

JOURNAL OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION

*of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the
United States of America - otherwise known as*
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

Held in Houston, Texas from October Eleventh to Twenty-Second, inclusive, in the Year of Our Lord

1970

WITH CONSTITUTION AND CANONS

Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations

Contents

- Members of the Commission, (p. 384)
- Sub-committees of the Commission (p. 385)
- Introduction (p. 26)
- Ecumenical Resolutions of the 1967 Convention (p. 386)
- The Report*
 - 1. Relations with the Eastern Churches (p. 387)
 - 2. Relations with the Roman Catholic Church (p. 391)
 - 3. Consultation on Church Union (p. 393)
 - 4. The West Indies (p. 397)
 - 5. Lutheran Episcopal Dialogue (p. 397)
 - 6. Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches (p. 398)
 - 7. Jewish-Episcopal Dialogue (p. 398)
 - 8. The Wider Episcopal Fellowship (p. 398)
 - 9. Councils of Churches (p. 399)
 - 10. Ecumenical Relations of the Executive Council (p. 400)
 - 11. Inter-Anglican Relations: Lambeth Resolutions, North American Anglican Consultation (p. 401)
 - 12. Proposed Resolutions (p. 402)
- Annexes:*
 - I. International Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations:
 - The Malta Report (p. 404)
 - II. U. S. Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations: The Report of ARC VII (p. 410)
 - III. A Plan of Union of the Consultation on Church Union (p. 416)
 - IV. Episcopal Delegates to Ecumenical Gatherings (p. 417)
 - V. Financial Report (p. 419)

Members of the Joint Commission

The Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson (Virginia),
Chairman
The Rev. John V. Butler (New York),
Vice Chairman
The Rev. James W. Kennedy (Southern Ohio),
Secretary
Mr. Paul B. Anderson (New York),
Treasurer
The Rt. Rev. John M. Allin (Mississippi)
The Rt. Rev. John M. Burgess
(Massachusetts)
The Rt. Rev. G. Francis Burrill (Chicago)
The Rt. Rev. Richard S. M. Emrich
(Michigan)
The Rt. Rev. Donald H. V. Hallock
(Milwaukee)
The Rev. Edward R. Hardy (Connecticut)
The Rt. Rev. John S. Higgins (Rhode Island)*
The Rev. John W. Hildebrand (Dallas)
Mrs. Penrose W. Hirst (Texas)
Mrs. Sherman E. Johnson (California)
Dr. Charles R. Lawrence (New York)
The Rev. Robert B. MacDonald
(Pennsylvania)
Dr. Marianne Micks (Southern Ohio)
The Rt. Rev. Cedric E. Mills (Virgin Islands)
The Rev. Albert T. Mollegen (Virginia)
The Rev. Canon Enrico C. S. Molnar
(Los Angeles)
Dr. Clifford P. Morehouse (Southwest Florida)
Mr. Paul W. Philips (Northern Indiana)**
Mr. J. L. Pierson (Missouri)
The Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife (Western New York)

* Bishop Higgins resigned, March 16, 1970.

** Replaced N. Hamner Cobbs (deceased).

Dr. George A. Shipman (Olympia)
 The Rev. Warner P. Traynham
 (Massachusetts)
 The Rev. Arthur A. Vogel (Milwaukee)
 The Rt. Rev. Edward Welles (West
 Missouri)
 Mr. Sherwood W. Wise (Mississippi)
 The Rev. William J. Wolf (Massachusetts)
 The Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (Presiding
 Bishop), *ex officio*
 Rev. John B. Coburn (President, House of
 Deputies), *ex officio*
 Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley, *ex officio*
 Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr., *Consultant*
 Peter Day, Ecumenical Officer
 John C. Cosby, Jr., Assistant Ecumenical
 Officer

**Sub-Committees Of The Joint Commission
 On Ecumenical Relations**

**1. Council on Relations
 with Eastern Churches**

Bishop Scaife, *chairman*, Rev. Mr.
 MacDonald, *secretary*, Dr. Anderson, Rev.
 Dr. Hardy Canon Molnar, Dr. Morehouse.
Co-opted: Rt. Rev. Francis W. Lickfield,
 Rt. Rev. Jonathan G. Sherman, Rev. J.
 Ralph Deppen (Chicago), Rev. Dr. Robert E.
 Terwilliger (New York).

**2. Committee on Relations with
 the Roman Catholic Church**

Bishop Hallock, *chairman*, Rev. Dr. Vogel,
secretary, Bishop Higgins, Bishop Welles,
 Bishop Allin, Rev. Dr. Wolf, Dr. Shipman,
 Dr. Morehouse, Dr. Day. *Co-opted:* Rev.
 Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

3. Committee on Unity Consultations

Bishop Gibson, *chairman*, Bishop Burrill,
 Bishop Bayne, Rev. Dr. Mollegen, Rev. Dr.
 Wolf, Rev. Mr. Traynham, Dean Micks,
 Dr. Day.

4. Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue

Bishop Emrich, *chairman*, Canon Molnar,
 Rev. Mr. Hildebrand, Mr. Pierson, Dr. Day.

**5. Relations with Pentecostal
 and Conservative Evangelical Churches**

Bishop Welles, *chairman*, Dr. Day, *secretary*.

6. Committee on Jewish-Episcopal Dialogue

Bishop Burrill, *chairman*, Rev. Dr. Butler,
 Mrs. Johnson. *Co-opted:* Rt. Rev. Jonathan
 G. Sherman.

**7. Committee on the Wider Episcopal
 Fellowship**

Bishop Higgins, *chairman*, Bishop Bayne,
 Dr. Day.

8. Committee on Councils of Churches

Bishop Allin, *chairman*, Rev. Dr. Kennedy,
secretary, Bishop Burgess, Rev. Dr. Butler,
 Dr. Lawrence, Dr. Phillips, Mr. Wise, Mrs.
 Hirst.

9. Theological Committee

Rev. Dr. Vogel, *chairman*, Rev. Dr. Hardy,
 Rev. Dr. Mollegen, Rev. Dr. Wolf, Dean
 Micks, Mrs. Johnson.

10. Executive Committee

Bishop Gibson, *chairman*, Rev. Dr. Kennedy,
secretary, Bishop Allin, Bishop Scaife, Rev.
 Dr. Butler, Dr. Anderson, Dr. Day.

INTRODUCTION

The Church is people in relationship with each other in Christ. They have a mission of showing forth God's glory in the world and of calling all men into relationship with him and with each other. In such a relationship there can be no discrimination against our fellowmen based on race or nationality, sex, or age, for "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

Yet, as we see the Church today, this unifying mission to the world is blocked and undermined by divisions within the Christian fellowship itself. It is the task of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, working with representatives of other Churches, to seek ways to break down these barriers within the Christian fellowship so that the good news of Jesus Christ can be proclaimed with one voice, the fellowship of Christian love can be freely expressed, and Christ's mission to the world can be more faithfully and effectively carried out.

In ecumenical relations, there is always the danger of drawing closer to one Church at the cost of moving further apart from another. The Commission has been alert to this problem, and during the past triennium has sought to do its work in such a way as to carry out the full intent of the first Ecumenical Resolution of the 1967 General Convention (see below). Developments in relationships with the Eastern Orthodox, the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans, and the eight other Churches involved with us in the Consultation on Church Union, are

ECUMENICAL

reported below as co-ordinated steps in working toward the goal of "the visible unity of the whole Christian fellowship in the faith and truth of Jesus Christ".

Relationships within the Anglican Communion, and with Churches with which Anglicans are already in full or limited communion, are important elements in the ecumenical enterprise which are not being neglected. And the co-operative work of the Churches in the World, National, and local Councils of Churches has been a subject of constant attention by the Commission, even as these conciliar structures face the necessity of finding new ways of doing mission in a changing world.

The Commission's work takes it into the area of structural and institutional relationships, because it is through structures and institutions that people are enabled to pool forces and get things done in a large and complex world. But our central concern is with persons, and with the healing gift of personhood made possible by the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Our work must be judged by the extent to which it facilitates a richer human life for all God's children, by opening up ways for Christians to celebrate his glory, to love and serve their fellowmen, and to receive empowerment for their mission.

ECUMENICAL RESOLUTIONS OF THE 1967 CONVENTION

The 1967 General Convention adopted a series of Resolutions declaring this Church's ecumenical policy and giving instructions to the Commission; they are

reproduced here as the "marching orders" under which we have operated during the past triennium.

1. *The Goal of Christian Unity*

Resolved, 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 Savior prayed.

2. *Consultation on Church Union*

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

b. Resolved, 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

c. Resolved, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations be authorized to participate in the development by the Consultation on Church Union of a proposed plan of union for study at all levels of Church life and ultimate

consideration by governing bodies of the Churches concerned, but not to negotiate the entry of this Church into such a plan of union; and be it further

d. Resolved, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations prepare a report on the Consultation for the Lambeth Conference, with any recommendations; and be it further

e. Resolved, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations be authorized to represent this Church, not only with the Consultation, but also with the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Orthodox Communions, and all other separated Christian bodies not yet represented in the Consultation, in the common effort toward understanding, co-operation, and unity among all Christian people.

3. *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

a. Resolved, 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

b. Resolved, That the Joint Commission relate the conversations in the United

States to the world-wide 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.

4. Ecumenical Study and Prayer

a. Resolved, That Church people in parishes be, and they hereby are, 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 God's people; that such studies be undertaken in concert with members of other Churches as much as possible; and that the Executive Council be, and it hereby is, authorized to provide designs and materials for such programs of study; and be it further

b. Resolved, 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.

THE REPORT

Reports, in some depth, of what has been done during the past triennium by the many committees and the one council of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, will cover but a fraction of the solid work and multiple involvements, more or less official, in many directions. Ecumenical Relations touches almost every area of the Church's life around the world.

A few highlights of the Joint Commission at work would have to make mention of at least the following projects accomplished or in process:

- Rapid progress has been made in discussions with the Roman Catholic Church under the Joint Commission on Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations in the U.S.A. (ARC).
- The continued attempt of the Orthodox to unify the various branches of Orthodoxy, especially in the United States, continues in dead earnest, even though incredibly complicated problems and ancient barriers exist.
- The Consultation on Church Union (COCU) has come up with "A Plan of Union", which faces all the member Churches with something specific to confront, amend, and eventually decide on; and many disturbing factors have arisen in the pattern of on-going ecumenical co-operation, not only in North America, with drastic changes suggested in the National Council of Churches and local Councils, but with a similar re-structuring of the World Council of Churches in the offing.
- Another large new emergent on the ecumenical horizon is the proliferation of "Consortia", which has faced the Churches with urgent and instant decisions in countless communities across inter-Church lines.
- Local ecumenical worship, study, and action, continue to grow throughout the nation, providing a new and fertile soil for the growth of true Christian unity, and

placing on national Church bodies the responsibility of keeping up with the development of the local Christian community.

1. Relations with the Eastern Churches

During the triennium, the Episcopal Church has been engaged in unity and renewal efforts with many of the Christian Churches in the United States. Naturally, the public media have given prominence to relations with Churches of the Protestant tradition, as expressed in the Consultation on Church Union, and to Roman Catholic relationships, since so many Christians in the United States are adherents of one of the nine COCU bodies or of the Roman Catholic Church.

There is, however, a third area of unity and renewal which is just beginning to make the press. This is the field of relations between Episcopal and Eastern Orthodox Churches. The latter are less numerous and, in fact, are often thought of as minority Churches. Now, however, we are beginning to realize that Orthodox Christians are just about as numerous as Episcopalians, and more so than any of the COCU bodies, except the Methodists and the Presbyterians.

In 1962, Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger and Greek Archbishop Iakovos inaugurated a joint Consultation between ten Episcopalians and ten Orthodox Churchmen. This Consultation has had twelve meetings, some for one day, some two days. The Orthodox have presented theological and practical explanations of peculiarities of worship and parish life

ECUMENICAL

which seem to hinder full collaboration between our two Churches, such as the use of ethnic languages and the different dates for celebrating Christian Church festivals, especially Christmas and Easter, and have received corresponding information from the Anglicans.

The fact that the United States is the only country in the world where Episcopal and Orthodox Churches have approximately equal numbers of adherents means that the experience of their study and work together can be of great value in the formal unity discussions in the international Joint Anglican and Orthodox Commission, to which reference will be made later in this report.

Most of the Orthodox Dioceses in North America are still characterized as missionary Dioceses of the mother Churches in the Middle East, Russia, or the Eastern European countries, being dependent on the latter for the continuity of apostolic episcopacy and, until recently, for priests. Within the last three years, however, the Orthodox jurisdictions in America have become vocal in requesting the mother Churches to recognize their maturity, so that they might become "indigenous"

American Churches. They have spoken out in two ways. The first way was a joint action of their Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops, asking a Pan-Orthodox Commission of the mother Churches, which was holding a scheduled meeting in Chambesy, Switzerland, to recognize the restiveness of Orthodox Americans, and, therefore, to urge the synods of the mother Churches to begin

deliberations aiming at granting maturity status to them. Unfortunately, the appeal to the Commission at Chambesy met no response. Thereupon, the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in America re-doubled its efforts to secure autonomy or autocephaly from the Moscow Patriarchate, which had established the Russian Church in Alaska as a mission as early as 1794. According to the canons of the undivided Church, a missionary Diocese, or group of Dioceses, in a given country can be granted the status of autocephaly (being self-headed) upon evidence of maturity. The Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, generally referred to as the "Metropolia", now claims such maturity and has been negotiating with the Patriarchate since 1963. Now granted, this body will change its name, and hopes to become the initial corpus in the "Orthodox Church of America". In its official notification of December 9, 1969, respecting an advanced stage of negotiations with Moscow, the Metropolia declared:

"Autocephaly means the complete canonical independence of the local church, her entering as an equal member with full rights into the family of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches, the right and the possibility to manage her life without any interference from outside. It is this status that our Metropolia always sought. And if now, by the mercy of God, this desire will be crowned with success, we have before us a future of peaceful and constructive existence in peace and canonical clarity. Our place within the family of Orthodox Churches will be clear to all and

with all we shall be in the fullness of Eucharistic communion and mutual canonical recognition. For all Orthodox in America the way will be indicated, the way to unity and growth into one Orthodox Church, in the land which is our early abode. We know how great the harvest is and what effort it requires from the laborers (Matthew 9:37). We believe that the Lord, who poured on us so much mercy, will not abandon us in the future."

