirable that any modification of the rite be made.

- *We should bear each other's burdens.* The fullest practical co-operation should be undertaken by Anglicans and Orthodox, both to tackle community problems and to administer to each other's needs. This readiness to co-operate must be governed by wisdom.

- *Members of one Church should not seek to win converts from the other.* Where an individual, on his own initiative, decides to seek the ministrations of the other Church, the priest must naturally do what he thinks best for that particular soul. But calculated efforts should not be made to detach Church people from their present allegiance. Care should be taken to avoid those situations in which clergymen under ecclesiastical discipline in one Church seek acceptance in the other.

Both the Orthodox and Anglicans baptize with water in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Episcopal Church accepts into its fellowship those who have received Baptism in the Orthodox Church, and the Orthodox Church accepts, by economy, those who have been baptized in the Episcopal Church.

Confirmation, or Chrismation, is given to the Orthodox at the time of Baptism, by the priest, using Holy Chrism, blessed by the Holy Synod of the Church of the individual jurisdiction. Anglican practice is to reserve Confirmation to the Bishop himself, with the laying-on-of-hands, after a profession of faith by the confirmand. An Orthodox person who has received Chrismation in infancy is not confirmed again, even conditionally, on coming to the Anglican Church, but is received upon profession of faith. Orthodox prac-

tice, however, is to give Chrismation to any individual coming into Orthodoxy from a Church in which Baptism is given with water and in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Orthodox persons who wish to check on matters concerning relationships between the Communions should get in touch with Archbishop Iakovos, as Chairman of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in the Americas. Episcopalians should get in touch with the office of the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church.

ANNEX B

Resolution of the Belgrade Conference*

The Inter-Orthodox Theological Commission on Dialogue with Anglicans, taking into consideration the text of the Resolution dated 14th September, 1966, prepared by the sub-committee that had been appointed to arrange, on the basis of the discussions, the context of the subjects of the Dialogue with the Anglicans, decided the following:

1) The Commission observes that the question of dialogue with the Anglicans has been brought to the attention of the Church not once but many times, at various periods. Since, however, the Anglican Church addressed herself separately to the various local Churches (such as the Churches of Constantinople, of Russia, of Rumania), with which Churches theological conversations took place on various subjects (such as the question of the validity of Anglican Orders), the Commission finds that the decisions that have been reached bind only those Churches whose Synods have approved the discussed subjects.

2) During the last hundred years, and at the Lambeth Conferences, the Anglican Church has always expressed the desire of approaching the Orthodox Church. There are statements of His Grace the Most Rev. Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Michael Ramsey, made in Constantinople and at the Theological School of Halki in 1962, regarding the acceptance of the Holy Scriptures, the degrees of priesthood, the Apostolic Succession, and the writings of the Holy Fathers, in which statements the desire is also expressed for the union of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches.

3) During the Conferences at Rhodes of the Orthodox Churches, the desire was also expressed for an approach with the Anglican Church. At the Third Pan-Orthodox Conference at Rhodes in 1964,

* Adopted by the Inter-Orthodox Theological Commission, meeting at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, September, 1966.

it was decided to establish an inter-Orthodox Theological Commission and a proposal was made to the Orthodox Churches to appoint their own representatives to the Commission. This Commission was to be convened and prepare its work before the opening of the dialogue with the Anglicans. The decision of the Rhodes Conference, at the request of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, was ratified by all the Orthodox Churches. After a mutual agreement between the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Serbia, the first meeting of the Inter-Orthodox Commission on the Dialogue with the Anglicans took place in the God-protected city of Belgrade from 1st to 15th September, 1966. At this meeting, some of the delegates read communications. After a broad discussion, in which all the delegates participated, it has been understood by all that the question of dialogue with the Anglicans is of great significance, and for this reason has been often discussed, though not completely, whenever the Anglican Church has expressed the desire to know the life and the doctrine of the Orthodox Church better and to approach Orthodoxy.

4) The Commission considers it as our Christian duty to respond gladly to this deep desire of the Anglicans and to their efforts to understand our faith and Ecclesiastical Order, which have been in existence from the beginning in the undivided Apostolic and Catholic Church, and which are kept unchanged in the Orthodox Church.

5) During the last forty to fifty years, various meetings have taken place between the Orthodox and the Anglicans, such as at Lambeth in 1930 and 1931, in Bucharest in 1935, in Sofia and Athens in 1940, and in Moscow in 1956. During these meetings, agreements were made with the Anglicans on some points.

6) The Commission proposes that the documents of all these meetings be communicated through the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople to all Orthodox Churches, so that those Churches which have not yet decided on the various points may be acquainted with them and may proceed to decisions relative to them. In addition, the following catalogue of subjects, which our Inter-Orthodox Commission thinks should be submitted to the Churches for their acceptance, examination, and decision, ought to be sent. The Commission requests that the Orthodox Churches examine the subjects of the second, third, and fourth categories and prepare recommendations within a year from the date of the delivery of the catalogue. These recommendations will be examined and finalized by the observations of the local Churches.

7) Categories of subjects:

First Category (Subjects on which agreement has been reached between the Anglican and some of the Orthodox Churches):

- (a) Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition (Terms of Inter-communion, 1921; Lambeth, 1931; Bucharest, 1955).
- (b) Justification of Man (Bucharest, 1935).
- (c) On the Mysteries in general (Terms of Inter-communion, 1921; Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1922; Lambeth, 1931; Bucharest, 1935).
- (d) The Holy Eucharist (Terms of Inter-communion, 1921; Anglican-Orthodox Conversations at Lambeth, 1930; Bucharest, 1935).
- (e) On the Mystery of the Priesthood, Apostolic Succession, and the Validity of Anglican Orders (Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1922; Patriarchate of Jerusalem, 1923; Church of Cyprus, 1923; Patriarchate of Alexandria, 1930; Patriarchate of Rumania, 1936).

Second Category (Subjects that have been examined, but on which no full agreement has as yet been reached):

- (a) The Procession of the Holy Spirit in the doctrine and the Symbols of the Anglican Church—"Filioque" (Terms of Inter-communion, 1921; Lambeth, 1931).
- (b) The Veneration of the Mother of God and of the Saints (Terms of Inter-communion, 1921; Moscow, 1956).
- (c) The Veneration of the Holy Icons and the Holy Relics (Terms of Inter-communion, 1921; Exposition of Faith of the Anglican priests, 1922; Moscow, 1956).
- (d) The Autocephaly of the Churches and the unity of Faith in the Church (Exposition of Faith, 1922).
- (e) The variety of customs in the Church (Lambeth, 1931; Moscow, 1956).
- (f) Memorial services for the Dead (Moscow, 1956).
- (g) The offering of the Sacraments in cases of necessity (Lambeth, 1931).

