

# The Joint Commission on World Mission

## CONTENTS

<b>MEMBERS</b> .....	AA-340
<b>REPORT</b> .....	AA-341
<b>PREAMBLE — “MISSION IMPERISHABLE”</b> .....	AA-341
<b>GOALS FOR NEXT TRIENNium</b> .....	AA-343
(1) “To assist in the follow-up and seek proper coordination to the responses of the P-I-M process.”	
(2) “To assist Executive Council in developing Covenant Planning before and after Autonomy in the overseas dioceses.”	
(a) <i>Resolution A - Covenant Plan for Autonomy between Liberia and PECUSA</i>	
(3) “To study the relationship and propose new policy between companion relationships and P-I-M.”	
(4) “To undertake a thorough and comprehensive review of the World Mission policies and priorities of this Church, with special attention to present and future funding in the light of these reviewed policies and priorities.”	
<b>BUDGET, Financial funding needed</b> .....	AA-350
<b>CONTINUATION OF JCWM-Resolution</b> .....	AA-350
<b>FINANCIAL REPORT</b> .....	AA-351
<b>RESOLUTION OF A.C.C.</b> .....	AA-351
(REAFFIRMATION OF FUNCTIONS)	

### Members

- The Rt. Rev. Robert P. Atkinson,  
West Virginia, *Chairman*
- Sra. Barbara Aldana,  
Guatemala, *Vice Chairman*
- Mr. Paul A. Frank, Jr.  
Ohio, *Secretary-Treasurer*
- The Rt. Rev. Edmond L. Browning,  
Hawaii
- The Rt. Rev. Telesforo Isaac,  
Dominican Republic (resigned during Triennium, not replaced)

The Rev. Charles H. Eddy,  
Alaska  
The Rev. Emmanuel W. Johnson,  
Liberia  
The Rev. John L. O'Hear,  
Delaware  
Mr. Armando Borboa-Salazar,  
Mexico  
Mr. Guillermo Bohorquez,  
Colombia  
Mrs. John T. Bottom,  
Mississippi  
Mr. Richard P. M. Bowden,  
Georgia  
Mrs. Leona Bryant,  
Virgin Islands  
Mrs. Juanita G. Harris  
Florida  
Ms. Ana Mercedes Lago,  
Puerto Rico

*Note:* The General Convention resolution established in 1976 that the Joint Commission on World Mission's membership be as follows: one half of the total membership come from jurisdictions outside the United States of America.

## **PREAMBLE — "MISSION IMPERISHABLE"**

The Confession of the Waldenses in the year 1573 stated the following: "Missionary work was born in the counsels of the Triune God where it was decreed that, by the preaching of the Gospel to all people, there should be brought to eternal glory a great multitude which no man could number from every tribe, people, and language."

There is a sense in which the Mission of the Church is not only worldwide, but also it is timeless and imperishable. There are Mission Imperatives which arise from the very nature of the Gospel of Jesus Christ which are rooted not in human thought, but in historical events. The major event involved is the sending by God of His Son, Jesus Christ, into the world to be its Lord and Savior. The Mission Imperishable is climaxed in our Lord's death, burial, and resurrection. The timeless and imperishable nature of the World Mission of the Church has an abiding apostolic role to fill. For more than sixty generations the World Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ, sometimes more and sometimes less, has spontaneously reached out from its local congregations with the Gospel of Good News. The Mission Imperative is highlighted by a strong emphasis on converting peoples and not solely individuals. The World Mission of the Church means making disciples of all nations within their cultural context over which Christ desires to extend His Lordship. We also hold that the Mission Imperishable is unfinished and ongoing. Individuals, families, communities, whole peoples and cultures yet remain to be discipled. As Vatican II so succinctly put it, the Church still has a priority obligation, "For the Gospel message has not yet been heard, or scarcely so, by two billion human beings, and their number is increasing daily."

On the eve of the 1980's, we believe that the Episcopal Church must dream new dreams, plan new procedures, marshal its resources to accomplish a relevant Mission Imperishable.