The way is now open for other Orthodox jurisdictions to join the "Orthodox Church of America". All of them adhere to Apostolic faith and order. One Romanian jurisdiction is already united with the Metropolia. It is likely that months and even years will elapse before the union of all can be achieved, because great differences in language and customs stand in the way. Even though they might be allowed to continue in diversity under the proposed structure of an "Orthodox Church of America", these differences are very precious to the people, and in practice may prove more important to them than canonical unity for some time to come.

While this problem is being worked out, in hope, by the dozen or more Orthodox missionary jurisdictions or exarchates in America, the mother Churches will be meeting in commissions to prepare for a Great Synod of the Orthodox Churches in communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople, Athenagoras I, the Ecumenical Patriarch and *Primus inter pares*. Such a Great Synod has not been held for centuries. An abortive attempt at holding a Synod on Mt. Athos was made

in 1931, but it was blocked by the enforced absence of the Orthodox Church of Russia, the largest of them all. Credit is due to the vision and great energy of the Ecumenical Patriarch, whose prayers and persistence were crowned with success in 1961, when a Conference of representatives of all the fourteen autocephalous or autonomous Churches was held on the Island of Rhodes, which, although Greek territory, is under his ecclesiastical authority. Subsequent meetings of a procedural nature were held in Rhodes in 1963 and 1964, and a full-scale Conference of Orthodox delegates in Belgrade in 1967. In the meantime, the Ecumenical Patriarch had become proprietor of a large villa at Chambesy, near Geneva, Switzerland, which he turned into an Orthodox Ecumenical Center. Here, a fifth meeting of the delegations took place, in 1968, just prior to the IV Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Uppsala, where the Orthodox formed about one-fifth of the official attendance.

At all five of these meetings, prominence was given to relationships with non-Orthodox Churches. At the 1967 Belgrade meeting, each of the autocephalous Churches was requested to appoint two delegates to deal with the matter of relations with the Anglican Communion. By this time, the Archbishop of Canterbury was also prepared to act in the matter, as he had agreed to do when he met with the Ecumenical Patriarch at Phanar in 1962, and had confirmed in his subsequent meetings with the Patriarchs of Moscow, Bucharest, and Belgrade, and in a meeting with the Archbishop of Athens. During the Lambeth

Conference in 1968, after conferring with heads of the other Provinces of the Anglican Communion, Archbishop Ramsey completed appointment of a delegation, which will meet with the Orthodox in a Joint Theological Commission. From The Episcopal Church the following persons were appointed: the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, the Rt. Rev. Francis William Lickfield, the Rt. Rev. Jonathan Goodhue Sherman (with the Rt. Rev. Allen Webster Brown as alternate), the Rev. Dr. Edward R. Hardy, and the Rev. Dr. William J. Wolf. Dr. Paul B. Anderson was appointed one of the joint secretaries.

The task of this joint Theological Commission is to gather up the threads from the long history of exchange visits and negotiations between Anglicans and Orthodox, reaching back to the 1880's, when a Russo-Greek-Anglican Committee was established by the General Convention. In particular, it will build upon the Joint Doctrinal Discussions in London, 1931, and the Bucharest Agreement on Anglican Orders, 1935, which was confirmed at the 1969 Special General Convention. The agenda developed by the Orthodox at Rhodes, Belgrade, and Chambesy indicate the chief points to be discussed in the "dialogue". These were considered by Committee 31 at Lambeth, under the chairmanship of Bishop Scaife. This Committee, however, recommended that the dialogue, while dealing seriously with the traditional problems—the Thirty-Nine Articles, the *filioque*, and the historical Episcopate—should pass beyond these topics to seek mutual stimulation and

common mind on modern problems of secularization, the role of women in the Church, and so on. The Orthodox, on their side, seem to be emphasizing the need for the Anglicans to clarify their "comprehensiveness", and the location of final authority in the Episcopal Church, so that they might get clear-cut positions representative of the whole of the Anglican Communion.

With a view to preparing elucidation on such points, a few of the Anglican delegates met in February, 1968, at Oxford, and the entire delegation was called together September 15-19, 1969, in Jerusalem (fourteen attended). Here, four papers on basic topics were read, thoroughly discussed, and referred back to the authors for revision. No summary of the meeting was attempted, but a statement was prepared for the Archbishop of Canterbury, to indicate the mind of the delegation on the future course and ultimate goal of Anglican-Orthodox negotiations. The key portion of this statement is as follows:

"The Commission is unanimous in thinking that in the forthcoming dialogue we must consider most carefully the theological issues which are at present the occasion of difficulty between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, so that the unity which is to be reached shall be a unity in the fullness of the truth of Christ. We are convinced that the issues raised in previous conversations, and not yet fully resolved, must receive further careful treatment. In this we are altogether at one with the views expressed by our Orthodox colleagues in their meetings at Belgrade

and Chambesy. We also believe that it will be vitally important for the dialogue to include: (1) A consideration of questions of a pastoral, liturgical and spiritual nature, so that we may together investigate how our doctrine is expressed in the life and worship of our churches and in the search for holiness, and (2) A consideration of the urgent and difficult questions involved in the presentation of the faith in the world today, so that we may together be able to find 'a contemporary expression of our common commitment to the faith of the early undivided ecumenical church, and of our determination to continue to present that faith in the future.' (Lambeth Conference, 1968).

"It is clear that the achievement of unity between our churches can scarcely be a sudden thing. Time must be given on both sides for the full consideration of the questions involved, and for a much wider information of the great body of the faithful. At the same time it is urgent that as soon as possible we should resume officially the dialogue which our predecessors began almost forty years ago. Although it is not possible for us to prophesy how the dialogue will develop, we believe that it is likely to advance in a number of stages. In putting forward a tentative outline of how this may happen, we do not of course intend in any way to commit our Orthodox colleagues to proposals which as yet we have been unable to discuss with them. We wish merely to give some shape to the hope that is in us, and not to fail to take the steps which are open to us merely because we do not yet

fully see the whole of the way which lies in front of us. First, there is the stage of deepening mutual knowledge and understanding, in which we are at present. We are thankful to God that much has already been done, but we recognize that there is more to do. We hope that this might lead to a second stage in which our churches might formally recognize each other as sister churches loving and respecting one another in Christ, even before the achievement of complete unity and full communion. In such a stage we envisage the possibility of constant collaboration in practical matters, regular mutual consultation and support, and mutual commemoration and prayer in the Holy Liturgy. It is only after this stage is reached that with the help of God under the guidance of the Holy Spirit we may look forward to the longed-for day of full union in faith and love, and the coming together in the common chalice of our one Lord."

In the course of these collective Anglican and Orthodox efforts, both the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Presiding Bishop have undertaken more personal measures for ensuring development of the cause of unity in this field. Thus, in 1967, the Presiding Bishop sent Dr. Peter Day, Ecumenical Officer, and Dr. Paul B. Anderson, of the Joint Commission's Council on Relations with the Eastern Churches, to make formal visits to Metropolitan Dositej of the Czechoslovak Orthodox Church, Patriarch German of Belgrade, Patriarch Justinian of Bucharest, Patriarch Kyrille of Sofia, and Archbishop Ieronymos of Athens. Bishop Hines

himself joined the two for a day with His All Holiness Patriarch Athenagoras at Istanbul.

These visits were significant in revealing to the Orthodox prelates that the Episcopal Church shared fully with the Church of England in the striving for unity with the Orthodox. Besides personal visits, the Council of Eastern Churches keeps the heads and theologians of Orthodox Churches informed on Episcopal Church life by sending the *Episcopal Church Annual*, Church periodicals, and other selected literature, to them.

An undertaking that is especially appreciated by the Orthodox and other Eastern Churches, both in the homelands and in America, is the biennial publication of *Parishes and Clergy of the Orthodox and Other Eastern Churches in North and South America, Together with the Parishes and Clergy of the Polish National Catholic Church*. This directory is issued by the Council on Eastern Churches of this Joint Commission, the chairman and editor being the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife. While each Orthodox body issues a listing of its own Bishops and other clergy, it is only in this volume of 208 pages that one can find a complete record of all. In the process of corresponding and telephoning with the respective heads of jurisdictions in America, Bishop Scaife has maintained and developed an unusual measure of goodwill and confidence on the part of the Eastern Churches. This re-inforces the work of Episcopal diocesan Bishops and clergy in their fraternal relations with the Eastern Churches and the Polish National Catholics. In view of the reciprocal recognition of Holy

Orders with the Old Catholics and the Polish National Catholic Churches, the formal aspect of unity with them has reached an advanced point. There is still need for much effort, locally as well as nationally, to transform this formal agreement into mutually stimulating local Church life.

During the administration of the Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill as Presiding Bishop, the Episcopal Church joined with four other Churches (United Presbyterian, Lutheran in America, American Baptist, and United Methodist) in a joint action to provide a resident Chaplain for ministry to the Anglican and Protestant Americans in Moscow, USSR. The Assumptionist Fathers provide a Chaplain for Roman Catholics. The two chaplains work in excellent harmony and collaboration, with the full backing of the American Ambassador. Each of the five Churches, in turn, selects, appoints, and pays for the chaplain for a two- or three-year period. The turn for an Episcopal chaplain will begin in September, 1971. Experience has shown that this chaplaincy is of extraordinary importance for the religious life of the personnel and their wives and children in the American and other embassies, and provides a welcome ecumenical contact with the heads of the Russian Orthodox and Russian Baptist Churches.

Retirement of Bishop Scaife

The Joint Commission deeply regrets the early retirement, for reasons of health, of the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, Bishop of Western New York, Chairman of the Council on Relations with Eastern Churches. For thirty years, his thorough and

enlightened leadership in all matters concerning the Orthodox, the Oriental Orthodox, and the Old Catholic Churches has greatly strengthened the cause of Christian unity. As editor of the biennial Directory of their clergy and parishes, Bishop Scaife came to know most of the hierarchs and many of the clergy of these Churches. They have duly recognized that in this way he has contributed to inter-Orthodox unity, as well as to Anglican-Orthodox relationships.

2. Relations with the Roman Catholic Church

The Episcopal Church's relationships with Roman Catholics, as well as with the Orthodox, take place both in an international and in a domestic setting. Important forward steps have been taken in both areas during the triennium.

The joint Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission (ARC), established by the ecumenical commissions of the two Churches in the U.S.A., has been able to define its goal as full communion and organic unity, and to affirm that "nothing in the course of this serious enterprise has emerged which would cause us to think that this goal is unattainable".

This historic document, Statement of ARC VII, (*Annex No. II*) was adopted by the seventh meeting of ARC, held in December, 1969. The Bishops' Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs of the Roman Catholic Church voted on March 18, 1970, that it "gratefully and enthusiastically accepts the ARC report,

considers it to be a significant report, and will give it very serious consideration". This Commission also gives its enthusiastic approval and asks General Convention to endorse the report and to implement it by adopting the recommendations for "diffusion" in its final section.

The statement recognizes that Anglican-Roman relations also exist within the context of discussions which both Churches are conducting with other Communions. It says: "We would never wish our own specific efforts and our own specific goal to be regarded as prejudicial to the many different efforts that are being made by our Churches toward this end. Specifically, we wish to mention in this regard the Consultation on Church Union."

Internationally, the work of the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission was completed in the Malta Report of January 3, 1968, which was referred to Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury and made available to the world-wide episcopate of both Churches (*Annex No. I*). An Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) has been established to carry forward the work. Its first meeting was held January 9-15, 1970, at St. George's House, Windsor Castle, where both Henry VIII and Charles I lie buried.

Members from the United States were the Rev. Arthur A. Vogel (Episcopal Church), and the Rev. Barnabas Ahern, the Rev. Herbert Ryan, and the Rev. George Tavad (Roman Catholic). Co-chairmen were the Rt. Rev. H. R. McAdoo, Anglican Bishop

ECUMENICAL

of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, and Bishop Clark, Roman Catholic Auxiliary of Northampton.

The first several days were spent discussing papers prepared for the meeting. In the discussion of fundamentals, the positions of the two Churches on the relation of Revelation to Faith and of Scripture to Tradition were found to be quite similar; more obvious difficulties were found in the areas of Church and Authority and Dogmatic Definitions and Comprehensiveness. A long discussion occurred between Roman Catholics about the degree of strictness with which Infallibility and the Assumption must be held by members of the Roman Catholic Church.

The discussion of Authority brought to light such opinions as the following: "irreformable" meant "irreversible" when used by Vatican I; the role of authority is "to keep the question open" by preserving the data, which makes the definition of authority approach "Anglican comprehensiveness". Whether presbyters or bishops came first is not as important for unity as the simple assertion that the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons are essential to the ministry of the Church.

In the discussion of Church, Intercommunion, and the Ministry, little support (in contrast to the discussions of ARC) was given to the concept of the Eucharist as a means of unity. The reciprocal nature of inter-Communion was used as an argument against its employment as a means to unity. A suggestion that Anglicans have an analogical view of the

Church, while Roman Catholics have a univocal one, seemed to meet with general approval. Anglicans were asked whether or not they could use "in" in describing the eucharistic Presence; and Anglicans again explained that Cranmer cannot be used as an authoritative interpreter of the Book of Common Prayer.

Almost a whole evening was spent discussing the ARC statement referred to above. There was genuine interest, amazement, pleasure, and encouragement for the work ARC had done.

Two days were spent in small-group work, the purpose of which was to produce guidelines for the work of various sub-commissions around the world. As finally constituted, one sub-commission, located in the British Isles and Ireland, will work on a *schema* on "Church and Authority" for the next meeting of the full Commission. Dean Chadwick and Bishop Butler are the conveners. A second sub-commission was located in North America. It will deal with "Ministry"; its conveners are Frs. Tavard and Vogel. A third sub-commission, located in South Africa, but with the Rev. J. W. Charley in Great Britain and the Rev. J. M. Tillard, O. P., in Canada, as correspondents, will work on "Eucharist". Bishop Knapp-Fisher is the convener. Bishop F. R. Arnott and a group in Australia will co-operate in work on the ministry.