Third Category (Subjects that have not been fully examined):

- (a) Ecclesiology (The Mystery of the Church and her essential marks, the Ecumenical Councils, Branch Theory, Establishment, the Supreme Authority in the Anglican Church).
- (b) Unity of Faith and the limits of liberty in the definition of Faith (Dogma, *Theologoumenon*, theological opinions, comprehensiveness).

Fourth Category (Subjects which must be examined immediately at the opening of the dialogue with the Anglicans):

- (a) The possibility of union with the Anglicans after their Inter-communion with the Old Catholics, the Lutherans in Sweden, and perhaps with the Methodists.
- (b) How the Anglican Church understands its union in Faith with the Orthodox Church.
- (c) How the decision that will be reached on the subject of the dialogue will bind the whole Anglican Communion.
- (d) The validity of the Thirty-Nine Articles in the Anglican Communion.

The above subjects will be discussed in the dialogue with the Anglicans immediately after, and within the duration of a year, the Churches have agreed upon their exchanged communications.

At the initiative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, there should be reached as soon as possible an understanding between the Orthodox Churches as to the allocation of the above subjects for study and the preparation of essays. For this reason, the Commission feels that the Pan-Orthodox and Pan-Anglican Dialogue should approach first those subjects on which the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches have agreed upon the valuation of the Anglican position.

In reference to the subjects of the first category, those Churches whose Synods have not yet made decisions are free to decide in the way that they find proper.

Due to the fact that, on the subjects of the first category, some of the Synods of the Churches have already decided and others are to decide in the future, the subjects of the first category cannot be included in the dialogue with the Anglicans for the time being.

The Commission feels it necessary to state that only Pan-Orthodox, and not bilateral, conversations on the subjects of the second, third, and fourth categories will take place with the Anglicans.

This Committee believes that it is necessary, before meeting with the counterpart Pan-Anglican Commission, that the Inter-Orthodox Theological Commission meet at a place and time to be determined, in order to examine and approve the essays which will be submitted and to define the Orthodox positions.

The results of the work of this Commission, after their ratification by the Synods of the local Churches, will be the subject-matter of the first discussions with the Anglicans.

Therefore, the opening of the dialogue will be according to the decision of the Third Pan-Orthodox Conference at Rhodes, "after a common agreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches"

Members of the Orthodox Theological Commission:

The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople
The Patriarchate of Alexandria

The Patriarchate of Jerusalem	The Church of Cyprus
The Patriarchate of Moscow	The Church of Greece
The Patriarchate of Serbia	The Church of Poland
The Patriarchate of Rumania	The Church of Czechoslovakia
The Patriarchate of Bulgaria	The Church of Finland

ANNEX C

Interim Guide-Lines for Relations with the Roman Catholic Church*

1) The Bishop of each Diocese of the Church is urged to appoint an ecumenical chairman or committee (this has been done, of course, in many Dioceses) responsible for promoting and co-ordinating ecumenical projects and services under his direction.

2) We encourage common prayer with Roman Catholics wherever possible. It is when we are most obviously in the Father's presence that we are most obviously one with each other.

In such prayer and worship we should not let unbridled enthusiasm place others in embarrassing situations, nor should we compromise ourselves.

We must witness at the same time to the Fatherhood of God, his encompassing love for all his children, and our respect for all our brothers where they now conscientiously stand. Such respect is a primary way in which we honor the Father's image in his children; the love of God compels such respect.

3) We should seek communication and dialogue at all levels. Our parish priests should make friends with their Roman Catholic counterparts, as should members of our congregations.

In such dialogue we should be prepared to explain our theology, traditions, history, worship, and religious psychology, to Roman Catholics and try to learn the same things about them. There must be communication before anything more can happen. However, the Bishop should be kept informed and give his consent to all official representations and arrangements.

4) "Dual officiating" at the Sacrament of Holy Matrimony is discouraged at the present time and under the present circumstances. Episcopal clergymen should not play an official role in ceremonies restricting the God-given freedom of their communicants in the religious rearing of their children.

5) Recognizing the affront to God involved in appearing to repeat what he has already done in the duly administered Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Confirmation, it is as wrong for our Bishops conditionally to confirm Roman Catholics received into the Episcopal Church as it is for Roman Catholic priests conditionally

* Approved by the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations at its meeting of June 14-16, 1966, for interim guidance and for distribution by the Ecumenical Officer.

to baptize Episcopalians received into the Roman Catholic Church. A doctrine of "economy" will reconcile, if necessary, any present differences between the two Churches in the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation.

To avoid accidental re-confirmation, parochial clergymen should be urged sufficiently to distinguish, at the time of Confirmation, between those to be confirmed and those to be received, where it is the custom for Roman Catholics to be received by one of our Bishops at a service of Confirmation.

6) We should not dash headlong into defenses of the validity of Anglican Orders. Restraint on our part will not compromise our historical position and may aid the work of the Holy Spirit. We must answer questions put to us, but in such a way as not to permit encrusted attitudes to obstruct newly flowing theological currents.

The problem of Orders must be considered in the full context of the Church and Christian living. We should work positively towards that end. The solution of this problem can be quite simple in the end—and will perhaps be possible only in the light of attitudes and issues more basic than many of the topic's past formulations.

7) We should give and seek active co-operation in all civic, social, and communal projects possible.

8) It is advisable to familiarize oneself with the Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council (as well as with the other decrees and constitutions of the Council) so that, if necessary, we can inform Roman Catholics of the official teaching of their Church. This can be a great service to Roman Catholics in this period of transition.

9) Although, in some instances (for example, in the choice of the preacher for an official service of our Church), we are more permissive than the Roman Catholic Church, we should be guided in our invitations to them by the limitations to which they must adhere.

The following regulations for Roman Catholics—subject to the local Bishop, the Council of Bishops, and the Vatican—have been issued by the Roman Catholic *Bishops' Commission for Ecumenical Affairs* as interim guide-lines for prayer in common and *communio in sacris* in the U.S.A. (What follows is a digest of salient points.)