There is renewed interest in World evangelism which raises several important questions as we contemplate the future role of the Episcopal Church and its Mission in the 1980's. Is this witness to Jesus Christ as comprehensive as the Gospel itself? — Is it an international, ecumenical united witness that aims at leaving no geographical corner of

## APPENDICES

---

the world, no strata and structure of society, nor any individual person outside the frontier of Christianity — or is it a parochial, docetic or individualistic witness? The challenges and opportunities throughout the world for the outreach of the Gospel involve not merely a quantitative mobilization of all of the resources of the Episcopal Church around the world, but an all-out concern for the many situations in which people find themselves and to which the Gospel must be addressed. The ripened condition of our world must be understood in the light of the Comprehensiveness of the Christian Mission Imperishable. The world needs a holistic, not a compartmentalized, distorted, docetic Gospel. The world needs to hear and see a united Church witnessing and preaching, in word and deed, the liberating message of Jesus Christ, worshipping and serving Him and disciplining its people all over the world.

The Partners-in-Mission concept has heightened, brightened, and lightened the way and direction for the Mission Imperishable for the 1980's. The Joint Commission on World Mission therefore:

- calls upon the Episcopal Church to mobilize all its resources — manpower, finances, talents, imagination, contacts, and opportunities — to meet the Mission Imperishable which the Lord lays open before us on the eve of the 1980's . . . .
- challenge the Episcopal Church to give a ministry to the world that is prophetic, priestly, in season and out of season . . . . .
- beseeches the Episcopal Church through its Partnership overseas to proclaim, teach, and witness to, without reduction or apologies, the *whole* Gospel of the Kingdom to the *whole* of mankind in the *whole* world . . . . .
- petitions the Episcopal Church to strive for the integral growth of the Church to the end that all the peoples of the earth might experience God's salvation in Jesus Christ in their struggles for hope and life everlasting, reconciliation and forgiveness, justice and mercy, dignity and spiritual stability . . . . .
- solicits the Episcopal Church to become a receiving Church, rather than always a giving Church . . . . .
- affirms and commends the Episcopal Church to continue to participate in the concept of Partners-in-Mission throughout the Anglican Communion.

The Joint Commission on World Mission has discovered in its work during the past three years a new spirit of cooperation within the structures of the Episcopal Church. We were able to experience during the past three years the coming together of several interest groups concerned about and mindful of the Mission Imperishable of the Gospel. For the first time ever the Coalition of Overseas Bishops (Coalition O) met with the General Convention's Joint Commission on World Mission, the Standing Committee on National and World Mission of the Executive Council, and representatives of the United Thank Offering and the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief. Heretofore all of these bodies, some old, some new, had been working at various pieces of world mission strategy in relative isolation from each other, only loosely tied together by a degree of overlapping membership and a thinly-spread, over-worked Executive Council staff. While secrecy was not the aim of separate strategies, compartmentalization had very nearly the same effect.

Since the Louisville General Convention in 1973, Coalition O has engaged our overseas bishops in fully open, joint decision-making. It is good to see that great stride forward being matched now by the inclusion of other groups in the Church which share responsibility for world mission.

There are dramatic needs to be shared. A major concern of the Joint Commission on World Mission has been the lack of missionary education and information among members of the Episcopal Church. We suggest that a serious and thoughtful effort be made to raise the consciousness of Episcopalians about such issues as hunger, oppression, disease, illiteracy and the special problems of evangelization in diverse cultural settings. It is felt that the average church member is totally unaware of the strides being made in helping overseas dioceses to become autonomous, indigenous,

self-supporting churches within the Anglican family and how crucial fiscal and human resources are to attaining those ends while the time is ripe.

Over the past three years, the Joint Commission on World Mission has considered many of the issues and concerns mentioned above in terms of its own life together as a Joint Commission on World Mission, as well as its own scope of accountability. Our report, therefore, will speak of and be concerned about a Mission Policy Handbook, Volunteers for Mission, the Episcopal Church's relationship with Liberia, Covenants for Autonomy, Partners-in-Mission, Phase II, the ongoing life and work of the Joint Commission on World Mission itself, and a serious and vigorous resolve to plan for the Mission of the Church in the 1980's with specific Goals for the next Triennium.