Briefly put, it was decided that authority should be approached only within the context of *koinonia* and ministry only within the context of *diakonia*. Important

convergence and agreement was discovered in the area of the Eucharist; no essential doctrinal differences about the Eucharist were discovered; once more, the condemnation of Anglican Orders was seen to be the major obstacle.

Frustration over the delay in issuing new Roman Catholic mixed-marriage regulations was expressed by all present. (Later, in April, such regulations were made public as a papal *Motu Proprio*, and have generally been well received as a forward step in both ecclesiastical and human relations.)

The Malta Report recommended that the International Commission also study "moral theology to determine similarities and differences in our teaching and practice in this field". As a result of that recommendation, two additional subjects have been scheduled for the next meeting:

1. The Nature and Methodology of Moral Theology
2. The Relations of Men and Women

Two papers, one by an Anglican and one by a Roman Catholic, will be written on each subject. The second subject will include such topics as married life, pre-marital and extra-marital sex, family planning, *Humanae Vitae*.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for September 21-28, 1970, somewhere in Europe.

Whatever the theological differences may have been during the consultation, there was, in the beginning, middle, and end, a

firm resolution on the part of all present to "get the job done". On the last day of the meeting, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal Heenan drove to Windsor for luncheon with the participants.

Both nationally and internationally, strong emphasis has been placed on involvement of bishops, priests, and the laity in sharing each other's spiritual activity and resources, and in co-operative activities. Unity must grow from the ground up, not from the top down. Only thus can divided Churches move toward the ultimate goal of one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, visibly embodied on earth and renewed and revitalized in mission and service to the family of man.

3. Consultation on Church Union

Carrying out the instructions of the 1967 General Convention, the Commission has participated in the development by the Consultation on Church Union of a draft plan of union which it now presents to the General Convention as a first step in Churchwide study at all levels of the Church's life for which the 1967 Resolution called. This document, entitled "A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting", together with its three appendices, has been sent to all Bishops and Deputies and is hereby incorporated in and made an integral part of this Report.

It was acted upon as follows by the St. Louis, 1970, meeting of the Consultation, in which ten representatives of the Joint Commission participated:

"The Consultation on Church Union on

March 13, 1970, commends this draft of the Plan of Union to the member Churches and to all Christians for study and response, seeking their assistance in further development and completion of this Plan of Union. Responses and evaluations are to be submitted to the Consultation's office in Princeton, New Jersey, with copies to the appropriate denominational offices, by January 15, 1972. It is essential that the process of study, evaluation, and response—such as suggestions for change, approval of basic directions—be done with, where possible, all nine participating Churches and others fully involved. During the biennium of 1970-72, the Consultation on Church Union does not seek official votes from the member Churches; the Consultation on Church Union does earnestly seek assistance in the further development of this plan which is pointed toward the union and vital renewal for mission of Christ's Church."

It is to be noted that the Consultation on Church Union itself has not yet given its stamp of approval to the Plan as a finished product. Rather, it believes that it now has a sufficiently comprehensive and detailed preliminary draft to make possible specific criticisms and suggestions for improvement by any and all who take seriously our Lord's prayer for the unity of his Church.

At this time, neither the Consultation nor this Commission is seeking either to persuade or dissuade this Church regarding acceptance of the draft plan. Our present task is to inform our constituency as widely as possible of all aspects of the subject and to listen attentively to specific responses.

Only by such a process may we hope to attain the goal of a united Church, truly catholic, evangelical, and reformed.

We propose that the study proceed along three distinct, but closely interrelated, lines:

- The first is interdenominational dialogue and encounter, which will help each of the nine Churches to understand the reality and depth of the Christian commitment of the others. Only so will the members of each be able to see why they quite rightly desire a united Church to be different in certain ways from the forms and usages of the past in order to embrace what each may bring as God's gifts for the whole Christian fellowship and ultimately for all mankind.
- The second kind of study is within the Episcopal Church at the local level, so that every priest and lay person may know what is actually proposed and may realistically evaluate the benefits and drawbacks of the proposal. From this study, we hope to receive insights that will help the Consultation to shape an instrument of obedience to Christ which we can receive in a spirit of thanksgiving and joy.
- The third is officially appointed diocesan scrutiny of the draft plan, with the aid of the ecumenical and local studies, resulting in specific indications as to its strengths and weaknesses. This official study is essential, if we are to avoid the twin perils of "ecumania" and xenophobia and hear clearly the voice of the Church.

It is part of the task of this Commission to make some comments of its own about the draft plan. This involves, first, looking

ECUMENICAL

at it from the perspective of the Episcopal Church; secondly, taking realistic account of the traditions of the other participating Churches in the context of the whole ecumenical scene; and thirdly, relating it to the issues, dangers, and opportunities, confronting God's people at this time, in this nation, and at this stage of theological, intellectual, technical, social, and human development. We must both be faithful to the heritage of the past and recognize our inescapable unity with and involvement in the rest of mankind in today's world.

The understanding of the nature of the Church which is characteristic of Anglican tradition requires that its oneness be expressed in full communion and organic unity among all Christians who can come to agreement on the basics of faith and order. Denominationalism is a principle incompatible with our understanding of the Scriptures, the creeds, and the Book of Common Prayer.

The vicissitudes of history have placed us in a situation where we are separated from both Catholic and Protestant Communions, but continue to feel strong ties of kinship with both. The restoration of unity cannot be achieved by choosing to work toward union with Churches of one tradition at the expense of relationships with Churches of another. Rather, the goal must be a Christian wholeness, which preserves the values of all traditions and endows us with the riches they hold in trust for a united Church.

In other sections, we have reported on our discussions with the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholics, discussions that are

going on internationally as well as in the U.S.A. In the next section, we report on our newly opened discussions with the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., which also will be paralleled by international discussions. The Consultation on Church Union, similarly, is a part of a worldwide effort toward Christian unity, in which virtually every Anglican Church is engaged with the non-episcopal Churches which are heirs of the English Reformation.

The Joint Commission was specifically charged by the General Convention of 1964 to conduct its discussions with our fellow-Churches in the Consultation on Church Union on the basis of the "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral". We have endeavored to be faithful to this charge and invite inspection of this Draft Plan of Union, not for an exclusively Episcopalian interpretation of Scriptures, creeds, Sacraments, and Ministry, but for a fundamentally Catholic one which is enriched by the coming together of a variety of Christian traditions in an effort to be loyal to the Church of Christ and the Apostles, the Fathers, and the Councils, and open to the future.

The original version of the Quadrilateral, stemming from the Chicago General Convention of 1886, reminds us that the four points do not stand in isolation, but are signposts of the Tradition of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church; and the draft Plan acknowledges its allegiance to this central Christian Tradition. As the chapter, "The Living Faith", says: "In addition to the one Tradition there are separate traditions—those customs and individual

expressions which characterize the several Churches. These separate traditions always stand under the judgment of Scripture and the one Tradition."

The sufficiency of the statements on these central issues, and on other issues in the draft plan, is a matter which this Church must evaluate. The following paragraphs are not intended to provide such an evaluation prematurely, but simply to provide an overview of what this first draft proposes and to raise some of the questions which need careful consideration.

I. Faith

The summary statement of the faith in the draft of the Plan begins with confession of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, with worship of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Scripture, declared to be interdependent with Tradition, has unique authority for the Church's whole life. The Apostles' and Nicene creeds are explicitly accepted as witnesses of that Tradition, to be used as acts of praise and allegiance that bind the united Church to the apostolic faith of the one Church in all times and places. One of the questions for consideration is whether the authority of the historic creeds is sufficiently distinguished from those of later creeds and confessions. The united Church may propose new affirmations, expressing its understanding of the living faith for today's world. Scripture, creeds, and liturgies, together, are recognized both as defining faith and demanding action through which the Church participates in the suffering and glory of its crucified and risen Lord.

In Chapter III, "What it Means to Be God's

People", the important subject of ecclesiology is treated in far more detail than in the previous document, *Principles of Church Union*.

II. *Worship and Sacraments*

Chapter VI of the draft, "Worship", begins as follows: "Christian worship is the response of celebration and thanksgiving for God's holy love revealed in Jesus Christ. It is mixed with joy and praise in his presence, with sorrow and repentance for our sins and failures, with petitions for the needs of others and of ourselves, and with hope in God's renewing grace and strength. Through our awe-filled recognition of the indescribable wonder and reality of God, we are enabled to join with those who, in all times and places, have offered the sacrifice of praise and obedience to Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us (Romans 8:34)."

It is made clear that the sacraments of "baptism and the Lord's Supper are at the heart of the Church's worship". Sacraments are called effective signs. There is a strong doctrine of baptismal regeneration, while both infant, and what is often called "believer's", baptism are permitted, with the proviso that none shall be baptized twice.

Confirmation is associated with, and called a "fulfillment of", baptism. In Confirmation, the Holy Spirit is said to be given for "ministry and mission to the world". The laying-on-of-hands in Confirmation can be done either by a bishop or a presbyter. This arrangement raises questions.

The sacrificial nature of the Lord's Supper is stated, as is the fact that Christ himself is spiritually received in the sacrament. It is required that the service always have the four-fold action of taking, giving thanks, breaking, and partaking; Christ's words of institution; an invocation of the Holy Spirit; and the two elements ordained by Christ. Only a bishop or presbyter can preside over the eucharistic feast.

The sacramental character of other acts, including all of the traditional seven, is recognized.

III. *The Ordained Ministry*

The draft of the proposed Plan of Union clearly accepts, and will maintain, the historic episcopate, along with the orders of presbyter and deacon, although the three orders are not mentioned in their traditional sequence. In the proposed plan, with its ordinal, it is stated that the historic episcopate is "a principal symbol and agency of unity and continuity in the Church and in its doctrine and ordered ministry from apostolic times". This does not require, imply, or exclude any further doctrine, theory, or description of this historic episcopate.

The priestly and pastoral role of both presbyter and bishop is brought out in the statements on ministry and in the proposed ordinal. These two treatments should be analyzed in conjunction with the chapter on structure, for consistency and completeness.

A provision for four-year terms for bishops, with the possibility of non-reelection, represents a new adaptation of the historic

episcopate; a bishop without jurisdiction will remain a member of the episcopal college.

The Plan states that the bishops together (collegiality of bishops) personify the "continuity of the Church's trusteeship of tradition and pastoral oversight".

No ordination will occur without a bishop in historic succession presiding, and no ordination of a bishop will occur without three bishops participating. No ordination will occur without representatives of all the people of God participating in the laying-on-of-hands.

Women will be eligible to all orders, including the episcopate.

The "Service of Inauguration of the Church of Christ Uniting" (Appendix I) asks God to unite our ministries and to "endue each with grace for the exercise of his ministry, whether as presbyter, bishop, or deacon". Bishops participate in the service and the laying-on-of-hands, both in the primary inaugural service and in similar services on local levels. Bishops-elect from Churches which do not have persons with the office or title of bishop will be ordained (consecrated) under the provisions of the Ordinal (Appendix II).

The Service of Inauguration is a key section of the draft plan, and should be carefully examined.

IV. *Transition*

Any proposed plan for uniting Churches of different polities and traditions must take into account the problem of transition from separate ways to new oneness. Agreement on

ECUMENICAL

faith and order, and on common goals of corporate life, still leaves a necessary choice of transitional strategies.

On the one hand, the unification of members and ministries for the agreed purpose of ultimate structural union, could usher in a period of growing together by gradual changes without pre-judgment of many of the final constitutional issues. On the other hand, constitutional forms of organized life can be agreed upon in advance and adaptation to these forms could proceed as quickly as possible.

Growing together without pre-judgment allows an openness to unknown possibilities and a more gradual change from existing structures, but it fails to supply assurances concerning any final organizational structures to which the participating Churches commit themselves.

The proposed plan now presented for study chooses the strategy of structural forms agreed upon in advance, in order to assure the continued use of certain congregational, presbyteral, and episcopal values, and also to assure full participation and rights of all groups and races in the final structure.

V. Structure

While the statements on faith, worship, sacraments, and ministry have had the benefits of long study, with considerable participation by the clergy and laity of the nine Churches (and other Churches as well), most of the material on the structure of the United Church is relatively new. It is presented in Chapter 8 of the draft plan. The organizational arrangements for the United Church deserve detailed analysis. The parish

would be the local unit of the Church. It would be composed, usually, of a group of congregations drawn from various parts of the uniting Churches. Task forces would be used for specialized objectives. The parish would be an integrated program unit. Its congregations would not necessarily be contiguous. Property and other resources would be held in common.

Beyond the parish, and below the national level, there are two jurisdictions, the district and the region. The district would be a geographical unit of some 75 parishes, the number depending upon local circumstances. The bishop, the chief pastor and executive officer, would be elected initially for a jurisdictional term of four years and would be eligible for additional terms. If not re-elected, he would remain a bishop without jurisdiction. The region would include at least three districts, but in all probability an average of about ten. The purpose is to provide a jurisdiction spanning metropolitan and other areas where co-ordinated planning and action would be advantageous. A regional bishop would be the chief executive officer. He serves for a four-year term and may be re-elected.

At the national level, a national assembly would exercise legislative authority for the Church as a whole, and would provide for necessary nation-wide concerns and services. The Assembly would sit as a single house and would vote together except on questions of faith and order. Whether such a question is present is determined by a majority vote of any one order. A Presiding Bishop will be elected for a four-year term and could succeed himself once. When a new presiding

bishop is elected he must be of a racial background different from that of his predecessor.

At each level of organization, a moderator is elected annually to preside over the meetings of the jurisdiction. The moderator may be either a layman or minister other than the executive officer. In each representative body a ratio of at least two laymen for each minister is required.

The transitional period begins when two or more of the uniting Churches have effected unification at a national service of inauguration, and continues until a constitution becomes effective. During this period, both the provisional national council and the transitional national assembly are composed of an equal number of representatives from each of the uniting Churches. No provision is made for the withdrawal of a denomination as a whole once the national service of inauguration has been held. An individual congregation, however, may withdraw during the first year of the uniting Churches' operation, retaining the church property used by it at the time of inauguration.

As the plan is now written, it is clear that the act of union is a serious and virtually irreversible step for any Church, to be undertaken only after the fullest and most careful consideration.

VI. Renewal in Mission

A central concern of union is the opening up of possibilities for our common life which are excluded or limited by our divisions. The whole plan is an effort to

realize the potential in old realities, as well as to discover fresh ways to express and live the gospel.