1) *Roman Catholics are encouraged to pray with their separated brethren* in special services for unity and at ecumenical gatherings.

Subject to the local Bishop, they may also participate in other services, for such purposes as peace, public need, mourning, and thanksgiving, where such services "are not part of the official liturgies of any communion".

The place of such services should "provide a worthy setting" and be agreeable to all participants and the local Bishop. Local priests may take an active part in conducting such services, as may laymen on occasion.

Roman Catholics should not accept invitations of a type where the norms of their Church prevent their issuing "a similar invitation".

The format, theme, Scripture readings, hymns, prayers, and homilies should be agreed upon ahead of time.

2) *Worship in common*: "communicatio in sacris".

a) *Baptism and Confirmation*: Non-Roman-Catholics may not act as sponsors.

b) *Holy Eucharist*: Inter-communion with Christians of other denominations should not be permitted, except in certain instances with Eastern Orthodox. Non-Roman-Catholic clergymen cannot preach at the Eucharist, but all Christians can take part in the dialogue, prayers, and hymns of the Mass.

c) *Holy Orders*: Christians of other Communion may not take leading roles, but may be present as guests.

d) *Matrimony*: Non-Romans may be witnesses and attendants. "It is not recommended that clergymen of other Communion be invited to take an active role in the ceremony."

e) *Funerals*: Roman Catholic priests may conduct services and lead prayers for non-Roman-Catholics. Non-Romans may be buried in Roman Catholic cemeteries, and clergymen of other Churches may then conduct services at the grave.

f) *Sacramentals* (prayers, blessings, anointings, sprinklings, and the divine offices): May be "given to those not of our Communion who desire to receive them". (At the Washington Consultation, it was made clear that reciprocity is limited in these matters along the lines of point one above.)

3) *Participation of Roman Catholics in the official worship of other Churches*: Where such services have "civic or social significance, especially weddings and funerals", Roman Catholics may attend and participate (under the supervision of the local Bishop).

- a) *Baptism and Confirmation*: Roman Catholics may attend, but not be sponsors.
- b) *Holy Eucharist*: Attendance is permitted, but not participation. Roman Catholic clergymen may not preach or read the Scriptures at such services.
- c) *Holy Orders*: Roman Catholics may be present, but not take an active role.
- d) *Matrimony*: Roman Catholics may serve as witnesses "under the guidance of the local Bishop".

ANNEX D

The Forward Movement Miniature Book entitled, *Principles of Church Union: Adopted by the Consultation at its Meeting 1966*, published by Forward Movement Publications, is being distributed with this Report and is, by reference, made an integral part of the Report. All citations from *Principles* in the body of the Report refer to page numbers of this edition.

ANNEX E

Episcopal Delegates to Ecumenical Gatherings

1. *General Assembly NCC—1966*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>I. Rt. Rev. John M. Burgess
(<i>Massachusetts</i>)
*Rev. Gardiner M. Day
(<i>Massachusetts</i>)
Mrs. Richard T. Loring
(<i>Massachusetts</i>)</p> | <p>V. Rt. Rev. Roger Blanchard
(<i>Southern Ohio</i>)
(P.R.) Rev. William O. Hanner
(<i>Chicago</i>)
Charles P. Taft
(<i>Southern Ohio</i>)
*Mrs. George Price (<i>Chicago</i>)</p> |
| <p>II. *Rt. Rev. Ned Cole, Jr.
(<i>Central New York</i>)
Rev. Darwin Kirby, Jr.
(<i>Albany</i>)
Drew Days (<i>New York</i>)
*Mrs. Robert H. Howe
(<i>Western New York</i>)</p> | <p>VI. Rt. Rev. Chandler Sterling
(<i>Montana</i>)
(P.R.) Very Rev. Harry W.
Vere (<i>North Dakota</i>)
+Mrs. Lloyd A. Hatch
(<i>Minnesota</i>)
Mrs. Robert Horne
(<i>Minnesota</i>)</p> |
| <p>III. *Rt. Rev. William Crittenden
(<i>Erie</i>)
*Rev. Jesse F. Anderson, Sr.
(<i>Pennsylvania</i>)
+E. A. Prichard (<i>Virginia</i>)
Mrs. Haywood Blake
(<i>Washington</i>)
Henry Chalfant (<i>Pittsburgh</i>)</p> | <p>VII. Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles
(<i>West Missouri</i>)
(P.R.) Mrs. E. Cotter Murray
(<i>Oklahoma</i>)
Very Rev. Gray M. Blandy
(<i>Texas</i>)
+Rev. Charles E. Wilcox
(<i>Oklahoma</i>)
William Ikard II
(<i>New Mexico</i>)</p> |
| <p>IV. +*Rt. Rev. W. L. Hargrave
(<i>South Florida</i>)
(P.R.) William H. Harris
(<i>Louisiana</i>)
Rev. William W. Lumpkin
(<i>Upper South Carolina</i>)
N. Hamner Cobbs (<i>Alabama</i>)
Mrs. M. R. Nellums
(<i>Tennessee</i>)</p> | <p>VIII. (P.R.) Rt. Rev. Sumner
F. D. Walters (<i>San Joaquin</i>)
Rev. Arthur A. Vall-Spinosa
(<i>Olympia</i>)
+Very Rev. Richard Coombs
(<i>Spokane</i>)
George Livermore (<i>California</i>)
Mrs. Robert Miller
(<i>Northern California</i>)</p> |
| | <p>IX. Rt. Rev. David B. Reed
(<i>Colombia</i>)</p> |

Selected by Reason of their Office:

1. *Presiding Bishop—Rt. Rev. John E. Hines
2. *Vice-President of the Executive Council—Warren H. Turner, Jr.
3. *Ecumenical Officer—Dr. Peter Day
4. Director of the Overseas Department—
Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr.
5. Director of the Home Department—Rt. Rev. Daniel Corrigan
6. Director of the Department of Christian Education—
Mrs. David R. Hunter
7. Director of the Department of Christian Social Relations—
Rev. Almon R. Pepper
8. Director of the General Division of Women's Work—
Frances M. Young

* General Board Member
+ Nominated by State Council of Churches
(P.R.) Provincial Representative

Bishop Bayne, Bishop Cole, and Mr. Ikard did not attend. The Rt. Rev. James L. Duncan Suffragan Bishop of South Florida, Rev. Howard Harper of the Executive Council, and the Rev. Frank Butler of South Florida, were seated as substitute delegates. Mrs. Muriel Webb of the Executive Council replaced the Rev. Almon R. Pepper on the fourth day.

