

# JOURNAL OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION

of the Protestant Episcopal Church  
in the United States of America  
-otherwise known as

the episcopal church

*Held in Louisville, Kentucky from September Thirtieth to October  
Eleventh, inclusive, in the Year of Our Lord 1973*

1973

with Constitution and Canons

# The Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations

## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Members of the Commission</i>	493
<i>The Report</i>	
Introduction	494
1. Relations with Eastern Churches	495
2. Relations with the Roman Catholic Church	499
3. Consultation on Church Union	500
4. Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue	503
5. Relations with Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches	504
6. Jewish-Episcopal Relations	504
7. The Wider Episcopal Fellowship	505
8. Councils of Churches	506
9. Inter-Anglican Relations	508
10. The Ecumenical Officer	508
11. Diocesan Ecumenical Officers	508
Summary and Resolutions	509
<i>Annexes</i>	
<b>I. Orthodox-Anglican Dialogue</b>	
A. Summary of the Consultations in the USA—1962-1973	512
B. Episcopal Participants in Orthodox-Anglican Consultations in the U.S.A.	513
C. U. S. Members of International Commission for Orthodox-Anglican Dialogue	514
<b>II. Anglican/Roman-Catholic Consultation</b>	
A. Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine	514
B. Response by Roman Catholic Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, USA	517
C. Response by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church	518
D. Comment by the United States Anglican/Roman-Catholic Consultation (ARC)	518
E. Doctrinal Agreement and Christian Unity	519
F. Episcopal Members of ARC	522
<b>III. Consultation on Church Union</b>	
A. Episcopal Church Response to <i>A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting</i>	522
B. Report of the Memphis Plenary of the Consultation on Church Union	523
C. Guidelines for Interim Eucharistic Fellowship	525
D. A Proposal for Generating Communities	532
E. Delegates to the Consultation on Church Union	535
<b>IV. Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue</b>	
A. <i>Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue—A Progress Report</i> (Book being sent to all members of General Convention)	536
B. Episcopal members of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue	536
<b>V. Episcopal Representation in Councils of Churches</b>	
A. Episcopal members of Central Committee of the World Council of Churches	536
B. Members of the Governing Board of the National Council of Churches, 1973-1976	536

---

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

---

C. Episcopal Delegation to the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, Dallas, Texas, December 1972.	537
VI. Ecumenical Committee of the Executive Council	538
VII. Financial Reports	539

### MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

#### Bishops

Rt. Rev. John M. Allin, *Chairman*  
Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne\*  
Rt. Rev. John M. Burgess  
Rt. Rev. Richard S. M. Emrich  
Rt. Rev. William H. Folwell  
Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson\*  
Rt. Rev. J. Brooke Mosley\*  
Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles

#### Presbyters

Very Rev. J. Ogden Hoffman, Jr.  
Rev. James W. Kennedy (*Secretary*)  
Rev. A. T. Mollegen  
Very Rev. Elton O. Smith, Jr.  
Rev. Arthur A. Vogel\*\*  
Rev. Robert E. Terwilliger, (*Vice-Chairman*)  
Rev. Warner B. Traynham  
Rev. William J. Wolf

#### Lay Persons

Paul B. Anderson  
Harold J. Berman  
Mrs. John S. Jackson, Jr.  
David Johnson  
Mrs. Sherman E. Johnson  
Charles R. Lawrence  
Marianne Micks  
Sherwood Wise

### UNITS OF THE JOINT COMMISSION ON ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

#### *Council on Relations with Eastern Churches*

Bishop Sherman, *President*; Rev. Dr. Terwilliger, *Secretary*; Rev. Dr. Mollegen, Dr. Anderson, Dr. Berman, Dr. Micks.

#### *Committee on Relations with the Roman Catholic Church*

Bishop Welles, *Chairman*; Dr. Day, *Secretary*; Bishop Vogel, Bishop Allin, Dr. Wolf.

---

\*Resigned: Bishop Gibson was replaced as Chairman by Bishop Allin and as a member by the Rt. Rev. Arthur A. Vogel. Bishop Bayne was replaced by the Rt. Rev. John H. Burt. Bishop Mosley was replaced by the Rt. Rev. John M. Krumm.

\*\*Dr. Vogel was replaced by the Rev. Walter H. Taylor upon his election to the episcopate and was later re-appointed to the Commission as a Bishop.

---

## APPENDICES

---

### *Committee on Unity Consultations\**

Bishop Gibson, *Chairman*; Bishop Vogel, Bishop Bayne, Dr. Mollegen, Dr. Wolf, Rev. Mr. Traynham, Dr. Micks.

### *Committee on Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue*

Bishop Emrich, *Chairman*; Dean Hoffman, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Day.

### *Committee on Relations with Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches*

Bishop Folwell, *Chairman*; Dr. Day, *Secretary*; Very Rev. Mr. Smith.

### *Committee on Jewish-Episcopal Fellowship*

Dr. Terwilliger, *Chairman*; Bishop Mosley, Mrs. Johnson, Dr. Butler, Dr. Berman.

### *Committee on the Wider Episcopal Fellowship*

Bishop Burgess, *Chairman*; Dean Smith, Mrs. Jackson, Dr. Day.

### *Committee on Councils of Churches*

Bishop Burt, *Chairman*; Dr. Kennedy, *Secretary*; Dean Smith, Bishop Burgess, Bishop Allin, Bishop Emrich, Dr. Lawrence, Mrs. Jackson, Mr. Wise, Mr. Johnson.

## INTRODUCTION

The Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations was created to enable the Episcopal Church to respond more faithfully to Christ's mandate that his Church be one:

. . . that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be in us, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. (John 17:20)

Ever since the General Convention of 1886, in Chicago, issued the now historic Quadrilateral setting forth the basis of our serious intent about the search for Christian unity, Episcopalians have given high priority to leadership in the ecumenical movement in all its manifestations.

The movement involves, of course, not simply the pursuit of organic unity itself (though that remains primary), but the host of ways by which Christians at every level attempt to make a united witness for Christ—all the way from local manifestations of inter-congregational co-operation; on through conciliar structures in their city, state, national, and international forms; and including many common ventures for disaster relief and other forms of joint action to meet human need.

During the past triennium, certain apparent retreats on the ecumenical front have led some to feel pessimistic about the future of ecumenism. One might cite the decision of the Consultation on Church Union not to press its plan for inter-Church union at this time, or the apparent Roman Catholic slowdown in implementing certain ecumenical thrusts of Vatican II, or the drastic cuts by the Episcopal Church in funding the National and World Councils of Churches. In truth, however, the three years since the Houston Convention have seen some phenomenal advances in a Christian response to the ecumenical imperative.

There are, for example, thirty-six different Church-unity quests currently under way throughout the world, many of them involving Anglicans. The Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Orthodox Churches have opened up to serious dialogue on doctrinal issues with other Communion, and the Episcopal participation in these dialogues has already led to important breakthroughs for doctrinal agreements. The National Council of Churches, under the presidency of a distinguished Episcopal laywoman, has gone through a re-structure process in which the thirty-three member Communion have affirmed with new vigor this co-operative venture, with the distinct

---

\*Has dealt primarily with the Consultation on Church Union during the past triennium. Bishop Krumm has succeeded Bishop Gibson as Chairman of the Committee and the delegation.

possibility that the Roman Catholic Church will soon join (as it has already joined scores of community and State Councils of Churches). Moreover, the lowering of mutual suspicions between congregations at the local level goes on apace. In nearly every community, uniting in witness, as in Key '73 and in the charismatic movement, and the sharing of worship and sacraments (some of it admittedly uncanonical) has brought Christians together in configurations which ten years ago would have been deemed unbelievable.

During this period, Episcopalians have learned with new appreciation how much we have to receive from others, as well as having things to share with them. There is less talk among us about inviting other Churches to walk across our "bridge" or along our *via media* and more realization that our own treasures can be enriched as we offer them humbly in the miracle of dialogue. Differences that formerly looked like problems dividing Christians now often appear more like opportunities for mutual enrichment.

In all of this, the role of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations is to co-ordinate and encourage, and to suggest for General Convention's consideration those legislative measures which seem appropriate for the next steps ahead in the ecumenical experience. The work of the Commission is done principally through units or committees, which touch on almost every area of the Church's ecumenical life, especially in our continuing and new relationships with other Churches and religious bodies. What follows now is a summary of the Commission's work in these several areas, together with Resolutions that, we believe, will move our ecumenical participation as a Church responsibly forward.

### 1. RELATIONS WITH EASTERN CHURCHES

Under the leadership of the late Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I and of Russian Patriarch Alexei, notable advances were made in Orthodox openings to the West. Their newly elected successors, Demetrios at the Phanar and Pimen in Moscow, have announced their intention to pursue the same policy of rapprochement with other Churches, and, in particular, with the Anglican Communion. The Presiding Bishop has visited and held fruitful conversations with the Patriarchs and leading hierarchs in both Istanbul (1967) and Moscow (1972), revealing the large role which the Episcopal Church in the United States has to play in this process.

The capping of this stage of relationships came when the Presiding Bishop, Dr. John E. Hines, traveled to Moscow in June, 1972, for a formal visit with His Holiness Patriarch Pimen. The significance of this visit is set forth in the following extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow:

Report of the Most Rev. Juvenaly, Metropolitan of Tula and Belev, President of the Department of External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate, regarding contacts between the representatives of the Episcopal Church, USA, and the Russian Orthodox Church, which took place during the visit in the USSR, June 2-10, of the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the USA, Dr. John Hines:

#### RESOLVED:

- 1) To express satisfaction with the brotherly and serious spirit of these contacts, continuing the traditional brotherly relations between the Episcopal Church, USA, and the Russian Orthodox Church.
- 2) To express the hope that the conversations which took place in Moscow will serve to broaden the collaboration between the two Churches and will be useful to the ecumenical movement as a whole.

An explanation is needed regarding inter-Orthodox unity, as well as their interest in relations with other Churches. For the Orthodox, a Church Council represents

---

## APPENDICES

---

authority. The First Great Council was held at Nicea in 325; the Seventh (and last, according to Orthodox reckoning) took place in 787. In the succeeding twelve centuries there have been only local or regional Councils. In 1961, delegates of the fourteen Churches in communion with the Ecumenical Patriarch, meeting at Rhodes, resolved to call a Great and Holy Council, and made up a "catalog" of topics to be discussed. Among them is the matter of relationship between the Orthodox and the Anglican Communion.

At first the proposed meeting was called a "Pro-Synod", *i.e.*, a Synod of Bishops charged with preparing the Great Council; but a 1965 meeting, also at Rhodes, revised the procedure in favor of omitting the preliminary meeting and aiming directly at holding a Great and Holy Council. It is not referred to as "ecumenical"; according to Orthodox doctrine and tradition, this high appellation depends upon the subsequent approbation of the faithful people in all the Orthodox Churches.

More than a century ago, formal conversations took place between Orthodox and Anglicans, in efforts to actualize the latent feeling that they belong together in the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. The Journals of the General Conventions from 1865 to the 1890's provide long reports by the "Russo-Greek Committee" (1862) on questions which were raised on both sides. The current discussions represent an important new stage in this process.

A sub-committee of the inter-Anglican Commission for Discussions with the Orthodox met in September, 1972, with a corresponding Orthodox group, and set up agenda for a joint meeting of the full membership of the two Commissions in 1973, which will constitute a resumption of the formal discussions last held in 1931.

The documents which have been exchanged, and the preliminary conversations between Commission members, indicate that the real problems to be faced are both the traditional ones (the *Filioque*, the implication in the XXXIX Articles that the authority of the Great Councils can be called in question, the validity of Anglican orders, Anglican comprehensiveness) and some problems which are not expressly set forth; for example, the role of the liturgy in expressing Church authority. The Anglicans are posing questions for interpretation of some points in Orthodox doctrine. They would like to see theological questions set in relation to one another, not as separate items. They seek a contemporary Orthodox presentation of the faith for modern situations.

At the conclusion of the joint meeting of the sub-committees, the following topics were set for discussion when the Commissions meet together in July, 1973: Orthodox papers on "The Work of the Holy Spirit as Interpreter of the Gospel and Giver of Life to the Church Today", and "The Redemptive Work of Christ on the Cross and in the Resurrection"; and Anglican papers on comprehensiveness, the mission of the Church, and the XXXIX Articles.

In the process now under way, the ultimate goal cannot yet be expressly defined. This will be the task of the Joint Commission of the two Churches. Invoking the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the inter-Anglican Commission in 1969 proposed three stages: (a) mutual information, (b) some form of common action, and (c) *communio in sacris*. The Orthodox customarily speak of unity being realized when the Anglicans truly feel themselves to be "Orthodox" and the latter accord recognition as such. However, it is manifest that the relatively inflexible doctrinal stand of the Orthodox and the stubbornly held comprehensiveness of the Anglicans present obstacles which will call for much explanation, openness, and probably adjustment, on the part of both. No less important for the achievement of unity will be the spreading of information to the respective flocks and their acceptance of agreements, since the objective is not just a formal document but domestication in the parishes of both Churches of the sense of the unity which *communio in sacris* implies.

The Episcopal Church has had the following members on the inter-Anglican Commission: the Rt. Rev. William J. Lickfield (Quincy), the Rt. Rev. Jonathan G. Sherman (Long Island), the Rev. Dr. Edward R. Hardy, and the Rev. Dr. Robert E. Terwilliger; together with Dr. Peter Day, Ecumenical Officer, *ex officio*, and Dr. Paul B. Anderson, Joint Secretary.

For six years the Church of England has been the host and paid the local expenses for meetings of the Anglican Commission for Dialogue with the Orthodox, and the Ecumenical Patriarchate was host to the 1972 joint meetings. It is now the turn for the Episcopal Church to act as host for one or more meetings.

The Anglican-Orthodox Consultations in the United States have taken place once or twice a year for the last eleven years. Each side has had a fairly constant body of ten or twelve participants. This has favored consistent progress in discussion on each subject. For instance, Professor Dr. John Meyendorff's paper in 1971, on the Mission of the Church, called forth such lively comments by both Orthodox and Anglicans that it was made the chief topic for the next two sessions. Dr. Meyendorff, who is a graduate of St. Sergius Theological Institute in Paris, a member of the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies in Washington, D. C., and the elected Chairman of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, has brought into the Consultation the stimulating thought of all of these institutions, setting a high standard of excellence for discussion. Bishop Sherman drew heavily on Dr. Meyendorff's paper when reporting to the inter-Anglican Commission in 1972 on the work going on in America.

The Orthodox Churchmen in the Consultations represent the Antiochian Syrian, the Orthodox Church in America (Metropolia), the Greek Archdiocese, the Serbian, and the Romanian Churches in this country. When, in April, 1970, the Moscow Patriarch removed the forty-five-year-old suspension on the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (the Metropolia) and formally recognized its establishment as the autocephalous "Orthodox Church in America", having the same rank as the fourteen existing autocephalic Churches, there was great resentment on the part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and some of the other Churches in the Near East. Some of their faithful in America at first hesitated to continue with the former Metropolia in the consultations. However, time and Christian charity have restored good feeling and all now participate.

Christian Churches of the whole world, and especially the Anglicans, mourn the death of the Russian Patriarch, His Holiness Alexei, in 1970, and of His All-Holiness Athenagoras, Archbishop of Constantinople and Ecumenical Patriarch, in 1971. The latter was especially dear to all Americans, as he had been head of the Greek Archdiocese here for fourteen years before returning to Istanbul. The Episcopal Church was represented at his funeral by the Rt. Rev. Edmond Browning, American Bishop in Europe. The Bulgarian Orthodox Church lost not only its Patriarch, His Holiness Kyrille, in 1971, but its Metropolitan in America, the Most Rev. Andrei, in 1972.