## **I. GOALS FOR THE NEXT TRIENNIUM**

The JCWM appreciates the opportunity it has had to serve the cause of World Mission for the Church. While we feel and believe much progress has been made during the past triennium, there is still much to be done and we should like to speak to this issue by proposing four (4) program goals for the JCWM in the next three years:

(1) *To assist in the follow-up and seek proper coordination to the responses of the Partners-in-Mission process.* The recently held Lambeth Conference in 1978 affirmed the need of the Anglican Communion to continue the pursuit of this Goal established by the JCWM. Before we anticipate the next Triennium in the accomplishment of this Goal, it is helpful to review the bidding, as it were, of the past Triennium.

### *A. The Past Triennium*

In April of 1977 The Episcopal Church engaged in a simultaneous Consultation on Partners-in-Mission. The Provinces of PECUSA brought together representatives from all Dioceses and many special interest groups within a Province for a four-day meeting. It is true to say, we believe, that these simultaneous Consultations made it possible for many to come together for one week of prayer, worship, fellowship, consultation, sharing information about Dioceses with Dioceses of the same Province, and discovering each other anew. Each Province developed Statements of Agreements defining new dimensions and understandings of partnership and appropriate responses from the external partners in attendance. The JCWM reviewed this process and experience with positive and affirmative resolutions of commendation for the PIM Consultative Method. The JCWM recognizes the advent in the past Triennium of the Venture in Mission — a sacramental adventure — a challenging opportunity for every member of PECUSA to make a new commitment to the Mission of the Church. It is coincidental that PIM took place at the time when the initial stage of VIM program was getting underway. If VIM is thought of mainly as a dollar-raising program, it will become no more than a substitute for renewal and mission and it will retard the growth of any form of partnership. We note during the past Triennium a coordination of planning and programs of PIM and VIM by the Executive Council. Yet it appears to us that VIM has taken front and center stage to PIM during the past three years. We sense floundering and inactivity, lack of serious and careful planning concerning PIM and its usefulness for the future. At the same time, we note with expectation that a second round of PIM Consultations are being planned for 1981.

Above all, the JCWM looks back upon the Consultation held in April of 1978 in Santo Domingo with gratitude and thanksgiving. We were able to experience

## APPENDICES

---

there the coming together of several interest groups concerned about and mindful of "The Mission Imperishable" recorded in our Preamble to this Report to General Convention. As we stated in the Preamble, "For the first time ever the Coalition of Overseas Bishops met with the JCWM, the Standing Committee on National and World Mission of the Executive Council and representatives of the U.T.O. and the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief. Heretofore all of these bodies, some old, some new, had been working at various pieces of world mission strategy in relative isolation from each other, only loosely tied together by a degree of overlapping membership and a thinly-spread, overworked Executive Council staff." The JCWM is justly proud of its ability to bring to pass this milestone in mission communication during the past Triennium.

The Lambeth Conference in 1978 spoke specifically to the PIM concept. It recorded that the consultative process is concerned with the meaning of mission as well as its implementation. It also recommended each Province of the Anglican Communion seek to educate Anglicans in the meaning of the PIM process and of the significant reorientation of mission strategy which is involved. Finally, Lambeth encouraged all Anglicans to experience the PIM process at every level of the Church's life — national, provincial, and Diocesan.

The JCWM notes with appreciation the 1979 Consultation on National Mission held in April of this year with Bishops, representatives of Dioceses involved in PIM Committees, Coalitions, Executive Council Standing Committees, and Church Center staff. We believe this event is a significant step forward in not only utilizing the PIM process, but also in evaluating and communicating the essence of the Consultative method for mission strategy.

### *B. The Next Triennium*

The Partners-in-Mission Consultation of 1977 was a possible first step toward a new mission strategy in the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. The PIM experience consisted of sharing of Diocesan data about the work and ministry the Church faces in the various Dioceses. It was an experience of "pass and review" in the presence of the Dioceses of the Provinces of PECUSA and in the presence of overseas observers and external consultants. The result of this sharing was a feeling of mutuality about problems and opportunities. The Joint Commission on World Mission affirms the consultative conference method which facilitated this sharing. Due to a high degree of discussion and participation, the consultative process fosters a strong sense of ownership by the participants. We believe there should be a well-intentioned and designed follow up to the 1977 experience for PECUSA. We wish to affirm the National Mission Consultation which is a beginning step in the follow-up process. We believe this process will help PECUSA to find a way of better communication and enable mutual acceptance with the expectation that trust and action will follow in the next Triennium.