2. General Assembly NCC—1969

- I. *Rt. Rev. John M. Burgess
(*Massachusetts*)
(P.R.) William H. Bulkeley
(*Connecticut*)
Rev. Murray Kenney
(*Massachusetts*)
Mrs. Richard T. Loring
(*Massachusetts*)
- II. Rt. Rev. Ned Cole, Jr.
(*Central New York*)
Rev. Darwin Kirby, Jr.
(*Albany*)
Drew Days
(*New York*)
*Mrs. Robert H. Howe
(*Western New York*)
- III. *Rt. Rev. William Crittenden
(*Erie*)
+E. A. Prichard
(*Virginia*)
Henry Chalfant
(*Pittsburgh*)
*Rev. Jesse F. Anderson, Sr.
(*Pennsylvania*)
Mrs. Hayward Blake
(*Washington*)
- IV. *Rt. Rev. W. L. Hargrave
(*South Florida*)
(P.R.) William H. Harris
(*Louisiana*)
N. Hamner Cobbs
(*Alabama*)
Mrs. M. R. Nellums
(*Tennessee*)
- V. Rt. Rev. Roger W. Blanchard
(*Southern Ohio*)
(P.R.) Rev. William O. Hanner
(*Chicago*)
+Mr. Charles Battle
(*Indianapolis*)
*Mrs. George Price
(*Chicago*)
- VI. Rt. Rev. Chandler W. Sterling
(*Montana*)
(P.R.) Very Rev. Harry W.
Vere
(*North Dakota*)
+Mrs. Lloyd A. Hatch
(*Minnesota*)
Mrs. Robert Horne
(*Minnesota*)
- VII. Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles
(*West Missouri*)
+Rt. Rev. Robert R. Brown
(*Arkansas*)
Rev. Gray M. Blandy
(*Texas*)
*William Ikard II
(*New Mexico*)
(P.R.) Mrs. E. Cotter Murray
(*Oklahoma*)
- VIII. Rt. Rev. Sumner F. D. Walters
(*San Joaquin*)
Rev. Arthur A. Vall-Spinosa
(*Olympia*)
+Very Rev. Richard Coombs
(*Spokane*)
*George Livermore
(*California*)
Mrs. Robert Miller
(*Northern California*)
- IX. Rt. Rev. David B. Reed
(*Colombia*)

Selected by Reason of their Office:

- *Presiding Bishop—Rt. Rev. John E. Hines
*Vice-President of the Executive Council—Warren H. Turner, Jr.
*Ecumenical Officer—Dr. Peter Day
Director of Overseas Department—Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr.
Director of Home Department—Rt. Rev. Daniel Corrigan
Director of Department of Christian Education—Mrs. David R. Hunter
Director of Department of Christian Social Relations—
Mrs. Muriel S. Webb
Director of General Division of Women's Work—Frances M. Young

* General Board Member from 1966 to 1969

+ Nominated by State Council of Churches

(P.R.) Provincial Representative

3. North American Conference on the Laity

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Gustave Simons (Connecticut) | 13. William F. Orr
(Western North Carolina) |
| 2. Hon. Fred C. Scribner, Jr.
(Maine) | 14. Norman Gross (South Dakota) |
| 3. Rt. Rev. Ned Cole, Jr.
(Central New York) | 15. Mrs. Robert Wilson (Missouri) |
| 4. Sam Welles (New York) | 16. Mrs. Harold Sorg (California) |
| 5. Michael Budzanoski
(Pittsburgh) | 17. L. Dale Pederson (Oregon) |
| 6. Dr. Inabel Lindsay
(Washington) | 18. Lester Green (Oregon) |
| 7. Mrs. Morag Simchak
(Washington) | 19. Mrs. Lemuel B. Shirley
(Panama) |
| 8. Mrs. John F. Marshall
(Washington) | 20. Mrs. Charles W. Battle
(Indianapolis) |
| 9. Mrs. Seaton Bailey (Georgia) | 21. George Feller |
| 10. Prime Osborn III (Florida) | 22. Staff persons who attended: |
| 11. Louis J. Willie (Alabama) | Miss Frances Young |
| 12. Dr. Theodore Switz (Chicago) | Rev. Edmund B. Partridge |
| | Rev. Howard Harper
(Observer) |
| | Carroll Greene, Jr. |

4. World Conference on Church and Society

- | | |
|--|--|
| Rev. Myron B. Bloy
(Massachusetts) | Rev. Daisuke Kitagawa
(Executive Council) |
| Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
(Massachusetts) | Dr. Margaret Mead (New York) |
| Rt. Rev. John E. Hines
(Presiding Bishop) | Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley
(Delaware) |
| | Dr. Charles V. Willie
(Central New York) |

5. World-Order Study Conference

- | | |
|---|--|
| Leila Anderson (New York) | Rt. Rev. Arnold Lewis
(Bishop for the Armed Forces) |
| Rt. Rev. George Cadigan (Missouri) | John Matthews (New Jersey) |
| Rt. Rev. William Crittenden (Erie) | Rev. Canon Gerald N. McAllister
(West Texas) |
| Rt. Rev. William Davidson
(Western Kansas) | Leslie Paffrath (Milwaukee) |
| Rev. Gardiner M. Day
(Massachusetts) | Rev. Almon R. Pepper
(Executive Council) |
| Hon. Joseph S. Farland
(Washington) | Rt. Rev. David E. Richards
(Central America) |
| Mrs. Marcus Goldman (Illinois) | Rev. Raymond K. Riebs
(Los Angeles) |
| Carroll Greene, Jr.
(Executive Council) | Rev. Patrick Sanders (Mississippi) |
| Rev. Herschel Halbert
(Executive Council) | Mrs. Dallas B. Sherman
(New York) |
| Dr. John A. Hallowell
(North Carolina) | Rev. Allen E. Sither (Vermont) |
| Rev. Thomas L. Hayes (Pittsburgh) | Mrs. Harold Sorg (California) |
| Rev. Daisuke Kitagawa
(Executive Council) | Rev. Alfred B. Starratt (Maryland) |
| Mrs. Hideo H. Kodani (California) | Rev. Robert T. Stellar (Los Angeles) |
| Rev. John M. Krumm (New York) | Rev. Cornelius C. Tarplee
(Executive Council) |