A personal friend of all of these great hierarchs was the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, Bishop of Western New York, and head of this Council, who died in September, 1970. Strongly influenced during his Seminary days by the late Dr. Frank Gavin, Bishop Scaife early entered upon a career of leadership in relationships with the Orthodox, the other Eastern Churches, and the Polish National Catholic Church. He visited the Orthodox Patriarchs at Istanbul, Moscow, Tbilisi in Georgia (USSR), Bucharest, Sophia, and Belgrade, as well as the non-Chalcedonian Patriarchs of the Armenian and the Ethiopian Churches. Chiefly, however, he will be remembered by all of the Eastern Churches in America, as he came to know personally all of their

## APPENDICES

---

Bishops and scores of their priests and faithful. The Episcopal Church thanks God for what he did to favor love and unity with all of them.

For more than a decade Bishop Scaife edited the biennial Directory of Orthodox and other Eastern Churches in America. The 1972 edition is modified in format and style, and enriched by embracing such features as the guidelines for practical relationships, the calendar for Orthodox Great Feasts, a glossary of unusual terms, and a brief bibliography. Compiled and edited with great care by the Rev. Dr. J. Robert Wright, General Theological Seminary, the "*Handbook of American Orthodoxy*" appeared in 1972, with a foreword by the Rt. Rev. Jonathan G. Sherman, Bishop of Long Island, who has succeeded Bishop Scaife as President of the Council on Eastern Churches of this Joint Commission. The Handbook was issued by Forward Movement Publications, in Cincinnati, and thus has had wide circulation.

The Episcopal Church is one of the five Communion forming the Committee for the American Protestant Chaplaincy in Moscow. Each Church takes its turn in nominating and financially supporting a chaplain there for a two- or three-year period. In 1972, the turn for the Episcopal Church came, and its nominee was the Rev. Raymond E. Oppenheim, who, with his wife Winifred, entered upon his duties in Moscow in February, 1972. The constituency is not only the Americans in Moscow and Leningrad, but also the British and all other non-Roman Catholic aliens (*i.e.*, not Soviet citizens) in the Soviet Union. Nearly two hundred attended Christmas services in 1972. There are more than a hundred children in the Sunday school, and about forty to fifty foreign students come to the monthly meeting at the Rev. Mr. Oppenheim's apartment. There is an excellent and responsible Church Council, chosen by and representing the various denominations and nationalities. The ambassadors of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Singapore, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, and some other countries, give their full support to the significant undertaking, made possible by the Roosevelt-Litvinov Agreement of November, 1933. The Rev. Mr. Oppenheim has also greatly strengthened current relationships with the Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church and with the leaders of the Union of Evangelical Christian Baptists in Moscow.

Thus, the Episcopal Church is deeply involved in rapidly developing relationships with the Eastern Churches. These Churches are contributing notably to the fibre of Church life in the USA.

St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary at Crestwood, New York, now has nearly a hundred students. Holy Cross Seminary at Brookline, Massachusetts, supplies pastors for the Greek Church. St. Sergius Theological Institute in Paris, still being supported by the Episcopal Church, has 29 students. The Antiochian Patriarchate in 1970 established a theological school at Belemond, Lebanon, for the training of clergy and scholars for the Orthodox of the Near East.

Recent years have seen great progress in resolving the historical differences in doctrinal formulation between the five Churches which rejected the decisions of the Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon (451), *i.e.*, the Armenian, Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite), Syrian of Malabar Coast, Coptic, and Ethiopian Churches; and the Eastern Churches which accept the Council, *i.e.*, the fourteen autocephalic Eastern Churches in communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Episcopal Church has excellent practical relations with the Armenian Churches in America and with the Coptic Church in Egypt and the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. The Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations has delayed moving into theological dialogue with them, largely for the reason that these five and the fourteen have been working, through commissions of theologians, to discover if their Christological doctrines are not really compatible, or perhaps even the same but expressed in different terms—a matter of contextuality rather than substance. The reports of their theological discussions imply



that it is now a matter to be transferred from the theologians to the councils of Bishops, or to the forthcoming Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Churches. If a basis of mutual recognition can be found, the theological method employed may be of great importance for future ecumenical dialogue.

## **2. RELATIONS WITH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH**

The Episcopal Church's relationships with Roman Catholics take place both in an international and in a national setting. Encouraging steps and progress have been achieved in both areas during the triennium.

Since the last report of the Joint Commission to the General Convention, there have been three meetings of the International Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission (ARCIC). A fifth meeting of ARCIC is scheduled in the month prior to the General Convention; the representative of the Episcopal Church on the Commission continues to be the Rt. Rev. Arthur A. Vogel. Two Roman Catholics from the USA, the Rev. George H. Tavard, A. A., and the Rev. Herbert Ryan, S. J., are also ARCIC members. At the second meeting of ARCIC, held in Venice, September, 1970, papers were given and discussion was held in the three major areas of "Authority", "Ministry", and "Eucharist". In addition, papers were given on the "Nature and Methodology of Moral Theology" and the "Relations of Men and Women". Realizing that it was being inundated with material, the Commission decided to divide into three sub-committees to work on the subject of the Eucharist, the area in which convergence and consensus were most obviously found between the two Communion. At the third meeting of the Commission, held in Windsor, England, September 1971, an "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine" was produced. That Statement, commonly referred to as the "Windsor Statement", has now been referred to the Churches for their judgment. The House of Bishops has received the statement "with gratitude", believing that if its substance is agreed upon by the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, controversy over Eucharistic Faith would no longer be "an obstacle to the unity sought by the churches in God's name". The House of Bishops commended the statement for "study and action at the next General Convention". ARC has contributed to the world-wide response to the statement.

The agenda for the fourth meeting of ARCIC, held in Gazzada, Italy, September, 1972, was to begin work on a possible consensus statement on "Ministry". During the meeting, considerable work was done on the "Nature of Ministry in the New Testament". Three sub-committees, located in England, North America, and South Africa, are presently working on "Apostolic Succession", "Priesthood", and "Ordination", respectively. It is hoped that a statement suitable for submission to the authorities of our Churches will be finished at a meeting of ARCIC in England, in September, 1973.

Here in the United States, the joint Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission (ARC) has held five meetings during the triennium: in St. Benedict, Louisiana, January, 1971; in Liberty, Missouri, June, 1971; in New York City, January, 1972; and in Cincinnati, Ohio, in June, 1972, and March, 1973. ARC's goal, the full communion of our two Churches, is ever before our eyes and in the context of other unity dialogues of both Churches. Some of the ARC papers and ideas are contributed to ARCIC through the three persons who serve on both Commissions. Perhaps the most useful document produced since last General Convention has been ARC XI's "Doctrinal Agreement and Christian Unity—Methodological Considerations" (see Annex II.E). For the first time since the beginning of the dialogue labors in June, 1965, two booklets were published: "ARC/DOC I" and "ARC/DOC II", containing ARC Statements; Lambeth Statements and Actions; words of Pope Paul VI, Archbishop Ramsey, and Cardinal Willebrands; actions of Roman Catholic Bishops and General Convention; and the Windsor Statement, together with a detailed commentary and study guide to

---

## APPENDICES

---

that Statement, making the two booklets invaluable both for private study and for group discussion.

ARC's principal method is to compare the contemporary teachings of the two Churches, as expressed in official documents and weighty advisory statements. The Dogmatic Constitutions, Constitutions, Decrees, and Declarations of Vatican II are compared with the teachings of the Book of Common Prayer, the Constitution and Canons, Resolutions of General Convention, Pastoral Letters and Position Papers of the House of Bishops, and resolutions and reports of the Lambeth Conference.

The remarkable degree of convergence found in these sources has led to the development of an agenda, scheduled for completion by 1976, taking up in orderly fashion: (1) The Purpose or Mission of the Church; (2) the Church as Eucharistic Fellowship (or Communion) and the relation between Eucharist and Mission; (3) The ministry as it exists within the Eucharistic Fellowship; (4) Authority as the means by which the nature of the Church and its mission are safeguarded and given effect in the life of the world, with attention to the relation of the papacy to different *typoi* of the Church (embodiments of the universal Church in particular ecclesial Communions); (5) Review of the relation between Church authority and other aspects under which the life of the Church is expressed and understood.

General Convention is asked in the Resolutions at the end of this Report to approve the continuance of this promising enterprise, and, in particular, to give endorsement to the Agreed Statement of ARCIC on Eucharistic Doctrine.

### 3. THE CONSULTATION ON CHURCH UNION

The Consultation on Church Union has reached a new level of maturity in its understanding of the process required in the search for the goal of visible unity. The 1973 Plenary of the Consultation arrived at significant conclusions on steps in this process:

1. Because there is general unreadiness to accept organizational structures for a United Church, it is evident that such structures must wait to be revealed and developed out of the experience of living and working together;
2. Because of increasing agreement among the Churches on matters of faith, worship, and ministry, there is immediate need for further study of Faith and Order, leading toward common agreements as a basis for ultimate union;
3. Because it is recognized that the experience of institutional racism is a barrier to Church union, this area of concern must have high priority in any strategy and process leading toward union;
4. Because unity, understanding, and fellowship are reached through the experience of working and worshipping together at various levels of Church life, the Consultation sees the next stages of its service as actively involving the Churches in such experience.

#### *The Study of a Plan of Union*

In 1970, the Consultation issued, for study and response, the document entitled, "A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting". This document was in some areas seriously misunderstood: it was wrongly assumed to be a proposal for union which the participating Churches should accept or reject. In spite of such misunderstandings, the document accomplished in a major way its purpose of involving the Churches creatively in the need of unity planning and study.

Study and response, which was the major program of the Consultation during the past three years, was most productive where it took place on an inter-denominational basis. Participants who were so involved for a period of time generally reported a deeper understanding of the need for unity and commitment to the goal of Church union.

---

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

---

Delegates to the 1973 plenary, sixty percent or more of them newcomers to such an official meeting, clearly witnessed to such an understanding and commitment.

The extent of study and response within the Episcopal Church was disappointing, showing widespread apathy in many areas. Nevertheless, there was more participation than that indicated by written responses, and there was adequate and serious response sufficient to enable the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations to submit to the Consultation its summary response of the attitudes, criticisms, and hopes of the Episcopal Church (Annex III. A).

From all of the participating Churches, taken together, there was a widespread and creative response. More than 3,000 local churches have been involved, reflecting the attention and opinion of nearly a half-million Church members. In addition, there were many reports from theological faculties and other leadership groups, as well as innumerable articles in religious publications in the United States and abroad.

The task of collating, evaluating, and assessing the implications of this great mass of Christian opinion and judgment was a tremendous one. Deeper study will, of course, continue; but the initial findings became the major agenda for the Consultation's plenary in April, 1973. The present conclusions and proposed program for the Consultation's immediate future are based soundly on the implications from this long study and response. The Consultation's official report from the 1973 Plenary is printed as Annex II. 2, to this report.

The Churches represented at the Memphis Plenary were the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S., the United Church of Christ, and the United Methodist Church. Absent was the United Presbyterian Church in the USA, which withdrew by action of its 1972 General Assembly. We are happy to record the decision of the 1973 Assembly to return to full participation in the Consultation. Perhaps the new directions charted by the Memphis plenary seem more realistic to Presbyterians and to members of other Churches as well.

### *Participation of Black Churches*

It is of especial note that the serious participation of the predominantly Black denominations has heightened in the past three years. The three Churches involved have taken recent official actions indicating their commitment to the purpose and goal of the Consultation. Their delegate attendance and leadership participation in the 1973 Plenary was stronger and more influential than ever before. The recognition of such leadership was clearly evidenced in the election of Bishop Frederick D. Jordan of the African Methodist Episcopal Church as the new chairman of the Consultation.

High among "the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions" in this country is our separation into Christian denominations on racial lines. If as Christians we are called to overcome racial and ethnic prejudice and discrimination, then surely we are called to oneness in Christ and in His Body, the Church. To this end our growing relationship with the Black Churches in the Consultation is of major significance in the pursuit of Christian unity.

### *Participation of the Roman Catholic Church*

Our bilateral Anglican and Episcopal Church consultations with the Roman Catholic Church are encouragingly recorded elsewhere in this report. It is proper to record here, however, the large measure of interest and participation the Roman Catholic Church has shown in the Consultation on Church Union. Rome is in bilateral dialogue with Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others, but is also encouraging the various consultations toward union in which these Churches are jointly engaged throughout the world.

## APPENDICES

---

The Roman Catholic Church is not at present a full participant in the Consultation, but from the earliest years has provided official observer-consultants who have participated actively in study, plenaries, and commission work.

Cardinal Willebrands and Cardinal Suenens have attended, addressed, and encouraged, meetings of the Consultation. Roman Catholics participated in the study of "A Plan of Union", in some areas more actively than Episcopalians. They produced and published an official study response, *Consultation on Church Union: A Catholic Perspective*, which became a part of the implications material.

Roman Catholic participation has provided scholars for the Consultation's Worship Commission; initiated a new joint commission on an Ecumenical Marriage Rite, which is presently at work; and sponsored and led a recent conference with representatives of the participating Churches at Seton Hall University. At the 1973 Plenary, the new Archbishop of Washington led the delegation of Roman Catholic consultants, which participated most helpfully.

These evidences of Roman Catholic interest are here recorded because it is sometimes assumed that the Episcopal Church must choose between "Catholic" and "Protestant" consultations leading toward unity. The Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations believe that all are working co-operatively and simultaneously toward the same goal.

### *The Participation of Lutheran Churches*

Recorded elsewhere in this report are the results and recommendations to date of Anglican and Lutheran dialogues, both in the United States and internationally. These, too, will have significant impact upon the future work of the Consultation. Lutheran Churches have not yet accepted full membership in the Consultation, although they have been encouraged to do so. But the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., a joint agency of the American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Church in America, and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is now participating on the same basis as the Roman Catholic Church and should be increasingly influential in the Consultation process.

### *Participation of Canadian Churches*

The Anglican Church of Canada, the United Church of Canada, and the Disciples of Christ in Canada are now in a relatively advanced stage of Church union negotiations. Their latest edition of *A Plan of Union* is especially commended for study.

Representatives of these Canadian Churches and of the Churches in the Consultation on Church Union have been meeting regularly through recent years. Representatives also attend on an official basis the plenary meetings on behalf of union in both countries. This continues to be mutually helpful in setting common directions and goals of union. It is especially significant for Episcopalians, since it brings the strength and insights of our Canadian Anglican brethren into our unity discussions and gives the value of a wider Anglican witness.

### *Unique Values of the Consultation*

In the Consultation on Church Union, the wholeness of Church life is perceived and explored as in none of the other inter-Church dialogues in which the Episcopal Church is engaged. The pattern of eucharistic worship, the ordination rite, the place of the local church as a locus of Christian identity and the relation of this spiritual reality to the practical problem of ownership of Church property, the tension between proclaiming the good news of salvation in Christ and the social mission of the contemporary Church—these and other ingredients of the totality of Christian living are studied by volunteers from the member Churches, with the assistance of a small staff, consisting at the moment of one gifted executive, Dr. Paul Crow, and a few office workers. (The full complement includes one associate executive.)

---

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

Those who contribute their time to this work may enter upon it reluctantly at first, but they quickly find it a joyful exercise in Christian obedience, so clearly is it related to the Scriptural ideal of the unity of the people of God.

The Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations believes that there is a clear need for the continuance of the Consultation on Church Union. The need of, and the movement toward, some form of visible Christian oneness and witness grows stronger throughout the world. Serious union consultations are presently in progress in thirty-six countries, and several unions involving Anglicans have recently been consummated.

If this particular Consultation did not exist, or did not continue, the theological and practical call to Christian unity would lead us in this country into some other similar Christian work. Although there are a number of important organizations for ecumenical relations and Christian co-operation, the Consultation on Church Union is the only body in the United States which explicitly serves the cause of a united Church to which Anglicans have long been committed.

