

The Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations

CONTENTS

Membership	62
Introduction	62
Resolution #A039: Ecumenical Agenda	64
Ecumenical Relations in Province IX and Extra-Provincial Dioceses	64
Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers	65
Resolution #A040: Appointment of Diocesan Ecumenical Officers and Financial Support	67
Churches in Full Communion	67
Old Catholic Churches	67
Philippine Independent Church	68
Official Dialogues	69
Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Forum	69
Resolution #A041: Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Consultation	69
Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue	69
Response to the <i>Dublin Agreed Statement</i>	70
Resolution #A042: Response to <i>Dublin Agreed Statement</i>	75
Anglican-Reformed Dialogue	76
Response to <i>God's Reign and Our Unity</i>	76
Resolution #A043: Response to <i>God's Reign and Our Unity</i>	79
Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue	80
Resolution #A044: Appreciation of the Rt. Rev. Arthur Vogel	81
Consultation on Church Union	81
Resolution #A045: Consultation on Church Union	82
Resolution #A046: Use of COCU Liturgy	82
Historic Black Methodist Episcopal-Episcopal Dialogue	82
Resolution #A047: Dialogue with Historic Black Methodist Episcopal Churches	83
Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue	83
Proposed <i>Concordat of Agreement</i>	84
Resolution #A048: Toward Full Communion	92
Resolution #A049: Implications of the Gospel	92
Resolution #A050: Joint Committee	93
Resolution #A051: Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers Training	93
Resolution A052: Consultation with Anglican and Ecumenical Partners	93
Dialogue with the Reformed Episcopal Church	93
Resolution #A053: Reformed Episcopal Church	94
Participation in Councils of Churches	94
National Council of the Churches of Christ	94
Resolution #A054: National Council of Churches	95
Resolution #A055: General Secretary of NCC	96
World Council of Churches	96

THE BLUE BOOK

Resolution #A056: Seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches	97
Resolution #A057: Ecumenical Decade in Solidarity with Women	98
Financial Report	98
Request for Budget Appropriation (#A058)	98
Appendix: Episcopal Church Representatives	99

MEMBERSHIP

Bishops

The Rt. Rev. Edward W. Jones, *Chair*, Indianapolis, Indiana
The Rt. Rev. A. Theodore Eastman, Baltimore, Maryland
The Rt. Rev. Armando Guerra, Guatemala City, Guatemala
The Rt. Rev. John H. MacNaughton, (1989) San Antonio, Texas
The Rt. Rev. Orris G. Walker, Jr., Garden City, New York
The Rt. Rev. Roger J. White, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Presbyters

The Very Rev. John H. Backus, Peoria, Illinois
The Rev. Julia M. Gatta, Storrs, Connecticut
The Very Rev. Robert E. Giannini, Indianapolis, Indiana
The Rev. William B. Lawson, *Secretary*, Lynn, Massachusetts
The Rev. Charles H. Long, Jr., Cincinnati, Ohio
The Rev. Patricia Wilson-Kastner, *Treasurer*, Norwich, Connecticut

Lay Persons

Mrs. Glennes T. Clifford, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Dr. E. Rozanne Elder, Kalamazoo, Michigan
Mr. G. Donald Ferree, Jr., Storrs, Connecticut
Ms. Barbara J. James, Des Moines, Iowa
Dr. J. Rebecca Lyman, *Vice-Chair*, Berkeley, California
Dr. Robert D. Mullin, Raleigh, North Carolina

Adjunct

The Rev. Charles Womelsdorf, *President*, EDEO

Assisting Staff

The Rev. William A. Norgren, Ecumenical Officer
Dr. Christopher M. Agnew, Associate Ecumenical Officer
The Rev. Dr. J. Robert Wright, Consultant to the Ecumenical Office

INTRODUCTION

The responsibilities of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations are described as follows in Canon I.1.2(n)(3):

- To develop a comprehensive and coordinated policy and strategy on relations between this Church and other Churches.
- To make recommendations to General Convention concerning interchurch cooperation and unity.

- To carry out such instructions on ecumenical matters as may be given it from time to time by the General Convention.
- To nominate for appointment by the Presiding Bishop, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, persons to serve on the governing bodies of ecumenical organizations to which this Church belongs by action of the General Convention and to participate in major conferences as convened by such organizations.

At the 69th General Convention (July 1988), a resolution was adopted setting forth a five-point agenda for the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (SCER) during the triennium 1989-91. This report to the 70th General Convention begins with a brief review of that agenda.

1. Point one encouraged "theological seminaries to include study of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral in their curricula in light of its continuing ecumenical significance." This resolution was communicated to each of this Church's eleven seminaries. The SCER looks forward to discovering the impact of this study on seminary formation.
2. Point two requested that the Episcopal Church delegations to the several ecumenical dialogues give priority to the question of authority in the Church. Reports on the implementation of this request have been received from each of the dialogues. As subsequent sections of this report will make evident, questions of magisterial authority, synodical authority, and practical authority are crucial to ecumenical partners seeking the visible unity of the Church.
3. Point three in the agenda focused on "the inseparability of unity and mission" and asked the SCER to give attention to "current theology and practice of mission in the Church." Each of our ecumenical conversations has stressed this guiding principle. We regard the invitation to the chairman of the SCER to address Executive Council on Mission and Unity in March 1990 as a sign that the Church at large is aware of this link.
4. Point four requested Episcopal Church delegations to the several dialogues to "articulate what they believe to be the criteria for entering by stages into a communion of communions." This has proved to be difficult in most cases, but we consider the proposed *Concordat of Agreement* between the Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as a major step in realizing our goal of achieving a communion of communions.
5. Point five. Two of the dialogues (Lutheran-Episcopal and the Consultation on Church Union) have reached a significant level of concurrence on "the importance of reaching agreement on eucharistic sharing as a step towards unity." Other dialogues have made no appreciable progress in this area.

The SCER met five times during the triennium 1989-91. Each major dialogue has been examined in depth, and oversight of the dialogues continues to represent a major part of the commission's work. Summations of this activity form a major part of the following report.

The other ecumenical frontier, equal in importance to the dialogues, is local ecumenism. For many years the Episcopal Church's ecumenical work at the local level has been carried on by a working network of Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (EDEO). It is to the EDEO that the SCER turns for information and implementation. A major milestone in Episcopal ecumenical relations, the *Concordat of Agreement*, will move the search for a communion of communions from the level of theory to practical application.

Our multilateral discussions in the Consultation on Church Union (COCU) have proven more complex and difficult. While we are committed to continual serious theological conversations within the COCU context, we also believe that bilateral discussions with member churches of COCU offer a further way of fulfilling the vision of an emerging communion of communions. To this end we are seeking to establish a new series of dialogues with the three historically black Methodist churches in COCU: the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church. We look forward also to cooperation with the newly formed Unity and Relationships Unit of the National Council of Churches to coordinate and conduct multilateral discussions.

Other matters of special interest during the past triennium have included: (1) significant ecumenical activity on the part of those churches in Mexico and Central America that constitute Province IX; (2) endorsement of the *Dublin Agreed Statement* (1984), representing important work done by the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussions; (3) acceptance of a report from the Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation urging reconsideration of *Apostolicae Curae*, a papal decision of 1896, which declared Anglican orders to be “absolutely null and utterly void”; (4) recommendation to the Presiding Bishop of delegates to the World Council of Churches Assembly (Canberra, Australia, February 1990); and (5) recommendations for renewing the agreement between the Episcopal Church and the Philippine Independent Church.