The National Mission Consultation can assist PECUSA in identifying mission opportunities at local Diocesan, regional, and national levels. It is even possible to interconnect between the Partners-in-Mission process and the Venture in Mission implementation of shared mission. The National Mission Consultation can familiarize Diocesan leadership with the consultative process as a means of formulating Diocesan and local mission goals; it can bring about shared mission strategy. The JCWM stands poised and ready to assist in this process as the Executive Council deems advisable.

The JCWM is on record to offer its help to the Executive Council in calling for and planning toward a Second National PIM Consultation with special emphasis on the use of the consultative process within the several Dioceses of PECUSA.

The JCWM is resolved to help the Executive Council in evaluating the measurable or

immeasurable elements of impact that other PIM Consultations have had upon PECUSA in the next Triennium.

The JCWM is desirous of exploring the ways and means of finding new avenues of communication through the Church media which will inform, educate, and inspire PECUSA to continue to utilize the PIM process for Diocesan, Regional, and National renewal of the Church.

The JCWM recommends that a sub-committee of the JCWM be appointed to carry out the objectives of Goal No. 1 as outlined above.

(2) *To assist Executive Council in developing Covenant Planning before and after Autonomy in the overseas dioceses.*

*A. Covenant Planning for Autonomy*

For many years, it has been the goal of this Church to encourage the overseas dioceses to become constitutionally autonomous and financially self-supporting to enhance and strengthen our mutual mission. A major concern of the Joint Commission has been the need to develop a planning process for autonomy. The Commission instituted this triennium what it calls Covenant Planning for Autonomy. This process attempts to develop covenants between the Church and overseas dioceses stating what each party to the agreement would do to achieve autonomy at a designated time of a future General Convention. To determine what is required of each partner requires evaluation and planning in such areas as evangelism, stewardship, social action and education as well as the development of financial plans for budgeting, investments and pensions. It also means careful planning of constitution and canons, structure and the determination of the metropolitan authority required for a new church to begin its new relationship with PECUSA and the Anglican Communion.

After developing this framework for planning, the Joint Commission invited six overseas dioceses, which had completed their internal planning with the approval of the Coalition of Overseas Bishops to negotiate a Covenant Plan. Two of these dioceses, Liberia and Puerto Rico, responded to the Commission. The first consultation occurred early in February, 1979, in Monrovia at the invitation of the Episcopal Church of Liberia (ECL). A team of three went to Monrovia and included the Rt. Rev. William H. Folwell of the Standing Committee for National and World Mission of Executive Council, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Van Culin, Executive for National and World Mission, and Paul A. Frank, Jr. of the Joint Commission. Also taking part in the consultation was the Rt. Rev. I. S. M. LeMaire, Bishop of Accra and Dean of the Province of West Africa, and Leonard S. Coleman of the Christian Organizations Research and Advisory Trust of Africa (CORAT).

Prior to the consultation, the committee representing ECL, chaired by Senator Charles D. Sherman, made an extensive and thoughtful draft proposal of a covenant. After several days of discussion, much of their proposal was adopted by the joint consultation and then approved at the convention of ECL held at Robertsport, Cape Mount, on February 10, 1979. It was also received and supported by action of the Executive Council of PECUSA at its meeting of February 14, 1979.

The Joint Commission heartily recommends adoption of this Covenant by the General Convention as a significant milestone in our planning for overseas autonomy.

**Resolution #A—110**

**Covenant Plan for Autonomy Between Liberia and PECUSA**

*Whereas*, the 65th General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (PECUSA) did, by a resolution, commend and support

## APPENDICES

---

the historic step of the Episcopal Church of Liberia (ECL) in becoming an Associate Member of the Church of the Province of West Africa (CPWA); and

*Whereas*, the Episcopal Church of Liberia has been a constituent member of PECUSA since the missionary activities of PECUSA organized the Church in Liberia in 1836, a period of almost a century and a half; and

*Whereas*, ECL has set 1982 as its target date for Constitutional Autonomy and 1990 for full independence with the encouragement of PECUSA; and

*Whereas*, it is the desire of both PECUSA and ECL that the long and historical association between the two Churches should not be completely severed but that there should be developed a new relationship consonant with ECL's membership in CPWA; and