### *Generating Communities and Interim Eucharistic Fellowship*

Of special interest to the Episcopal Church are the two proposals of the COCU relating to "Generating Communities" and "Interim Eucharistic Fellowship" (Annex III. C., D.).

These proposals suggest means by which representatives of the participating Churches may have the experience of common life, service, and worship. Since this involves for the Episcopal Church serious questions of sacramental and ministerial authority, the Joint Commission recommends that the two documents, and the questions of their implementation, be considered by the House of Bishops at its next meeting.

We believe that the Consultation has effectively served this cause, has matured in its understanding of the required process, and has outlined a program for the immediate future in which the Episcopal Church can be a leading and full participant.

Our Episcopal emphasis on sacramental worship, and on the continuity of the Church's life in faith, worship, and historic episcopal order, is needed in the Consultation.

#### 4. LUTHERAN-EPISCOPAL DIALOGUE

"Anglicans and Lutherans have been in dialogue both in the United States and internationally for about three years. This is a comparatively short period, as Church unity discussions go, but the participants in both sets of conversations report sufficient agreement on the Christian faith to enable them to recommend to their parent bodies, and through them to the decision-making authorities of the Churches, that steps now be taken toward the realization of *communio in sacris*." (Peter Day and Paul D. Opsahl, in the introduction to *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue: A Progress Report*; Cincinnati, Ohio: Forward Movement Publications, January, 1973.) This small book, though published separately, is hereby made an integral part of the 1973 Report of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.

The theological and ecclesiological work already done by the Lutheran/Roman-Catholic and Anglican/Roman-Catholic dialogues contributed substantially to the Lutheran-Episcopal consultations. The recommendations made by the Committee on Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue in no way urge the structural union of our respective Churches, but they do contain some proposals offered in response to our growing mutual understanding and agreement in the Gospel. They recognize and acknowledge what is already happening in many places among both the clergy and laity of our several Churches.

The Executive Committee of the Lutheran Council in the United States of America has received and transmitted the document, generally entitled *Lutheran-Episcopal*

---

## APPENDICES

---

*Dialogue: A Progress Report*, to the presidents of the several Lutheran synods, and the Standing Committee of the Division of Theological Studies of the Lutheran Council has recommended a second series of Lutheran-Episcopal conversations.

The report anticipates a more explicit mutual recognition than heretofore of one another as members of the one Body of Christ, and a similar acknowledgement of our respective ecclesial bodies as having been blessed by God as instruments of His grace, looking forward to such a degree of official inter-communion at the Lord's Table as growing mutual trust and understanding make possible. The report recommends continued theological dialogue, and mutual consultation at every practicable level of operation, so as to further growth into that full unity to which God by His Spirit calls us.

Implementation of the specific recommendations on pages 22-25 of *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue* will necessarily be a process requiring many steps, some of which can be taken only by the Lutheran denominations severally. Recommendations involving the exercise of pastoral authority of Bishops need to be studied by the Episcopal Church's House of Bishops to consider what can be done in the present situation and what must await appropriate legislation. While this process is going on, the Commission strongly recommends the adoption of the Resolution on page 511, authorizing a second round of dialogue on the subject, "What is the Gospel?", as proposed by the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.

### 5. RELATIONS WITH PENTECOSTAL AND CONSERVATIVE EVANGELICAL CHURCHES

The Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches in the United States are continuing to become more involved in joint undertakings with other Christian bodies. The growing experience of the Episcopal Church with the charismatic movement is providing many contacts with Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical Churches that are resulting in fruitful influence in both directions.

Although still shunning the word *ecumenical*, our Conservative Evangelical and Pentecostal brothers and sisters are increasingly aware of the need for allies in these confusing times to bear witness to the Gospel of Christ. During the triennium, the Episcopal Church has been represented at numerous Pentecostal and Conservative Evangelical gatherings, including annual conventions of the National Association of Evangelicals and the Ninth Triennial World Pentecostal Congress, and individual members of the Commission continue to cultivate personal contacts and relationships.

### 6. JEWISH-EPISCOPAL RELATIONS

The General Convention of 1964 took steps toward closer relationships with the Jews, rejecting the concept of deicide and adopting the following Resolutions for positive action:

*Resolved*, That the General Convention condemn un-Christian actions against the Jews; and that this Church seek positive dialogue with appropriate representative bodies of the Jewish faith; and be it further

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

Since that time, the Commission has attempted to include in its program activities promoting such positive dialogue. However, the theological relationships between Judaism and Christianity are not the only focus of concern in relationships between Jews and Christians. The problems arising from the Middle East crisis; difficulties of Jews in Soviet Russia; the issues of anti-Semitism, both at home and abroad; and other social and political problems are matters with which the Episcopal Church must deal. Many of these issues are outside the special ability of a Commission primarily concerned with overcoming divisions among Churches in the U.S.A. Judaism is not

simply a religious body, nor can it be understood simply as a political-social group with a common history. It is a reality in both of these dimensions.

Accordingly, this Commission took counsel with the Presiding Bishop and the President of the House of Deputies concerning the best way in which this Church can listen to the concerns of the Jewish community and work together for increased mutual understanding and co-operation, for the purpose of an expansion of these relationships.

As a result, it was agreed that an Advisory Committee to the Presiding Bishop on Jewish-Christian relations would be established, with approximately five members, and with staff service by the ecumenical officer and the public-affairs officer. The task of the committee would be to co-ordinate the Episcopal Church's relationships with the Jewish community and to bring concerns in this area to the attention of the appropriate operating units—for example, the Commissions on the Church in Human Affairs and on Ecumenical Relations; units of the Executive Council, such as Christian education, social welfare, and overseas relations; and the theological seminaries.

The Committee is expected to begin its work in the autumn of 1973.

### 7. WIDER EPISCOPAL FELLOWSHIP

The union of Christians in North India and Pakistan in the Church of North India and the Church of Pakistan was consummated in 1970, and in spite of successive disasters—hurricane and flood in 1970, and the war in 1971, from which emerged the new nation of Bangladesh—the union remains firm in the three nations which presently exist in the area.

Following the advice of the 1968 Lambeth Conference, a number of Churches of the Anglican Communion have recognized these United Churches as true embodiments of the Holy Catholic Church, with the historic ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, and have proposed to enter into full communion with them. The vote in the General Synod of the Church of England was overwhelmingly favorable.

So far, about two-thirds of the self-governing Anglican Churches have taken affirmative action. The Commission recommends that the Episcopal Church follow the lead of the Lambeth Conference, the Church of England, the Anglican Church of Canada, and others, by proposing to these newly united Churches the relationship defined in the Bonn concordat, as provided in the Resolution on page 511.

Another event of interest in the life of the Wider Episcopal Fellowship was a conference of Bishops and other representatives of the Portuguese and Spanish Churches, the Old Catholic Churches, and the Anglican jurisdictions on the continent of Europe, held at Trier, Germany, in the Roman Catholic Abbey of St. Matthias, in September, 1972.

On the question of overlapping jurisdictions, it was agreed that differences of language, race, and culture make the continuance of this pastoral situation necessary for a long time to come. The conference agreed that "acceptance of it can be justified theologically if it is remembered that as a member of the apostolic college a Bishop's jurisdiction is potentially universal, though normally limited, and if in such situations the Bishops work together in overseeing the mission of the Church in that area, while at the same time each retains jurisdiction over particular congregations and priests".

Practical approaches were discussed for making unity in mission more effective as a result of the full communion which exists among these Churches.

The work of inter-Church aid has long been a part of the overseas budget of the Executive Council, which is currently assisting the Philippine Independent Church and the Churches of Spain and Portugal, with smaller sums to the Old Catholic Church of Holland and the Church of South India. The Presiding Bishop's Fund has

---

## APPENDICES

---

also had a substantial inter-Church aid component in the past, but will probably give such aid in the future only when it fits the Fund's more precisely defined task of "relief, rehabilitation, and development." The proposed Overseas Budget for 1973 will include assistance to Orthodox Churches, which hitherto have been helped from the Presiding Bishop's Fund.

Changes in the structure of Anglicanism in the Middle East, where the Jerusalem and the East Mission has historically helped to meet the needs of the Orthodox and other ancient Churches, dictate a new charter for the Good Friday Offering, maintaining its emphasis on the work of the Church in the Holy Land, but providing more flexibility to use some of the offering for needs of other Churches in other parts of the world. (See Resolution A-117).

### 8. COUNCILS OF CHURCHES

An important work of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations has been to maintain and further our relations with the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A., and to be responsible for nominating our delegations to major ecumenical gatherings for approval by the Executive Council. The highlights of the past three years can be given in the following thumbnail paragraphs:

#### *The National Council*

The Commission gave careful consideration to the re-structuring of the National Council of Churches. The Episcopal Church was represented on the first task force by Mr. Warren Turner and Mrs. Robert Webb, and on the second task force (the committee on Future Ecumenical Structure) by the Rt. Rev. John Burt. Mrs. Webb has also been serving as chairman of Church World Service, the disaster-relief arm of the Churches.

Mrs. Theodore Wedel served with distinction as President of the Council during the past triennium, and gave magnificent leadership during a very trying transitional period.

Members of the Commission met with some of the executives of the Council at 475 Riverside Drive, and explored our relationships at all levels. Episcopal members of the General Board were also invited to attend this meeting.

The process of nominating our representatives for the General Assembly and the new Governing Board has been successful in providing a balanced representation geographically, as well as in all other categories, thanks mainly to advice from the Presidents of Provinces. The General Convention of 1964 set up guidelines for this Church's representation of Bishops, Priests, and Lay Persons from the eight domestic Provinces; in the new structure, the National Council of Churches itself set up requirements concerning top executives, clergy-laity, sex, race, and age. Fitting all these together resulted in the discovery of many able representatives new to us and, we believe, in an effective and well-balanced delegation.

There has been close co-operation between this Commission's Committee on Councils of Churches and the Executive Council's Committee on Ecumenical Relations. This led to a full-scale presentation to the Executive Council of the whole range of the work of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations in a three-hour presentation at Greenwich in 1972.

At the final General Assembly in Dallas, Texas (the re-structure included the abolition of the Assembly), members of the Committees of both the Commission and the Executive Council met with the entire Episcopal delegation. The high point of this pre-Assembly meeting was Bishop Burt's excellent review of the Council's new structure. The Presiding Bishop presided. Bishop Burt is the new chairman of the Committee on Councils of Churches.

---



## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

Support to ecumenical programmatic involvement by the Executive Council has been given by the former chairman of the Committee on Councils of Churches, Bishop Allin, and by the Ecumenical Officer, Dr. Day, through the Executive Council's Committee on Ecumenical Relations, of which Mrs. John S. Jackson, Jr. (a member of the Commission) is chairman. Some twenty-three priority items within the Executive Council's Program Budget are included in program concerns of the National Council of Churches—the NCC Corporate Information Center, Church World Service, Stewardship, International Affairs, and the Broadcasting and Film Commission are but five illustrations of this.

The re-structure of the National Council of Churches is off to an auspicious start, and we note with satisfaction that the Episcopal Church is now working more co-operatively with the NCC at the staff level. The past triennium has been happily marked both by a commitment to, and by an achievement of, a closer dialogue between Episcopal members on the NCC Governing Board and the Executive Council's Committee on Ecumenical Relations.

### *The World Council*

In the triennium just past, the World Council of Churches has been active in a wide range of activities and concerns. During a period of introspection and uncertainty in some Churches, the World Council's membership has continued to grow every year. At the Louvain, 1971, meeting of its Faith and Order Commission, a number of break-throughs were achieved, particularly in a common understanding of the sacraments.

The Bangkok conference on Salvation Today, 1973, has received great attention. Long-term achievements of the meeting have yet to be manifested. It is clear that the ancient calling to Christian witness and mission is in no wise diminished. At the same time, no single articulation of how mission and witness can be defined is satisfactory to all. Furthermore, certain western understandings of the traditional calling to evangelistic obedience are undoubtedly seen to be limited and perhaps misused. World Council projects in inter-Church aid, refugee, and disaster relief continue to proliferate and are renowned among international service organizations for their efficiency and imaginativeness.

In the worldwide concern for the future of humanity and the planet Earth, the Council has been able to foster the inter-disciplinary study and action now urgently required, and has helped to provide the moral guidance that technicians of many sorts are increasingly demanding.

The World Council's Program to Combat Racism is significant. The Commission notes with satisfaction the special appropriation of \$25,000 by the Executive Council in support of the World Council's special fund to combat racism. The credibility that this program gave to the Council among governments in Africa, and elsewhere, led to direct ecumenical involvement in the successful termination of the civil war in the Sudan.

Dialogue between Christians and people of other living faiths and ideologies is beginning to prosper.

Concern for each member Church as it finds itself today in its own region and nation has never been higher than at present, and Deputies to the 64th General Convention, as they work out the priorities of the Episcopal Church for the next triennium, will take particular interest in noting that those areas marked for primary attention in the document, *What We Learned from What You Said*,—education, evangelism, communication, empowerment—have already been given detailed consideration by the World Council of Churches. The World Council has gathered and can make available a wealth of material for the use of the Episcopal Church. The World Council is

## **APPENDICES**

---

prepared to be of even greater service to its member Communion in the United States, to the extent that it is given the support necessary to do its work.

### **9. INTER-ANGLICAN RELATIONS**

For a number of years, annual consultations have been held with the Anglican Churches of Canada and the West Indies in order to exchange information in such areas of mutual concern as unity, ecumenicity, and relations with the Orthodox, the Roman Catholics, and the Jews. In addition, actions taken are shared, so that Anglicans in North America and the Caribbean can be kept abreast of the progress or lack of progress in these areas. The Executive Committee of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, with additional experts in the agenda items to be considered, such as Orthodox and Roman Catholic relations and the Consultation on Church Union, represent the Episcopal Church. The next consultation is scheduled for November 26-27 in New York in the Presiding Bishops's Conference Room. Through the Anglican Consultative Council and its Secretary General, the Commission is kept in touch with ecumenical developments in Anglicanism around the world, and the U. S. ecumenical officer, in turn, supplies information about the Episcopal Church's plans and activities for transmission to the other Churches of our Communion.

### **10. THE ECUMENICAL OFFICER**

The responsibilities of the Ecumenical Officer and those of the Joint Commission are closely inter-related. Among the many duties of the former is that of providing administrative service to the Commission, which is essential to its work. His office is, of necessity, the point of co-ordination and communication for all ecumenical activities: those of the Commission, the Executive Council, ecumenical agencies, the Dioceses, and the Church at large.

The Joint Commission calls attention to the fact that so small a staff can hardly be expected to accomplish fully this vast responsibility. During the past triennium, there have been many occasions where lack of time and staff have meant failure to carry out desired services.

Peter Day has done an amazing job as staff officer for the Joint Commission and the Executive Council's Committee on Ecumenical Relations. Attendance at endless meetings, at home and abroad, and a network of local ecumenical officers to supervise and assist are enough to keep him busy. But his talent for writing and participating theologically in all of our consultations with other Church bodies, such as the Lutherans, Roman Catholics, Orthodox, and the Consultation on Church Union, have added almost unbearably to his burdens, which never seem to get him down. We are grateful for his unselfish and indefatigable labors and wish to acknowledge our indebtedness. He is indispensable to the work of the Joint Commission.

### **11. DIOCESAN ECUMENICAL OFFICERS**

The Church's effectiveness in ecumenical relations has been powerfully forwarded for some years by a network of ecumenical commissions and chairmen (usually called ecumenical officers) in most of the Dioceses. During the past triennium, significant ecumenical action has more and more been shifted to the local scene in relations with Roman Catholics and with the Churches in the Consultation on Church Union. More recently, steps have been taken to intensify relations with Orthodox clergymen and laymen and with the Lutherans, applying and testing the results of national and international dialogues; and in the coming triennium an even greater expansion of local ecumenical activity is expected in all these areas of relationship.