One earnest of this purpose is the new form of the basic unit of the Church's life, the parish, previously described. Its varied racial and socio-economic levels are designed to assure inclusiveness, and to hold up constantly the vision of the Church as extending beyond the local congregation. Further, ways are proposed to guarantee that variety in age, race, and sex is characteristic of all levels of Church life. An openness to one another as persons and groups, and the determination to foster that same openness in society, is one of the avowed purposes of the enterprise. According to the draft plan, the laity has fundamental responsibility for the Christian mission.

As the Consultation's message to the Churches says, "The whole society of man today is characterized by a deep impulse toward unity. Even those forces which seem quite secular in origin may not be dismissed merely as pressure for conformity, but may be an intimation of God's will in the world at large, which we are bound to hear and obey. There can be no ecumenism worthy of the name without a change of heart."

This call for "a change of heart" echoes the Second Vatican Council decree on Ecumenism, and is a reminder that the Church may be united only through a renewal of its members. The goal of a renewed Church is to offer mankind a sign of the unity foreshadowed in Christ's promise, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all

men unto me."

The present task of the people of our Church and of all the Churches is to study and work and pray for a serviceable plan for a united and uniting Church which may indeed bear witness to our crucified and risen Lord in the world.

4. The West Indies

During the past triennium, there has not been a great deal of advance in the Anglican and Methodist consultations in the West Indies. The Commission was unable to provide representation at the December, 1969, Conference. There is a feeling in the West Indies that until the Anglican-Methodist consultation in England is settled there will be little activity in the Province of the West Indies.

During 1969, the Rev. David Chaplin, the representative of the World Council of Churches for the West Indies, met with the Anglican, Methodist, Moravian, Lutheran, and Roman clergy in St. Thomas.

Bishop Mills of the Virgin Islands attended the consecration of a Moravian Bishop held in Antigua in July, 1969.

In 1969, an Inter-Faith Council was organized, including clergymen and lay members of the Churches in St. Thomas.

5. Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue

At the beginning of each triennium, for many years, the Commission has made overtures to the Lutherans, seeking to open up fraternal dialogue on matters of faith and order. Intra-Lutheran relationships have complicated these efforts in the past, but

with the formation of the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., consisting of the Lutheran Church in America, the American Lutheran Church (both bodies being the result of unions within Lutheranism), the Lutheran Church of the Missouri Synod, and the Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, a means exists for discussion between Episcopalians and representatives of Lutheranism as a whole. The interest of the General Convention in this ecumenical area was recorded in Resolution 2-(e) of 1967, printed on page 27 of this Report.

The first such discussion, entitled Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, took up the question of "The Meaning and Authority of the Scriptures in the Life of the Church", under the joint chairmanship of Bishop Emrich of Michigan and the Rev. O. V. Anderson of Milwaukee, October 14-16, 1969, in Detroit. It was primarily a get-acquainted session, and no findings were issued. The second discussion was held in Milwaukee, Wis., April 7-9, 1970, on the subject of "The Worship and Sacraments of the Church; Their Relation to the Unity of the Church". It was agreed that after the fourth or fifth meeting, we would review progress and make plans for the future of the dialogue.

At this meeting, after thorough discussion of four papers on various aspects of the subject, it was agreed that the goal of discussions should be defined as altar and pulpit fellowship (full communion), and that the next subject for investigation should be baptismal unity, followed by a consideration of apostolicity and its bearing on faith, ministry, sacraments, and prayer, and (at a later meeting) a consideration of

ECUMENICAL

what needs to be done to achieve complete *communio in sacris*.

In a press statement issued at the conclusion of the meeting, it was stated that Anglicans and Lutherans found themselves in general agreement on the nature of Christian worship, and regarded the Holy Communion as its central act. It was agreed that there was a definite general outline of the eucharistic action which might be expressed in a variety of liturgical texts.

Bishop Enrich of Michigan, Episcopal co-chairman of the American discussion, and the Rev. John W. Rodgers of Virginia Theological Seminary, were appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury as members of the world-wide Anglican-Lutheran dialogue. The first meeting has been scheduled for Oxford, England, in September, 1970.

6. Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches

The triennium has witnessed a striking reversal of attitude towards, and resulting growth of, social concern and involvement among the Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches in the United States, and more of a willingness to engage in informal conversations with other Christian bodies. The international head of the Assemblies of God, the largest Pentecostal Church in the world, attended the 1968 Lambeth Conference as an official observer. The Episcopal Church has been represented at numerous Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical gatherings, including the great 1969 Minneapolis

Congress, annual Conventions of the National Association of Evangelicals, and the Eighth Triennial World Pentecostal Congress in Brazil.

7. Jewish-Episcopal Dialogue

This triennium has seen the beginning of fruitful dialogue between Jewish and Episcopal groups in several locations throughout the United States.

The Committee had several meetings and, after suitable contacts with Jewish leaders, prepared and conducted three conferences in New York City, Berkeley, California, and Chicago, Illinois.

It was recognized in the beginning that Judaism is divided roughly into three groups—Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed. In New York, it was possible to meet with the three groups at one time, but in Berkeley and Chicago it was decided to concentrate effort on contacts with the Reformed, who had many things in common with Episcopalians, *i.e.*, similar economic status, and tolerance for different traditions.

Some sensitivity about discussing "religion" was encountered, and conferences were keyed to family life and social or economic concerns shared by both religious bodies.

However, as the different meetings developed, it became easier to discuss matters of faith. There was some "facing up" to social barriers; the state of Israel and its struggle for survival; the Bible and traditional writings; and finally some discussion about Jesus. The different meetings provided opportunity for discussion

and "shared worship".

The Committee feels that good beginnings have been made and urges a continuation and development of this program in the next triennium.

8. Wider Episcopal Fellowship

Because of budget stringencies, the work of the Committee on the Wider Episcopal Fellowship over the last few years has had to be done chiefly by correspondence and by privately raised funds.

- *The Polish National Catholic Church* now has a new Prime Bishop, the Most Rev. Thaddeus F. Zielinski. He has gone on record as being in favor of another conference between representatives of this Church and of the PNC, similar to the one held in 1967 in the Diocese of Bethlehem.

- *The Spanish Reformed Church*—Since Bishop Taibo's privately financed visit to the United States in November, 1968, plans have been made for a Companion-Diocese relationship between Spain and Puerto Rico. Implementation awaits a visit of the Bishop of Puerto Rico to Spain.

- *The Lusitanian Church*—Bishop Daniel Cabral, formerly Assistant Bishop of the Lusitanian Church, became Bishop of the Anglican Diocese of Lebombo some two years ago. Our Church in Brazil entertained Bishop Cabral for a month-long visit recently, with the hope that a Companion-Diocese relationship can be developed between those two Churches, to their mutual advantage.

The Committee hopes that in respect of both the Spanish/Puerto-Rican and the

Lebombo-Brazil link-up there will also be a third "strong" Diocese in the United States or Canada to form a three-way link.

● Of all the Churches with which the Episcopal Church is in full communion, the *Philippine Independent Church* is the one with which the closest working relationships are established. Further developments in these relationships have taken place during the past triennium. A Philippine Episcopal priest has been assigned to service at the Independent Cathedral, and at least one bishop has asked two Episcopal priests to come to his Diocese. The past custom of assigning two priests, one from each Church, to work side by side, is being replaced by a willingness to let one priest represent both Churches in one place. St. Andrew's Seminary continues to educate priests for both Churches. In areas where both Churches have work, such as the greater Manila area, joint clergy conferences and joint planning for mission are taking place.

Looking forward to the tenth anniversary of the Concordat in 1971, the Joint Council of the two Churches, at Bishop Hines' suggestion, has decided that it is time to review the accomplishments of the past ten years and do some thorough joint planning for the future.

9. Councils of Churches

The Committee on Councils of Churches has met twice each year during the present triennium. On two of these occasions, the Committee met with Dr. Edwin Espy, General Secretary of the National Council of Churches, and members of his executive staff, at the headquarters of the Council.

On another occasion, certain members of the Committee had a dinner meeting with the Episcopal Church's delegation to the World Council of Churches. These meetings were part of an effort to improve communication and co-ordination between and among those in the Episcopal Church who have been assigned responsibility for representing the Episcopal Church and relating it to the structures of the National and World Councils of Churches.

An *ad hoc* committee of the Committee on Councils of Churches held an additional meeting in New York to prepare a special report on the "consortium" movement and its effect upon Councils of Churches in these changing times (see Ecumenical Relations of the Executive Council below).

During the past three years, the Committee has greatly increased its efforts to provide representative nominations of delegations to the National Council of Churches' General Assembly and General Board and to the World Council of Churches. In preparing these nominations of the Episcopal Church's delegations to the two Councils of Churches, close attention has been given to the guidelines of the General Convention, and the recommendations and advice of the Presidents of the several Provinces have been sought. The Church has been well represented by its delegations to the various Council of Churches' meetings. Care has been taken by the Ecumenical Officer, at the request of the Committee, to secure representative Churchmen to fill vacancies at particular meetings, especially of the National Council of Churches' General Board, the substitutes being chosen from

members of the General Assembly, or from the bishops, or their representatives, within the general area where a meeting was being held.

Concern must be expressed regarding the financial support of this Church now being provided to the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. During the past three years, our support has been reduced, there having been a reduction of some 20% from \$231,000.00 in 1969 to \$166,600.00 for 1970 to the National Council of Churches, and from \$76,650.00 in 1969 to \$55,400.00 for 1970 to the World Council of Churches.

The Commission is seeking to understand the present change factors, causes, and underlying transitions within the conciliar movement. The nature of the transition being faced is illustrated in a statement by the General Secretary of the National Council of Churches, Dr. Edwin Espy: "Such developments pose with growing urgency the issue of the capacity of the National Council of Churches to be at the same time the instrument of conciliar inclusiveness and of united mission. The trend at the present time in the member Churches of the NCC is in the direction of manifesting unity in the development of ecumenical policy and the adoption of common positions, while moving outside the NCC increasingly to enter into joint mission. Both the present trend within the National Council of Churches, and the ecumenical developments which are on the horizon, suggest the need for a modification of some of the conciliar assumptions which exist at the present time. What seems to be

ECUMENICAL

called for is a philosophy, a structure, and a style of operation which will stand ready to permit member Churches to manifest at any given time, in relation to any specific need, the degree of unity they are capable of mustering in relation to manifestations of mission in which they are ready to join. The ecumenical structure would have as a major function the facilitation of operations, where member Churches, which choose to be so engaged, would always be the proprietors and would always assume full responsibility for the action programs in which they share, whether under direct NCC administration or separately. This is different from an ecumenical structure which, in the form of a holding company created by the member Churches, is necessarily responsible itself for the program it helps bring into being."

In the light of present trends and possible future developments, this Committee is recognizing the need to hold joint meetings with the Church's various delegations to both the National Council and the World Council of Churches.

10. Ecumenical Relations of the Executive Council

At the request of the Staff Program Group of the Executive Council, the Commission, through its Committee on Councils of Churches, undertook a thorough study of consortia and coalitions, whereby ecumenical action is taken by a small group of Churches with similar program goals and which by-pass the more comprehensive Councils of Churches, in the interests of quicker and more effective action. One of

the most successful of these is JSAC (Joint Strategy and Action Committee), which channels funds and resources to locally sponsored programs. Another is JED (Joint Educational Development). Still another is the Action Training Coalition.

The beginnings of this movement were noted in the Commission's 1967 Report, but the movement has now grown to occupy a significant place on the ecumenical scene.

On the recommendation of the Commission, the Council, at its February, 1970, meeting, voted to approve the use of this form of ecumenical action, if kept in balance with the Church's commitment to the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, and established a committee to apply guidelines and maintain an overview of the subject.

Because of shrinking income, the 1969 budget suffered deep cuts in the whole ecumenical field. The cuts in NCC and WCC support have been noted. But, also, the JSAC joint funding has been reduced from \$49,500.00 to \$15,000.00; the Action Training Coalition from \$50,000.00 to \$28,500.00; and JED's small appropriation was cut from \$5,000.00 to \$3,800.00.

During this triennium, the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in July, 1968, and the eighth General Assembly of the National Council of Churches in December, 1969, were attended by Episcopal delegations that were nominated by the Joint Commission and elected by the Executive Council. At the Uppsala World Assembly, David Johnson, a young Episcopal

delegate, was elected to the World Council's Central Committee, and at the Detroit NCC meeting, Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel was elected president, and Mr. Warren H. Turner, Jr., was named a vice-president-at-large.

During the triennial period, three conferences have been planned for diocesan ecumenical chairmen through the offices of John C. Cosby, Assistant Ecumenical Officer, who succeeded Carroll Greene in January, 1968. The first was held in conjunction with the Mutual Responsibility Commission (1968), and the 1969 and 1970 meetings were held as a part of the National Workshop for Christian Unity, an independent Roman Catholic event. Mr. Cosby has been active on the planning level of the workshops.

The Ecumenical Bulletin has become a simple, quickly produced and mailed, news channel, sent to the diocesan ecumenical chairmen, and to a larger list of persons involved ecumenically.

The Executive Council's involvement in the Consultation on Church Union has intensified, and in 1968 *An Order of Worship* (The COCU Liturgy) was distributed to all Episcopal clergymen. Mrs. Robert Andersen of the Council's Communication Department is serving as audio-visual chairman of the Consultation's Communication Council, and Mr. Cosby has co-ordinated the plenary sessions for 1969 and 1970.

The statement has been made that no new programs are initiated by the Executive Council unless they are constructed

ecumenically; adherence to this principle has resulted in a highly ecumenical program outreach for the Council by working in numbers of consortia and conciliar structures. Some are long-lasting, others short in duration. At the same time, there has been a decline in program involvements with the National Council of Churches' program units.

As part of the re-structure of the Executive Council, the Committee on Ecumenical Relations was abolished, and it was planned that ecumenical matters were to be fed direct to the Council by the Ecumenical Officer and members of this Commission who are also Council members. A Staff Committee on Ecumenical Relations was created by the Staff Program Group to enable the ecumenical office to co-ordinate and integrate the ecumenical dimensions of the Church's program under the direction of the Staff Program Group. This representative staff group began working in May, 1969.