*Whereas*, the 65th General Convention of PECUSA did authorize the Joint Commission on World Mission and the Standing Committee on Structure of the Church to study the implications of ECL's membership in CPWA and make recommendations within the true spirit of Mutual Responsibility and Inter-Dependence (MRI) in the Body of Christ for new relationships between PECUSA and the Overseas Dioceses which have had a long and historical association with PECUSA and which Overseas Dioceses, in the development of new associations, may still desire some kind of continuing relationship with PECUSA; and

*Whereas*, Representatives of PECUSA and Representatives of ECL, in pursuance of said authorization, have met and had discussions in a spirit of true understanding and friendship and have arrived at mutually acceptable agreements;

*Resolved*, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, that the 66th General Convention of the Episcopal Church meeting in Colorado does agree and covenant with the Episcopal Church of Liberia and does commit itself to this covenant for the planning of autonomy with the Episcopal Church of Liberia as follows:

1. That ECL confirms its intention to become a full member of CPWA.
2. That there will be established a Joint Committee of Consultation to be made up of members from ECL and PECUSA. The CPWA will be invited to membership in this Committee. The Committee's tasks will be to consult, cooperate and offer advice on missionary activities which shall include, but not be limited to, Partners-in-Mission, Spiritual Renewal, Stewardship development plans, educational, health and agricultural programs, the training and development of clergy and theologians, and other shared programs.
3. That, prior to ECL becoming a full member of CPWA, ECL with the assistance of PECUSA will develop Pension Schemes for ECL clergy and other employees of the Diocese.
4. That, because of its historic nature as the only religious and privately supported institution of higher learning in Sub-Sahara Africa, PECUSA will continue to give moral and financial assistance to ECL in its support of Cuttington University College.
5. That ECL may seek and PECUSA will encourage the development of companion diocese relationships between ECL and dioceses of PECUSA.
6. That PECUSA will continue to promote the Venture in Mission Project at Kabolia; will carry out the financial aid as outlined in the projection entitled, "Episcopal Diocese of Liberia -- Budget Projection from 1976-1986"; and will assist in seeking sources of capital funds for development; all of which is looking forward to full financial independence for ECL in 1990.
7. That the Bishop of Liberia shall be invited to be a collegial member of the House of Bishops of PECUSA; and that a means shall be provided by the rules of order of the House of Deputies to enable representatives of ECL to "seat and voice" in the House of Deputies of PECUSA.

8. That upon the request and recommendation of the Bishop of Liberia, the House of Bishops will appoint an Episcopal Partner to consult with him.

9. That ECL will make an annual voluntary contribution to the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief.

10. That this Covenant will become effective upon approval by both the Diocesan Convention of Liberia and the General Convention of PECUSA.

11. That ECL will provide PECUSA with a completed copy of the Constitution and Canons of ECL and of CPWA as being revised by The Constitutional Amendment Committee of CPWA, in accordance with regulations of the Anglican Consultative Council.

12. This Covenant shall be subject to review not less than once every three years to enable changes and modifications as may become necessary, and will continue in force until agreement by both parties to terminate.

A preliminary visit was made to Puerto Rico in 1978 to determine a basis to establish a covenant agreement to be operative after autonomy has been achieved. Additional discussions are to be held during the Spring of 1979 with a following report to Convention.

The Joint Commission believes that additional covenant consultations should take place during the next triennium and Executive Council has agreed to do so. We recommend a sub-committee be appointed by the Commission during the next triennium to assist in these consultations. While agreements must necessarily be tailored to the needs of each overseas diocese, much planning for autonomy should be done at the local level and wherever possible on a regional basis to enable regional development and partnership. The Executive Council has found Covenant Planning helpful and, therefore, has invited all dioceses seeking autonomy to participate in negotiations leading to Covenant Agreements. The Joint Commission heartily endorses this call and stands ready to assist in the process.

(3) *To study the relationship and propose new policy between companion relationships and Partners-in-Mission*

A. *Companion Relationships/ Partners-in-Mission*

One of the purposes of the Joint Commission has been to keep in the mind of the Church the necessity of working in accord with the Partnership principle set forth at Toronto in 1963 as Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ, and reiterated at the Anglican Consultative Council's meeting in Dublin in 1973 where the Council stated that "although the responsibility for mission in any place belongs primarily to the Church in that place, however, this mission must be shared in each and every place with fellow Christians from each and every part of the World."