Recognizing that of the four points of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, the historic episcopate and the exercise of authority remain the problematic issues, the SCER commits itself to an extensive and graduated study of these matters and other aspects of ecclesiology in the 1992-94 triennium.

Resolution #A039

Ecumenical Agenda

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention endorse the following ecumenical agenda for the Episcopal Church in the years ahead:**

- 1 **1. That the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations sponsor a focused**
2 **consultation on ecclesiology that will bring together theologians, representatives of**
3 **other dialogue partners, members of the Faith and Order units of the World Council**
4 **of Churches and the National Council of the Churches of Christ, and the Episcopal**
5 **Diocesan Ecumenical Officers.**
- 6 **2. That the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations request an explicit**
7 **examination of ecclesiology in each of our dialogues and encourage exchange of in-**
8 **formation and experience among them.**
- 9 **3. That the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations invite the coopera-**
10 **tion of the Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers in challenging and assisting the**
11 **Church at diocesan and parish levels to test issues of ecclesiology against actual ex-**
12 **perience and in order that the Church’s local life may more intentionally reflect her**
13 **ecclesiology and that her ecclesiology may be sharpened by her actual experience.**

ECUMENICAL RELATIONS IN PROVINCE IX AND EXTRA-PROVINCIAL DIOCESES

The Committee on Ecumenism of Province IX has directed its attention during the past three years to strengthening personal and institutional contacts with other churches

in order to create opportunities for cooperation and understanding in the near future. According to diocesan reports, while conditions have improved considerably in some places, in others there has been no change, and in still others the situation seems to be more complicated.

Among the dioceses reporting improvement are Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Venezuela, Nicaragua, and Panama. In these dioceses friendship and cooperation in facing social concerns has been possible between the Episcopal Church and other Christian bodies. In dioceses such as Costa Rica, Ecuador, Republica Dominicana, Cuba, and Puerto Rico, where ecumenical relations were always reported as good, the situation continues to be the same.

The dioceses of Mexico felt that the Roman Catholic Church had increased its criticism against the Protestant churches previous to the Pope's visitation in the country. The Mexican dioceses were concerned also about the possibility of the Mexican government's reestablishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

Very good relations have already been established with Protestant and Evangelical churches, but the province continues to see relations with the Roman Catholic Church as its most important task. Since the last General Convention the Committee on Ecumenism of Province IX has been enlarged by the participation of the Anglican Province of the Southern Cone of America and the Episcopal Church of Brazil. The committee has held two important meetings. The first was in Bogota, Colombia, in February 1988, with the participation of representatives of the Roman Catholic Conference of Latin American Bishops (CELAM). At this time a study was made of the concept of Mission, Culture, and Creation, and a joint document was prepared which expressed their mutual pain over separation and their hope for coming together again. At the second meeting held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in January 1990, an analysis was made of the ecumenical situation in Latin America. Emphasis was placed on the importance of another meeting with CELAM, the publication of pertinent material, and the beginning of formal talks with Protestant churches.

EPISCOPAL DIOCESAN ECUMENICAL OFFICERS

The organization known as Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (EDEO) is a network of local ecumenical officers and assistant ecumenical officers. Within each diocese these officers normally work in conjunction with ecumenical commissions and parish ecumenical representatives, and with area ecumenical agencies and commissions (state and regional). Responding to requests from SCER, EDEO disseminates and initiates studies, reports, and information of interest to the local church, as well as monitoring local ecumenical efforts and priorities. EDEO meets annually in April in conjunction with the National Workshop on Christian Unity, encouraging renewed commitment and enthusiasm for the ecumenical agenda at every level of the Church's life. The network makes resources (documents and persons) available to local officers and assistants.

A major emphasis during this triennium has been our developing relationship with the newly united Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) as we move toward the goal of full communion. With the joint publication in 1988 of the report *Implications of the Gospel*, EDEO joined with the Synodical Representatives of ELCA for studies of this document and initiation of covenant relationships and practical cooperation in all areas of local ministry. With the publication in 1991 of the report *Toward Full Communion* and a proposed *Concordat of Agreement* between the two churches, the two networks (EDEO and ELCA Synodical Representatives) will develop means to implement the directions of General Convention, SCER, and the churchwide Assembly of the

THE BLUE BOOK

ELCA. In the dioceses, covenants and joint working relations are rapidly developing in many areas of the country.

EDEO's work with its Roman Catholic counterpart, the National Association of Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (NADEO), witnessed the formation of a newly reconstituted EDEO/NADEO Standing Committee. The research of this committee is centering on community and the process of reception. The goal of the current Standing Committee will be the publication of a document next year provisionally entitled *Receiving the Vision: How Serious Are We?* Three major areas will be dealt with: (1) Laity and Community, with a new survey of Anglican-Roman Catholic (ARC) families and ARC covenanted parishes; (2) *Episcopate and Community*, a look into (a) *Episcopate and Jurisdiction* and (b) *Episcopate and the Teaching Office*; and (3) *Ordained Ministry and Community*, dealing with practices of the transfer of ordained clergy and the ordination of women as priests and bishops.

The EDEO And NADEO Executive Boards continue to enjoy joint meetings on occasion, and the ELCA has recently been invited to participate in this bond that has developed over the years.

In addition to developing ties with the Lutheran and Roman Catholic communions, EDEO works on the documentation and growing bonds developed through the Consultation on Church Union and bilateral dialogues. At this time the network awaits action by General Convention to determine the future direction and needs to which EDEO can best apply its efforts.

The past triennium witnessed the second Ecumenical Institute for the training of new ecumenical officers and assistants. The first Institute was held in 1986 in Washington, D.C., and the second convened in 1990 in Evanston, Illinois, at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. The ELCA joined with EDEO for this latest Institute. Conversations are currently in process with NADEO concerning the possibility of a periodic Ecumenical Institute for ecumenically seasoned persons to focus on specific ways to aid the reception and implementation processes of the various dialogues and agreements at local, national, and international levels.

The Executive Board of EDEO continues to enjoy appointed representatives from the Anglican Congregations of the Religious, Armed Forces, Episcopal Church Women, and SCER. EDEO is also represented at meetings of SCER. These invitations have resulted from the recognition that EDEO shares a mutual commitment to and involvement in local ecumenism and would thereby have much to contribute to, and gain from, these relationships. EDEO also has a liaison with the Unity and Relationships Unit of the National Council of Churches. EDEO is also represented and actively involved in the planning of the National Workshop on Christian Unity, and the annual meeting each year adds approximately 100 Episcopal participants to that gathering. Prominent Anglican speakers and seminar leaders are a regular part of the workshop.

The Executive Board of EDEO is composed of its officers, representatives from each of the eight domestic provinces of the Episcopal Church, two at-large members, and the representatives mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The work of the Board is accomplished by ten standing committees, including: the EDEO/NADEO Standing Committee; the EDEO/ELCA committee developing relationships according to the Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982; the Episcopal-Jewish committee, formed to encourage local conversations (a member serves as liaison with the Presiding Bishop's Committee on Christian-Jewish Relations); the Ecumenical Institute committee to develop training for ecumenical officers and others; and the General Convention committee responsible for

monitoring ecumenical legislation and assisting in hosting representatives of other communions and religious faiths.