Through the Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism of the National Council of Churches, assistance is being given to the work of State and local Councils of Churches and of issue-oriented coalitions concerned with the problems of society.

---

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

Roman Catholic participation in these forms of ecumenical action is steadily increasing, and in many localities instrumentalities have come into existence for co-operation between Christians and Jews.

The National Ecumenical Workshop has become an important tool of ecumenical stimulation and planning. In addition to the general sessions, it provides time for the diocesan or regional ecumenical officers of the various Communion—notably the Roman Catholics, the Episcopalians, and the Methodists—to meet separately and consider the ecumenical responsibilities and opportunities of their respective Communion.

At the 1973 workshop, the Episcopal Church's diocesan representatives expressed their concerns on several matters for the attention of the Commission.

They saw the goal of our present ecumenical efforts as "common unity in faith at the table of the Lord", and expressed the opinion that "institutional union" should not be a priority concern of General Convention at this time.

The diocesan leaders also saw the need for reviewing the Episcopal Church's varied ecumenical responsibilities and finding ways in which they could strengthen the service of the national ecumenical officer. They said:

"We propose the appointment of a task force or *ad hoc* committee with geographical representation, to meet this spring. We see the forthcoming tasks for this task force as being the following:

1. Evaluate the work role of the national ecumenical officer and his role in the national Church.
2. The relationship of the national ecumenical officer to the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.
3. Explore the relationships between the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations and the diocesan ecumenical chairmen.
4. Assist in appointing representation to the Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism of the National Council of Churches.
5. Assist in providing representation to the National Planning Committee for the 1974 National Workshop.
6. Find ways to replace the newsletter as a means of regular communication with diocesan chairmen.
7. Provide a directory of names for those who are doing creative work in ecumenical relations, e. g., clusters, covenants, parishes, etc.

"We view with concern the absence of members of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations at this workshop and from the meeting of Episcopal diocesan chairmen and officers. The fact that Dioceses named diocesan officers at the request of the Joint Commission should be kept in mind.

"Need was noted to discuss and agree on 'What is our task as diocesan ecumenical chairmen?'"

"We should share with one another what has been successful in our area. Where a hole can be found in the ecumenical wall, pour all you can through it and tell others.

"Ecumenical activity takes place on three levels: 1. diocesan projects, 2. parish activities with Bishop's knowledge, and 3. underground. One way to start is through personal contact, by Bishops, and by ecumenical relations committee members, with opposite numbers in other Churches."

### SUMMARY AND RESOLUTIONS

A recurring theme in this Report has been the expansion of the ecumenical movement into the local life of the Church in Diocese and parish. Ecumenism is no longer a monopoly of farsighted Church leaders and visionaries, and its local manifestation is

## APPENDICES

---

no longer confined to social-action programs and inter-denominational fellowship on a secular level.

This Report concludes with a review of the activities of diocesan ecumenical leadership, and that is where effective ecumenism begins today. Local dialogue and participation in prayer and worship with Orthodox, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Churches participating in the Consultation on Church Union has begun in many places and is in full flower in others. In some localities, relationships have been established with Church fellowships that are not at present in dialogue with the Episcopal Church at the national level—for example, the Baptists, North and South; the Church of the Brethren; the Reformed Church in America.

The intensification of these local relationships is already raising questions of sacraments and ministry that need to be answered in three dimensions—the theological, the canonical, and the pastoral.

### *Request to House of Bishops*

Accordingly, the Commission earnestly requests the House of Bishops to set aside a substantial period of time—one, or if possible, two days at the next meeting of the House—to consider how the Bishop of a Diocese, in consultation with his fellow Bishops, can respond to the growing pressure for a faithful, orderly, and loving response to such concerns as the following:

- The movement, already begun in some Dioceses, for Roman Catholic and Episcopal parishes to enter into a covenant for mutual support, common prayer, and joint action in mission.
- The proposal from the Consultation on Church Union for “an interim Eucharistic fellowship” in which the Churches concerned (three black and six white) can, on the basis proposed by the Consultation, celebrate the Eucharist together some three times a year as both the sign and the cause of the Church’s unity and as the source of mission to both the spiritual and the material needs of the human family.
- The Consultation’s proposal for “generating communities” in which unity can be made, not a far-away goal, but a present reality of experience. Such a generating community will not represent the fulness of Church life as understood in Anglicanism unless the Bishop has a place in it.
- The proposal of the Episcopal-Lutheran Dialogue for recognition of each other’s ministry and sacraments, with consequent permission, under certain circumstances, for communion at each other’s altars.
- The current revival of the question whether episcopal ordination can be given to non-episcopal ministers who would remain within their present Communion and also have authorization to minister sacramentally to Episcopalians.
- The question whether such ordination is needed, when, as in the case of the Lutherans, apostolicity is maintained by other means; and the wider question of a sound contemporary understanding of the nature of the apostolic ministry based on a review of the New Testament background and post-Vatican II theological developments.

The ecumenical movement is not receding. It is coming close to the door of every parish church, and exerting pressure on those who have the responsibility for pastoral leadership. We believe that the whole Church would welcome the counsel of the House of Bishops as these new ecumenical possibilities take shape.

### PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

#### Resolution A-110

***Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations be continued for the next triennium, and that the present**

---

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

members continue to serve until the newly appointed Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations has met and organized.

*EXPLANATION: The Commission's work is continuous; at least one meeting under its auspices is planned for November, 1973, and preparatory work for meetings in 1974 and later will also need to be done before the new Commission has had time to meet and organize.*

### Resolution A-111

*Resolved*, the House \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the sum of \$67,000 be appropriated from the Budget of General Convention for the work of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations during the current triennium.

### Resolution A-112—*On Unity Discussions*

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations be instructed and encouraged to continue its discussions, looking toward unity, with the Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran Churches, and with the nine Churches in the Consultation on Church Union.

### Resolution A-113—*On Discussions with the Orthodox*

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the General Convention endorse the work toward unity of the Anglican-Orthodox Consultations in the United States and the participation of Episcopal Church representatives in the Anglican Commission for Dialogue with the Orthodox established by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Ecumenical Patriarch; and approve the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations' offer of hospitality to the international Anglican-Orthodox Joint Commission for a future meeting.

### Resolution A-114—*On Receiving the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine"*

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That this General Convention receive with gratitude the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine" adopted by the International Anglican/Roman-Catholic Commission at Windsor, England, in September, 1971, welcoming the substantial agreement on eucharistic faith it expresses as an important contribution toward overcoming the separation of our two Churches.

### Resolution A-115—*On Receiving Report of Anglican-Lutheran Dialogue*

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That this 64th General Convention of the Episcopal Church receive with gratitude the report of the first series of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogues and authorize a second series of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogues, under the same joint sponsorship, on the subject, "What is the Gospel?"

### Resolution A-116—*On Concordats with Churches of North India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh*

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Episcopal Church invite the Church of North India, the Church of Pakistan, and the Church of Bangladesh to enter into full communion with it on the principles of the 1931 Bonn Concordat; namely,

- (a) Each Church recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other, and maintains its own.
- (b) Each Church agrees to admit members of the other to participate in the sacraments.
- (c) Full communion does not require from either Church the acceptance of all doctrinal opinions, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith.

## APPENDICES

---

### Resolution A-117—On Appropriations from Good Friday Offering

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Executive Council be instructed to appropriate annually from the Good Friday Offering not less than \$15,000 to the work of the Church in the Holy Land, and that the balance remaining in the Good Friday Offering be used at the discretion of the Executive Council for the work of the Anglican Communion in the Middle East and for the needs of Orthodox and other Christian Churches in the Middle East and elsewhere; and be it further

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, That the Executive Council be instructed to show in its annual report the amount received from the Good Friday Offering and the expenditures made from it.

## ANNEXES

### I. ORTHODOX-ANGLICAN DIALOGUE

#### A. Summary of the Consultations in the USA - 1962-1973

##### 1. *Seabury House, Greenwich, Conn., September 27 - 29, 1962.*

The discussion centered about the nature of the Church as expressed in doctrine, canonical structure, discipline, and parish life. The members were grouped as they were interested in theological or parish matters.

##### 2. *The Greek Archdiocese, New York, November 19 - 20, 1963.*

Discussions centered about hindrances and helps in our progress to unity, and the difficult question of how to prepare both theologians and parishes for love and for canonical obedience in our relations, with consideration of the meaning of our relationship in the parishes.

##### 3. *The Greek Archdiocese, New York, April 15 - 16, 1964.*

Papers were given on the meaning of the Eucharist, by Dean Panteleimon Rodopoulos and Dr. Vogel. Outlines of pamphlets, "Orthodoxy for Anglican Readers" and "Anglicanism for Orthodox Readers", by Frs. Romanides and Morton, were discussed.

##### 4. *The Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, November 10 - 11, 1964.*

Fr. Schneirla presented a paper on the Eucharist, and Dr. Day one on the goal of our discussions. There was some discussion of the implications of the Second Vatican Council for Anglicans and Orthodox.

##### 5. *The Cathedral of St. John the Divine, March 6, 1965.*

Fr. MacDonald gave some notes on parochial co-operation between Anglicans and Orthodox. Dr. Hardy gave a paper on the *Theotokos* in Anglican thought, and Dr. West read a paper on Icons.

##### 6. *The Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, Brookline, Mass.*

The lecture by the Archbishop of Canterbury at Bucharest on June 3, 1965, on Christian Unity, Anglican and Orthodox, was considered. A draft statement of our relationships in this country was discussed, and guidelines were produced and approved.

##### 7. *St. Vladimir's Seminary, Tuckahoe, N. Y., May 27, 1966.*

Father Tsoumas gave a summary of a poll which he had taken on popular ideas of our relationship. Dr. Hardy spoke of the principles behind unity, and Dr. Day presented a view of COCU.

8. *St. Vladimir's Seminary, Tuckahoe, N. Y., May 25, 1967.*

Papers by Drs. Kesic and Stephanopoulos were presented, on the Slavic and Greek reactions to the recent Pan-Orthodox Conference at Belgrade. This naturally led to discussion of our role in preparation for the coming Pan-Orthodox / Pan-Anglican meeting. Dr. Bebis presented a paper on the Patriarch Meletios.

9. *The Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, January 24, 1968.*

Dr. Macquarrie gave a paper on the Holy Spirit and the Church. Dr. Vogel then spoke of ecumenical commitments and how they affect us.

10. *St. Vladimir's Seminary, Tuckahoe, N. Y., October 11, 1968.*

Fr. Schmemmann gave a paper on Secularism in Orthodox lands and the West. This was followed by discussion of the Orthodox Ecumenical Conference at Chambesy in 1968.

11. *Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School, Brookline, Mass. May 9, 1969.*

The discussions centered about the Lambeth Conference of 1968 and on the terms of possible unity between us.

12. *Trinity Institute, New York, June 19, 1969.*

Our reaction to Dr. Norgren's paper on crisis and promise in the ecumenical movement and to Dr. Nissiotis' on Orthodoxy and ecumenism was discussed, with an attempt to define our own relationship, as distinct from Europe's. Further consideration was given to the survey by Fr. Tsoumas and to a parallel by Dr. Molnar.

13. *St. Hilda's School, New York, March 12, 1970.*

The Consultation met with the Archbishop of Canterbury. From his remarks, we went on to attempt again to define our task and to identify the basic questions. It was agreed that a review of our membership was needed and to attempt to establish groups parallel to us elsewhere.

14. *St. Vladimir's Seminary, Tuckahoe-Crestwood. Feb. 18-19, 1972.*

Papers by Bishop Lickfield and Father John Meyendorff on "The Mission of the Church", by Fr. Paul Schneirla on the two papers read by Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira at Helsinki, and a paper by Paul B. Anderson on the Orthodox Commission at Helsinki and the Anglican Commission meeting at Haywards Heath, England.

15. *Cathedral House, New York. June 16, 1972.*

Papers by Professor S. Verkhovsky and Dr. A. T. Mollegen on the COCU draft plan for union; also one by the Rev. Georges Florovsky on the Orthodox view on ordination of women.

16. *Trinity Institute, New York. February 10, 1973.*

Continuation of study of "Mission of the Church". Fr. Meyendorff further defined the Orthodox position; Dr. Mollegen's paper on Anglican Evangelicalism and Christian Social Ethics; Father Hopko on the Church and the World in Orthodox tradition. Professor D. J. Constantellos also read a paper on "The Byzantine Background of Orthodox Social Action".

#### **B. Episcopal Participants in Orthodox-Anglican Consultations in the U.S.A.**

(From this list ten members attend any one session)

\* Rt. Rev. Jonathan G. Sherman, *Co-Chairman*, Long Island

## APPENDICES

---

- Rt. Rev. Stephen F. Bayne, New York  
Rt. Rev. F. W. Lickfield, Illinois  
Rev. Winston Crum, Evanston  
Ven. J. Ralph Deppen, Chicago  
Rev. Joseph Frary, New York  
Rev. Livingston Merchant, Pennsylvania  
\* Rev. A. T. Mollegen, Virginia  
Very Rev. J. P. Morton, New York  
Rev. William A. Norgren, New York  
Rev. Richard H. Norris, New York  
\* Rev. Robert E. Terwilliger, New York  
Rev. Edward N. West, New York  
Rev. J. Robert Wright, New York  
\* Paul B. Anderson, New York  
\* Harold J. Berman, Cambridge, Mass.  
\* Peter Day, New York  
\* Marianne Micks, Ohio

\* By virtue of membership on Council on Eastern Churches of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.

C. U.S. Members of International Commission for Orthodox-Anglican Dialogue, appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1973

- Rt. Rev. Jonathan G. Sherman  
Rev. Edward R. Hardy  
Rev. Robert E. Terwilliger  
Mr. Paul B. Anderson

## II. ANGLICAN/ROMAN-CATHOLIC CONSULTATION

### A. Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission - The Windsor Statement

*The Windsor Statement represents the agreement of the members of the International Anglican—Roman-Catholic Commission and is published on their responsibility. Although the publication is done with their knowledge and consent, neither on the Roman Catholic nor on the Anglican side have the authorities accorded the document official status. It is still under consideration.*

*The members of the International Anglican—Roman-Catholic Commission have reached substantial and unanimous agreement on the doctrine of the Eucharist and are conscious of the importance of this fact. However, they realize that there is room for further clarification in order to complete what they have begun. Therefore, they are anxious to receive reactions and observations, especially from those places where Roman Catholics and Anglicans are together in greater numbers and where there may be joint meetings for ecumenical dialogue.*

*The question of the minister of the Eucharist is not touched on in this Agreed Statement. This is solely because the statement deals with the first stage of the Commission's program. The second stage is at present in progress and deals with ministry in the Church.*

### \*\* AGREED STATEMENT ON EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

1. In the course of the Church's history, several traditions have developed in expressing Christian understanding of the Eucharist. (For example, various names have become customary as descriptions of the Eucharist: Lord's Supper, Liturgy, Holy Mysteries, Synaxis, Mass, Holy Communion. The Eucharist has become the most universally accepted term.) An important stage in progress towards organic unity is a substantial consensus on the purpose and meaning of the Eucharist. Our intention has

\*\*Adopted by the Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission, Third Meeting, Windsor, England, 7th September 1971.



been to seek a deeper understanding of the reality of the Eucharist which is consonant with biblical teaching and with the tradition of our common inheritance, and to express in this document the consensus we have reached.

2. Through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, God has reconciled men to himself, and in Christ he offers unity to all mankind. By his word, God calls us into a new relationship with himself as our Father and with one another as his children—a relationship inaugurated by baptism into Christ through the Holy Spirit, nurtured and deepened through the Eucharist, and expressed in a confession of one faith and a common life of loving service.