As a result of the Partners-in-Mission consultation held in the United States in 1977, some PECUSA provinces and dioceses have entered into ongoing relationships with "overseas partners," (invited consultants from overseas) who participated in their respective provincial consultations. Also, there are approximately two dozen Companion Diocese relationships between PECUSA domestic dioceses and overseas PECUSA and Anglican dioceses.

The Commission points to the need to expand and facilitate such relationships, and, therefore, recommends that a study be made of the nature of the present ones, and of the feasibility of an overall plan to assist the process. To do this we recommend the appointment of a sub-committee with the following tasks:

I. *Study*

A. Review the nature of present Companion Diocese relationships.

## APPENDICES

---

- B. Evaluate learnings from Companionship relationships.
- C. Review Overseas partner relationships resulting from U.S. Partners-in-Mission Consultation I.
- D. Evaluate learnings from Consultation I.
- E. Review planning from Consultation II.

### 2. *Correlation*

Determine the feasibility of proposing an overall plan to correlate and dovetail Partners and Companion Relationships.

### 3. *Promotion*

Propose plans to encourage greater participation in overseas relationships.

*(4) To undertake a thorough and comprehensive review of the World Mission policies and priorities of this Church, with special attention to present and future funding in the light of these reviewed policies and priorities.*

A. We believe that the above goal has been inherent in the stated task of this commission from its creation. The review of certain policies and programs of this Church's world mission concerns has in this past triennium been largely in the area of covenant planning (for autonomy of the 21 overseas dioceses) and in the monitoring of the Partners-in-Mission process.

We had hoped that our review might be more extensive. At the 1976 65th General Convention a resolution was passed calling for the Executive Council to oversee the preparation of a policy handbook which would collect all the policy decisions which have been made in the past several conventions that affect this Church's world mission stance.

On review of this resolution, the Executive Council's staff decided that the writing of the handbook should be done in two parts: first, a handbook defining the mode of operation related to overseas support of various personnel and programs; and secondly, a bringing together an organized setting forth of all the official statements regarding policies of our Church related to World Mission. Because of a reduced number of staff persons in the World Mission Department, this process has been delayed — the first document was presented and passed by the Executive Council at its December, 1978 meeting, and at the writing of this report it is anticipated that the second part will be presented to the April meeting of the Executive Council. Consequently, JCWM will have to wait until the next triennium to review the policies as collected in this second section.

Nevertheless, even though we feel that a majority of our time has been given to Covenant Planning, Partners-in-Mission Consultations review, and that we have not had the necessary materials from a policy handbook that would have given us the data for the systematic review, we have during this triennium reviewed certain current programs and examined certain problems which we believe need to be brought to the attention of this General Convention.

We are encouraged by the advance that the Volunteers for Mission program, established in 1976 65th General Convention, has made, even in the face of little financial support given it by the Church. This program, which seeks dedicated people to serve in overseas areas resulted out of the PIM consultations for certain skills needed for a limited time, is one which we believe has enormous possibilities in using our lay resources for the mission enterprise of this Church. We feel embarrassed that such a program has hardly been able to get "off the ground" because of restricted budget limitations. Because of a dedicated staff at the national level we at least have a beginning. But where can it possibly go from here with the financial uncertainty of this Church?

With a similar concern, we call to the attention of this General Convention that this JCWM has been deeply distressed that monies released from previous commitments

to the Church in Brazil (\$145,800) and to the Nippon Seiko Kai (\$271,776) are being absorbed by rising fixed costs of our national operation rather than being placed into new missionary thrusts of this Church. Seriously disturbed by this trend, the Santo Domingo Conference (referred to in the above report) forwarded the following resolution to Executive Council in April of 1978:

*"Whereas" the missionary grant in aid to the Episcopal Church of Brazil is diminishing annually and releasing each year until 1983 approximately \$49,000 and*

*Whereas, a similar need and opportunity for new work overseas is urgent,*

Therefore, it is the consensus of this Consultation of the Coalition of Overseas Bishops, the JCWM, the Standing Committee on National and World Mission of Executive Council, the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief and the United Thank Offering that we recommend to the Executive Council to include these amounts in the 1979 and succeeding program budgets for new work in overseas dioceses through budgetary grants and Partners-in-Mission projects."