The establishment of ecumenical policy is the task of the General Convention, assisted by the studies, dialogues, and recommendations of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.

The conduct of ecumenical programs is the task of the central program agency of the Church, the Executive Council, which has the general task of executing Convention policy.

During the next triennium, the Commission foresees the necessity of programs carrying out the implications of national and

international ecumenical developments at diocesan and local levels. Rather than turn itself into a program agency, competing with the Executive Council for program funds, the Commission recommends that the following program items be included in the budget of the Executive Council for 1971:

- Support of Central Office of C.O.C.U.—\$23,400.00
- Educational Programs in Roman Catholic relations and study of the proposed Plan of Union—\$45,000.00
- Expenses of delegates to international Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran discussions—\$6,300.00
Total—\$74,700.00

In addition, the Commission urges the Program and Budget Committee of the General Convention to review the proposed 1971 budget items in the area of ecumenical relations, particularly the appropriations to the National and World Councils of Churches, the United Ministries in Higher Education, the Joint Strategy and Action Committee, and World Relief and Inter-Church Aid, to consider whether the disproportionate cuts in these areas really represent the policy of this Church.

11. Inter-Anglican Relations

The Lambeth Conference of 1968 dealt with many matters of concern to the Joint Commission. Though no Resolution on the Consultation on Church Union was adopted, the Committee on Renewal in Unity commented: "Conversations [on Church

Union] are also in progress in the U.S.A. A summary of the basic principles so far agreed upon has been published in *Consultation on Church Union 1967*. The situation in this country [U.S.A.] is complicated, inasmuch as no fewer than nine churches are involved. We warmly endorse the verdict of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church as 'a significant advance towards Christian unity in certain matters of doctrine, worship, sacraments, and ministry' and we are pleased to note that the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations has been authorized to participate in the development of a proposed plan of union for study at all levels of church life." (Pages 132-133, *The Lambeth Conference Report*.)

The Conference adopted certain Resolutions recommending action by Anglican Churches, on which the Commission reports as follows:

- On Resolutions 34-38, concerning the ordination of women to the priesthood, the Commission recommends that a separate Joint Commission be established to consider the theological, practical, and ecumenical aspects of this subject and report to the next General Convention.
- On Resolution 45, dealing with the admission of non-Anglicans to Holy Communion in certain circumstances, the Commission believes that the Statement on Communion Discipline of the 1967 General Convention covers the ground adequately.
- On Resolution 48, concerning relationships with the Church of South India, the Commission recommends that paragraph (a) be implemented by removal of the

ECUMENICAL

proviso of the General Convention of 1958 that a minister of the Church of South India "celebrate in Protestant Episcopal Churches only" while temporarily within a Diocese of this Church.

● On paragraph (b) of the same Resolution, concerning full communion with the Church of South India, the Commission notes that the 30-year period, after which the Church of South India intends to review its policy concerning non-episcopally ordained ministers, will be concluded in 1977, and recommends that action be deferred for the present.

● On Resolutions 49 and 50 concerning full communion with the Churches of North India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, the Commission recommends that full consideration be given to this subject as soon as possible after the consummation of the several unions, expressing, in the meantime, the Episcopal Church's warm sympathy with these promising ecumenical ventures.

The Commission calls attention to the fact that while Special General Convention II at South Bend approved the formation of the Anglican Consultative Council and provided for a nominating committee to propose names for this Church's participants, the Convention failed to proceed to an election. We strongly urge that the Houston Convention proceed to such an election, in order that this Church may be properly represented at the inaugural meeting of the Council.

North American Anglican Consultation

For the past six years, the Executive

Committee of the Joint Commission has met annually with representatives of the Anglican Church of Canada to co-ordinate the ecumenical strategy of the two Churches. During this triennium, with the formation of an Anglican Regional Council of North America, the West Indies has been added to the group, and its name has become the North American Anglican Ecumenical Consultation.

Discussions and reports have covered the whole field of ecumenical relations, with special attention to relationships with the Church of South India and the unions in North India, Pakistan, and Ceylon. Each Church has reported on relations with the Orthodox and Roman Catholics, as well as on its consultations with non-episcopal Churches.

12. Proposed Resolutions

Although this Report covers a wide range of topics and concerns, the work of the Joint Commission is basically one simple task: to work for the fulfilment of Christ's prayer, "that they all may be one". This was not a prayer about structures, but about a relationship between the divine Father and Son which must be reflected in the relationship between Christian and Christian by the power of the Holy Spirit.

From these relationships must spring the structures which make it possible for people to work together at their common tasks, just as the first disciples discovered they needed committees, program agencies, and decision-making bodies, as reported in the Acts of the Apostles, in order to get the Lord's work done in Jerusalem, and Antioch,

and Ephesus, and Corinth.

To implement the recommendations contained in this Report, the Commission proposes the following Resolutions:

1. *Continuing the Commission*

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations be continued for the next triennium, and that the present members continue to serve until the new ones have been appointed and the new Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations has been organized.

2. *Expenses of the Commission*

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the sum of \$70,050.00, for the triennium 1970-73, be appropriated for the expenses of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, and the work of its Council and several Committees.

3. *Orthodox Relations*

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this General Convention accept with satisfaction the report on progress made in unity discussions with the Orthodox Churches in communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople, and endorse the approach set forth in the statement prepared by the Anglican delegation meeting at Jerusalem, 1969, in preparation for the forthcoming Joint Theological Dialogue with the Orthodox; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this General Convention accept the report on the work of the

Orthodox-Anglican Consultation in the United States, and proposes that its results be integrated into the work of the Anglican delegation preparing for the International Joint Theological Dialogue.

4. Roman Catholic Relations

Whereas, Official representatives of this Church and of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States have, in seven sessions of the joint Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission (ARC), made great progress in mutual understanding and agreement, notably in regard to the nature of Baptism, Holy Communion, and the Church as Eucharistic Community; and

Whereas, The seventh meeting of ARC, held in December, 1969, adopted a significant document which reported the progress to date, defined the goal as "full communion and organic unity", and affirmed that "nothing in the course of this serious enterprise has emerged which would cause us to think that this goal is unattainable"; and

Whereas, The Bishops' Committee on Ecumenical and Religious Affairs of the Roman Catholic Church voted on March 18, 1970, that it "gratefully and enthusiastically accepts the ARC report, considers it to be a significant report, and will give it very serious consideration"; and

Whereas, The Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations also gives its enthusiastic approval, and asks the General Convention "to endorse the report and to implement it by adopting the

recommendations in its final section"; now be it

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That this 63rd General Convention of the Episcopal Church

(1) Gratefully and enthusiastically accept the report of the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission, as incorporated in the Report of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations;

(2) Endorse the progress along the lines of the joint Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission;

(3) Direct the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations to continue its participation in the joint Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission, looking toward the defined goal of full communion and organic unity between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church; and

(4) Authorize and direct the Executive Council to co-operate with the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations in the implementation of the programs recommended by the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission, especially as set forth in paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 11 of Section D of the report, relating to joint clergy conferences, sharing in theological training, co-operation between staff personnel in the areas of adult education, professional leadership training, education of the young, missions, and other means of diffusing ecumenical knowledge and understanding through our Churches at all

levels.

5. Consultation on Church Union

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations be authorized to continue to participate in the development by the Consultation on Church Union of a proposed plan of union for study at all levels of Church life and ultimate consideration by the governing bodies of the Churches concerned, but not to negotiate the entry of this Church into such a plan of union; and be it further

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That members of the Episcopal Church be urged to participate in ecumenical, parochial, and other forms of study of the draft plan of union, reporting their criticisms and suggestions through diocesan ecumenical commissions to the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations; and that each Diocese be urged to make an official study of the draft plan, reporting its findings no later than December 1, 1971; and that the Executive Council be authorized and directed to take part in providing designs, materials, and other aids for such study.

6. Ecumenical Program Funds

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, That, to carry out the program implications of the foregoing Resolutions, the following sums be included in the Program and Budget administered by the Executive Council:

• Support of the Central Office of the Consultation on Church Union—\$23,400.00

ECUMENICAL

• **Educational Programs in Roman Catholic Relations and Study of the proposed Plan of Union—\$45,000.00**

• **Expenses of delegates to international Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran Dialogues—\$6,300.00**
Total—\$74,700.00

7. *Recommendations from Lambeth*

(a) *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That a Joint Commission of three bishops, three priests, and six lay persons be established, to consider the question of ordination of women to the priesthood in the light of Resolutions 34-38 of the Lambeth Conference of 1968; and that the sum of \$4,000.00 be appropriated for its expenses.

(b) *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That an episcopally ordained bishop or priest of the Church of South India, temporarily visiting within a Diocese of the Episcopal Church be permitted to celebrate the Holy Communion in this Church, without limitation concerning his ministrations in other Churches; *Provided*, that if such a minister enter into the settled ministry of this Church he be subject to the same canon law as other bishops and priests of this Church.

(c) *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, That the following message be sent severally to the Churches of North India, Pakistan, and Lanka, in connection with the inauguration of the unions approved by the General Synod of the Church of India, Burma, Pakistan, and Ceylon, in January 1970:

“The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, meeting in General Convention in Houston, Texas, sends its affectionate greetings and best wishes to the Church of _____ upon its entry into Church union in obedience to our Savior’s prayer that his followers be one. We pray that the Church of _____ will possess every spiritual gift that each of the participating Churches has hitherto held in separation and will be richly blessed in mission and service in the days to come. We look forward with hope and expectation to the establishment of full communion, after adequate study and mutual consultation, and to vigorous co-operation in God’s service.”

ANNEX I

LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1968 *Documents on Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations*

1. Letter from His Eminence Augustin Cardinal Bea to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, 10 June 1968.
2. Report of the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission, after meeting at Gazzada (9 to 13 January 1967), Huntercombe Manor (31 August to 4 September 1967) and Malta (30 December 1967 to 3 January 1968).
3. Appendix to the Report of the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission.

Letter from His Eminence Augustin Cardinal Bea to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury 10 June 1968

Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity

Vatican City,
10 June 1968

Your Grace,

It is with heartfelt joy that I am sending to you the personal letter of the Holy Father in which he expresses his satisfaction and gratitude for the work of the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission, which after its sessions held during 1967 at Gazzada, Huntercombe, and in Malta, has completed the preparatory work committed to its members by compiling at its last session a report which makes concrete proposals for the continuation of the work done by the Commission. Despite our diversities we have some truths in common, which are very important and oblige us to travel the road towards unity.

His Holiness has charged me to explain more in detail, how this continuation, on the basis of the work already done, should further be planned:

We approve the idea and agree that further studies be made on the points related in the report:

(a) on a common declaration of faith between Catholics and Anglicans;

(b) on liturgical problems of common concern for the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion;

(c) on the possibility of co-ordinate action through joint or parallel statements on urgent human issues at international, national, and local level;

(d) on the problems and difficulties which arise in the field of missionary strategy and activity of the Church, and the possibility of co-operation;

(e) on the theological and pastoral problems of the doctrine of marriage and the difficulties caused by mixed marriages;

(f) on the ecclesiological principles of the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion in connection with the problem of sacramental intercommunion;

(g) on the theology of the Church and the theology of the ministry in connection with the nature of the priesthood and the application of this doctrine to the Anglican ministry of today;

(h) on the nature of authority in the Church and its concrete form in the teaching authority, in the Petrine primacy, etc.;

(i) on problems of moral theology;

(j) on the application of practical directions given in the Decree of the Second Vatican Council on Ecumenism and in the Directory issued by our Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity.

Moreover we approve certain practical recommendations made in the report such as:

(a) periodical joint meetings, in regions where both the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion have a hierarchy, of either the whole or some considerable representation of the two hierarchies;

(b) consultations on pastoral problems of evangelization in the modern world;

(c) common prayers, according to the rules of the Directory issued by our Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity;

(d) development, under the direction of the respective Superiors, of a special relationship between religious orders of similar inspiration in the two communions.

Other practical recommendations, however, such as agreements for joint use of churches, and agreements to share facilities for theological education and temporary exchange of students, require further investigation and especially consultation with the appropriate authorities (the episcopal conferences and competent authority in Rome).

In order to assure the continuation of the work done by the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission and to carry out the proposals for further studies and activities, we accept the recommendations made by the Commission:

(a) that the Commission be replaced by a Joint Commission responsible for the oversight of Roman-Catholic/Anglican relations, and the co-ordination of future work undertaken together by the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican

Communion;

(b) the constitution of joint sub-commissions, responsible to the Joint Commission, which are necessary for the execution of the programme if approved by the authorities on both sides;

(c) the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations in association with the Anglican Executive Officer should study the methods and concrete ways in which the practical recommendations, as far as they have been approved on both sides, can be realized.

Concerning the question of the publication of the Malta Report, we believe it is better not to give the report for publication to the press. In some of its phrases, the formulation seems not quite clear and exact. Its publication through the press might create the impression that the report represents more than a report of a preparatory commission and even create among the Bishops of the Church the impression that the Report has been already approved by the competent authorities in all its details and that it was communicated to them for implementation. But in fact we are still at a phase of study and for the present moment we prefer that further steps be taken after careful study and with approval of the official authorities on both sides. Of course we do not intend to prevent Your Grace from communicating the content of the report to the members of the Lambeth Conference, if you would think this advisable in order to have their reactions

ECUMENICAL

and their proposals for the continuation of the dialogue and the co-operation.

I express my sincere hope that with the support of the prayers of all the faithful through the grace of God the Churches may be led by him who is the way, the truth, and the life, to the unity in the Holy Spirit, "That there may be one visible Church of God, a Church truly universal and sent forth to the whole world that the world may be converted to the Gospel and so be saved, to the glory of God" (Decree on Ecumenism, 1).

With a warm and heartfelt greeting in the name of our common Lord and with a renewal of my personal pledge of prayers for the guidance of the Holy Spirit in your momentous labours this summer.

I remain,
Yours devotedly in Christ,

✠ J. G. M. Willebrands
(signed) ✠ Aug. Card. Bea
Secr.