### *I The Mystery of the Eucharist*

3. When his people are gathered at the Eucharist to commemorate his saving acts for our redemption, Christ makes effective among us the eternal benefits of his victory and elicits and renews our response of faith, thanksgiving, and self-surrender. Christ through the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist builds up the life of the Church, strengthens its fellowship and furthers its mission. The identity of the Church as the Body of Christ is both expressed and effectively proclaimed by its being centered in, and partaking of, his Body and Blood. In the whole action of the Eucharist, and in and by his sacramental presence given through bread and wine, the crucified and risen Lord, according to his promise, offers himself to his people.

4. In the Eucharist we proclaim the Lord's death until he comes. Receiving a foretaste of the kingdom to come, we look back with thanksgiving to what Christ has done for us, we greet him present among us, we look forward to his final appearing in the fullness of his kingdom, when "The Son also himself [shall] be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:28). When we gather around the same table in this communal meal at the invitation of the same Lord and when we "partake of the one loaf", we are one in commitment, not only to Christ and to one another, but also to the mission of the Church in the world.

### *II The Eucharist and The Sacrifice of Christ*

5. Christ's redeeming death and resurrection took place once and for all in history. Christ's death on the cross, the culmination of his whole life of obedience, was the one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world. There can be no repetition of or addition to what was then accomplished once for all by Christ. Any attempt to express a nexus between the sacrifice of Christ and the Eucharist must not obscure this fundamental fact of the Christian faith.\* Yet God has given the Eucharist to his Church as a means through which the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective in the life of the Church. The notion of *memorial* as understood in the Passover celebration at the time of Christ—*i.e.*, the making effective in the present of an event in the past—has opened the way to a clearer understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the Eucharist. The eucharistic memorial is no mere calling to mind of a past event or of its significance, but the Church's effectual proclamation of God's mighty acts. Christ instituted the Eucharist as a *memorial (anamnesis)* of the totality of God's reconciling action in him. In the eucharistic prayer, the Church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ's death, and his members, united with God and one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his Passion on behalf of the whole Church, participate in these benefits, and enter into the movement of his self-offering.

---

\*The early Church, in expressing the meaning of Christ's death and resurrection, often used the language of sacrifice. For the Hebrew, *sacrifice* was a traditional means of communication with God. The Passover, for example, was a communal meal; the day of Atonement was essentially expiatory; and the Covenant established communion between God and man.

## APPENDICES

---

### III The Presence of Christ

6. Communion with Christ in the Eucharist presupposes his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and wine which, in this mystery, become his body and blood.\* The real presence of his Body and Blood can, however, only be understood within the context of the redemptive activity whereby he gives himself, and, in himself, reconciliation, peace, and life, to his own. On the one hand, the eucharistic gift springs out of the Paschal Mystery of Christ's death and resurrection, in which God's saving purpose has already been definitively realized. On the other hand, its purpose is to transmit the life of the crucified and risen Christ to his body, the Church, so that its members may be more fully united with Christ and with one another.

7. Christ is present and active, in various ways, in the entire eucharistic celebration. It is the same Lord who, through the proclaimed Word, invites his people to his table; who, through his minister, presides at that table; and who gives himself sacramentally in the Body and Blood of his paschal sacrifice. It is the Lord present at the right hand of the Father, and therefore transcending the sacramental order, who thus offers to his Church, in the eucharistic signs, the special gift of himself.

8. The sacramental Body and Blood of the Savior are present as an offering to the believer awaiting his welcome. When this offering is met by faith, a lifegiving encounter results. Through faith, Christ's presence—which does not depend on the individual's faith in order to be the Lord's real gift of himself to his Church—becomes no longer just a presence *for* the believer, but also a presence *with* him. Thus, in considering the mystery of the eucharistic presence, we must recognize both the sacramental sign of Christ's presence and the personal relationship between Christ and the faithful which arises from that presence.

9. The Lord's words at the Last Supper, "Take and eat; this is my body", do not allow us to dissociate the gift of the presence and the act of sacramental eating. The elements are not mere signs; Christ's Body and Blood become really present and are really given. But they are really present and given in order that, receiving them, believers may be united in communion with Christ the Lord.

10. According to the traditional order of the liturgy, the consecratory prayer (*anaphora*) leads to the communion of the faithful. Through this prayer of thanksgiving, a word of faith addressed to the Father, the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit, so that in communion we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood.

11. The Lord who thus comes to his people in the power of the Holy Spirit is the Lord of glory. In the eucharistic celebration we anticipate the joys of the age to come. By the transforming action of the Spirit of God, earthly bread and wine become the heavenly manna and the new wine, the eschatological banquet for the new man: elements of the first creation become pledges and first fruits of the new heaven and the new earth.

12. We believe that we have reached substantial agreement on the doctrine of the Eucharist. Although we are all conditioned by the traditional ways in which we have expressed and practiced our eucharistic faith, we are convinced that if there are any remaining points of disagreement they can be resolved on the principles here established. We acknowledge a variety of theological approaches within both our Communion. But we have seen it as our task to find a way of advancing together beyond the doctrinal disagreements of the past. It is our hope that, in view of the

---

\*The word *transubstantiation* is commonly used in the Roman Catholic Church to indicate that God acting in the Eucharist effects a change in the inner reality of the elements. The term should be seen as affirming the *fact* of Christ's presence and of the mysterious and radical change which takes place. In contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining *how* the change takes place.

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

agreement which we have reached on eucharistic faith, this doctrine will no longer constitute an obstacle to the unity we seek.

**B. Response to the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine" by the Roman Catholic Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, U.S.A.**

The full membership of the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs (BCEIA) of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) of the U.S.A., wishes to respond to the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine" adopted by ARCIC at Windsor, September 7, 1971, and authorized for publication by the Archbishop of Canterbury and by the Cardinal-President of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity (S.P.C.U.), December 31, 1971, for "further study and discussion".

This Committee is aware of the commentaries of the Roman Catholic Chairman of ARCIC, Bishop Alan C. Clark; and of the Roman Catholic member, Reverend Herbert Ryan, S.J., in *Worship*—Vol. 46; and, likewise, those by the Anglican member of ARCIC, Dr. Julian Charley, and the Anglican theologian, A. M. Allchin, in *One in Christ*, 1971-2.

This Committee is also aware of the comments of the Theological Commission of NCCB, USA, and of the statement of the Roman Catholic National Theology Commission of England.

This Committee (BCEIA) accepts with gratitude the comments of its own sub-committee, ARC—USA, in joint discussion with the Episcopal members, and especially the reservations of some of the members of the Joint Committee re: Presence and Sacrifice.

As Committee of the whole, the members of BCEIA are happy to observe:

1. That serious dialogue on the Eucharist as recommended by the II Vatican Council's Decree *On Ecumenism* No. 22, has been so successfully employed at the highest level by representatives of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Communion. And, above all, that this dialogue has issued in the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine".

2. As Roman Catholics believing, as stated in the Proemium of the new Roman Missal (1970), that "the Church's rule of prayer corresponds to the Church's unchanging rule of faith", we are happy to see in the agreed statement a reflection of "the faith of the Church" as found, for example, in the antiphon *O Sacrum Convivium*; for the "agreed statement" paraphrases this celebrated summary of Catholic eucharistic doctrine in its number 4. But the statement is more than a summary; we find its four salient points of Catholic faith:

(a) "*In quo Christus sumitur.*" (Cf. Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the agreed statement).

(b) "*Recolitur memoria passionis ejus.*"

(Cf. No. 5 of the agreed statement).

(c) "*Mens impletur gratia*" (Cf. Nos. 9 and 10 of the agreed statement).

(d) "*Futurae gloriae pignus datur*" (Cf. No. 11 of the agreed statement).

3. We wish to commend ARCIC for bypassing polemics of the 16th and subsequent centuries and adopting more contemporary—and more ancient and traditional—expressions as found in recent Roman Catholic documents:

(a) *Mystici Corporis* of Pius XII, June 29, 1943 (Cf. Sec. 81, 82 and 83).

(b) *Mediator Dei* of Pius XII of November 20, 1947 (Cf. Sec. 68, 69, 70 and 115).

(c) II Vatican Council Decree "On Priestly Life and Ministry" (Cf. No. 2).

4. We express the Christian hope that, on the principles of the agreed statement, whatever differences appear to divide the Anglican and Roman Catholic Communion on this subject of the Eucharist can be solved.

September 28, 1972

## **APPENDICES**

---

### **C. Response to the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine" by the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church**

*Resolved*, That the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church, meeting at Pocono Manor, Pa., October 29, 1971

- (1) receives with gratitude the Statement on the doctrine of the Eucharist issued by the Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission and welcomes the substantial agreement and common eucharistic faith it expresses;
- (2) believes that the Statement, if agreed upon by the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, would remove eucharistic faith as an obstacle to the unity sought by the Churches in God's name; and
- (3) commends the Statement, when released for publication, to the Episcopal Church for study and action at the next General Convention.

### **D. Comment on the "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine" by the United States Anglican/Roman-Catholic Consultation.**

The United States Anglican/Roman-Catholic Consultation (ARC) rejoices that the Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) at its third meeting (Windsor, Sept. 7, 1971) issued an "Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine". In accordance with the suggestion of the International Commission, the United States Consultation discussed this statement at some length at its eleventh meeting (Jan. 20-24, 1972) and again at its twelfth meeting (June 11-15, 1972) and offers its evaluation.

We recognize that, according to the intention of its authors, the Agreed Statement is not a celebration of a reconciliation already achieved between our two Communion; but, rather, a group consensus, which, it is hoped, will serve as an instrument or catalyst for such reconciliation. Consequently, the statement should not be viewed as a complete and definitive body of eucharistic doctrine. It is a marker along the way to a fuller and more embracing consensus.

In its broad outlines, the statement meets with our warm approval. We accept it as a helpful study document to promote full communion between our Churches. We especially commend the expressed intention of the Commission "to seek a deeper understanding of the reality of the Eucharist which is consonant with biblical teaching and with our common inheritance" (no. 1). In addition, we welcome the real progress shown in this statement, which, in our judgment, expresses positions that may be accepted by both Anglicans and Roman Catholics in loyalty to their respective Churches.

In its closing paragraph, we note, the statement claims that the participants believe that they "have reached substantial agreement on the doctrine of the Eucharist." We agree that if all Anglicans and Roman Catholics were to see this statement as an adequate expression of the essentials of their eucharistic faith, as the signers evidently did, divergences on eucharistic doctrine would no longer constitute an obstacle to full unity between our two Communion. Most of the members of our Consultation, both Anglican and Roman Catholic, find the Agreed Statement adequate.

However, as the authors of the statement well know, there are in both our Communion important constituencies who would not be satisfied with the Agreed Statement. Even in our own Consultation there are a few who find the statement on one point or another either too vague or too restrictive for them to accept it as an adequate expression of the essentials of their eucharistic faith.

The hesitations voiced in our Consultation have focused on two main issues—sacrifice and real presence. Regarding sacrifice, some feel that a statement of this kind should clearly affirm that the eucharist is a sacrifice. While the Agreed Statement can be read as implicitly affirming this, some Anglicans and Roman Catholics, even in our own

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

Consultation, feel that this point needs to be made explicit before sufficient agreement can be said to have been reached. In this connection, some would like to see greater clarity as to the notion of sacrifice as the word is used in the statement.

With regard to the real presence, some members of our Consultation found that the first sentence of paragraph 6, affirming that "the bread and wine . . . in this mystery, become his Body and Blood," could, taken in itself, suggest a restrictive understanding of the real presence. In some future modification, they suggested, this sentence could be phrased in a more inclusive way, so as to emphasize those traditions that insist as well on a more dynamic or spiritual interpretation of the real presence. In this way, the statement might be made acceptable to a wider constituency who might not be satisfied with its present form.

Recognizing the great progress represented by this important statement of the International Commission, and the desirability of extending and deepening the consensus that the members of the Commission have already found among themselves, we invite the people of our respective Communion in the United States to join together in studying the statement thoughtfully and prayerfully. We commit ourselves to facilitating this process in whatever way we can and will prepare a study guide for this purpose. In this connection, we should like to call attention to the statement of principles regarding methodology which our Consultation adopted on January 24, 1972.\* These principles, we believe, are pertinent to the present discussion of eucharistic doctrine. In view of the ultimately ineffable nature of the eucharistic mystery, theological reflection will always fall short of the reality we experience in eucharistic worship.

Anglican/Roman-Catholic Consultation U.S.A.

### E. Doctrinal Agreement and Christian Unity

#### METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS \*\*

"We are all to come to unity in our faith and in our knowledge of the Son of God, until we become the perfect Man, mature with the fullness of Christ himself" (Eph. 4:13 BJ).

With its call to unity in truth and to living the truth in love, the Epistle to the Ephesians depicts the Christian life as the growth of a body to maturity, or, in another passage, as the erection of a building whose cornerstone is Christ. The goal is a completeness, a perfection, a fullness, that lies ahead, and toward which each Christian and the Christian fellowship as a whole must grow.

Ecumenical dialogue among separated Christians is a part of this process of growth. Its aim is not to produce a statement of minimum essentials by which one Church can measure the orthodoxy of another, but to deepen, strengthen, and enrich the life of both. As Vatican II declares in the Constitution on Divine Revelation, "There is growth in the understanding of the realities and the words which have been handed

---

\*\*Doctrinal Agreement and Christian Unity: Methodological Considerations"

\*\*As part of the work of its eleventh biannual meeting held in New York City, the Anglican/Roman-Catholic Consultation in the United States (ARC) unanimously approved this statement on January 24, 1972. The statement is made public in the hope of advancing one of the aims of the *Report of the Anglican—Roman-Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission* written at Malta, January 3, 1968. The pertinent section of the "Malta Report" is 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."

## APPENDICES

---

down. . . . As the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves toward the fullness of divine truth until the words of God reach their complete fulfillment in her." (*Dei Verbum* 8).

Churches coming out of the isolation imposed by the divisions of the past find that they are able to contribute to each other's growth in the fullness of divine truth. But unless the origins and purposes of theological discourse are rightly understood, differences in terminology and in modes of conceptualization, due in part to past isolation, can lead to failure of communication and even impasses in doctrinal discussion. Theological discourse must always be interpreted within the horizon of man's experience of the divine mystery, because it grows out of that experience. From this it follows that no formal or conceptual statement can ever be fully adequate to the religious data. Because of man's nature, however, his religious experience must come to expression by every means available to him.

Whenever man speaks about the engulfing mystery of God, he speaks from within a particular situation—geographical, temporal, cultural, sociological, psychological, linguistic. . . . Because of the transcendence of God's mystery, one must always speak about him symbolically; but these symbols, taken from man's experience of the world, always have the stamp of human particularity. Even statements made by groups of men in representative councils bear this stamp of particularity. For example, when the early Councils apply to God and Christ terms such as substance, person, and nature, they are using the terminology and conceptual tools available in a given culture. When these terms in another time and culture take on different connotations their effectiveness for expressing the truths of faith may be impaired. Human discourse, even under the working of grace, is perspectival, and hence, also pluralistic.

To acknowledge the relativity of theological statements is not to fall into relativism but to escape it. Because encounter with God always calls man beyond himself, it must be recognized that all religious expression may itself be transcended. The abiding presence of the Holy Spirit moves communities of believers to express their life in Christ in ways that may not be abstractly deducible from their previous statements.

The result of the preceding analysis is to recognize that Christians who are orthodox in their faith may express it in varying formulations, as the Bible and the creeds of the early Church so well exemplify. This does not mean that all formulations are equally appropriate. Some may, in fact, express, and conduce to, a misapprehension of God and his relationship to man, and thus be impediments to the Christian life.