A portion of the budget for EDEO comes directly from the dioceses. Each diocese is asked to contribute \$200 per year, and the overwhelming majority of dioceses meet this request. Of this amount \$25 is returned to the province for work at that level. In appointing ecumenical officers and associates as requested by General Convention, dioceses are asked to appoint one person from the lay order and one from the ordained order if feasible. Representation from as broad a spectrum of the Church as possible is encouraged. In this Decade of Evangelism, EDEO recognizes the need to endeavor with renewed zeal to make visible the bond between the unity for which our Lord prays, and the witness and mission of the Church through the power and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Resolution #A040

Appointment of Diocesan Ecumenical Officers and Financial Support

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
- 2 **encourage all dioceses that have not already done so to appoint Ecumenical Officers**
- 3 **and Associates, with sensitivity to inclusivity, and to provide financial support for their**
- 4 **work within the dioceses and as members of the Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical**
- 5 **Officers.**

CHURCHES IN FULL COMMUNION

OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES

A delegation from the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada met with representatives from the Polish National Catholic Church in Mississauga, Ontario, from February 12 to 14, 1990, instituting a new phase of the North American Working Group of the International Anglican-Old Catholic Theological Conference that was authorized by the 69th General Convention of 1988. The group heard a paper entitled 'A Problematic Partnership: Polish National Catholics and Anglicans, 1900-1970.' Information on the dialogues of each church was exchanged, areas of possible cooperation were explored, and future works planned.

Although the Polish National Catholic Church terminated sacramental communion with North American Anglicans in 1977 over the ordination of women, full communion with all the other churches of the Old Catholic Union of Utrecht continues at the international level, where the prospects look hopeful and promising. The Union of Utrecht celebrated its one hundredth anniversary in September of 1989 with full Anglican participation, the Archbishop of Utrecht being assisted at mass by an Old Catholic woman deacon. In May of the same year the Old Catholic diocesan synod of Germany voted overwhelmingly a strongly worded statement in support of the ordination of women to all three orders, and has now published its theological rationale in a 52-page booklet, *The Inclusion of Women in the Apostolic Ministry* (texts in German or in English available from the Old Catholic Bishopric of Germany, Gregor-Mendel-Str. 1, 5300 Bonn).

At the International Anglican-Old Catholic Theological Conference, which met near Morschach in Switzerland in August 1990, the Episcopal Church was represented by the Rt. Rev. Harold Robinson, retired Bishop of Western New York, and Professor J. Robert Wright of the General Theological Seminary. The conference began an intensive reexamination of the Bonn Agreement of 1931, which established intercommunion between

Anglicans and Old Catholics. Professor Wright presented a research paper on how “all the essentials of the Christian Faith” were understood in the Agreement at that time. The conference resolved to request designated status as the official consultation for relations between the two communions, and the Bishop of Repton in England, the Rt. Rev. Henry Richmond, was announced as the new co-chair from the Anglican side.

Bishop Robinson also represented the Episcopal Church and the Presiding Bishop at the 25th International Old Catholic Congress, meeting at Geneva in August 1990. It was voted, again overwhelmingly, to ask that the international conference of Old Catholic bishops adopt the same position on the ordination of women as priests and bishops that had already been taken on their ordination as deacons — that each national Old Catholic church decide for itself. (Women have already been ordained as Old Catholic deacons in Switzerland and in Germany, one of the latter now working in the Netherlands.) In the summer of 1991 the International Old Catholic Bishops Conference will be convened in a special meeting to consider the position of women in the Church.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENT CHURCH

The Philippine Independent Church (PIC) was formed in 1902, one result of the Philippines’ struggle for independence from Spanish domination. Since 1961 the PIC and the Episcopal Church (EC) have been in a relationship of full communion. The concordat on which this is based “does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, 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.” The Honolulu Agreement between the Presiding Bishop and the Obispo Maximo of the PIC in 1985 established the Joint Council of the EC and the PIC in the United States to “advance the interests of mutual responsibility as between the two churches.”

Two recent events have prompted the SCER, at the Presiding Bishop’s request, to reexamine the Honolulu Agreement. First, the Philippine Episcopal Church (PEC) became an autonomous Anglican Province in May 1990. Any concordat between the PIC and the PEC is not a direct concern of SCER, but discussions between the two churches will remain of interest. Second, the PIC organized a new Diocese of the United States and Canada in July 1990. Prior to the formation of this diocese, the PIC established pastoral districts in the United States, under the immediate jurisdiction of the Obispo Maximo in the Philippines. Today all PIC congregations in the United States and Canada are under the direct and immediate oversight of the Rt. Rev. Vic Esclamado of Chicago.

The SCER recognizes the authority of the Joint Council of the EC and the PIC and recommends that it reexamine the Honolulu Agreement, changing or modifying where necessary to conform to these new realities. The SCER (1) urges that all appropriate efforts be made to assure that the EC stands prepared to encourage, assist, and cooperate with the PIC and their efforts to minister to and evangelize Filipinos residing in the United States, and (2) recommends that the members of the EC welcome and befriend Bishop Esclamado and work with him to discover new ways in which the two churches can enter into partnership in mission and to continue to clarify areas of pastoral and ecclesiastical concern, particularly the opportunities and problems inherent in parallel jurisdiction.

The SCER is pleased with the presence of the PIC in our midst, welcomes their diocesan bishop and pledges to him and to his clergy and laity our warmest regards and our desire to share with them in their ministry to Filipinos in their diaspora.

OFFICIAL DIALOGUES

ANGLICAN-ORIENTAL ORTHODOX FORUM

Relations with the Oriental Orthodox churches, those that do not formally accept the statement on Christology of the fourth ecumenical council of Chalcedon (451) (cf. Book of Common Prayer p. 864), are conducted officially at the international level through the international Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Forum, which held its second meeting at the monastery of St. Bishoy in the Wadi el Natroun near Cairo, Egypt, in March 1990. Extensive discussions, held in the presence of His Holiness Pope Shenouda III of the Coptic Orthodox Church, focused on the emerging agreement of these churches in Christological doctrine with the Anglican Communion, the Eastern Orthodox Churches, and the Roman Catholic Church, as well as other questions.

The Rt. Rev. John Dennis, Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich and Anglican chair of the Forum, visited New York in January of 1991 for a first regional Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Consultation in North America, and representatives from the Episcopal Church, the Armenian Apostolic Church, and the Syrian Orthodox Church were present for it at St. Vartan Armenian Cathedral. Visits were also planned to the St. Illuminator Armenian Cathedral and the Syrian Orthodox Cathedral in Hackensack, N.J. The topics discussed included a survey of relations between these churches and opportunities for pastoral cooperation. It was agreed that future consultations should be planned.

Resolution #A041

Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Consultation

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That the 70th General Convention,**
 2 **in view of the emerging agreement of the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Com-**
 3 **munion with the ancient Oriental Orthodox churches, in view of the strategic and**
 4 **delicate situation of those ancient churches in the lands of the Middle East today, and**
 5 **in view of the increasing importance of their presence in the United States, commend**
 6 **these churches to the prayers of the Episcopal Church, urge its members to acquaint**
 7 **themselves more thoroughly with these churches as they are described in the book en-**
 8 **titled *Light From the East*, and direct the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Rela-**
 9 **tions to continue the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Consultation.**

ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX DIALOGUE

Under the able leadership of its co-chairs, Archbishop Peter L'Huillier of the Orthodox Church in America, Bishop of the Diocese of New York and New Jersey, and the Rt. Rev. David B. Reed of the Diocese of Kentucky, the Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation (AOTC) met three times during the triennium, twice at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary in Crestwood, New York, and once at the College of Preachers in Washington, D.C. The liturgy was thus celebrated alternately between the two traditions.