World-Order Study Conference (Continued)

Hon. Herbert Tate (Newark)	Very Rev. Harry W. Vere (North Dakota)
Warren H. Turner, Jr. (Executive Council)	Rt. Rev. J. Milton Richardson (Texas)
W. Paul Uhlman (Olympia)	Very Rev. William H. Mead (Missouri)
Rev. Arthur E. Walmsley (Executive Council)	Mrs. George Cadigan (Missouri)
Rev. M. Moran Weston (New York)	Ven. and Mrs. Charles F. Rehkopf (Missouri)
Gardner Winters (Texas)	Rev. and Mrs. Edward G. Cobb (Missouri)
<i>Other Episcopalians present:</i>	
Mrs. William Crittenden (Erie)	Rev. Canon and Mrs. William C. Rainford II (Missouri)
Mrs. Parker E. Monroe (Rhode Island)	Rev. Canon and Mrs. Stanley F. Rodgers (Missouri)
Rev. Canon William S. Van Meter (New York)	Rev. Robert M. Smith (Maryland)

6. Ninth Orthodox-Anglican Consultation

Anglicans

Rt. Rev. L. L. Scaife (Western New York)	Rev. Canon E. N. West (New York)
Rev. Dr. Powel Dawley (New York)	Dr. Paul B. Anderson (New York)
Rev. S. S. Garmey (New York)	Ven. J. R. Deppen (Chicago)
Rev. J. P. Morton (Newark)	Rev. R. B. MacDonald (Pennsylvania)
Rev. Dr. K. R. Waldron (New York)	Rev. Dr. A. Vogel (Milwaukee)
Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (Presiding Bishop)	Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr. (Executive Council)
Dr. Peter Day (Executive Council)	Ven. G. Johnson (Anglican Church of Canada)
Rev. Dr. E. R. Hardy (Connecticut)	Rev. T. Keithly (Dallas)
Rev. W. A. Nogren (New York)	Rev. Dr. W. J. Wolf (Massachusetts)

Orthodox

Most Rev. Archbishop Iakovos	Very Rev. P. Schneirla
Rev. Demetrios Constantelos	Rev. F. Galdau
Rev. Michael Vapouris	Prof. Sergei Verkhovskoy
Rev. G. Tsoumas	Dr. Veselin Kesic
Rev. G. J. Bacopoulos	Very Rev. G. Papadeas
Rev. J. Meyendorf	Rev. B. Gregory
Rev. A. Schmemmann	Dr. George Gebis

7. Second North American Study Conference on Church and Family

a) Professionals in Human Relations

Winfield Best	(New York)	Ven. Kenneth E. Nelson	(Albany)
Rev. Lloyd W. Clarke	(Western New York)	Rev. C. Wesley Shike	(New York)
Mrs. Martha H. Clarke	(Western New York)	Rev. Eric Snyder	(Executive Council)
Mrs. Pat O. Johnson	(Oklahoma)	Esther Stamats	(Washington)
Rev. Gregory D. M. Maletta	(Washington)	D. Milo Upjohn, ACSW	(Pennsylvania)
Rev. Canon Peter C. Moore	(New Mexico)	Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel	(New York)
Rev. J. Kenneth Morris	(Upper South Carolina)	Rev. Ronald E. Whittall	(Kentucky)
		Dr. Lenore M. Sportsman	(Albany)

b) Professional Educators

Rev. John P. Carter	(Virginia)	Dr. William M. Smith, Jr.	(Harrisburg)
Dr. F. Joseph Mullin	(Chicago)	Rev. Frederick C. Wood, Jr.	(Maryland)
Mrs. Anne G. Pannell	(Virginia)		
Mrs. Paul S. Peters	(Texas)		
Rev. Warren H. Scott	(Atlanta)		

c) Theologians

Rev. Wilford O. Cross	(Dallas)	Rev. Albert T. Mollegen	(Virginia)
Rev. Hayden McCallum	(Pennsylvania)	Rev. Gibson Winter	(Chicago)

d) Executive Council Members and Officers—Joint Commission on Human Affairs—(General Convention)

Joint Commission on the Church in
Human Affairs:

Very Rev. C. Julian Bartlett
(California)
Mrs. Gurney Williams
(New York)

Episcopal Service for Youth
Rev. Benjamin Priest (New York)

Executive Council Department Mem-
ber:

Mrs. Cyril M. Higley
(Central New York)

Executive Council Officers:

Rt. Rev. Daniel Corrigan
Rev. Robert Hansel
Rev. Dr. Kenneth W. Mann
Mrs. Peggy Morrison
Rev. Edwin J. Rooney
Mrs. Maxine Thornton
Rev. Arthur E. Walmsley
Mrs. Muriel S. Webb

e) Diocesan Representatives

Rev. & Mrs. Hugh E. Banning (Michigan)	Rev. & Mrs. Dennis Lee (New York)
Rev. Canon G. William Beale (California)	Rev. James P. Lincoln (Virginia)
Rev. John R. Bill (Los Angeles)	Rev. William S. Logan (Michigan)
Rev. Everett W. Francis (Michigan)	Rev. Canon Alfred Vaill (Pennsylvania)
Rev. Charles R. Greene (North Carolina)	Rev. Joseph B. Weathersby (Michigan)
Major Reginald K. Ingram (Washington)	Rev. Robert Willoughby (Michigan)

8. Observers at Vatican Council

Rev. Frederick C. Grant (First Session) (New York)	Dr. Peter Day (Fourth Session, First Half) (Executive Council)
Rev. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. (Second Session) (California)	Rev. Clement W. Welsh (Fourth Session, Second Half) (Washington)
Rev. William J. Wolf (Third Session) (Massachusetts)	

9. Fourth Assembly of the WCC

Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (Presiding Bishop)	Rev. Reynell Perkins (West Texas)
Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley (Delaware)	Dr. Clifford P. Morehouse (New York)
Rev. Dr. James W. Kennedy (Southern Ohio)	Dupuy Bateman (Pittsburgh)
Rev. Dr. Arthur A. Vogel (Milwaukee)	Mrs. John Jackson (Oregon)
	Mrs. Wallace Shutt (Mississippi)
	David Johnson (New York)
	Gerald A. McWorter (Chicago)