The participants in this dialogue, fortunately, rejoice in the possession of the same Sacred Scriptures, the same credal formulations of the ancient Church, and a substantial body of shared intellectual and spiritual tradition. They also acknowledge the need for critical scholarship if the meaning of the ancient texts is to be accessible to modern man. There are, however, some other doctrinal formulations which, in the course of a sadly separated history, have been adopted by one Communion or the other and are generally seen as obstacles to full communion between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches.

In order to promote the cause of full mutual recognition and full ecclesiastical communion, the participants commend the following operative principles in the assessment of whether such divergent formulations do indeed constitute an essential obstacle to full communion:

### 1. *Paradoxical Tension*

As previously pointed out, theological language never adequately corresponds to the reality to which it refers. In revelation itself there is always an inherent tension between God's self-disclosure and man's capacity for understanding: human thought and language can never encompass the divine mystery. For this reason, there is a

peculiar ambiguity in theological statements. The grammatical opposite of a true statement of faith, therefore, may in some sense be also true. *E.g.*, man is—or is not—saved by faith alone; the Bible is—or is not—the word of God.

### 2. *Contextual Transfer*

It should be recognized that past doctrinal utterances were made in definite cultural situations that are not our own, and hence that they reflect the presuppositions, terminology, and concerns of their times. This means that a Christian today, in order to be orthodox and to maintain continuity with the tradition expressed in the language of another day, may need to find new language and even new concepts to express the same truth; *e.g.*, the descent into hell.

### 3. *Relative Emphasis*

It should be acknowledged that some statements made in the past as “definitions” and imposed under anathema, are no longer insisted upon, because, at least today, they do not seem to be of crucial importance in relationship to salvation. *E.g.*, the teaching of the Council of Vienne on the soul as the substantial form of the human body (*DS* 902).

### 4. *Doctrinal Pluralism*

(a) Within a single Church, one and the same formula often receives different theological interpretations—*e.g.*, the Banesian and Molinist interpretations of the Tridentine canons on grace; the use of the Thirty-Nine Articles in the Church of England. We see these as instances of the principle of comprehensiveness, which, rightly understood, involves living in tension, and does not admit of easy compromise or superficial syncretism.

(b) Because the same mystery can sometimes be conveyed more effectively by different formulas in different cultural contexts, one may support a variety of theological expressions among different groups of Christians. In Churches entering into full ecclesiastical communion, different creedal formulas are sometimes mutually acknowledged—*e.g.*, the use or omission of the “Filioque” in the agreement between Churches of the East and West at the time of the Council of Florence.

Both these forms of doctrinal diversity should be taken into consideration in assessing the possibilities of overcoming obstacles to union among separated Churches.

### 5. *Empathetic Evaluation*

Any Church, in deciding whether it can enter into communion with another, should seek to appraise the role played by the formulations of the other community in the life of that community. One should not condemn all that one would not personally wish to say.

In this connection, one may apply the principle of St. Ignatius Loyola, prefixed to the *Spiritual Exercises*: “. . . It is necessary to suppose that every good Christian is more ready to put a good interpretation on another’s statement than to condemn it as false. If an orthodox construction cannot be put on a proposition, the one who made it should be asked how he understands it. . . .”

### 6. *Responsive Listening*

Since no Church exists by itself in this world, every Church should listen respectfully to what the others find unacceptable in its own formulations, and consider whether its own official doctrinal commitments can be re-expressed in contemporary statements that remove the occasion for offense. In this way, the Churches will be of mutual help to one another in their ongoing expression of the faith.

Mindful of the fact that the revelation once for all given to man is the person of Christ present in the Spirit, Christians are called to be faithful to that presence at all

---

## APPENDICES

---

times in their living tradition. The foregoing principles should be applied in conformity to that abiding presence, and thus in a way that leads to an ever richer appropriation of the gospel. "So the body grows until it has built itself up in love." (Eph. 4:16 BJ).

### F. Episcopal Members of ARC

Rt. Rev. John M. Allin, Jackson, Miss.

Rt. Rev. Arthur Vogel, (also member of ARCIC), Kansas City, Mo.

Rt. Rev. Edward R. Welles, Manset, Me.

Rev. John F. Porter, Detroit, Mich.

Rev. William J. Wolf, Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. J. Robert Wright, New York City

Peter Day, New York City

Mrs. Sherman Johnson, Mansfield, Ohio

George A. Shipman, Seattle, Washington

### III. CONSULTATION ON CHURCH UNION

#### A. Episcopal Church Response to a Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting

*Report of the Executive Committee of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations\**

The Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations delegated to its Executive Committee the responsibility of reporting on the responses within the Episcopal Church to the study of *A Plan of Union*. The Joint Commission itself has not made a detailed study and response subsequent to that in its Report to the General Convention in October 1970 (see *Journal of the General Convention, 1970*, pp. 393-397).

The Episcopal Church, by action of the last General Convention, remains committed to the purpose of the Consultation on Church Union and to participation in the development of a proposed plan of union. Responses to study up to this date (May 18, 1972) have been disappointing in their limited number, their lack of deep interest in the goal of organic union, and, in some cases, their lack of understanding of study and response as part of the process toward the ultimate goal.

The plan, with a study guide, was sent to all clergymen in the U.S.A. and possessions, and further material was sent to Bishops and some ninety diocesan ecumenical chairmen, to provide resources for a study voted by the Houston General Convention in 1970. Responses were received from only 19 of the 91 domestic Dioceses and 133 of the 7,069 parishes, although it is known that study was conducted in many other areas from which no report was received.

In one Diocese where a serious effort was made to promote the study—the Diocese of Georgia—responses came from 13 of 62 resident clergymen, of whom two favored the proposed plan, nine opposed it, and two gave no opinion. Results among the laity were equally scanty. Of 119 laypeople replying, 14½% reacted positively, 48½% negatively. Fifty-eight laymen noted that they favored Christian unity but not the proposed plan.

Those Dioceses which produced a detailed study and report—notably, Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, and some others—provide useful constructive criticism. One item repeatedly mentioned was the danger of a narrowly American Christianity lacking strong links to the rest of the Christian world.

Widespread apathy appears to be a general reaction of parishes and Dioceses of the Episcopal Church to *A Plan of Union*. Specific objections may in some cases be based upon failure to understand what the Plan actually says, but may also be based on a

---

\*Approved by the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations at its meeting on May 3-4, 1973.



suspicion at the local level that denominational differences in *ethos* might lead to conflicting interpretations of the statements made in the Plan.

However, the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral and the Statement of Faith and Order of 1949, frequently mentioned in the reports of local study, continue to express the Episcopal Church's lasting commitment to the cause of Christian unity based on the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate; and the Commission continues to believe that its mission from General Convention is to seek, in dialogue with other Churches, ways of ordering Church life that express the unity which is God's gift to His Church.

Impressions of this committee, upon reviewing the reports, which vary from rejection of the Plan to general approval, may be summed up as follows:

1. That emphasis in the immediate future should be on theologically based approaches to inter-communion rather than on organizational plans.
2. That the Lord's Supper/Holy Communion/Eucharist be understood as a cause as well as a sign of unity.
3. That the development of pilot parishes on the model proposed in *A Plan of Union* be encouraged on an exploratory basis.
4. That unity in the Spirit must precede organizational union, but that some form of the latter should ultimately be expected as a result of the former.

The Executive Committee believes that the Episcopal Church should continue to participate in the Consultation on Church Union, with its movement and process toward the goal of organic union of the divided Christian Communions, but it recommends changes in emphasis and participation as follows:

1. That the Consultation on Church Union differentiate between immediate and long-range goals. It seems clear that the Episcopal Church is not now prepared seriously to consider dissolving present denominational structures in a wider ecclesiastical structure. The immediate goal appears to be process and activity drawing the divided Churches into closer community and understanding, and seeking solutions to existing differences in faith and order which now inhibit unity of members and ministry. The search for a plan of desirable organizational unity should continue as a long-range goal, using both the responses from studies already conducted and the insights resulting from continued participation in the Consultation process.
2. That full participation of the Roman Catholic Church in such a re-oriented search for unity be vigorously sought, and that contributions from Orthodox, Lutheran, and other Churches be invited, not only in observer status, but also in working commissions, addresses, and papers.

Copies of the responses received from Dioceses and parishes are being forwarded to the office of the Consultation on Church Union.

### **B. The Way Ahead: Report of the Memphis Plenary of the Consultation on Church Union**

Concluding a two-year period of listening to the Churches, the Consultation on Church Union expresses its gratitude for the seriousness with which its work has been studied. More than 3,000 churches have been involved, reflecting the active attention of nearly 400,000 Church members.

The responses reflect a wide variety of attitudes toward Church union. Almost without exception, respondents recognize the reality of the unity of the Church and acknowledge the Gospel mandate to make visible the unity which has been given in Christ. Moreover, the responses show a general agreement among the Churches on matters of faith, worship, and the basic nature of the Church's ministry, but a general unreadiness to accept the organizational structures proposed for a United Church.

## **APPENDICES**

---

Because of the nature of these responses, it has become clear that viable proposals for organization and structure of the Church of Christ Uniting need to be developed out of the experience of living and working together. The Consultation, therefore, sees the next stages of its work as activity involving the Churches in working together at the various levels of their life. Growing out of this experience, a full plan of union can be developed for a United Church —catholic, evangelical, and reformed.

To move toward the fulfillment of this vision of Church union, the Consultation authorizes the following steps:

1. That we seek from our member Churches appropriate action to confirm their commitment to the process of Church union and the role of the Consultation itself in guiding that process. We seek from the Churches a clear commitment to help us deal with these five priorities:

- Institutional Racism
- Faith, Worship, and Ministry
- Generating Communities
- Study of the Local Expression of the Church
- Interim Eucharistic Fellowship

2. That the Executive Committee appoint a commission to rewrite the portions of *A Plan of Union* on faith, worship, and ministry, gathering together those elements in which there has been general theological consensus, and giving attention to weaknesses and omissions identified in the study process, as well as to suggestions on form and language; and that upon approval, at the next plenary if possible, the revised section on faith, worship, and ministry be submitted to the Churches for vote as a theological basis for working toward mutual recognition of members and ministries and further development of a plan of union.

3. That the Consultation welcomes and encourages both denominational and ecumenical exploration by the member Churches of alternative models of Church life at all levels, particularly at the middle judicatory level.

4. That the Executive Committee authorize a task force to make a theological and sociological study of the forms of the Church at the local level. This should include the “parish” as a means by which to achieve a richer and more diverse Christian fellowship and liberation from institutional racism; and the local congregation, which, because of its personal values, is regarded by many as the locus of Christian identity.

5. That in order to develop and draw upon the experience of new forms of life together, the Consultation approve the proposal for “Generating Communities” and authorize the establishment of its Advisory Support Group.

6. That the document entitled “Congregations Uniting for Mission” be commended to the participating Communions as a valuable resource for distribution, study, and action for congregations and other local groups seeking models for increasing mutuality of action, worship, and service.

7. That the Consultation establish a Commission on Institutional Racism to assume responsibilities such as the following:

- a) To develop, recommend, and advocate appropriate strategies of compensatory action to deal with institutional racism in our present divided Churches and in proposals for future structures of the Church of Christ Uniting.
- b) To set and advocate the adoption of specific goals, guidelines, and timetables for compensatory action at every level of life of the Churches participating in the Consultation, utilizing the concerns and resources from the Memphis plenary.

- c) To review, evaluate, and report on actions taken by the Churches in the area of institutional racism.
- d) To affirm the presence of the black experience and the experience of other ethnic minorities and their role in dealing with institutional racism.
- e) To develop plans and programs designed to equip the constituency to deal with institutional racism as an instrument of injustice for which whites bear special responsibility, requiring the development of a new white consciousness of the same depth and magnitude as the problem itself.

We recognize that the experience of institutional racism in our member Churches is a barrier to Church union and that compensatory action is essential to any viable strategy for dealing with it.

8. That the "Guidelines for Interim Eucharistic Fellowship" document be confirmed and commended to the member Communions for distribution to the churches as they seek to grow together as a community of faith. We believe the Interim Eucharistic Fellowship is an effective sign of reconciliation when its participants have committed themselves to an inclusive fellowship of faith and action.

9. That we refer to the Executive Committee our urgent concern that seminaries and seminarians be concerned with the issues we have identified as indispensable to the future life of the Church of Christ Uniting, requesting that strategies be devised to implement full engagement between the Consultation on Church Union and the total seminary community. Suggestions for possible action might include such items as the following:

- a) Inter-seminary dialogue around the issues of the COCU Plan, models, and strategies.
- b) An inter-seminary exchange program for students to study at other COCU-related seminaries for a term.
- c) Experiment with contextual training for seminarians in a parish-cluster setting, with the parish ministers and laity in a study-problem-solving motif.

### C. Guidelines for Interim Eucharistic Fellowship

(Proposed by the Consultation on Church Union, April 1973.)

#### *Introduction*

In September, 1971, the 10th plenary of the Consultation on Church Union made a bold recommendation to its participating Churches and other Christian Communions in the U.S.A. The churches and congregations were challenged "to move in the near future to an *interim eucharistic fellowship* on some regular basis." (See *Digest X*, 1971, pp. 36, 168-172.) This proposal sets before us new possibilities of sharing the Lord's Supper (Eucharist, Holy Communion) among Christians throughout the land. It leads us to deal with a central event in the life of the Christian community. It forces us to take to heart a divided Table as a flagrant sign of disunity among the Churches. It stands as a sign of integrity in our conversations and a testimony to Christian truth. It offers to the world and ourselves a clearer manifestation of the oneness already given to us in Jesus Christ.

These guidelines are set forth as aids for two or more congregations who are determined to try to work out what it means to celebrate the Eucharist together. The process is to be initiated by Christians in communities across the U.S.A. who see this proposal as a realistic call to local ecumenical action. These guidelines are prepared to alert you to some of the considerations which must be faced, and to enable responsible experimentation and growth in Christian love and faith. From many eucharistic sharings and liturgical experiments—thousands of which are already underway—will come, hopefully, a wealth of experience and insight which will strengthen our

## APPENDICES

---

pilgrimage toward a Church truly catholic, truly evangelical, and truly reformed for these times.

### *Dimensions of the Proposal*

This proposal carries a certain timeliness for the Consultation on Church Union and the total ecumenical situation. In recent years, an unprecedented sharing of the Lord's Supper across traditional divisions has taken place in local communities everywhere. Both inside and outside the regular Church structures, shared experiences of witness and fellowship challenge and overcome many of the traditional barriers which have divided Christians at the Table for centuries. Theological discussions have helped Christians consider and resolve issues which long were assumed to be insuperable stumbling blocks. The Churches have witnessed an emerging consensus on the Eucharist which goes beyond their past positions. Particularly important among these consensus statements are the eucharistic sections in COCU's *Principles of Church Union* (1967) and *A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting* (1970), the statement between Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox theologians in America entitled "The Eucharist in the Life of the Church" (1970), the Anglican/Roman-Catholic International Commission's statement (1971), the Leuenberg agreement (1971) between Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Europe, and the conciliar statement of the WCC Commission on Faith and Order, "Beyond Intercommunion" (1971).

On the basis of these developments, an emerging consensus, and sincere pressures from local ecumenical activity, many Churches have found it possible, indeed essential, to reconsider their policies toward inter-communion with other Christian bodies. This proposal for interim eucharistic fellowship, therefore, is prompted by the belief that such a strategic moment has come for the Churches involved in the COCU negotiations. We have not yet reached the goal of corporate union which will permit full communion of all Christians in each place. Serious tensions and differences remain, and interim eucharistic fellowship will not, and should not, hide them. Nor can inter-communion ever be considered a substitute for full Church union.

Nevertheless, the achievements of our decade of covenant conversations since 1962 make possible a common, though "interim" (*i.e.*, on the road toward), celebration of the Lord's Supper. Such a practice can move the Churches toward greater unity and give visible testimony to the unity we already have.