Report of the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission

After a meeting at Gazzada (9 to 13 January 1967), Huntercombe Manor (31 August to 4 September 1967), and Malta (30 December 1967 to 3 January 1968)

I

1. The visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Pope Paul VI in March 1966, and their decision to constitute an Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory

Commission, marked a new stage in relations between our two Churches. The three meetings of the Commission, held during 1967 at Gazzada, Huntercombe, and in Malta, were characterized not only by a spirit of charity and frankness, but also by a growing sense of urgency, penitence, thankfulness, and purpose: of *urgency*, in response to the pressure of God's will, apprehended as well in the processes of history and the aspirations and achievements of men in his world as in the life, worship, witness, and service of his Church; of *penitence*, in the conviction of our shared responsibility for cherishing animosities and prejudices which for four hundred years have kept us apart, and prevented our attempting to understand or resolve our differences; of *thankfulness* for the measure of unity which through baptism into Christ we already share, and for our recent growth towards greater unity and mutual understanding; of *purpose*, in our determination that the work begun in us by God shall be brought, by his grace, to fulfilment in the restoration of his peace to his Church and his world.

2. The members of the Commission have completed the preparatory work committed to them by compiling this report which they submit for their consideration to His Holiness the Pope and His Grace the Archbishop. The Decree on Ecumenism recognizes that among the Western Communions separated from the Roman See the Churches of the Anglican Communion "hold a special place". We hope in humility that our work may so help to further

reconciliation between Anglicans and Roman Catholics as also to promote the wider unity of all Christians in their common Lord. We share the hope and prayer expressed in the common declaration issued by the Pope and the Archbishop after their meeting that "a serious dialogue founded on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions may lead to that unity in truth for which Christ prayed".

3. We record with great thankfulness our common faith in God our Father, in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit; our common baptism in the one Church of God; our sharing of the holy Scriptures, of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Chalcedonian definition, and the teaching of the Fathers; our common Christian inheritance for many centuries with its living traditions of liturgy, theology, spirituality, Church order, and mission.

4. Divergences since the sixteenth century have arisen not so much from the substance of this inheritance as from our separate ways of receiving it. They derive from our experience of its value and power, from our interpretation of its meaning and authority, from our formulation of its content, from our theological elaboration of what it implies, and from our understanding of the manner in which the Church should keep and teach the Faith. Further study is needed to distinguish between those differences which are merely apparent, and those which are real and require serious examination.

5. We agree that revealed Truth is given in holy Scripture and formulated in dogmatic definitions through thought-forms and language which are historically conditioned. We are encouraged by the growing agreement of theologians in our two Communion on methods of interpreting this historical transmission of revelation. We should examine further and together both the way in which we assent to and apprehend dogmatic truths and the legitimate means of understanding and interpreting them theologically. Although we agree that doctrinal comprehensiveness must have its limits, we believe that diversity has an intrinsic value when used creatively rather than destructively.

6. In considering these questions within the context of the present situation of our two Communion, we propose particularly, as matter for dialogue, the following possible convergences of lines of thought: first, between the traditional Anglican distinction of internal and external communion and the distinction drawn by the Vatican Council between full and partial communion; secondly, between the Anglican distinction of fundamentals from non-fundamentals and the distinction implied by the Vatican Council's references to a "hierarchy of Truths" (Decree on Ecumenism, 11), to the difference between "revealed truths" and "the manner in which they are formulated" (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 62), and to diversities in theological tradition being often "complementary rather than conflicting" (Decree on Ecumenism, 17).

II

7. We recommend that the second stage in our growing together begin with an official and explicit affirmation of mutual recognition from the highest authorities of each Communion. It would acknowledge that both Communion are at one in the faith that the Church is founded upon the revelation of God the Father, made known to us in the Person and work of Jesus Christ, who is present through the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures and his Church, and is the only Mediator between God and Man, the ultimate Authority for all our doctrine.

Each accepts the basic truths set forth in the ecumenical Creeds and the common tradition of the ancient Church, although neither Communion is tied to a positive acceptance of all beliefs and devotional practices of the other.

8. In every region where each Communion has a hierarchy, we propose an annual joint meeting of either the whole or some considerable representation of the two hierarchies.

9. In the same circumstances we further recommend:

- (a) Constant consultation between committees concerned with pastoral and evangelistic problems, including, where appropriate, the appointment of joint committees.
- (b) Agreements for joint use of churches and other ecclesiastical buildings, both existing and to be built, wherever such use is helpful for one or other of the two Communion.
- (c) Agreements to share facilities for

theological education, and with the hope that all future priests of each Communion should have attended some course taught by a professor of the other Communion. Arrangements should also be made where possible for temporary exchange of students.

(d) Collaboration in projects and institutions of theological scholarship to be warmly encouraged.

10. Prayer in common has been recommended by the Decree on Ecumenism and provisions for this common worship are to be found in the *Directory* (para. 56). We urge that they be implemented.

11. Our similar liturgical and spiritual traditions make extensive sharing possible and desirable; for example, in non-eucharistic services, the exploration of new forms of worship, and retreats in common. Religious orders of similar inspiration in the two Communion are urged to develop a special relationship.

12. Our closeness in the field of sacramental belief leads us further to recommend that on occasion the exchange of preachers for the homily during the celebration of the Eucharist be also permitted, without prejudice to the more general regulations contained in the *Directory*.

13. Since our liturgies are closely related by reason of their common source, the ferment of liturgical renewal and reform now engaging both our Communion provides an unprecedented opportunity for collaboration. We should co-operate, and not take unilateral action, in any significant

ECUMENICAL

changes in the seasons and major holy days of the Christian Year; and we should experiment together in the development of a common eucharistic lectionary. A matter of special urgency, in view of the advanced stage of liturgical revision in both Communion, is that we reach agreement on the vernacular forms of those prayers, hymns, and responses which our people share in common in their respective liturgies. (A list of these texts is appended.) We recommend that this be taken up without delay.

We are gratified that collaboration in this work has been initiated by the exchange of observers and consultants in many of our respective liturgical commissions. Especially in matters concerning the vernacular, we recommend that representatives of our two Communion (not excluding other Christian bodies with similar liturgical concerns) be associated on a basis of equality both in international and in national and regional committees assigned this responsibility.

14. We believe that joint or parallel statements from our Church leaders at international, national, and local level on urgent human issues can provide a valuable form of Christian witness.

15. In the field of missionary strategy and activity ecumenical understanding is both uniquely valuable and particularly difficult. Very little has hitherto been attempted in this field between our two Communion and, while our other recommendations of course apply to the young Churches and mission areas, we propose further the institution at international level of an

official joint consultation to consider the difficulties involved and the co-operation which should be undertaken.

16. The increasing number of mixed marriages points to the need for a thorough investigation of the doctrine of marriage in its sacramental dimension, its ethical demands, its canonical status, and its pastoral implications. It is hoped that the work of the Joint Commission on Marriage will be promptly initiated and vigorously pursued, and that its recommendations will help to alleviate some of the difficulties caused by mixed marriages, to indicate acceptable changes in Church regulations, and to provide safeguards against the dangers which threaten to undermine family life in our time.

III

17. We cannot envisage in detail what may be the issues and demands of the final stage in our quest for the full, organic unity of our two Communion. We know only that we must be constant in prayer for the grace of the Holy Spirit in order that we may be open to his guidance and judgement, and receptive to each other's faith and understanding. There remain fundamental theological and moral questions between us where we need immediately to seek together for reconciling answers. In this search we cannot escape the witness of our history; but we cannot resolve our differences by mere reconsideration of, and judgement upon, the past. We must press on in confident faith that new light will be given us to lead us to our goal.

18. The fulfilment of our aim is far from imminent. In these circumstances the question of accepting some measure of sacramental inter-communion apart from full visible unity is being raised on every side. In the minds of many Christians no issue is today more urgent. We cannot ignore this, but equally we cannot sanction changes touching the very heart of Church life, eucharistic communion, without being certain that such changes would be truly Christian. Such certainty cannot be reached without more and careful study of the theology implied.

19. We are agreed that among the conditions required for inter-communion are both a true sharing in faith and the mutual recognition of ministry. The latter presents a particular difficulty in regard to Anglican Orders according to the traditional judgement of the Roman Church. We believe that the present growing together of our two Communion and the needs of the future require of us a very serious consideration of this question in the light of modern theology. The theology of the ministry forms part of the theology of the Church and must be considered as such. It is only when sufficient agreement has been reached as to the nature of the priesthood and the meaning to be attached in this context to the word "validity" that we could proceed, working always jointly, to the application of this doctrine to the Anglican ministry of today. We would wish to re-examine historical events and past documents only to the extent that they can throw light upon the facts of the

present situation.

20. In addition, a serious theological examination should be jointly undertaken on the nature of authority, with particular reference to its bearing on the interpretation of the historic faith to which both our Communion are committed. Real or apparent differences between us come to the surface in such matters as the unity and indefectibility of the Church and its teaching authority, the Petrine primacy, infallibility, and Mariological definitions.

21. In continuation of the work done by our Commission, we recommend that it be replaced by a Permanent Joint Commission responsible (in co-operation with the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations in association with the Anglican Executive Officer) for the oversight of Roman-Catholic/Anglican relations, and the coordination of future work undertaken together by our two Communion.

22. We also recommend the constitution of two joint sub-commissions, responsible to the Permanent Commission, to undertake two urgent and important tasks: ONE to examine the question of inter-communion, and the related matters of Church and Ministry;

THE OTHER to examine the question of authority, its nature, exercise, and implications.

We consider it important that adequate money, secretarial assistance, and research facilities should be given to the Commission and its sub-commissions in

order that their members may do their work with thoroughness and efficiency.

23. We also recommend joint study of moral theology to determine similarities and differences in our teaching and practice in this field.

24. In concluding our Report we cannot do better than quote the words of those by whom we were commissioned, and to whom, with respect, we now submit it:

In willing obedience to the command of Christ Who bade His disciples love one another, they declare that, with His help, they wish to leave in the hands of the God of mercy all that in the past has been opposed to this precept of charity, and that they make their own the mind of the Apostle which he expressed in these words: "Forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus (Phil. 3. 13-14)."

The Common Declaration by Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury.
24 March 1966

Malta, 2 January 1968

ADDENDUM

Some Common Liturgical Forms

- A. The Lord's Prayer
- The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds
- The Salutation, Responses
- The Gloria Patri
- The Kyrie
- The Gloria in excelsis

The Sursum corda, Sanctus, and Benedictus qui venit

The Agnus Dei

B. The Te Deum

The Canticles: Benedictus, Magnificat, and Nunc Dimittis

C. The Psalter

Anglican/Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission

List of Members

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Most Rev. Charles Helmsing, Bishop of Kansas City-St. Joseph

(Joint Chairman)

The Most Rev. J. G. M. Willebrands, titular Bishop of Mauriana

The Most Rev. William Z. Gomes, Bishop of Poona

The Right Rev. Langton D. Fox, titular Bishop of Maura

The Right Rev. Christopher Butler, O.S.B., titular Bishop of Nova Barbara

The Rev. Louis Bouyer

The Rev. Father George Tavard, A.A.

The Rev. Michael Richards

The Rev. Father John Keating, C.S.P.

The Rev. Adrian Hastings

The Rev. Camillus Hay, O.F.M.

The Very Rev. Canon W. A. Purdy

ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The Right Rev. J. R. H. Moorman, Bishop of Ripon

(Joint Chairman)

*The Right Rev. W. G. H. Simon, Bishop of Llandaff

* Unfortunately unable to attend the third meeting.

ECUMENICAL

The Right Rev. C. H. W. de Soysa, Bishop of Colombo
The Right Rev. E. G. Knapp-Fisher, Bishop of Pretoria
The Right Rev. H. R. McAadoo, Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin
The Rev. Canon James Atkinson
The Rev. Canon Eric Kemp
The Rev. Professor Howard E. Root
The Rev. Dr. Massey H. Shepherd Jr.
The Rev. Professor Eugene R. Fairweather
The Rev. Professor Albert T. Mollegen
The Rev. Canon John Findlow
The Rev. Canon John R. Satterthwaite

ANNEX II.

STATEMENT OF ARC VII

A. Background

Anglicans and Roman Catholics in the United States have been meeting officially since June of 1965. The group of representatives named by the Roman Catholic Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs and the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations of The Episcopal Church has subsequently been known as the Joint Commission on Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations in the United States (usually informally abbreviated to ARC).

Seven meetings have been held to date. These were ARC I, in June of 1965, in Washington, D.C.; ARC II, in February of 1966, at Kansas City, Missouri; ARC III, in October of 1966, at Providence, Rhode

Island; ARC IV, in May of 1967, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin; ARC V, in January of 1968, at Jackson, Mississippi; ARC VI, in December of 1968, at Liberty, Missouri; ARC VII, in December of 1969, at Boynton Beach, Florida.

From the beginning, members of ARC have sensed the creative theological and ecumenical possibilities in the situation of their two Churches in the United States. At their first meeting, they came to a speedy agreement on several questions relating to the sacraments of Christian initiation. In particular, they were agreed that the instances of conditional baptism of Episcopalians upon admission to the Roman Catholic Church or of confirmation of Roman Catholics by Episcopalians were abuses. With their common sacramental emphasis, the group chose at the same time the topic of the ensuing conversations to be: "The Eucharist, Sign and Cause of Unity; the Church as a Eucharistic Fellowship." ARC studied this theme continuously in meetings II through V.

At ARC II, the question was immediately raised, as the conclusion to one of the several papers presented it: "Could not we, in the controlled situation which is ours, celebrate together the Eucharist? If not, why not? What precisely are the barriers?"

It became clear that some of both Roman Catholic and Anglican members felt it possible, on the basis of principle, to propose that discriminate Eucharistic communion be celebrated, now or in the near future, by the group as a legitimate ecclesial action.

In all of the ARC meetings, on successive days, Anglican and Roman Catholic liturgies have been celebrated with all of the members attending. In every instance, only Anglicans have received communion at the Anglican liturgy and only Roman Catholics have received at the Roman Catholic liturgy.

ARC II considered a number of barriers which have existed to the full communion and organic unity of our Churches. Many of these appeared no longer to be obstacles to the participation of Anglicans and Roman Catholics together in the Eucharist in one another's churches. Some important difficulties remained, barring such an action insofar as could be seen at that time. Still, some expressed the sentiment that perhaps such communion was not so far away, especially when the urgency of the Churches' united presence to the world was sufficiently realized. In the press conference which followed, it was this optimism which overshadowed the report on the specifics of the conference and, consequently, several newspapers had headlines suggesting imminent inter-communion or a new joint rite. While such suggestions did not become actualities in succeeding meetings, nevertheless, a certain expectation, which cannot be ignored, was created among our people and, indeed, among certain members of the commission itself.