Building on the two agreed statements published in the previous triennium, an "Agreed Statement on Christian Initiation" and an "Agreed Statement on the Eucharist," the AOTC turned its attention to issues of ecclesiology. In January 1990 it produced "Joint Reflections on the Nature and Unity of the Church," a document the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations has found helpful in formulating its own response to the *Dublin Agreed Statement*. Drawing on the notion of "degrees of communion" (*koinonia*), the Consultation has found a fresh way of understanding the relationship our divided churches now enjoy, even in the absence of full communion.

We rejoice that a reconstituted International Commission of Anglican-Orthodox Theological Dialogue resumed its meetings last year in response to a joint communique published by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Ecumenical Patriarch in December 1987. In this they "reaffirmed their fullest commitment to the official dialogue between the churches and expressed their desire for the reinforcement of the dialogue, which neither of the churches wished in any way to downgrade: the dialogue is aimed at nothing less than that visible and sacramental unity which Christ wills for his One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." The Rt. Rev. Mark Dyer, Bishop of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and a member of the AOTC, and His Eminence Metropolitan John Zizioulas of Pergamon are the new co-chairmen of this International Commission.

To date, the Commission has received and discussed major papers on the doctrine of God as Trinity. In this regard, it welcomed the decision of the Lambeth Conference in 1988 to recommend to the churches of the Anglican Communion the removal of the *Filioque* from future liturgical revisions, as approved by the 69th General Convention. Future meetings of the Dialogue will include study of the Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ; the Holy Spirit, Creation and Humanity; and the Ministry of the Church. At the end of this series of discussions, the Commission expects to issue an agreed statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry of the Church as it reflects the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

We are happy to note that in July 1990 Episcopalians were invited to participate in welcoming His All Holiness Dimitrios, Archbishop of Constantinople, for the first visit of an Ecumenical Patriarch to the United States. The Presiding Bishop was among those who greeted the Patriarch when he arrived in Washington, D.C., his first stop in this country. After several days of meetings and services there, the Patriarch and his party continued on to New York City, where he was welcomed by the Rt. Rev. Richard Grein, Bishop of New York, and Dean John Backus of Quincy, a member of SCER. Episcopalians, led by the Presiding Bishop and Bishop Grein, also joined the Patriarch in a historic service of worship at the headquarters of the National Council of Churches. Before leaving the United States, the Patriarch and his entourage included visits to Massachusetts, California, and Illinois.

RESPONSE TO THE *DUBLIN AGREED STATEMENT*

Introduction

Although the immediate impetus for this dialogue came from the meeting of Archbishop Michael Ramsey of Canterbury and Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras in 1962, the Orthodox carefully noted that the decision was *to resume* a dialogue that had begun with the Joint Doctrinal Discussions of 1931 and had been interrupted by World War II.

The topics covered in the statement — the Church; the Trinity, Prayer and Holiness; and Worship and Tradition — are all serious topics of concern for any discussion of Christian unity. The fact that both sides have found so much agreement during their talks ought to excite considerable interest not only among Anglicans but in the Orthodox world as well. Certainly both sides have been represented by strong delegations who, from the time of their first post-war meetings in 1973, have labored to produce an impressive degree of agreement.

In its introduction, the statement sketches the background and goals of the dialogue. The first series of joint conversations that took place (1973-76) resulted in the *Moscow*

Agreed Statement. However, after the Lambeth Conference resolution on the ordination of women in 1978, Archbishop Athenagoras, the leader of the Orthodox delegation, suggested that the future discussions be regarded as “an academic and informative exercise, and no longer as an ecclesial endeavor aiming at the union of the two churches” (p.3). Happily, other Orthodox leaders did not agree, so that the dialogue continued on its original standing, issuing eventually in the *Dublin Agreed Statement*.

In the context of this troubled history, the document is all the more remarkable for the quality of its theological work, for its generally irenic tone, and for the measure of consensus it reflects. The emphasis on prayer and spirituality gives the statement a unique character among the products of our various ecumenical dialogues, recalling for us the necessity of this grounding for all theological endeavor. Moreover, the articulation of a new vision is helpful: the hope for reunion in our time has been replaced by a realistic assessment of contemporary Anglican-Orthodox dialogue as the “first stage” of an extended process.

Appreciation and Evaluation

SECTION I: THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH

The first section of the statement itself, “The Mystery of the Church,” is by far the most substantial portion and manifests a striking agreement. We ought not to be surprised that we have discovered so much in common, for in a sense we have been building not only on the results of formal consultation, but on centuries of cordial relationships as well.

(1) We are grateful that the statement reminds us that the very method of theological inquiry depends on “sanctification through prayer” and that doctrine must ever be linked to “the daily life of the Christian community” (I.1).

(2) Anglicans share with Orthodox a reverent reserve about defining too closely the mysteries of the faith. Excessive precision can be a snare that ends up limiting theological inquiry. Thus, in its opening paragraphs on “The Mystery of the Church,” the statement notes that the Church “cannot be defined or fully described” but is rather a “lived experience” (I.3). Nevertheless, the report does present a spectrum of images drawn from the New Testament by which the Church can be at least partially described, such as the Body of Christ, the messianic gathering, the temple of God, and the bride of Christ. Then, invoking the terms of the Creed, the statement considers the Church under her traditional “marks”: one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Anglicans will find this biblical and creedal approach to the mystery of the Church methodologically congruent with the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.

(3) We find the *Dublin Agreed Statement* harmonious with the general treatment of apostolicity found in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM). While BEM states that “Apostolic Tradition in the Church means continuity in the permanent characteristics of the Church of the Apostles” (“Ministry” 34), *Dublin* asserts that the Church maintains apostolic tradition “by its preaching and teaching and by a constantly renewed understanding and living of Scripture. By critical discernment it rejects inauthentic ways of thought and life” (I.15). Unfortunately, these and other points of similarity to BEM are not noted in the document.

(4) In its discussion of the episcopate and apostolic succession, *Dublin* reminds us that the episcopate is a sign of unity to be exercised collegially in union with other bishops as well as with the clergy and laity of a given diocese.

(5) The notion of primacy or seniority, respectively described here as Anglican and Orthodox terms, is similarly understood and valued in both communions. It is regarded by each as a ministry of "pastoral service" to the Church (I.23). *The Final Report* (ARCIC I) had called attention to this character of primacy, a point noted with gratitude by the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussions. However, in a sharp criticism of that document, *Dublin* points out that the Ecumenical Patriarch, while not claiming any universal jurisdiction, nevertheless had a "special seniority" ascribed to him by the Ecumenical Councils (I.27). The document further notes that historically "the Anglican Communion has developed on the Orthodox rather than the Roman Catholic pattern, as a fellowship of self-governing national or regional Churches" (I.28).

This places the Anglican Communion in a unique ecumenical position vis-a-vis the two great traditions of East and West: with a polity similar to the Orthodox, we nonetheless share the Western Christian heritage enjoyed by the Church of Rome and other churches. By calling attention to the primacy of the Ecumenical Patriarch, *Dublin* serves as something of a counterweight to *The Final Report*, with its understandable focus upon the Western Patriarch. We trust that the perspective of the *Dublin Agreed Statement* will augment our future ecumenical discussions, particularly with Roman Catholics.

(6) We appreciate the recognition in *The Dublin Statement* that "Evangelism involves the Church in social action which can be an authentic witness to the gospel and should not be separated from it or contrasted with it." Because Christians bring a distinct vision and spirit to their social programs, these ought not to become "an end in itself, for 'man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God' (Matt. 4.4)" (I.34).