We have, therefore, the *kairos* and makings of a proposal which enable the Eucharist to be more broadly shared as the sacrament of reconciliation and thanksgiving. The Denver plenary declared, "We believe that the chapters on the sacraments and ministry in *A Plan of Union* suggest the kind of theological agreement within which, in our declared quest for a United Church, we could share in the one Table of our Lord, even as we share in witness and service." Equally significant is *An Order of Worship for the Proclamation of the Word of God and the Celebration of the Lord's Supper*, published by the Consultation in 1968. This experimental liturgy has been used very widely over the past years by congregations, theological-seminary and university chapels, ecumenical gatherings, cluster parishes, general assemblies, and other Christian assemblies. This service is adaptable to widely different liturgical settings and situations.

Several specific dimensions of this proposal need to be clearly understood:

1. Interim eucharistic fellowship is not a matter of a regulated timetable or co-ordinated master plan. The celebrations will be pursued at different paces in different communities. The only urging is that the churches in your community "move toward interim eucharistic fellowship . . . in the near future."
2. The proposal assumes that an actual community of faith exists among those who come together. It is not necessary to have complete agreement on the doctrinal

formulations of the faith. Yet those who participate in the Eucharist accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior and believe he is present in this event. They come to the Table as an act of faith in him and as a yearning to grow in unity and love.

3. The exact meaning of sharing the Lord's Supper "on a regular basis" will be determined most effectively in each local situation. It obviously means a variety of calendars and series. The intention is for members of the churches in your community to come together for shared eucharistic celebrations on several agreed-upon occasions, not less than three or four times a year. A normal Sunday service would be the most appropriate occasion, when entire congregations are involved. Some congregations may decide to join together monthly. Other regular patterns could be chosen, e.g., World Communion Sunday (October), the Sunday during the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity (January), and Pentecost; or the first Sundays in Advent, Lent, and Pentecost; or the four Sundays of Advent. The point is simply to allow these occasions to be ongoing events in the life of the congregations, not an isolated liturgical fanfare.

4. A regular eucharistic celebration should involve the congregations in thinking about and moving toward a total fellowship in membership, ministry, and witness. This suggests that the congregations will find new relations in planning, joint action, service, and other aspects of their program. In many instances, if the joint celebration is other than Sunday morning, the occasion of eucharistic fellowship could be preceded or followed by a presentation and reflection on some aspect of Church unity/union. It ought also, whenever and wherever possible, precede or follow some significant shared *action* in the community.

5. The eucharistic fellowship should make every effort possible to involve members and ministers of all churches in the community, including, of course, all the COCU congregations. Both the diversity and the full participation of the different traditions will cause each celebration to be more meaningful, and will avoid the temptation to set up merely a bilateral service between two nearby congregations of a similar social status or liturgical tradition.

6. The planning and practice of interim eucharistic fellowship should not be pursued in blindness to the polarizations and disunities which tear the human community apart. The Eucharist proclaims reconciliation, and is a judgment upon those barriers which oppress, isolate, misuse, or falsely categorize those of different political persuasions, classes, nationalities, races, sexes, and languages. This proposal helps us to deal openly and fully with the alienations between male and female, rich and poor, black and white, educated and uneducated, conservative and progressive. It reminds all Christians that we must be "in love and charity" with our brothers and sisters as we presume to gather together at the Lord's Table. As we come face to face about the Table we more clearly see Christ in each other.

7. Such eucharistic fellowship is not a substitute for corporate union, but is a vital step along the road toward fuller unity/union.

### *Ingredients of the Planning Process*

The Consultation on Church Union assumes that meaningful eucharistic sharing should emerge from careful, and at times agonizing, planning and reflection of those who live and worship in the same community.

One of the first acts is to set up a planning committee of clergymen and lay people from each of the participating congregations. The goal is not only to plan effectively for the forthcoming joint communion services but to develop a forum of conversations and sharing of concerns among the congregations. Anyone who feels a concern can publicize and convene the first meeting, although *all* the COCU participating churches and other Christian congregations should be involved *before* detailed plans are made. The effectiveness of this planning committee will contribute to or detract from the prospects of interim eucharistic fellowship in your community.

---

## APPENDICES

---

The planning committee should consider not only immediate concerns, e.g., the format of the next joint service of the Lord's Supper, but the long-range agenda. In order to be effective, the committee and the process it guides will

- Enable the groups or congregations to study the theological meaning of the Eucharist. Some will grasp anew its understanding as both cause and sign of unity; others will recover a sense of the reality of Holy Communion which they have lost. No service should be held without the preparation of the congregations, e.g., a discussion, seminar, address, or the like;
- Set your timetable for regularly scheduled eucharistic celebrations and outline the necessary steps and stages;
- Arrange for a diversity of eucharistic experiences, carefully planning the services, choosing the appropriate places of worship, etc.;
- Develop a strategy which will prepare each congregation for the joint eucharistic sharings;
- Respect differences of conscience which exist. An attitude of openness and understanding should be held toward those congregations or members which view eucharistic sharing in this manner either with serious reservations or lethargy. Dealing with their responses may prove to be highly significant for your process, even though in some instances it will delay or limit the observance in your community.

Significant questions will be faced in this planning and study process; for example, most of the Churches—Methodists (UM, AME, AMEZ, CME), Presbyterian, United Church of Christ, and Disciples—have a theoretical relationship of open communion. And it is now recognized that Episcopalians can participate in special ecumenical Eucharists. If this is so, then why have we only rarely received Holy Communion together? Why has not this open communion led to more decisive forms of Church unity and common mission? How can the diversities in communion practices be appreciated and seen as contributing to a deeper meaning of the sacrament?

### *The Lord's Supper in Total Perspective*

The meaning of the Lord's Supper has many facets, all of which join together in this unique act. Individuals as well as Church traditions hold widely varying views. No single definition can comprehend or give a complete exposition of the Eucharist. The reality of this event goes beyond our ability to explain it; our "words can never fully express but only point toward redemptive mystery". (*A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting*, p. 36)

Yet the fullness of the Eucharist is experienced as a whole in its symbols and symbolic actions. As Christians have continually testified, the Eucharist is

- not our Table, but the Lord's Table; he is the minister;
- a remembrance (*anamnesis*) of Christ in which he is really present with his people;
- the family meal of Christians at which they express and experience communion and union with one another as well as with the Lord;
- an act of sacrifice, in which we are united with Christ in his self-offering to the Father and offer our praise, thanksgiving, and service;
- a means whereby God in Christ acts and Christ comes to be present with his people;
- where Christians are renewed in the covenant of grace and receive forgiveness of sin;
- a foretaste of the heavenly banquet which the Lord prepares in his kingdom.

While no one liturgy can fully embody the dimensions of the Lord's Supper, the following elements are usually accepted in varying sequence:

- corporate acts of praise;
- public reading and proclamation of the Word of God;
- prayers of intercession for the Church and the world, for the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the Lord's Prayer;
- an act of thanksgiving which recalls Christ's sacrifice;
- Christ's words of institution;
- breaking the bread, sharing the cup, and partaking of both in communion with members of the body of Christ;
- an offering for the poor and needy.

Such a list is not meant to exclude other items, such as confession and the declaration of the forgiveness of sins, the affirmation of faith using biblical and historic confessions, and others.

### *Practical and Pastoral Issues*

Those who explore the possibility of regular eucharistic fellowship will find a number of issues, theological and non-theological, coming to the fore and demanding some resolution. In all likelihood, the psychological and personal issues will ignite the most tension and passion. No universal list can be projected for all situations, but your agenda will have to consider and decide these issues with Christian empathy and charity. Decisions on the following and other issues will have to be worked out by your planning committee under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. True ecumenism involves both repentance and the acceptance of diversities.

#### 1. The use of wine and/or grape juice

This is a particularly difficult and emotional matter because the different usages are proposed by Church regulations and social custom. Some congregations insist that a "pure fermented juice of the grape" (wine) be used in the Lord's Supper; Episcopal and Roman Catholic parishes follow this practice, although an increasing number of congregations in other traditions use wine regularly or on special eucharistic occasions. Other congregations resolutely use a "pure unfermented juice of the grape".

The argument for wine is biblical and historical. It was used by Jesus at the Last Supper, and until recent centuries was the universal practice of the Church. The preference for grape juice developed in a social milieu, conditioned by the prohibition movement, which opposed the drinking of all alcoholic beverages and was a part of the Church's witness to an urgent social problem.

With changing social patterns and the desire to follow the biblical practice, much of the rigidity of this debate is being dispelled and the diversity of uses is appreciated. In some communities, however, this issue still causes tense feelings between Christians. It should be clearly known that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is not conditioned by the use of wine or grape juice. It would be tragic if this issue prevented congregations in a community from coming together around the Table of the Lord. Each congregation must be willing to listen to the convictions and respect the usages of others. In many places, this will resolve the difference; in others it will at least allow Christians to break bread and drink the cup together, while continuing the dialogue.

For those who are unfamiliar with sacramental wine and wish to use it in the celebration of the Supper, they should use wines of mild taste and moderate price. Most wine shops have communion wines especially prepared for this purpose. Those normally disposed to use unfermented grape juice have several commercially produced brands from which to choose.

## APPENDICES

---

Although the prevailing custom in the Western Church is to use unleavened bread in the Lord's Supper, there is a growing interest in using leavened bread. This interest is prompted less for historical reasons than by pastoral concerns. The bread eaten at the Lord's Table should seem like real bread. The loaf is broken during the words of institution before the congregation.

### 2. Mutuality of Place of Worship

In a truly ecumenical Eucharist, every effort will need to be made to be sure that the setting is one in which members of all the participating congregations feel welcome and at home. True eucharistic fellowship transcends any feeling of hosts and guests, but this will require careful planning and preparation of all participants.

One obvious way to avoid any patronizing spirit is to choose a neutral location for the services, such as a school auditorium, a public hall, or an outdoor setting. This may bring an easy neutrality, but it does not necessarily bring an automatic atmosphere of worship. In some cases, careful and imaginative planning could transform the location into an appropriate setting of celebration. Whatever the place, you have a good opportunity for creativity in the liturgical arts, and could open people to new possibilities and patterns. If the sanctuary of one of the participating congregations is used, special thought should be given to how the building's arrangements and atmosphere can reflect the ecumenical character of the event.

### 3. Ministerial Authorization

It is assumed that participating clergymen are authorized to celebrate the Lord's Supper in their own churches. Nevertheless, the mutuality of authorization and recognition of each other's celebrations remain goals not yet achieved with all the Consultation Churches, or in others which may desire to participate in interim eucharistic fellowship. This problem of episcopal and non-episcopal ministries involves theological convictions, and should be recognized and honored. The clergy of the Episcopal Church, for example, is limited by Church rules to celebrating in liturgical forms authorized by their Church and to inviting assisting clergymen from Churches in communion with the Episcopal Church. The Consultation's *Order of Worship*, however, is authorized by that body and concelebration of ministers permitted.

### 4. Concelebration of the Ministers

In recent years, when Christians of different traditions join together in the Eucharist, it is sometimes customary to have ministers of the different traditions share in the celebration. This practice is called concelebration. While concelebration is unfamiliar to most of our Churches it may offer an important opportunity for the services of interim eucharistic fellowship. As ministers of the various COCU Churches participate in the liturgy, the unity and the diversity of the Church are visibly proclaimed.

In its earlier, more general use, concelebration referred to the whole people of God assembled for the Eucharist. In its narrower, more recent sense, it is applied to the mutual leadership (collegiality) in the Eucharist of a number of ordained ministers (presbyters) from one tradition or from different Churches. More especially, they join together in the prayer of consecration and in the distribution of the elements to the deacons or the congregation. When the time comes in the service for the thanksgiving and prayer of consecration, the concelebrating ministers should stand together around the Table.

Each concelebrating minister may also have other parts in the service, e.g., one may say the opening greeting, another may read a Scripture Lesson, another may offer the pastoral prayer, and so forth. Care should be taken not to make the service appear piece-meal; nor should the participation of so many ministers crowd out the participation of others, e.g., deacons and lay people, in reading the lessons or doing other functions assigned to them. Above all, it should be noted that a concelebrated



service requires careful rehearsal for all participants, as do all ecumenical services. The relevance of concelebration lies in its symbolism of the unity of the Church. It also portrays some mutuality of ministry amid rich diversity, although it does not always imply total theological agreement.

### 5. Diversity of Administration

A broad variety of practices enrich the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Churches. Some bear the mark of ancient usage; others have developed in local or regional situations; but even so, they may also communicate an important insight into the sacrament.

Some traditions emphasize the use of a common chalice from which everyone drinks; others deliberately use trays of individual communion cups. Traditional and practical implications may be resolved by using both: a common chalice (or chalices) used with wine, cups with grape juice.

In some Churches, the bread and the chalice are received by worshipers going to the Table and either standing or kneeling. In other Churches, the elements are passed to the worshipers by deacons and elders, where each serves himself, then passes the bread and the cup to his neighbor. Again, in each practice an important symbolic act is done.

No mode of the administration of the Eucharist—posture, vessel, or practice—should be regarded as uniquely divine, but because of personal feelings and liturgical sensitivities it is important to respect the convictions of persons with different views. Even the important dynamics of these issues are secondary to the eucharistic fellowship being shared. Surely those planning the services and equipping the congregation for full participation will help all to approach these differences with openness, and to discuss them with appreciation.

### 6. Reverent Disposition of the Elements

For some traditions, *e.g.*, Episcopal, it is critical to make sure that any consecrated bread and wine/juice which remain at the end of the service after all have partaken should be "reverently disposed of". Various means of disposition are possible. The remaining elements can be consumed by the ministers; members of the congregation may be invited to come forward to consume these elements after the service. In some Churches the elements are disposed of by pouring them into a special vessel draining into the earth. In other cases, the elements are kept in an appropriate container for later administering Holy Communion to the sick or to others who could not be present at public worship.

### 7. Appropriate Atmosphere

If a sense of congregational involvement is to be realized, an experimental service requires that great care be given to the small details of a service. If liturgy is to be meaningful, it should be well presented. All the people participating should have a clear idea of what is expected of them—what they have to do and what they have to say. The atmosphere projected is equally important. Imagination and sensitivity should be employed about such things as the music, hymns, the kind of language used, the vestments of the ministers, the roles assigned to various persons, the ordering of the elements in the liturgy.

A balance can be found between formality and informality, between the ordered and the spontaneous, between the traditional and the contemporary.

The Eucharist is a celebration of God's reconciling work in the life of the world. It has the power to transform, *i.e.*, to bring us together in genuine fellowship and to send us forth in Christ's name into the hurting world which he loves. As we move along the way to a fully committed fellowship, we cannot rest until it is so. We

## APPENDICES

---

cannot accept as satisfactory any pace or prospect toward a United Church that is less demanding or less urgent than faithfulness to his good news demands.

### D. A Proposal For Generating Communities

(From the Eleventh Plenary of the Consultation on Church Union, Memphis, Tenn. April 2-6, 1973.)

#### *Prologue*

“Church union conversations remain abstract and ineffective unless they bring about a real spiritual encounter in local places among Christians of different traditions and among fellow human beings. Until this happens, so much of the conversations and the concrete proposals seem alien, foreign to the experience of people. Hence the priority of the hour is to discover those ways through which those in local situations can grow together in common worship, joint mission, and relationships of fellowship and trust. Significant here is that the shape of unity will not be designed from the top; the Consultation will encourage local experiences of Church unity which will inform the shaping of a United Church. Union will be generated from local and regional places.”