ARC III advanced agreements by clarifying language, the meaning of liturgical practices and the general theological nature of holy orders and of the priestly ministry. Both Churches hold firmly for the necessity of an ordained ministry in which are included

the three orders of bishops, priests (presbyters), and deacons. Problems and practices of intercommunion were again discussed and not entirely resolved.

ARC IV took up the study of Eucharistic sacrifice, studying the Documents of the Second Vatican Council, the Lambeth Conference Report of 1958, the 1948 Statement of Faith and Order of the Episcopal Church, and other statements of the contemporary position of both our Churches. It concluded that while, since the time of the Reformation, the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice had been considered a major obstacle to the reconciliation of the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church, this was no longer true. It based its conclusion on the findings of the modern biblical, liturgical, and theological studies which, ARC members believed, had transcended the polemical formulations of an earlier period.

This same consultation considered it to be of the utmost importance for the clergy and laity of the two Churches to acknowledge their substantial agreement in this area of Eucharistic doctrine and to build upon it as they go forward in dialogue. In elucidation, ARC IV published a statement, as a kind of brief summary of such consensus (see General Convention Journal 1967, appendix 9, pp. 57-63).

The next consultation again studied official documentation and theological papers, this time on the necessity and role of the ordained priesthood and the relationship of this ministry to the common priesthood and to the role of the laity in the Church. It

concluded that there was no basic difference of understanding on these topics and that whatever minor differences of understanding did exist, they did not *in themselves* constitute the barrier to the two Churches' celebrating and receiving communion together.

The sixth consultation heard papers exploring the problem of unity from the viewpoint of a layman's experience and of a bishop's experience as a guardian and representative of Church unity. However, most of the dialogue was devoted to consideration of the future of such bilateral consultations as ARC and to the procedures for the issuance of releases, interim statements, and the occasional publishing of the proceedings of such sessions.

Most of the meeting was spent clarifying such procedures. An Executive Committee was set up to expedite internal housekeeping matters in the future. A careful statement of the competence of ARC and of its relation to the news media was drawn up.

B. Pastoral Situation

ARC members, as they work toward Christian reconciliation, feel the demands of urgency pushing them ahead. The religious situation in the United States today is challenging, and, we believe, pressing. Its salient characteristics are these:

- American cultural patterns have changed. During the past two generations the mobility of people—in residence, in social interaction, and in income level—has weakened the sense of dependence upon cultural and national traditions linking people to their background in the Old

World. Present tensions of race and region are uniquely American problems existing within an emerging American culture. Attachments to religious affiliations embedded in other national traditions increasingly are no longer dominant influences. In this emerging socio-cultural context, a fragmented Christianity finds it difficult to contribute the healing and cohering influences so clearly needed.

- The Second Vatican Council spoke to the hearts of all people. In the American setting it was heard as the promise of a renewed Christianity and raised hopes for a united Christendom. A variety of influences have combined in the United States to bring about a pattern of consultations, involving both Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, in separate exploratory discussions with other Christian groups. Especially noteworthy is the Consultation on Church Union, an effort at shaping a united Church in which nine Churches, including the Episcopal Church, are engaged. Renewal and the rediscovery of the Christian commitment influence the American religious scene. The Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission understands itself as part of this movement.

- Because the Roman Catholic and Anglican Communions in the U.S. share a greatly treasured Christian tradition, they are deeply aware of their common commitment to preserve these inheritances and to carry them forward into the emerging fabric of American religious life. At the same time, both are sensitive to the larger world-wide scope of their

ECUMENICAL

Communions, and they are resolved through ARC both to contribute to the Permanent Joint Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission the fruits of their efforts in the American context and also to utilize the accomplishments realized by the international consultation.

• The members of ARC feel strongly the urgency to move soundly and positively toward a position of organic unity of their Communions. Concerned Christians are already finding ways for the expression of their shared commitment. Often these are beyond the bounds of the formal Church structures.

C. Projections

We, the members of the Joint Commission on Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations, now declare that we see the goal as to realize full communion of the Roman Catholic Church with the Episcopal Church and the other Churches of the Anglican Communion. For the past four and one half years, we have given our energies to the task of this consultation. Nothing in the course of this serious enterprise has emerged which would cause us to think for a moment that this goal, given the guidance and support of the Spirit of Christ, is unattainable. To the contrary, the progress which we hope we have achieved in the Holy Spirit has deeply encouraged us to press forward with a sense of earnest responsibility toward this achievement, insofar as this lies within our strength and capacity. This we want to do, not only with a sense of the seriousness of our undertaking, but with a profound sense of

responsibility to the now separate Churches to which we belong. We wish to submit all our findings, and the proposals which we offer, to the serious, searching, scrutiny and judgment of our Churches. We shall be most attentive to their response.

At the same time, we hasten to add that we cannot conceive our efforts in this bilateral consultation as divorced from the other significant efforts which in our times we are privileged to witness being made to achieve the goal of further reconciliation and full ecclesial unity among all Christians. We would never wish our own specific efforts and our own specific goal to be regarded as prejudicial to the many different efforts that are being made by our Churches toward this end. Specifically, we wish to mention in this regard the Consultation on Church Union, in which the Episcopal Church is engaged, and the other bilateral consultations in which both our Churches are honored to participate. All of these endeavors have been a source of gratification to the members of ARC and we, in turn, hope that our endeavor may be seen as a source of encouragement to them.

Moreover, we cannot see the task that is set before us as unrelated to the agonizing and critically important quest of men of our times, amid the deeply painful experiences of our century, to achieve a fuller unity among all the members of the human family. Our faith impels us to look to the Church of Christ as a visible sign of the possible unity of mankind. We are, therefore, keenly distressed that the one Church, of which all baptized Christians are members, is seen to be divided more than

it is perceived to be one Church. We understand all too well how this state of affairs has come to be and how it persists. But we wish to encourage all faithful Christians who, with us, regard this present condition of the Church as a source of suffering to her members and of scandal to others.

We offer our efforts to be joined with those of all others who seek to alleviate this suffering and remove this scandalous state both from the Church and from the whole human family as well. If the full significance of the Anglican and Roman Catholic ecumenical quest for unity cannot be perceived apart from the quest of all Christians for their fullest unity, neither will our furthest hopes be fulfilled apart from the need of all men for a much greater realization of the fitting unity of all mankind.

This we regard as an important imperative of the Church of Christ among men in human history, both serving and rejoicing over the possibilities that God has bestowed upon us. We see our communities as intimately linked with mankind and its history. "The joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties, of the men of this age, these too are the joys and hopes, griefs and anxieties, of the followers of Christ." (Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, n.1.)

The International Consultation

In the recommendations of the Preparatory Commission for Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations, we are able to discern three possible stages in the restoration of full communion between our Churches.

(1) *Re-encounter through personal exchange and dialogue*

After four centuries of estrangement, we have witnessed the beginning of reconciliation between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. The visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Pope Paul VI marked in a visible way the success, not only of the program for ecumenical effort proposed by the II Vatican Council, but also of many earlier, courageous, initiatives on the part of Anglicans and Roman Catholics. This meeting of our leaders and especially their participation in a Service of Prayer, gave proof of their personal commitment to the quest for full organic unity.

This meeting led happily to the establishment of an international Preparatory Commission and to its results; namely, the Malta Report and the creation of an international Permanent Commission for Anglican/Roman-Catholic Relations.

It is now our purpose in ARC to pursue, as far as possible, in the United States, the recommendations of the international Preparatory Commission as they have been approved by the Holy See and Canterbury. ARC already has a history and has laid a foundation upon which we can build. Our earlier statements stand as our testimony. Still, we await expectantly further response and criticism of these efforts from our Churches.

Around the world, and across our nation, there are many signs of a developing rapport between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. There is need at this time,

however, to signalize in new ways our commitment to the cause of unity. Among the recommendations of the Malta Report is one which calls for fraternal meetings between Roman Catholic and Anglican bishops. Given our common belief in the role of bishops as bearers of an apostolic office and as "the visible principle and foundation of unity" in their particular Churches (Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, n.23), we look forward to such exchanges in the U.S.A.

At some appropriate time in the not too distant future, we also hope for an event which, following the example set by Pope Paul and Archbishop Michael, will manifest anew the character of the close relations between our Churches. At the national level, some public service, both a solemn celebration of our given unity and a humble prayer for full unity, should take place under the leadership of representative bishops of both Churches and with participation by representatives of the clergy and laity of both Churches. This event would be intended as a common pledge of our resolve to seek full communion and organic unity.

(II) *Growing together: Interim Steps*

We in ARC feel the necessity for a common declaration of faith between Catholics and Anglicans, but we feel that this project would be more appropriately undertaken by the newly formed international Permanent Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission than by ARC. As we now see it, such a statement would affirm, in the description of the Preparatory Commission, "our common faith in God our Father, in our Lord Jesus

Christ, and in the Holy Spirit; our common baptism in the one Church of God; our sharing of the Holy Scriptures, of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Chalcedonian definition, and the teaching of the Fathers; our common Christian inheritance for many centuries with its living traditions of liturgy, theology, spirituality, Church order, and mission." (Paragraph 3 of the Malta Report.)

Having achieved agreement in our past meetings of ARC on the Church as a Eucharistic fellowship, on the theology of the celebrant, and on the nature of Eucharistic sacrifice, we now feel our next step in ARC should be to move on toward mutual recognition of ministry in a statement that we can forward to our respective Church authorities for action.

We endorse the following statement from the international Anglican/Roman-Catholic Preparatory Commission:

"We are agreed that among the conditions required for inter-communion are both a true sharing in faith and the mutual recognition of ministry. The latter presents a particular difficulty in regard to Anglican Orders according to the traditional judgment of the Roman Church. We believe that the present growing together of our two Communion and the needs of the future require of us a very serious consideration of this question in the light of modern theology. The theology of the ministry forms part of the theology of the Church and must be considered as such. It is only when sufficient agreement has been reached as to

ECUMENICAL

the nature of the priesthood and the meaning to be attached in this context to the word 'validity' that we could proceed, working always jointly, to the application of this doctrine to the Anglican ministry of today. We would wish to re-examine historical events and past documents only to the extent that they can throw light upon the facts of the present situation." (Paragraph 19 of the Malta Report.)

We feel that ARC should immediately study the question of orders, together with the related topics of episcopal collegiality, the papacy, and the authority and teaching office in the whole Church. Our next meeting will examine these subjects, also, in the context of developments in other bilateral conversations, such as the Roman-Catholic/Lutheran dialogue, and the findings of the Consultation on Church Union.

Further agreements on the topics already listed may give us more light on possible stages or steps of partial Eucharistic communion on the way to full communion between the Roman Catholic Church and the Churches of the Anglican Communion. Without attempting to predict the shape of such stages, because of our limited perspective at this point, and the new developments in polity and theology, we feel we should examine the following relationships as offering, not static nor fully satisfactory models, but some possible points of departure for new developments between our Churches:

- The Concordat establishing communion

between the Old Catholic and Anglican Churches.

- The nature of uniatism within the Roman Catholic Church.
- The proposals of the Second Vatican Council about relationships between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Churches.
- The Services of Reconciliation in the many proposed Church unions involving Anglicans, such as the Consultation on Church Union, the North-India/Pakistan Plan (now officially approved by the constituting Churches), and the Plans in England, Ceylon, Nigeria, Ghana, Canada, and New Zealand.

If we can achieve a mutually acceptable statement concerning episcopacy and priesthood, we hope to recommend the reconciliation of the ordained ministries of the two Churches without "reordination" or "conditional ordination".

(III) *Toward Full Communion and Organic Unity*

Following the completion of the above-mentioned tasks, we can hope for the restoration of full communion and organic unity. The terms "full communion" and "organic unity" need further definition, but both of them signify an intention to arrive at the oneness for which Christ prayed in his high priestly prayer: a unity which shows forth the relationship between the

Father and the Son in the Spirit, so that the world may see the glory of God revealed in the relationship of his disciples with one another.

Full communion must not be interpreted as an agreement to disagree while sharing in the Eucharistic gifts, nor may organic unity be understood as a juridical concept implying a particular form of Church government. Such a unity is hard to visualize, but would include a common profession of faith and would mean a sufficient compatibility of polity to make possible a united mission to the human family. Whatever structural forms emerge, it is hoped that cultural and liturgical variety will remain so that the values of both the Roman and Anglican *ethos* will survive and develop.

We hope also to further the reconciliation of our respective Churches in such a way as to promote the still wider reconciliation with other Christian Churches.

D. Diffusion

Since the goal of ARC is full communion and organic union between our two Churches, we recognize the need for making this goal, and our progress toward it, widely known among the bishops, priests, religious, and laity, of the two Churches. Accordingly, we would like to see the following programs set in motion.

- (1) In the press and the television news, with the assistance of our press officers,

we should arrange for an announcement of our joint acceptance of this goal, accompanied by interviews with our two chairmen and two other members of the consultation.

(2) Promotion of spiritual ecumenism is necessary to make us all realize that the varieties of spirituality within our two Communion can be a source of mutual enrichment, and that loyalty to our relationships with God will be strengthened, not eroded, by participation in each other's spiritual activity and resources (*communicatio in spiritualibus*).

(3) The projected meeting of bishops, combining a day of recollection with a day of discussion of pastoral concerns and problems, should serve several purposes besides the direct goals of the meeting itself: (a) making our efforts toward union visible to the world; (b) establishing continuing collaboration between bishops with overlapping jurisdictions; (c) providing a model for further conferences, perhaps on a regional basis, to strengthen relationships between our two hierarchies throughout the nation.

(4) Joint clergy conferences should be encouraged, and our ecumenical officers and diocesan ecumenical contacts should become resources for subjects and speakers (perhaps as "traveling teams") to assure successful programs that would move our two Churches toward the common goal.

(5) The movement toward sharing in theological training should be systematically

encouraged, with the aim of raising up a new generation of priests who know and understand their common spiritual heritage.