Still, both churches would seem now to need a more developed theology of evangelism than what appears in *Dublin*. Recent events in the Orthodox world, which none could have foreseen in 1984, surely make this a topic of major importance to the Orthodox. But long before the dramatic changes in the Soviet Union and its allied countries, the question of evangelism in this country needed vigorous study both by Anglicans and by the Orthodox. Some Anglicans wonder how the Orthodox Church can claim to be One with its multiple jurisdictions across the United States. On the other hand, some Orthodox would ask Anglicans what they are doing about evangelism in an increasingly unchurched America.

(7) Ecumenical dialogue since the 1984 publication of *Dublin* has opened a way beyond certain impasses manifest in it. Three issues discussed in the document's opening section turned out to be especially problematic: the unity of the Church in the face of present disunion among Christians; the holiness of the Church in relation to the sinfulness of her members; and the practice of "intercommunion."

After asserting that "our divisions do not destroy but they damage the basic unity we have in Christ," *Dublin* suggests that Anglicans "are accustomed to seeing our divisions as within the Church: they do not believe that they alone are the one true Church, but they believe that they belong to it." The Orthodox, on the other hand, "believe that the Orthodox Church is the one true Church of Christ, which as His body is not and cannot be divided"; yet "they see Anglicans as brothers and sisters in Christ" (I.9; cf. Epilogue 99-100).

A similar conundrum faced *Dublin* with respect to the holiness of the Church. All agree that "holiness" is one of the marks of the Church (I.10). But for Anglicans, "because the Church under Christ is the community where God's grace is at work, healing and

transforming sinful men and women . . . the struggle between sin and grace is to be seen as characteristic of, rather than accidental to, the Church on earth" (Epilogue 99). This acknowledgment accords with our agreement in *Salvation and the Church*, 29 (ARCIC II) that "the Church is in constant need of repentance and renewal so that it can be more clearly seen for what it is: the one, holy body of Christ." Yet the Orthodox, "while agreeing that the human members of the Church on earth are sinful, do not believe that the sinfulness should be ascribed to the Church as the body of Christ indwelt by the Spirit" (E.99).

In discussing both the unity and holiness of the Church, *Dublin* reflects the contradictions that follow inevitably from an insufficiently eschatological perspective. As a recent paper formulated by the Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation in the United States has pointed out, "Closer attention to the prophetic or eschatological aspect of the Church may make possible the formulation of a more adequate theological framework for explaining such apparent contradictions. By proceeding in that way false dichotomies will be avoided, and the real differences between the positions of our churches will be perceived" ("Joint Reflections on the Nature and Unity of the Church" [1990], par.6).

(8) Likewise the AOTC (USA) mentions how development of the notion of *koinonia* since 1984 in other dialogues can help untangle the knotty question of "communion" and "intercommunion" that troubled the *Dublin Agreed Statement*. *Dublin* had suggested that "Anglicans have come to recognize different stages in which churches stand in a progressively closer relationship to each other, with a corresponding and consequent degree of eucharistic sharing," though they distinguish such "Intercommunion" from "Full or Organic Communion." But "for the Orthodox, 'communion' involves a mystical and sanctifying unity created by the Body and Blood of Christ, . . . and therefore they can have no differences of faith." Thus "the concept of 'Intercommunion' has no place in Orthodox ecclesiology" (I.19-20). Commenting on this passage, the AOTC paper states:

We believe . . . that a more wide-ranging discussion of the meaning of "communion (*koinonia*)" would be useful. . . . Christian *koinonia* has a human dimension which is at once tangible and spiritual, but it is ultimately a communion with God given by God. It is grounded in the divine life itself, reflecting and participating in the very life of God who has freely communicated himself to us through his Son by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Seen within this larger context, it is clear that "communion" or "intercommunion" is not simply a matter of eucharistic sharing. While Christian *koinonia*, initiated in baptism, is epitomized in eucharistic fellowship, it is not limited to it. Christian *koinonia* expresses itself in many ways It is therefore possible and fully appropriate for both Orthodox and Anglicans to speak of "degrees of communion (*koinonia*)" in which they stand in relation to other bodies of Christians with whom they do not now have "full communion" or "organic union."

Consideration of this subject challenges us to strengthen and extend the *koinonia* which we are already privileged to enjoy even in the absence of eucharistic fellowship ("Joint Reflections on the Nature and Unity of the Church," pars. 11-13).

SECTION II: FAITH IN THE TRINITY, PRAYER AND HOLINESS

(1) In its attention to the connection between theology and spirituality, the statement remind us of many teachings we know, but for that reason often fail to articulate. Above all it reminds us Anglicans:

(a) that theological teaching occurs within the Christian community across time and space, and is not an intellectual exercise of isolated individuals (II.36);

(b) that the purpose of doctrine is to attempt to express the unfathomable mystery of revelation “in such a way as both to safeguard it from misunderstanding and to enable others to share in it” (II.36);

(c) that prayer, by the community in its liturgy and by individual believers, occurs only by the presence of the Holy Spirit who prays in and through us; that prayer, like doctrine, is shaped by the faith of the Church throughout the ages;

(d) that through grace “every human person has the possibility of becoming a partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1.4). The Holy Spirit praying in us heals and renews us at the center of our being” (II.37);

(e) that “progress in prayer and obedience involves . . . commitment to a disciplined life”; and growth in holiness demands “continual repentance and assurance of God’s forgiveness” (II.42-43);

(f) that since holiness restores us to the image of God and makes all things whole, “God’s call to holiness is also a call to work for justice” (II.43).

(2) The discussion of the *Filioque* (II.44-46) amplifies that found in the *Moscow Agreed Statement*. We rejoice in the decision of the 1985 General Convention, and the resolutions of the 1988 Lambeth Conference and the 1990 Anglican Consultative Council (Cardiff), which commend the removal of this venerable accretion from our liturgical texts. The SCER has referred this matter to the Standing Liturgical Commission for implementation in future revisions of the Book of Common Prayer.

SECTION III: WORSHIP AND TRADITION

(1) Because Anglicans and Orthodox share a common understanding of the relationship between prayer and theology, and “hold that the liturgy and all worship are essentially for the expression, maintenance and communication of the true faith,” we both see standards of orthodoxy in terms of “right worship.” Thus liturgical texts constitute “fundamental doctrinal standards for both” (III.63).

(2) Underlying this shared approach to worship is the recognition:

(a) that tradition is not the enshrinement of a static past but the ever open and “constant action of the Holy Spirit in the Church” (III.48);

(b) that “the liturgical life of the Church is the very heart of tradition.” It is the means by which the Christian community and Christian persons participate in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, and in Christ are united to one another across time and space (III.56,60,62);

(c) that worship forms faith and is inseparable from it (III.53);

(d) that “in worship the Church becomes what she really is: body, fellowship, communion in Christ” (III.53).

(3) The *Dublin Agreed Statement* reflects the development of Anglican appreciation for the role of icons in Christian devotion. The report puts forward the traditional Christological basis of icons and their compatibility with the classic Anglican reverence, articulated by Bishop Thomas Ken (1637-1711), for “persons or places or things . . . which may promote the decency and order of the worship, or the edification of faithful people” (III.82). The best and most succinct statement on the subject is found in the Epilogue: “Anglicans agree that the theology of the icon is founded upon, and intended to safeguard, the doctrine of the Incarnation” (E.113).