We are fully aware of the fact that this resolution was extremely difficult to deal with by the Executive Council given the process by which our national budget is designed against the rising inflation of fixed costs.

At the end of this Triennium we received from the Committee on World Mission of the House of Bishops meeting in Kansas City in October of 1978, a request to the JCWM to make a review of the "World Mission priorities of this Church, with special attention to present and future findings in light of these reviewed priorities." With this request and given the example of the Volunteers for Mission program plus the experience we have had in trying to resolve the matter of released funds we present the following preamble and objectives to our future plans for the next triennium in our 4th goal.

*B. Preamble to the Goals and Objectives For the Next Triennium*

We sense that there is a question about World Mission throughout the Church. What is the Mission of Church? What are the policies for Mission? What are the priorities for Mission?

We have noticed that the national budget of this Church is pretty well "locked in." The same programs and priorities continue without being challenged in the manner strongly suggested by Partners-in-Mission.

The Lambeth Conference asked the ACC to assist their member churches to develop a more effective system for responding to needs identified in the PIM Consultations, including the sharing of resources, both of people and of material things.

Concerning the sharing of resources, we noticed that funds that are released or cut from World Mission and other program budgets are channeled into the fixed costs portion of the budget. This process if allowed to go unchecked can only cause tremendous problems in the future.

The facts are that there is an 8-9% annual increase in fixed costs in the National Budget. The increase in giving to the national church is 1-2%. The 7-8% deficit is taken from programs and released funds and given to fixed costs.

We recommend that a sub-committee of the JCWM be appointed to accomplish the following goals:

*Goals For the Next Triennium*

- 1) Review the mission policies that were compiled during the past triennium at our request.
- 2) Determine if there is a need for any new policies, and if so, what those new policies will be.
- 3) Recommend an organized and comprehensive set of policies for mission.
- 4) Establish the priorities for mission policy.
- 5) See that these policies and priorities are used when the budgeting process takes place.

The goals outlined will be accomplished by working in concert and partnership with

---

## APPENDICES

---

the Executive Council, Coalition of Overseas Bishops, Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief and the United Thank Offering.

### II. BUDGET

To accomplish these goals, the following funding will be required:

Biannual meetings of the Commission (6):	\$48,000
Executive Committee meetings (3):	3,000
Three Sub-committees — one meeting per year for two years:	6,000
Continuation of developing Covenant Planning for Autonomy among overseas dioceses:	5,000
	<u>\$62,000</u>

#### Resolution #A—111

*Resolved, the House \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, that \$62,000 be appropriated for the work of the Commission.*

### III. CONTINUATION OF THE COMMISSION

To accomplish these goals and to provide the Church, the General Convention and the Executive Council with a continuing body to monitor and evaluate the overseas mission of the Episcopal Church, we propose the continuation of the Joint Commission as a Standing Commission.

#### Resolution #A—112 Continuation of JCWM

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, that a Standing Commission on World Mission be created, charged with assuming those responsibilities heretofore committed to the Joint Commission on World Mission; and be it further*

*Resolved, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, that in order to accomplish this, Title I, Canon 1, Section 2, be hereby amended with the addition of a new sub-section (K) to read as follows:*

*There shall be a Standing Commission on World Mission. Its duties shall be to review, evaluate, plan and propose on overseas mission to the General Convention and Executive Council.*

*(1) The Commission shall consist of fourteen (14) members, three (3) of whom shall be bishops, three (3) of whom shall be presbyters, and eight (8) of whom shall be lay persons.*

*(2) One half of the total membership of the Commission shall come from jurisdictions from outside the continental United States of America.*

*(3) The bishops are to be appointed by the Presiding Bishop and the presbyters and lay persons to be appointed by the President of the House of Deputies. Vacancies occurring during the intervals between meetings of the General Convention may be filled by the respective Presidents of the two Houses.*

*(4) Members shall be appointed for terms which shall be equal to the interval between the meeting of the General Convention at which such members were*

*appointed and the adjournment of the second succeeding regular meeting of the General Convention. Terms shall be rotated so that as near as may be, the terms of one half the members of the Commission shall expire at the conclusion of each regular meeting of the General Convention.*