Paul A. Crow, Jr., a sermon delivered  
in Grace (Episcopal) Cathedral,  
San Francisco, December 3, 1972

#### *I. Context / Rationale for Proposal*

A vital process of reconciliation has been initiated with the proposal that Christians seek a common life in unity and mission in a Church “truly catholic, truly evangelical, and truly reformed.” The Consultation on Church Union has produced *A Plan of Union for the Church of Christ Uniting* and over 3,000 official responses have been received from study-response groups in local churches and from other groups and individuals in the participating denominations. It appears that an unprecedented theological consensus has been articulated in *A Plan of Union* and affirmed in the responses to it on matters of faith, Scripture, and tradition; the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist; and on membership and ministry. Simultaneously, throughout the country, as Christians have joined together in their communities to create change in order that God’s gift of life might become more fully human for persons in society, there has also been expressed an encouraging witness to God’s active participation in the life of his world. A new vision of the Church has emerged. Yet to be discerned are the structural forms that can best implement those common understandings of faith and those common forms of Christian mission in the world.

The new vision which has been generated by the work of the Consultation needs more concrete manifestation. The ordering of the Church’s life needs more conscious relatedness to God’s call to fuller union for the fulfillment of the mission of the Church. It is to this end, hopefully, that this proposal for “generating communities” is offered.

#### *II. Proposal*

***THAT the Consultation on Church Union identify, enable, and nourish a limited number of experimental communities where Christians have manifested and committed themselves to a shared life based on the “marks of wholeness” of the Church of Christ Uniting.***

***THAT these communities be called “generating communities”, because they are in part generated out of a vision of the Church shared in the Consultation on Church Union, and because they will hopefully generate models for the Church of Christ Uniting.***

#### **“MARKS OF WHOLENESS” OF THE CHURCH**

There is a certain “wholeness” integral to the Church of Christ Uniting vision of the Church which distinguishes it from any of our existing denominational realities. The

---

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

indispensable gifts of the Spirit in creating such a renewed vision of a United Church would include the following "marks of wholeness":

1. An authentic Church will be responsive to the revelation, judgment, and grace of God as known through the Scriptures and incarnated in Jesus Christ, and will endeavor at every level of its life to authenticate the power of the Gospel through the mission in the world.
2. It will preserve the continuity of its several heritages in grateful recognition of their enriching influences, while at the same time fostering maximum openness to further enrichment from other traditions and cultural influences.
3. It will establish norms of an ordered life containing diversity within its unity and openness to change along with elements of continuity.
4. It will strive for inclusiveness in the full participation and representation of all its members, while preserving the unique contributions provided by the diversities of race, age, sex, culture, and economic background.
5. While affirming the ministry of the whole People of God it will provide for particular vocations in ministry and mission.

### GOALS

Such "generating communities" will deepen the awareness of the wholeness of the Gospel and the wholeness of the Church and will demonstrate the experience of Christian community where such marks of wholeness are present. They will establish local goals for fellowship and mission while testing the goals of the Church of Christ Uniting vision. Such testing will provide new insights and experiential data in contributing to an ongoing process of structural design for a United Church.

### STYLE

A "generating community" seeking to embody the "marks of wholeness" will develop a recognizable life-style which

- treasures the historic faith while encouraging its contemporary expression,
- celebrates this faith in regular eucharistic fellowship in common with other churches,
- structures itself for mission on all levels of its life,
- fosters flexibility and encourages experimentation,
- maintains an openness to further ecumenical relationships which may include non-Consultation-on-Church-Union Churches, clusters, task-groups, study processes, and persons of pluralistic perspectives,
- regards all organization as provisional, and
- shares its learnings with others through the Consultation on Church Union and related groups.

### *III. Steps in the Process*

#### INITIATIVES

Initiatives for the establishment of "generating communities" may come from several sources; for example,

#### *1. The local congregations*

As a result of living-room dialogues, cross-denominational studies and study-response groups, and a myriad of action projects, a number of local congregations have within them groups of Christians who have discovered unity in fellowship, mission, and worship across denominations. The relationships which they have developed with one another and their common study of *A Plan of Union* may serve as a natural impetus for them to covenant together in becoming a more inclusive and extensive "generating community". Some of these groups represent directions of entire congregations.

---

## APPENDICES

---

### 2. *Experimental communities*

Experimental communities, sometimes in the form of house churches, sometimes “underground churches”, sometimes task-oriented communes, in which the struggle for the “marks of wholeness” is a primary concern, are already in existence. These groups may not be related to local congregations in any way, but the Consultation on Church Union model might be seen as an option by them.

### 3. *Middle judicatories*

Middle judicatories, already engaged together in consultations in specific parish development, may suggest that these local situations under their jurisdiction continue to move in the union direction by assuming the covenant to be identified as a “generating community”.

### 4. *National staff*

Through correspondence and personal knowledge of local situations where the ecumenical understanding is present in both spirit and substance, national staff of Consultation participants may issue invitations to key persons and/or churches to become “generating communities”.

### 5. *Other*

Wherever a new vision of the Church in its wholeness is matched by a desire to embody it, wherever the goals and style of the generating community concept are accepted, such a community of Christians may be the initiators in being named a “generating community”.

## COVENANT

### 1. *Responsibilities of a “Generating Community”*

A prospective “generating community” declares itself committed to the “marks of wholeness” of the Church of Christ Uniting. After studying Consultation on Church Union materials, especially *A Plan of Union*, it enters into a covenant with the Consultation on Church Union in order that it might be identified as a “generating community”. A “generating community” would covenant to set its own goals, to design its own provisional structures, to test the principles of the Church of Christ Uniting, and to share its findings and work in close co-operation with the Consultation.

### 2. *Responsibilities of the Consultation on Church Union*

The Consultation would covenant to provide a “generating community” with tools, advice, and consultative skills to nourish and stimulate the ecumenical vision; would seek to provide for staff resources from either national or regional bodies with experience in ecumenical experimental situations; would provide counsel on significant issues raised in response to *A Plan of Union*; and would assist a “generating community” in interpreting its own experience in order to benefit the Church of Christ Uniting process.

Simultaneously, the consultative relationship is a two-way process. New structures and models, as developed in “generating community” settings, will provide suggestions for new shapes of the Church on the local scene. While the primary value of the “generating communities” will lie in the experience of unity and involvement in mission among its participants, the forms which “generating communities” develop will facilitate in major ways any redraft of *A Plan of Union*.

## MIDDLE JUDICATORIES

The “generating communities” will need close co-operation with, and the full assistance of, their member denominations and their agencies and judicatories concerned with the renewal of the Church. It is expected that such communities will

---

---

## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

consult fully with those bodies, and that the Consultation will also seek to assist in interpreting and communicating goals and results of the "generating communities" to all bodies which are involved at middle judicatory levels. A "generating community" is not a new denominational entity but a para-denominational experiment in Christian community, according to the style of the Church of Christ Uniting, in which Consultation on Church Union member denominations are expected to have a vital stake. Maximum openness to other ecumenical expressions beyond Consultation members may be included in these relationships.

### *IV. Advisory-Support Group for Generating Communities*

#### 1. PURPOSE

The Advisory Support Group would be charged with reviewing proposals for identifying "generating communities". It would provide appropriate counsel to each "generating community" according to the covenant entered into by the Consultation. It would make available literature and personnel resources, consult with necessary judicatory leadership, evaluate developments in each "generating community", and communicate results and insights as these may affect any revisions of *A Plan of Union*.

#### 2. MEMBERSHIP

The Advisory Support Group would be made up of two or more persons from each of the participating Consultation Churches, including those who are participants in the COCU process. An appropriate number of consultants would be named. It is hoped additional staff might be seconded for research and development.

#### 3. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

When necessary, it would facilitate overtures being made to potential "generating communities". It would, along with the chief ecumenical officer of each denomination involved, carry on necessary consultation with middle judiciaries, encouraging such judiciaries to assume advice and support. Where "generating communities" are not directly related to denominations, the Advisory Support Group would provide the primary counsel and support.

### *IV. Suggested Time Line*

If this proposal for "generating communities" is accepted at the Memphis plenary, the Advisory Support Group would need to be organized shortly thereafter. By October, ten "generating communities" should be identified, with ten additional "generating communities" identified at two six-month intervals following. It is expected that the covenanting communities would agree to a three-year minimum commitment, according to the following three stages:

Stage I	Organization, consultation, communication with all covenanting bodies (six months)
Stage II	Involvement in worship, study, and mission (two years)
Stage III	Evaluation and reporting (six months)

### **E. Delegates to the Consultation on Church Union.**

#### *1. Denver Plenary, 1971*

Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson, *Chairman*  
Rt. Rev. Ned Cole  
Rt. Rev. William H. Folwell  
Rt. Rev. Arthur A. Vogel  
Rev. Warner R. Traynham, Boston,  
Mass.  
Rev. William J. Wolf, Cambridge, Mass.  
Peter Day, New York

## APPENDICES

---

Janice Sylvia Jackson, Michigan  
George A. Shipman, Seattle, Washington

### 2. *Memphis Plenary, 1973*

Rt. Rev. Robert F. Gibson  
Rt. Rev. William H. Folwell  
Rt. Rev. John M. Krumm  
Rev. A. T. Mollegen, Alexandria,  
Virginia  
Rev. Warner B. Traynham, Boston,  
Mass.  
Peter Day, New York  
Mrs. John S. Jackson, Jr., Lake Oswego,  
Oregon  
Miss Donna Osborne, Memphis, Tenn.  
Miss Marnie Shideler, Sardis, Miss.  
Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel, Alexandria,  
Va.

### IV. LUTHERAN-EPISCOPAL DIALOGUE

A. The Forward Movement book, *Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue—a Progress Report*, has been sent to all members of General Convention as an integral part of the report of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations.

B. Episcopal members of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue are as follows:

- \* Rt. Rev. Richard S. M. Emrich,  
Detroit, Mich.
- \* Rev. Reginald H. Fuller, Alexandria,  
Va.  
Very Rev. Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr.,  
Cambridge, Mass.  
Rev. John W. Hildebrand, Fort Worth,  
Texas  
Very Rev. J. Ogden Hoffman, Jr.,  
Sacramento, Calif.
- \* Rev. John H. Rodgers, Jr., Alexandria,  
Va.  
Rev. Robert H. Whitaker, *Secretary*,  
Detroit, Mich.  
Peter Day, New York  
Mrs. Sherman E. Johnson, Mansfield,  
Ohio

### V. THE EPISCOPAL REPRESENTATION IN COUNCILS OF CHURCHES

A. Episcopal Members of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches:

Rt. Rev. John E. Hines, Presiding Bishop  
David E. Johnson (New York). Mr. Johnson is also a member of the Executive Committee of the World Council.

B. Members of the Present Governing Board of the National Council of Churches (1973-1976)

Rt. Rev. John E. Hines  
Rt. Rev. Roger W. Blanchard

---

\* Also members of the International Commission

Rt. Rev. John H. Burt  
Rt. Rev. William E. Sanders  
Rev. Canon Gerald N. McAllister  
Rev. Robert C. Martin  
Very Rev. Harry W. Vere  
Rev. Paul M. Washington  
Peter Day  
Mrs. G. C. Hazard  
Mrs. David R. Hunter  
Clarence A. Jones  
Ronald E. Taylor  
Ervine Twin  
Gretchen Zimmerman

**C. Episcopal Delegation to the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, 1972.**  
(listed by Provinces)

- I. Rt. Rev. John M. Burgess (Massachusetts)  
\* Rev. E. D. Geyer (Vermont) \*\*  
Marcus Lovett (Connecticut)  
Mrs. Howard Bateman (Rhode Island)  
Mrs. Robert Webb (Connecticut)
- II. Rt. Rev. Richard B. Martin (Long Island)  
Rev. Darwin Kirby, Jr.  
(Albany) \*\*  
\* Mrs. G. C. Hazard (Long Island) \*\*  
Boyd Johnson (New York)  
Warner Turner (New York)
- III. Rt. Rev. Robert Appleyard (Pittsburgh)  
\*Rev. Paul M. Washington (Pennsylvania)  
E. A. Prichard (Virginia)  
Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel (Virginia)
- IV. \*Rt. Rev. William E. Sanders (Tennessee)  
Rev. W. Ted Gannaway (South Florida)  
Edward Colvin (Alabama) \*\*  
Mrs. Ernest H. Clarke (Kentucky)
- V. \*Rt. Rev. John Harris Burt (Ohio)  
Rev. William O. Hanner (Chicago) \*\*  
Charles Battle (Indianapolis)  
\* 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 Stibolt (Iowa) \*\*  
Rev. Webster Two Hawk (South Dakota) \*\*
- VII. Rt. Rev. Christoph Keller, Jr. (Arkansas)  
\* Rev. Gerald N. McAllister (South Texas)  
Mrs. Cotter Murray (Oklahoma)  
Thomas A. Webster (West Missouri)

## APPENDICES

---

- VIII. Rt. Rev. Robert C. Rusack (Los Angeles)  
Very Rev. Richard Coombs (Spokane)  
Frank Clarke, M. D. (California)  
\* Mrs. Robert E. Pence (Arizona) \*\*
- IX. Rt. Rev. William A. Franklin (Colombia)

— ◆ —  
Presiding Bishop – Rt. Rev. John E. Hines

— ◆ —  
*Members of the Executive Council Staff:*

\*Rt. Rev. Roger W. Blanchard, *Executive Vice-President*  
Oscar Carr, *Vice-President* \*\*  
Rev. John F. Stevens, *Secretary*  
Mrs. David R. Hunter  
Rev. Robert C. Martin  
Leon Modeste  
\*Peter Day  
John Goodbody \*\*

### VI. ECUMENICAL COMMITTEE OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Mrs. John S. Jackson, Jr. (*Chairman*),  
Oregon  
Rt. Rev. John M. Allin, Mississippi  
Rt. Rev. Allen W. Brown, Albany  
Rt. Rev. Philip E. McNairy, Minnesota  
Rev. Gerald N. McAllister, West Texas  
Rev. George A. Smith, Minnesota  
Robert Davidson, Western Kansas  
Clifford P. Morehouse, Southwest Florida  
Joseph I. Worsham, Dallas

*Staff*

Peter Day  
Mrs. Howard O. Bingley  
Mrs. David R. Hunter

---

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

\*\* Persons who were elected to the General Assembly but did not attend are indicated by a double asterisk after their names. Substitutes were:

Rt. Rev. John M. Allin (Mississippi)  
Rt. Rev. A. Donald Davies (Dallas)  
Rev. Everett W. Francis (Executive Council staff)  
Rev. Charles M. Vogt (Montana)  
Very Rev. Charles Preston Wiles (Dallas)  
Joan Boardman (California)  
Mrs. John S. Jackson, Jr. (Oregon)  
Ervine Twin (South Dakota)  
Anselmo Valdez (West Texas)  
Gretchen Zimmerman (Olympia)

---



## ECUMENICAL RELATIONS

### VII. FINANCIAL REPORT

#### A. Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations

##### *Receipts*

Appropriated by the 1970 General Convention	\$70,000.00
---	-------------

##### *Disbursements*

Travel and meetings, to April 30, 1973	37,237.17
Anticipated Expense, to August 15, 1973	7,466.00

Total anticipated disbursements	44,703.17
Anticipated Balance	25,296.83

To Balance Appropriation	70,000.00
--------------------------	-----------

#### B. Council on Relations With Eastern Churches

##### *Receipts*

April 17, 1970 Balance, brought forward	6,930.37
Sale of Orthodox Directory and Handbook	794.87
Refund of Travel Advance to Treasurer	302.00

Total receipts	8,027.24
----------------	----------

##### *Disbursements*

Orthodox projects, reference materials for the Council, Postage, Miscellaneous	4,658.35
Travel Advance, for Refund	302.00

Total disbursements	4,960.35
---------------------	----------

Balance to Carry Forward April 30, 1973	3,066.89
---	----------

---

Interest-bearing deposit at Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, New York, Legacy from the Estate of the late Wm. K. Richardson, pending its use in the property-development plan of St. Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris: principal, \$4,940.64; plus interest, \$2,303.04; total, \$7,293.68, at March 31, 1973.