FINAL SECTION: EPILOGUE

(1) In summarizing the agreements and disagreements discovered during twelve years of discussion, members of the Commission drew the hopeful conclusion that “none of the points of disagreement mentioned above is to be regarded as insoluble but each is to be regarded as a challenge to this Commission . . . to advance more deeply in its understanding of the truth” (E.114). The Epilogue itself points the way forward to future discussion in its affirmations:

(a) that a difference of theological terminology does not necessarily mean a difference of fundamental belief (E.89);

(b) that “the Church cannot define dogmas which are not grounded both in Scripture and in tradition” (E.91);

(c) that “the Ecumenical Councils provide an authoritative interpretation of Scripture,” with Anglicans according full authority only to the first four Councils (E.104-105); and

(d) that “the ecumenicity of Councils is manifested through their acceptance by the Church” (E.107; also I.30). (Cf. *The Final Report: Authority in the Church* II.25.)

(2) However, it is clear that in building upon these foundations we must:

(a) explore the different ways Anglicans and Orthodox apply critical methods of historical research to Scripture (E.90) and tradition;

(b) try to articulate the essential content of the apostolic faith. If, as the Orthodox believe, “there can be communion only between local churches that have a unity of faith, ministry and sacraments” (E.101), the attention of the dialogue should surely be directed to the question of what constitutes unity of faith, what impedes unity of ministry, and what is meant by unity of sacraments, considering especially the effect of baptismal incorporation into the Church;

(c) state the limits of legitimate “freedom and variety” in regard to the teachings and practices of the Church (E.92). (Cf. III.63,70,72; E.102.)

Conclusion

The *Dublin Agreed Statement*, like the *Moscow Agreed Statement*, is a gift in this ecumenical time — one we have shared with our first partners. These two statements need study and comment from both sides if we are to receive the work thus far accomplished and prepare for the fruits of the next phase of dialogue. The SCER is heartened by reports from the newly constituted International Commission that substantive theological issues, such as those we have outlined for further consideration, are on the agenda. It is clear that full communion has no meaning without the East, and the *Dublin Agreed Statement* offers a promise of what can be if we seize the opportunity.

Resolution #A042

Response to *Dublin Agreed Statement*

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, **That the 70th General Convention:**

- 1 **1. Accept the Report of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations on the**
- 2 ***Dublin Agreed Statement 1984;***
- 3 **2. Express our appreciation for, and commendation of, the *Dublin Agreed Statement;***
- 4 **3. In accord with the request of the Lambeth Conference, transmit this report to**
- 5 **the Anglican Consultative Council as our official response to the *Dublin Agreed***
- 6 ***Statement.***

ANGLICAN-REFORMED DIALOGUE

This dialogue was initiated by the Anglican Consultative Council and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches in 1978. The North American member churches of the World Alliance are: Associated Reformed Presbyterian Church, Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Hungarian Reformed Church in America, Lithuanian Evangelical Reformed Church, Presbyterian Church (USA), Reformed Church in America, Second Reformed Presbyterian Church, and the United Church of Christ.

The Anglican-Reformed International Commission report *God's Reign and Our Unity* (1984) has been examined by representatives of theological faculties of two Episcopal seminaries and by the SCER. In the following evaluation, they find that more discussion is needed of the report's relevance to the American scene, but that it could provide a basis for bilateral dialogue between the Episcopal Church and member churches of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches.

RESPONSE TO *GOD'S REIGN AND OUR UNITY*

The document *God's Reign and Our Unity* is the product of four years of labor by the Anglican-Reformed International Commission. The report provides a fresh, largely non-American perspective upon the possibility of unity between our two traditions. We applaud the endeavor to overcome a four-hundred-year-old division, since we recognize that here in America this division has been one of the oldest and most persistent that our Church has confronted and one whose bitterness lies deep within the group memories of both of our communions.

The document's starting point is eschatology, and the eschatological perspective predominates throughout. It is a forthright and theologically grounded work that offers a bold rethinking of the meaning of ecumenism. It is concerned with keeping at the forefront a view of the Church as eschatological sign and as missionary vehicle. An underlying presupposition is that with the collapse of Christendom the Church now finds itself in a new situation.

From the outset we sought to go behind the historical and traditional problems which have divided us since Reformation times and to put our quest for unity in new perspectives. We sought to do this by enquiring into the relationship between the Church and the Kingdom of God, the priority of grace, the trinitarian and christological basis of ministry, the mission of the Church. (Preface, p. v)

The document is divided into six sections or chapters: (1) "Our Task," (2) "The Church: God's Apostolic People," (3) "Life in the Church," (4) "Ministry in the Church," (5) "Our Goal," and (6) "Recommendations." We would like to comment briefly on sections two through five.

Section Two: The Church: God's Apostolic People

Chapter two sets forth the eschatological and missionary vision of the Church and argues that the ecumenical nature of the Church is its necessary corollary. An eschatological understanding of the Church recognizes that the Church is not an end in itself.

If the Church were an end in itself then it would follow that multiplication of numbers would be the criterion by which priorities should be judged, but if the Church is a sign and first-fruits of the reconciliation of all things in Christ, the fruit of evangelism should be communities reconciled to one another in Christ. (2:31)

The Church is one because Christ is one. After acknowledging the worry that ecumenism might overshadow other traditional concerns of the Church (e.g., mission, social justice, and theological truth), the chapter suggests that its vision of the Church would only enhance these other goals. We are pleased by the theological spirit of this chapter, and are appreciative of its emphasis upon eschatology and mission. Yet we continue to have two chief reservations about this chapter's great reliance upon an eschatological ecclesiology:

(1) We fear that the confidence that underlies this vision — i.e., that the collapse of Christendom offers a new ecumenical beginning for the Church — does not adequately confront the past record of conflict between our communions, most particularly within the English-speaking world. Our shared history is filled with times of open conflict (e.g., the English Civil Wars, conflicts in Northern Ireland, etc.) and also a number of failed attempts at reunion. In America alone we must remember the failed concordat with the Congregationalists in the early 1920s as well as the failed union with the Presbyterians in the 1940s. We believe that any ecumenical discussion, if it is to be successful, must take seriously these past misunderstandings.

(2) We are somewhat apprehensive that such a persuasively argued eschatological interpretation of the Church may engender a lack of attention to the traditional historical foci of discussion between our communions. We fear that from such a perspective persons might fail to take full account of issues which earlier generations have so carefully delineated.

Section Three: Life in the Church

Chapter Three, "Life in the Church," focuses upon the idea of the Church and its sacramental life. It begins with the proclamation:

The Church owes its being to that which has been done once and for all in the incarnation, ministry, passion, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ whom we acknowledge and confess as the Son, the second person of the triune God. The Church lives only in dependence upon him, the Head, and this dependence consists in faith, love, and obedience. (3:39)

Here too the strong theological grounding of the work is to be praised. The discussion of the nature of the Church is laudable on a number of further grounds. It is scriptural; it is trinitarian; it integrates the moral life of the Church with its theology; and here it honestly addresses historic differences between the communions.

We should note in passing, however, that this introductory section on the nature of the Church employs the terms "orthodoxy" and "orthopraxis" in a nontraditional way (at least for Anglicans). Under the category of "orthodoxy" the document includes both doctrine and liturgy, in contrast to the usual Anglican understanding that classifies the latter as orthopraxis. In turn the document redefines orthopraxis as "right morality." It is clear from the context that the background for this redefinition is the excommunication by the World Alliance of Reformed Churches of apartheid-accepting churches. Although we acknowledge the particular use of this redefined meaning of orthopraxis, we believe that any broader or more general invocation of the redefinition merits close examination. What, for example, is the nature of this new orthopraxis, what are to be its limits, and how can it be illumined by tradition and reason?