10. Consultation on Church Union

Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson, Jr. (Virginia)	Rev. William J. Wolf (Massachusetts)
Rt. Rev. G. Francis Burrill (Chicago)	J. L. Pierson (Missouri)
Rt. Rev. Richard S. M. Emrich (Michigan)	Dr. Peter Day (Executive Council)
Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr. (Executive Council)	Alternates:
Rev. Albert T. Mollegen (Virginia)	Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (Presiding Bishop)
Rev. Canon Enrico C. S. Molnar (Los Angeles)	Dr. Clifford P. Morehouse (New York)
	Rev. Dr. Arthur A. Vogel (Milwaukee)

11. *Joint Council Philippine Independent and Episcopal Churches, Manila, 1965, 1966, 1967*

Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (<i>Co-Chairman</i>)	Dr. Clifford P. Morehouse (<i>New York</i>)
Rt. Rev. Lyman B. Ogilby (<i>Philippines</i>)	Very Rev. Wayland S. Mandell, Dean of PIC Affairs for the Presiding Bishop
Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson (<i>Virginia</i>)	Rev. John V. Butler (<i>New York</i>)

12. *Various Meetings in which the Joint Commission has been represented during the Triennium*

Old Catholic Congress, Vienna, October, 1965: Bishop Scaife and Dr. Day

Anglican-Presbyterian Unity Discussions, Edinburgh, Scotland, January, 1966
(Observers): Bishop Gibson and Dr. Day.

Conference on Ecumenical Developments in Anglican and Old Catholic Churches, Oxford, England, June, 1966: Bishop Scaife, Bishop Higgins, Rev. Dr. Hardy, and Dr. Day.

Annual meetings with Ecumenical Chairmen of Anglican Church of Canada, 1964, 1965, 1966: The Executive Committee.

Dedication of Anglican Center in Rome: Bishop Hallock.

Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission: Rev. Dr. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

Faith and Order Consultation on the Ancient Councils, Bad Gastein, Germany, 1966: Rev. Dr. Hardy (Dr. Hardy then toured extensively on ecumenical concerns in Europe, Africa, and the Near East.)

Central Committee, World Council of Churches: Bishop Lichtenberger and Dr. Nathan Pusey are the regular delegates; at the Enugu, Nigeria, meeting in 1965, and the Geneva, Switzerland, meeting in 1966, they were represented by Rev. Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Day.

Study of Orthodoxy in Australia: Dr. Paul B. Anderson.

Approximately two hundred members of the Episcopal Church serve on various committees and boards of the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches.

ANNEX F

Statement on Communion Discipline

The Holy Communion must be seen in its proper context of the fellowship of committed Christians in the household of the Apostolic Faith, to which we are admitted by Baptism. In the historic tradition which the Episcopal Church maintains and practices, the baptized member completes his baptismal initiation by personal profession of faith and loyalty, and so proceeds to the blessing of Confirmation and participation in the Holy Eucharist.

In the historic Churches, Eastern and Western, the Bishop, as the center of unity of the Christian family, is active in the whole process—authorizing the administration of Baptism (usually by a priest, but sometimes by a deacon or a layman); confirming, either in person or (in some traditions) by delegation to a priest; ordaining the celebrant of the Eucharist, if he does not officiate at it himself.

The normative condition of the Church is union in one fellowship, at once of faith, sacramental practice, personal relations, and Church Order; and this is, therefore, the situation which the services and rules of the Prayer Book embody.

The anomalous situation of Christian division requires us to accept at the heart of our Christian experience the pain of divisions which the present ecumenical renewal of the Church is beginning to overcome. Yet all who have been baptized in the Name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit, have been made members of the Body of Christ.

Those who in other Christian traditions than ours have, by personal profession of faith and personal commitment affirmed their status as members of the Body, may, on occasion, be led by their Christian obedience to wish to receive Communion in our Church. We believe that they may properly do so where the discipline of their own Church permits, not only at special occasions of ecumenical gatherings specifically looking toward Church unity, but also in circumstances of individual spiritual need; and that this does not require any rubrical or canonical changes.

We hope that such recognition of the deep significance of our basic fellowship and Baptism will help to speed the day when all the children of God will be able to join in fellowship around the Table of the Lord.

ANNEX G

Financial Report*PART I**JOINT COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS**Receipts*

Appropriated by the General Convention	\$25,000.00		
Additional appropriations	15,000.00	\$40,000.00	
Special private contribution (<i>contra</i>) . .		<u>1,000.00</u>	
Total Receipts			\$41,000.00

Disbursements

Expenses of meetings, including travel, lodging, and meals	\$26,713.31		
Postage, telephone, miscellaneous expense	607.46		
Sharing in Consultation on Church Union	<u>4,344.00</u>		
Total disbursements a/c General Convention appropriation to March 16, 1967		31,664.77	
Transmission of special contribution to American Committee for W.C.C. (<i>contra</i>)		<u>1,000.00</u>	
Total disbursements to March 16, 1967			<u>32,664.77</u>
Unexpended balance, March 16, 1967			8,335.23
Estimated additional expense to Aug. 15, 1967			6,754.83
Anticipated balance of Appropriations, Aug. 15, 1967			<u>\$ 1,580.40</u>

PART II
COUNCIL ON RELATIONS WITH EASTERN CHURCHES

Receipts

Good Friday Offering (15%)	\$42,271.94	
Sale of Directory of Eastern Churches (to January 1, 1967)	1,036.98	
For Transmission to Bulgarian Orthodox Archdiocese (<i>contra</i>)	<u>16,100.00</u>	
Total		\$59,408.92
Balance brought forward, May 15, 1964	\$7,254.33	
Add, returned check	<u>2,039.00</u>	<u>9,293.33</u>
Total Receipts		<u>\$68,702.25</u>

Disbursements

Appropriations to St. Sergius' Institute related undertakings in Paris	32,706.98	
Appropriations to other Orthodox proj- ects	5,028.66	
Year Books and reference materials . . .	281.11	
Travel and consultations	1,714.87	
Postage, telephone, miscellaneous office expense	815.85	
Manufacture of Directory	2,722.62	
Directory distribution expense	691.85	
Transmission to Bulgarian Archdiocese (<i>contra</i>)	<u>16,100.00</u>	
Total Disbursements		<u>60,061.94</u>
Balance, March 16, 1967		<u>\$ 8,640.31</u>

Legacy from the Estate of the late Wm. K. Richardson, with interest to January 10, 1967—\$5,558.65—is held on interest-bearing deposit, pending its use in the property-development plan of St. Sergius' Institute in Paris.