(6) Co-operation should be fostered between our program-resource persons, especially in the areas of adult education, professional leadership development, and missions. Steps should be taken toward unifying our basic approaches toward religious education of the young.

(7) The religious orders should be made aware of the desirability of closer relationships between orders of similar inspiration, as recommended in the Malta Report and approved by authority.

(8) Participation of the laity in joint retreats and conferences, in living-room dialogues, and in the week of prayer for Christian unity, should be systematically encouraged.

(9) Our Christian brotherhood should issue in theologically based joint action for the whole family of man. Together we must bear witness to Christ's love for persons of all races and identify with them in their struggle for justice. Together we must work to build or preserve a natural environment fit for the dignity of each human person and help to create a community in which every man can live in peace, free from fear, hunger, and poverty. In doing these things, our mutual love will grow to include all men.

(10) The special relationship springing from our many areas of common life and

tradition should not only be a source of mutual enrichment for our two Churches, but should also serve the purpose of moving toward the greater goal of unity of the whole Christian fellowship. There should be continuing consultation, in particular, on the subject of Anglican union discussions with other Churches, to help assure that they will fulfill their declared purpose of being steps toward the unity of the whole body of Christ.

(11) The Ecumenical Commissions of our two Churches, through their staffs, should assume responsibility for these and other means of diffusing ecumenical knowledge and understanding through our Churches at all levels.

Conclusion

The participants in the ARC present this statement, prepared and reviewed by us at our seventh session, as one which records our substantial agreement. As a group, we also recognize the fact that we must continuously seek more and more adequate ways to express the insights that come to us and the hopes that we share. It is in this spirit and with this clear understanding that we submit this statement to the judgment of the authorities of our Churches and offer it for the consideration of our fellow workers in the ecumenical undertaking.

Co-chairmen:

The Right Reverend Donald H. V. Hallock
Bishop of Milwaukee
The Most Reverend Charles H. Helmsing
Bishop of Kansas City-St. Joseph

ECUMENICAL

Participants:

The Right Reverend John M. Allin
Bishop of Mississippi
The Most Reverend William D. Borders
Bishop of Orlando
The Right Reverend John S. Higgins
Bishop of Rhode Island
The Right Reverend Edward R. Welles
Bishop of West Missouri
The Most Reverend Aloysius J. Wycislo
Bishop of Green Bay
Reverend Monsignor William W. Baum
Reverend Lawrence Guillot
Reverend John F. Hotchkin
Reverend Monsignor Bernard F. Law
Reverend Herbert Ryan, S.J.
Reverend George Tavaré
Reverend Arthur A. Vogel
Reverend William J. Wolf
Mr. Peter Day
Mr. Clifford P. Morehouse
Mr. George A. Shipman

Addendum 1

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 the 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 present 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.

Addendum 2

The Joint Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission recognizes that it can make only recommendations, not decisions, concerning closer relations and doctrinal agreements between our two Churches. Such decisions must be arrived at by the appropriate authorities of each Church after consideration and recommendation by our parent bodies, the Bishops' Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs and the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.

The work in which we are engaged, however, is not secret by nature and from time to time may be of interest and concern to the people of God in general. They, too, are part of the process whereby the Church makes its decisions, and their reactions, whether favorable or unfavorable, are significant to the authoritative decision-making bodies.

The mass media are, with all their limitations, a major means of informing the people of God as to the ideas and opportunities being proposed to the two parent bodies. We believe that a policy of openness, in spite of occasional confusion or mistakes, will result, in the long run, in more positive achievements than a policy of close control of the dissemination of information. This group itself must, of course, be sensitive to its responsibilities not to misrepresent either its own status or the actual state of ecumenical agreement between our two Communion.

ANNEX III

A PLAN OF UNION for the Church of Christ Uniting, Commended to the Churches for Study and Response by the Consultation on Church Union, March 9-13, 1970, at St. Louis, Missouri, copyright 1970, by the Executive Committee of the Consultation on Church Union (pp. 104) is an integral part of this Report, though it is being sent separately to all Bishops and Deputies. Additional copies may be obtained from C.O.C.U. Distribution Center, P. O. Box 989, Philadelphia, Pa., 19105, at 65 cents per copy, 25 cents in quantities of four or more.

ANNEX IV

Episcopal Delegates to Ecumenical Gatherings

1. *Orthodox-Anglican Consultation*

- (a) In the U.S.A. (From this list, 10 members attend any one session)

Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife (Western New York),
Chairman
 Rev. Robert B. MacDonald, *Secretary* (Pennsylvania)
 Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (Presiding Bishop)
 Rev. P. Dawley (New York)
 Rev. S. S. Garmey (New York)
 Rev. J. P. Morton (Chicago)
 Rev. Kenneth Waldron (New York)
 Rev. Dr. Edward R. Hardy (Conn.)
 Rev. W. A. Norgren (National Council of Churches)
 Rev. Canon E. N. West (New York)
 Dr. Paul B. Anderson, *consultant*, (New York)
 Ven. J. R. Deppen (Chicago)
 Rev. Dr. Arthur A. Vogel (Milwaukee)
 Rev. T. Keithly (Dallas)
 Rev. Dr. W. J. Wolf (Massachusetts)
 Dr. Peter Day, *Ecumenical Officer* (Executive Council)

- (b) International

Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife (Western New York)
 Rt. Rev. F. W. Lickfield (Quincy)
 Rt. Rev. A. W. Brown (Albany)
 Rt. Rev. J. G. Sherman (Long Island)
 Rev. Dr. Edward R. Hardy (Connecticut)
 Rev. Dr. William J. Wolf (Massachusetts)
 Dr. Paul B. Anderson (New York)

2. *Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission*

- (a) In the U. S. A.

See Annex II—ARC Report

- (b) International

The Rev. Arthur A. Vogel (Milwaukee)

3. *Consultation on Church Union*

Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson (Virginia)
 Rt. Rev. G. Francis Burrill (Chicago)
 Rt. Rev. Ned Cole (Central New York)
 Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr. (Executive Council)
 Rev. Albert T. Mollegen (Virginia)
 Rev. William J. Wolf (Massachusetts)
 Rev. Warner R. Traynham (Massachusetts)
 Miss Janice S. Jackson (Student representative, Michigan)
 Dean Marianne H. Micks (Southern Ohio)
 Dr. George Shipman (Olympia)

4. *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue*

Rt. Rev. Richard S. Emrich (Michigan)
 Rev. Lynn C. Edwards (Pittsburgh)
 Rev. Reginald H. Fuller (New York)
 Rev. Harvey H. Guthrie (Massachusetts)
 Rev. John W. Hildebrand (Dallas)
 Rev. Dr. Enrico C. Molnar (Los Angeles)
 Rev. Dr. Jules Moreau (Illinois)
 Mr. J. L. Pierson (Missouri)
 Rev. Dr. Robert H. Whitaker (Michigan)
 Dr. Peter Day (Ecumenical Officer)

5. *Fourth Assembly, World Council of Churches, Uppsala, Sweden, 1968*

Rt. Rev. John E. Hines (Presiding Bishop)
 Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley (Delaware)
 Rev. Dr. James W. Kennedy (Southern Ohio)
 Rev. Dr. Arthur A. Vogel (Milwaukee)
 Rev. Reynell Perkins (West Texas)
 Dr. Clifford P. Morehouse (New York)
 Mrs. John Jackson (Oregon)
 Mrs. Wallace Shutt (Mississippi)
 Mr. David Johnson (New York)
 Mr. Gerald A. McWorter (Tennessee)
 Mrs. Muriel Webb (Commission on World Mission and Evangelism)
 Dr. Peter Day (Ecumenical Officer)

ECUMENICAL

6. General Assembly NCC—1969

- I. *Rt. Rev. John M. Burgess (Massachusetts)
Mr. 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)**
Mr. Drew Days (New York)
*Mrs. G. C. Hazard (Long Island)
- III. *Rt. Rev. William Crittenden (Erie)
Mr. E. A. Prichard (Virginia)
Mrs. Henry Chalfant (Pittsburgh, Pa.)**
*Rev. Jesse F. Anderson, Sr. (Pennsylvania)
Mrs. Hayward Blake (Washington)
- IV. *Rt. Rev. W. L. Hargrave (South Florida)**
Rev. William Lumpkin (Upper South Carolina)**
Mr. William H. Harris (Louisiana)**
Mrs. M. R. Nellums (Tennessee)
Mr. Edward Colvin (Alabama)
- V. Rt. Rev. Roger W. Blanchard (Southern Ohio)**
Rev. William O. Hanner (Chicago)
Mrs. Charles Battle (Indianapolis)
*Mr. Ronald E. Taylor (Indianapolis)
- VI. Rt. Rev. J. Gilliam (Montana)
*Very Rev. Harry W. Vere (North Dakota)
*Mrs. Lloyd A. Hatch (Minnesota)
Mrs. Robert Horne (South Dakota)
- VII. Rt. Rev. Edw. R. Welles (West Missouri)
Rev. Gerald McAllister (South Texas)
Rt. Rev. Robt. R. Brown (Arkansas)
*Mr. William Ikard, II (New Mexico and Southwest Texas)
Mrs. E. Cotter Murray (Oklahoma)
- VIII. Rt. Rev. Robert C. Rusack (Los Angeles)
Rt. Rev. Norman C. Foote (Idaho)
Very Rev. Richard Coombs (Spokane)
*Mr. George Livermore (California)
Mrs. Robert Miller (Northern California)
- IX. Rt. Rev. David B. Reed (Colombia)

6. General Assembly NCC—1969

Selected by Reason of their Office:

- *Presiding Bishop—Rt. Rev. John E. Hines
- *First Vice-Pres. of the Executive Council, Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr.
- *Vice-Pres. for Administration, Warren H. Turner, Jr.
- *Ecumenical Officer, Peter Day
Deputy for Overseas Relations, Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley
Director General Convention Spec. Program, Leon Modeste
Director Services to Dioceses—Walker Taylor, Jr.
Director Experimental and Specialized Services—Mrs. R. Webb

7. General Assembly NCC—1972

- I. Rt. Rev. John M. Burgess (Boston)
*Rev. E. D. Geyer (Vermont)
Mrs. Marcus Lovett (Conn.)
Mrs. Howard Bateman (Rhode Island)
- II. Rt. Rev. Richard B. Martin (Long Island)
Rev. Darwin Kirby, Jr. (Albany)
*Mrs. G. C. Hazard (Long Island)
Mr. Boyd Johnson (New York)
- III. Rt. Rev. Robert Appleyard (Pittsburgh)
*Rev. Paul Washington (Pennsylvania)
Mr. E. A. Prichard (Virginia)
Mrs. Cynthia Wedel (Virginia)
- IV. *Rt. Rev. William E. Sanders (Tennessee)
Rev. W. Ted Gannaway (South Florida)
Mr. Edward Colvin (Alabama)
Mrs. Ernest H. Clarke (Kentucky)
- V. *Rt. Rev. John Harris Burt (Ohio)
Rev. William O. Hanner (Chicago)
Mr. Charles Battle (Indianapolis)
*Mr. Ronald E. Taylor (Indianapolis)
- VI. Rt. Rev. Jackson E. Gilliam (Montana)
*Very Rev. Harry W. Vere (North Dakota)
Mrs. Lloyd A. Hatch (Minnesota)
Mrs. Richard Stibold (Iowa)
Rev. Webster Two Hawk (South Dakota)

- VII. Rt. Rev. Christoph Keller, Jr. (Arkansas)
 Rev. Gerald McAllister (South Texas)
 Mrs. Cotter Murray (Oklahoma)
 *Mr. James Wyckoff (Texas)
- VIII. Rt. Rev. Robert C. Rusack (Los Angeles)
 Rev. Dr. Richard Coombs (Spokane)
 Dr. Frank Clark, M.D. (California)
 *Mrs. Robert E. Pence (Arizona)
- IX. Rt. Rev. David B. Reed (Colombia)
Selected by Reason of their Office:
 *Presiding Bishop—Rt. Rev. John E. Hines
 *First Vice-President, Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, Jr.
 *Vice-President for Administration

*Ecumenical Officer, Peter Day
 Deputy for Overseas Relations, Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley
 Director General Convention Spec. Program, Leon Modeste
 Director Services to Dioceses
 Director Experimental and Specialized Services, Mrs. R. Webb

* General Assembly members also serving as NCC General Board members for the triennium ending with the General Assembly are indicated by a single asterisk in front of their names.

** Persons who served as proxies in the 1969 General Assembly for absent members noted with a double asterisk opposite their names.

ANNEX V FINANCIAL REPORT

Part I

JOINT COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

Receipts

Appropriated by the 1967 General Convention	\$49,500.00
Additional Appropriation by Special General Convention	4,000.00
Gift to Lutheran Dialogue	1,000.00
Total appropriated	\$54,500.00

Disbursements

Expenses of meetings, including travel, lodging, meals	\$47,384.23
Postage, Telephone, Miscellaneous office expense	2,187.23
Total Disbursements, April 17, 1970	\$49,571.46
Anticipated expenses to August 15, 1970	4,928.54
Total actual anticipated disbursements	\$54,500.00
Anticipated Balance	-0-

Part II

COUNCIL ON RELATIONS WITH EASTERN CHURCHES

Receipts

Good Friday Offering	\$16,207.23	
Sale of Directory	1,220.13	
Refunds (inc. \$8,731.32 from Gen. Conv. Treas. on member travel)	9,508.22	
Transmissions (inc. \$13,655.35 from WCC for Bulgarian Church)	14,009.36	\$40,944.94
Balance per 1967 Report	8,640.31	
Less adjustment a/c previous Triennium	334.53	8,305.78
Total Receipts		\$49,250.72

Disbursements

Eastern Churches Projects	\$ 8,852.82	
Reference material for Council	613.79	
Travel and meetings (inc. refunds)	13,033.23	
Post, Telephone, Office, Miscellaneous	193.29	
Manufacture of Directory of Eastern Churches, two issues	5,617.86	
Transmissions (inc. WCC for Bulgaria)	14,009.36	42,320.35
Balance to carry forward April 17, 1970		6,930.37

Legacy from the Estate of the late Wm. K. Richardson is held on interest-bearing deposit at Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, pending its use in the property-development plan of St. Sergius Institute in Paris (as of 4/23/70).

\$6,330.41