In its discussion of the sacramental life the document addresses some very important points. Concerning baptism, for example, it rightly notes that both communions have shared in a common failure in understanding its full meaning. Furthermore, it notes

the crucial role baptism plays for the mission of the Church to the world. We find this discussion of baptism fruitful and hope that in the future it will lead to a further exploration of the ecumenical and ethical consequences of baptism. Concerning the eucharist, the document is to be applauded for its honest recognition of past failures that have impeded the right understanding of the significance of the eucharist (such as the unnatural division between word and sacrament) and its creative attempt to set forth fresh models for eucharistic understanding. The text admirably employs such metaphors for the eucharist as the sharing of the Christ, eucharist as food for the journey, eucharist as *anamnesis*, and eucharist as vehicle of *epiklesis*. The issues raised in this section, we believe, suggest two further questions from the Anglican perspective:

(1) Could not a more thorough discussion of baptism and eucharist show forth their interconnectedness, and in turn show how they are constitutive of the Church? and

(2) How are both to be agents of transformation in this world? We should further note that for those of us outside of the Reformed tradition, it is not immediately obvious how one can reconcile the claim that baptism and eucharist rest on the finished work of Christ (viz. 63) with the eschatological thrust of the document.

Section Four: Ministry in the Church

Regarding this section on ministry, the document urges in a most commendable way that discussion be shifted from that of outward forms to that of inward substance, and that the Church be viewed as a dynamic rather than static community. Too often, it rightly notes, discussions of outward form have led both communities into a form of nominalism (viz. 7.A). By shifting the discussion of ministry back to its biblical roots, one recognizes:

From the very beginning there is a pattern of ministerial leadership in the life of the Church. It is to the whole Church that the commission is given, but the Church was never an unstructured aggregate of individual believers out of which a ministerial structure had to develop. (IV, 76)

The ministry is rooted in the very nature of the Church. The document's authors willingly confront past points of disagreement and do not shy away from current questions of dispute. However, by emphasizing the interconnection of authority and love, the document suggests possible ways for overcoming the historic divisions over patterns of ministry. True ministry is personal, collegial, and communal, and in the past the ministry of neither communion completely reflected this vision. The document is to be praised for the vision it raises of the episcopate as the symbol of catholicity and apostolicity.

We cannot help but note that in the discussion of ministry there are hints of contrasting theological traditions. Following a long-standing Reformed theological tradition, the central model for Christian ministry is that of the right ordering of the community (viz. 83). Thus, for example, in its discussion of lay presidency the document states:

The presidency of the ordained person does not depend upon his possessing a priesthood which others lack; it depends upon the good ordering which is essential to the life of the Church as it exercises corporately the priesthood given to it by the one who is alone the good High Priest. (83)

We recognize the long tradition within the Reformed tradition of a juridical model of ministry, and also its scriptural foundation. We also acknowledge how this understanding of ministry has endowed the Reformed communion with a discipline and seriousness that is to be much praised. Yet this juridical model has not been the predominant one within the Anglican tradition. We have more often emphasized a pastoral or sacramental model of ministry rather than a juridical, and for some parts of our communion such

imagery would be alien, and at least on the surface disturbing. We would urge more discussion to help clarify the relation between these different models or understandings of the nature of Christian ministry.

Section Five: Our Goal

In this section the document again takes up the eschatological perspective with which it began. It is pointed in its criticism of the North American denominational system and raises the question whether any of these denominations may be properly called a church (viz. 5:106). Although it acknowledges different possible paths towards Christian reunion, on the whole the document rejects the path of the reconciliation of these denominational communities in favor of a wider unity of the entire Church on the local level, which is described as (in words quoted from a pronouncement of the Fifth WCC Assembly) “a conciliar fellowship of local churches which are themselves truly united” (108-10). We find this call to be radical, challenging, and provocative, and it clearly expresses one vision of the reunited *ecclesia*. We would want to begin future discussion with the question of whether this agenda complements or conflicts with our Church’s officially expressed ecumenical vision of a communion of communions.

Conclusion

God’s Reign and Our Unity is a welcome contribution to our common ecumenical agenda. It is a serious, sophisticated, and insightful theological statement that will provide the basis of much further discussion. In and of itself it will provide an excellent theological handbook for members of either communion interested in ecumenical discussion. For our own American context it poses three particular questions:

(1) Granted its largely British backdrop, how well does it reflect the peculiarities of the American situation? We have already noted how both in Section Two, where the document does not adequately confront historical conflicts and misunderstandings that have served to divide our communions, and in Section Five, where the North American denominational model is strongly criticized, the document fails to address the *de facto* American religious situation. Furthermore, we should note that the type of Reformed theological vision *God’s Reign and Our Unity* sets forth is not the predominant Reformed theological approach on the American scene. Three of the most important elements of the current American Reformed theological world (the “mainline” American Presbyterian emphasis as reflected in their recent “A Brief Statement of Faith,” the conservative evangelical tradition, and the Dutch Reformed tradition) seem to be underrepresented in the document. Hence we must raise the question of the theological relevance of the document to the American context.

(2) In this regard can the positive goals of the document be “retranslated” into a theological language closer both to Anglicanism and the American Reformed traditions?

(3) Can the document be of further help in our Church’s discussion of the COCU proposal?

Resolution #A043

Response to *God’s Reign and Our Unity*

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That the 70th General Convention**
- 2 **accept the evaluation of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations on the**
- 3 **document *God’s Reign and Our Unity* and in accord with the request of the Lambeth**
- 4 **Conference transmit a copy of this evaluation to the Anglican Consultative Council**
- 5 **as our official response to the document.**

ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE

During the triennium, the Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation (ARC) met five times (sessions 34 through 38), continuing the series begun in 1965.

In the early part of the triennium, we discussed our responses to *The Final Report* of ARCIC I. We also monitored the official responses of our parent bodies in the United States.

The bulk of our work was devoted to a study begun in the last triennium of *Apostolicae curae*, Pope Leo XIII's apostolic letter of 1896 on the validity of Anglican orders. Based on the work of a special papal commissions, *Apostolicae curae* concluded that the ordinal developed in the English Church during the Reformation was so defective that all ordinations according to that rite were "absolutely null and utterly void." Two developments in recent years have resulted in a new look at that condemnation.

First, when Pope John Paul II opened the Vatican archives for the period of the Leo XIII pontificate, scholars were given an opportunity to examine in detail the circumstances surrounding the promulgation of *Apostolicae curae*. Careful study of the primary sources indicates that Pope Leo's commission was not of a common mind on the matter of Anglican orders.

Second, because of the deepening dialogue between the two communions, Anglicans and Roman Catholics have moved closer to a consensus on many crucial issues as reflected in *The Final Report* of ARCIC I. The developments have enabled ARC/USA to produce an agreed statement which invites the Roman Catholic Church to review its official position on Anglican orders.

Issued in 1990 under the title *Anglican Orders: A Report on the Evolving Context of Their Evaluation in the Roman Catholic Church*, this statement has been forwarded to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Pope John Paul II, ARCIC II, and the appropriate authorities in our two national churches. It is available in *Ecumenical Bulletin* 100 for general information, wider study and discussion.

Our continuing work will focus on a study of authority in the two communions, the major unresolved issue to emerge from *The Final Report*. Fundamental papers have been prepared by two members of the Consultation and have been criticized and revised several times. These are being augmented by additional papers on selected cases. The present goal is to examine and understand the teaching authority in each communion in relation to papal primacy, in order to develop a statement on authority and primacy that goes beyond the agreement reached in *The Final Report*.

As of the time of this writing, the official response of the Roman Catholic Church to the 1982 *Final Report* of ARCIC-I, which had been expected to be released from the Vatican in the summer of 1988, has not yet appeared.