ANNEX H

Supplemental Report**Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations**

Although the fourth meeting of the consultation with the Roman Catholic Church was held too late for the inclusion of an account thereof in the pre-filed Report of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, the Commission believes that the agreed-upon statement on the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which resulted from the meeting, is of sufficient importance to be the subject of a supplementary Report to General Convention.

The consultation met May 24–26, 1967, at Milwaukee and at Nashotah House in Wisconsin. The membership of the consultation, appointed by the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, on behalf of this Church, and, on behalf of the Roman Catholics, by the United States Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Inter-religious Affairs, consisted of the following:

ANGLICANS

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Rt. Rev. Donald H. V. Hallock
Bishop of Milwaukee | 6. Professor George A. Shipman
Graduate School of Public
Affairs
University of Washington |
| 2. Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles
Bishop of West Missouri | 7. Rev. Arthur A. Vogel
Professor of Apologetics and
Systematic Theology
Nashotah House |
| 3. Rt. Rev. John M. Allin
Bishop of Mississippi | 8. Rev. William J. Wolf
Professor of Theology
Episcopal Theological School |
| 4. Clifford P. Morehouse
President of the House of
Deputies of The General
Convention | 9. Peter Day
Ecumenical Officer
The Episcopal Church |
| 5. Rev. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.
Professor of Liturgics
Church Divinity School of
the Pacific | |

ROMAN CATHOLICS

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing
Bishop of Kansas City-
St. Joseph | 5. Rev. Lawrence B. Guillot
Director, Ecumenical Library
Kansas City, Missouri |
| 2. Most Rev. A. Wycislo
Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago | 6. Rev. John Hotchkin
Asst. Exec. Dir., Bishops'
Commission for Ecumenical
and Interreligious Affairs
Washington, D. C. |
| 3. Rev. Thomas Ambrogi, S.J.
Professor of Theology
Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland | 7. Professor Thomas P. Neill
Professor of History
St. Louis University |
| 4. Rev. Bernard J. Cooke, S.J.
Chrm., Dept. of Theology
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin | 8. Rev. George H. Tavard
Professor of Religious
Studies
Pennsylvania State
University |

Background

Since the time of the Reformation, the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice has been considered a major obstacle to the reconciliation of the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church. It is the conviction of our consultation that this is no longer true.

We have made a careful study of the Documents of the Second Vatican Council, the Lambeth Conference Report of 1958, the 1949 Statement of Faith and Order of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA, and other statements of the contemporary position of both our Churches. From these statements, it is clear to us that the findings of modern biblical, theological, and liturgical studies have transcended many of the polemical formulations of an earlier period.

We believe that it is of utmost importance for the clergy and laity of our two Churches to acknowledge their substantial identity in this area of Eucharistic doctrine, and to build upon it as they go forward in dialogue. Whatever doctrinal disagreements may remain between our Churches, the understanding of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist is not among them.

The following is an effort to sum up the consensus at which we have arrived.

Eucharistic Sacrifice

The Church is the Body of Christ and is built up by the Word through the Eucharist.

Baptism is the entrance into the eucharistic community. In the Holy Eucharist, Christians are united with Christ as the fulfillment and perfection of their baptismal union with him.

In the Lord's Supper, we participate at the same time in Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension; the Christian community is thus transformed in grace and the pledge of future glory is given to us.

Our communion with Christ in the Holy Eucharist is also communion with one another. Such union is achieved through the Holy Spirit.

Christian people, participating in Christ's priesthood through baptism and confirmation, are meant to be a living sacrifice to God. That sacrifice finds its fullest expression in the eucharistic offering of the priesthood of the people of God. Such sacramental offering of the whole people is made possible through the special action of the ministerial priest, who is empowered by his ordination to make Christ's sacrifice for his people.

The sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist is not just the sacrifice of the cross, but the sacrifice of Christ's whole life of obedience to the Father, which culminated in his death on the cross and his glorious resurrection. We offer nothing we have not first received; because of our incorporation into Christ at baptism, he offers us in himself to the Father.

*Documents Studied**From Vatican Council II:*

What has revealed the love of God among us is that the only-begotten Son of God has been sent by the Father into the world, so that, being made man, the Son might by His redemption of the entire human race give new life to it and unify it (cf. 1 Jn. 4:9; Col. 1:18-20; Jn. 11:52). Before offering Himself up as a spotless victim upon the altar of the cross, He prayed to His Father for those who believe: "That all may be one even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (Jn. 17:21). In His Church He instituted the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist by which the unity of the Church is both signified and brought about. He gave His followers a new commandment of mutual love (cf. Jn. 13:34), and promised the Spirit, their Advocate (cf. Jn. 16:7), who, as Lord and life-giver, would abide with them forever. (*Decree on Ecumenism, Par. #2, 1*)

In the human nature which He united to Himself, the Son of God redeemed man and transformed him into a new creation (cf. Gal. 6:15; 2 Cor. 5:17) by overcoming death through His own death and resurrection. By communicating His Spirit to His brothers, called together from all peoples, Christ made them mystically into His own body.

In that body, the life of Christ is poured into the believers, who, through the sacraments, are united in a hidden and real way to Christ who suffered and was glorified. Through Baptism we are formed in the likeness of Christ: "For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13). In this sacred rite, a union with Christ's death and resurrection is both symbolized and brought about: "For we were buried with him by means of Baptism into death." And if "we have been united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be so in the likeness of his resurrection also" (Rom. 6:4-5). (*Constitution on The Church, Par #7*)

At the Last Supper, on the night when He was betrayed, our Savior instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice of His Body and Blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until He should come again, and so to entrust to His beloved spouse the Church, a memorial of His death and resurrection: a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet in which Christ is consumed, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us. (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Par. #47*)

Truly in partaking of the body of the Lord in the breaking of the Eucharistic bread, we are taken up into communion with Him and with one another. "Because the bread is one, we though many, are one body, all of us who partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. 10:17). In this way all of us are made members of His body (cf. 1 Cor. 10:27), "but severally members one of another" (Rom. 12:5). (*Constitution on the Church, Par. #7*)