*(5) The Commission shall elect its chairperson and other officers and have power to constitute committees and designate consultants for carrying on its work.*

*(6) Expenses of the Commission shall be met by appropriations by the General Convention.*

*(7) The staff of the Executive Council responsible for the administration of the World Mission program shall provide necessary staff functions for the Commission.*

---

IV  
FINANCIAL REPORT

Receipts

Appropriated by the 1976 General Convention and by subsequent authorizations of the Program, Budget and Finance Committee: \$58,181.00

Disbursements (as of 2/12/79)

Commission Meeting Expenses (5 meetings): 27,881.24  
Executive Committee Meeting Expenses (3 Meetings): 2,638.47  
Special meeting in Santo Domingo of World Mission Executives: 7,487.74  
Partners-in-Mission Liaison: 600.96  
Covenant Planning Travel Expenses: 2,386.75  
Other: 268.10

\$41,263.26

Anticipated Additional expense until end of year:

16,917.74

\$58,181.00

---

ANGLICAN CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL

Finally, in reviewing the actions of the 65th General Convention, we have discovered that a resolution dealing with criteria to guide us in electing our representatives to the Anglican Consultative Council, although passed by the House of Bishops on the Sixth Day of the Convention, failed to get out of committee in the House of Deputies on to its floor for action. Inasmuch as we feel that such a resolution would not only be helpful as we consider the membership of our delegation, but would also give the opportunity for the 66th General Convention to reaffirm its belief in the functions of the ACC we feel it necessary to once again submit this resolution. So this resolution will have its proper impact we share the following functions of the ACC:

1) To share information about developments in one or more provinces with the other parts of the Anglican Communion and to serve as needed as an instrument of common action.

## APPENDICES

---

2) To advise on inter-Anglican, provincial, and diocesan relationships, including the division of provinces, the formation of new provinces and of organized councils, and the problems of extra-provincial dioceses.

3) To develop as far as possible agreed Anglican policies in the world mission of the Church, and to encourage national and regional churches to engage together in developing and implementing such policies by sharing their resources of manpower, money, and experience to the best advantage of all.

4) To keep before national and regional churches the importance of the fullest possible Anglican collaboration with other Christian Churches.

5) To encourage and guide Anglican participation in the Ecumenical Movement and in ecumenical organizations; to cooperate with the World Council of Churches and united confessional bodies on behalf of the Anglican Communion; and to make arrangements for the conduct of pan-Anglican conversations with the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, and other churches.

6) To advise on matters arising out of national or regional church union negotiations or conversations and on subsequent relations with united churches.

7) To advise on problems of inter-Anglican communications and to help in the dissemination of Anglican and ecumenical information.

8) To keep in review the needs that may arise for further study and, where necessary, to promote inquiry and research.

### **Resolution #A—113**

*Whereas*, the functions of the Anglican Consultative Council are described in its Constitution duly approved by this Church (1969 General Convention Journal, p. 321); and

*Whereas*, there appears to be some confusion concerning these functions in relationship to the Episcopal Church; and

*Whereas*, it is important that this matter be clarified for the continuing and beneficial relationship between the Anglican Consultative Council and the Episcopal Church; and

*Whereas*, there are no established criteria to guide us in electing our representatives to the Anglican Consultative Council; now therefore be it

**Resolved**, the House of \_\_\_\_\_ concurring, that the General Convention: (1) reaffirm its acceptance of the Constitution of the Anglican Consultative Council and more especially that section of the Constitution dealing with "Functions", reminding our Church that the Anglican Consultative Council is an advisory, consultative, and not a legislative body, and therefore speaks to the member churches but not for them; (2) instruct our elected representatives to the Anglican Consultative Council to keep lines of communication open to the Executive Council and the House of Bishops, and report formally to each meeting of the General Convention of this Church; (3) express our confidence in the present process of selecting the representatives to the Anglican Consultative Council, urging that at least the following criteria be given consideration in electing these representatives:

a. Representatives should possess a demonstrated knowledge of and concern for the world mission of the Church;

b. Representatives should have a participatory knowledge of and a work experience in the life of the Episcopal Church;

c. Representatives should possess a close and effective relationship with the decision-making process of the Episcopal Church.

This report was written and approved by all the members present at the Commission's final meeting February 20-22, 1979 (two members were absent).