As all the members of the human body, though they are many, form one body, so also are the faithful in Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 12:12). Also, in the building up of Christ's body there is a flourishing variety of members and functions. There is only one Spirit who, according to His own richness and the needs of the ministries, distributes His different gifts for the welfare of the Church (cf. 1 Cor. 12:1-11). Among these gifts stand out the grace

given to the apostles. To their authority, the Spirit Himself subjected even those who were endowed with charisms (cf. 1 Cor. 14). Giving the body unity through Himself and through His power and through the internal cohesion of its members, this same Spirit produces and urges love among the believers. Consequently, if one member suffers anything, all the members suffer it, too, and if one member is honored, all the members rejoice together (cf. 1 Cor. 12:26). (*Same, Par. #7*)

Christ the Lord, High Priest taken from among men (cf. Heb. 5:1-5), "made a kingdom and priests to God his Father" (Apoc. 1:6, cf. 5:9-10) out of this new people. The baptized, by regeneration and the anointing of the Holy Spirit, are consecrated into a spiritual house and a holy priesthood. Thus through all those works befitting Christian men they can offer spiritual sacrifices and proclaim the power of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvelous light (cf. 1 Pet. 2:4-10). Therefore all the disciples of Christ, persevering in prayer and praising God (cf. Acts 2:42-47), should present themselves as a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God (cf. Rom. 12:1). Everywhere on earth they must bear witness to Christ and give an answer to those who seek an account of that hope of eternal life which is in them (cf. 1 Pet. 3:15). (*Same, Par. #10*)

Though they differ from one another in essence and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchial priesthood are nonetheless interrelated. Each of them in its own special way is a participation in the one priesthood of Christ. The ministerial priest, by the sacred power he enjoys, molds and rules the priestly people. Acting in the person of Christ, he brings about the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and offers it to God in the name of all the people. For their part, the faithful join in the offering of the Eucharist by virtue of their royal priesthood. They likewise exercise that priesthood by receiving the sacraments, by prayer and thanksgiving, by the witness of a holy life, and by self-denial and active charity. (*Same, Par. #10*)

From 1949 Statement of Faith and Order of the Episcopal Church:

1. *The Ministry.* The fundamental Christian ministry is the ministry of Christ. There is no Christian priesthood or ministry apart from His. His priestly and ministerial function is to reconcile the world to God in and through Himself, by His Incarnation and by His "one sacrifice once offered" and by the gift of the Holy Spirit, delivering men from the power of sin and death.

The Church as the Body of Christ, sharing His life, has a ministerial function derived from that of Christ. In this function every member has his place and share according to his different capabilities and calling. The Church is set before us in the New Testament as a body of believers having within it, as its recognized focus of unity, of teaching and of authority, the Apostolate, which owed its origin to the action of the Lord Himself. There was not first an Apostolate which gathered a body of believers about itself; nor was there a completely structureless collection of believers which gave authority to the Apostles to speak and act on its behalf. From the first there was the fellowship of believers finding its unity in the Twelve. Thus the New Testament bears witness to the principle of a distinctive ministry, as an original element, but not the sole constitutive element, in the life of the Church. (pp. 12-13)

From Vatican Council II

It is through the sacraments and the exercise of the virtues that the sacred nature and organic structure of the priestly community is brought into operation. Incorporated into the Church through baptism, the faithful are consecrated by the baptismal character to the exercise of the cult of the Christian religion. Reborn as sons of God, they must confess before men the faith which they have received from God through the Church. Bound more intimately to the Church by the sacrament of confirmation, they are endowed by the Holy Spirit with special strength. Hence they are more strictly obliged to spread and defend the faith both by word and by deed as true witnesses of Christ.

Taking part in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which is the fount and apex of the whole Christian life, they offer the divine Victim to God, and offer themselves along with it. Thus, both by the act of oblation and through holy communion, all perform their proper part in this liturgical service, not, indeed, all in the same way but each in that way which is appropriate to himself. Strengthened anew at the holy table by the Body of Christ, they manifest in a practical way that unity of God's People which is suitably signified and wondrously brought about by this great awesome sacrament. (*Constitution on the Church, Par. # 11*)

From the Lambeth Conference of 1958

It is commonly acknowledged that what Christ accomplished on the cross can properly be described as a sacrifice. It is enough to recall the two sacrificial sayings of our Lord himself. "My life a ransom for many" and "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many", and the phrases in the Epistle to the Hebrews (10:10, 12) "The offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all", and "when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God."

This sacrifice is an act of willing obedience. "Lo, I am come to do thy will O God" (Hebrews 10. 7; Phil. 2. 8), and inasmuch as Christ is not only perfect and representative man but also the eternal Son of God, "this act of will is not only the one perfect response of humanity to the will of God but also it is the will of God going out to man in yearning love."¹ "The new man, the Adam who is Christ, fulfils in the Cross the thanksgiving of man to God. In Christ the fulness of God giving himself to man meets with the fulness of man offering himself to God."²

The sacrifice of Christ as the offering of willing obedience included not only his death on the Cross but all that contributed to it, of which it was the culmination. The finished work of Calvary is consummated in the resurrection and ascension.

This sacrifice is once and for all, but though it cannot be repeated, it is not merely a past fact; it is not only an event in history, but the revelation of eternal truth. He is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, now seated at the right hand of God after the power of an endless life. The fact revealed in time past has to be continually translated into the present by the operation of the Spirit. "He will take what is mine and declare it to you." (John 16. 14).

1. C. F. D. Moule, *The Sacrifice of Christ*, p. 26.
2. Bouyer, *Life and Liturgy*, p. 131.

Christ's sacrificial work on the Cross was for us; he died as our Redeemer. He who once died and is now alive for ever more is also in us; he dwells in our hearts by faith. And in virtue of this union, we are now identified with him both in his death and passion, and in his resurrection life and glory. There is but one Body, of which he is the Head and we are the members; and we are made one with each other because we are one in him.

In our baptism we were united with him by the likeness of his death (Rom. 6. 5) and in the Eucharist we abide in him as we eat his Body and drink his Blood (John 6. 56). We come to the Father in and through Jesus our great High Priest. We have nothing to offer that we have not first received, but we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us and so present it again, and ourselves in him, before the Father. We are partakers of the sacrifice of Christ (1 Cor. 10. 16), and this is shown forth by our sacrifice of praise to God continually through Christ (Heb. 13. 15), and by our life of service and suffering for his sake in the world (Phil. 3. 9, 10). We ourselves, incorporate in the mystical body of Christ, are the sacrifice we offer. Christ with us offers us in himself to God.