Also, as of the time of this writing the new agreed statement of ARCIC-II, *The Church as Communion*, finalized at Dublin in September of 1990, has not yet been released.

At the meeting of ARCIC-II held in Dublin in late August and early September of 1990, the resignation of the Rt. Rev. Arthur Vogel, retired Bishop of West Missouri and a charter member of ARCIC-I and ARCIC-II, was announced.

The present work of ARCIC-II is proceeding to a consideration of moral questions between the two churches with the assistance of external consultants selected by the co-chairmen.

Resolution #A044

Appreciation of the Rt. Rev. Arthur Vogel

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That the outstanding contribution**
 2 **of the Rt. Rev. Arthur Vogel, retired Bishop of West Missouri, to the work of the**
 3 **Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission be acknowledged and gratefully**
 4 **appreciated by this General Convention upon the occasion of his retirement from the**
 5 **Commission in August of 1990.**

CONSULTATION ON CHURCH UNION

In 1984, the member churches of the Consultation on Church Union (COCU) were asked to recognize in *The COCU Consensus: In Quest of a Church of Christ Uniting*, (1) an expression, in the matters with which it deals, of the Apostolic faith, order, worship, and witness of the Church; (2) an anticipation of the Church Uniting which the participating bodies, by the power of the Holy Spirit, wish to become; and (3) a sufficient theological basis for the covenanting acts and the uniting process proposed at this time by the Consultation.

The 69th General Convention (1988) responded affirmatively to requests (1) and (2). However, in the matter of the third request (recognizing *The COCU Consensus* as “a sufficient theological basis” for covenanting), the 1988 Convention added the words “not yet” to indicate that the Episcopal Church was not clear about the covenanting acts yet to be proposed, and that there were certain reservations about the theology set forth in the text of *The COCU Consensus*.

Subsequently, a joint committee composed of members of the SCER and of the COCU Executive Committee set about the task of preparing a series of “Elucidations,” intended to be clarifying statements which, while not displacing or expanding the text, would represent an authorized interpretation of it. The SCER as a whole could not endorse the “Elucidations” as an authorized interpretation of the text. However, in the judgement of the commission these elucidations help move dialogue forward by considering the theological reservations articulated in 1988 and the subsequent document, *Churches in Covenant Communion*.

The resolution being presented to this 70th General Convention revises the wording as originally presented in 1988. The reasons for the revision are twofold: first, to allow adequate time for a thorough study of the covenanting proposals, as set forth in *Churches in Covenant Communion*; and second, to affirm the Episcopal Church’s commitment to deepening our relationships with other member churches of the Consultation on Church Union.

While the Episcopal Church is grateful to COCU for the bold proposal set forth in *Churches in Covenant Communion* and in *The COCU Consensus*, it is clear that, before real unity can be achieved, there must be growth in our knowledge and understanding of each other and further theological dialogue.

The resolution, if adopted, will affirm the Episcopal Church’s commitment to continuing the ecumenical journey with other COCU member churches toward the visible unity that Christ wills for the Church. The resolution also seeks to broaden the avenues for dialogue and for sharing, particularly at the local level, where such broadening and deepening must happen if it is to happen at all.

The proposed resolution is also in keeping with Resolution #13 of the 1988 Lambeth Conference, which declared: “This Conference, acknowledging that the withdrawal of Anglicans from several previous covenanting proposals and schemes of unity with

THE BLUE BOOK

Methodist, Reformed and other Churches is a cause for sorrow and repentance, nevertheless is encouraged by: (1) the continuing unity conversations in the Consultation on Church Union (USA).”

Resolution #A045

Consultation on Church Union

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
2 **of the Episcopal Church recognize *The COCU Consensus: In Quest of a Church of***
3 ***Christ Uniting* to be a significant and valuable contribution for deepening our rela-**
4 **tionships and pursuing further theological dialogue with the other member churches**
5 **of the Consultation in our continuing ecumenical journey toward a communion of**
6 **communions; and be it further**

7 *Resolved*, **That the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations be directed to in-**
8 **itiate and facilitate a study of *Churches in Covenant Communion* as one way whereby**
9 **the member churches of the Consultation may advance the vision of visible unity in**
10 **a communion of communions; and be it further**

11 *Resolved*, **That the possibilities of bilateral dialogues with member churches of COCU**
12 **be explored as a way to grow in our knowledge and understanding of each other, and**
13 **that diocesan ecumenical commissions and officers be asked to explore ways of shar-**
14 **ing worship, study, witness, and evangelism with other member churches of the Con-**
15 **sultation on Church Union.**

Resolution #A046

Use of COCU Liturgy

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
2 **authorize in special circumstances of ecumenical worship the trial use of the eucharistic**
3 **liturgy *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: A New Text* (available from Forward Move-**
4 **ment Publications), subject to the approval of the diocesan bishop, provided that:**

5 (a) **an ordained priest of this Church is the celebrant, or one of the celebrants at**
6 **a concelebrated service;**

7 (b) **the elements used are those used by our Lord, namely bread and wine;**

8 (c) **any of the consecrated elements remaining at the end of the service be reverent-**
9 **ly consumed; and**

10 (d) **the guidelines for interim eucharistic sharing authorized by the 65th General**
11 **Convention (*Journal*, 1976, pp. C89-90) be observed; and be it further**

12 *Resolved*, **That local member churches of the Consultation on Church Union be en-**
13 **couraged to use this liturgy not only when all member churches are gathered together**
14 **in worship but also when two or three churches are gathered in worship.**

HISTORIC BLACK METHODIST EPISCOPAL-EPISCOPAL DIALOGUE

The General Convention of 1988 called for an exploration of the possibilities for bilateral dialogues with member churches of the Consultation on Church Union. Conversations between the Presiding Bishop and bishops of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church indicated interest in such discussions. The SCER voted to begin explorations, and in December 1990 a planning meeting set out a tentative agenda for the dialogue.

Resolution #A047

Dialogue with Historic Black Methodist Episcopal Churches

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
- 2 **establish a formal dialogue between the Episcopal Church and the African Methodist**
- 3 **Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and the Christian**
- 4 **Methodist Episcopal Church under the supervision of the Standing Commission on**
- 5 **Ecumenical Relations.**

LUTHERAN-EPISCOPAL DIALOGUE

Since 1983 members of the third series of the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue (LED) have been at work on the mandate given by the General Conventions of the respective churches in the Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982. By that mandate the dialogue was authorized to discuss "any other outstanding questions that must be resolved before full communion . . . can be established between the respective churches, e.g., implications of the Gospel, historic episcopate, and ordering of ministry (Bishops, Priests, Deacons) in the total context of apostolicity" (*Journal*, 1982, p. C48).

In January 1988 the dialogue announced partial completion of its mandate with the adoption of the agreed statement entitled *Implications of the Gospel*. The 1988 General Convention directed the SCER to devise and execute during the ensuing triennium a process for study and evaluation of that document and directed the SCER to report to the 70th General Convention the results of such study and evaluation, along with recommendations concerning whether the Episcopal Church can "receive and affirm the agreed statement as a faithful expression of the Gospel and as a step on the road to full communion with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America."

During this triennium, LED has met five times to discuss and attempt to resolve the remaining questions concerning the "historic episcopate and ordering of ministry (Bishops, Priests, Deacons) in the total context of apostolicity." Papers were assigned to scholars both within and outside the dialogue to explore historical as well as contemporary opinion on these subjects. In January 1989 a drafting committee was appointed to produce an agreed statement which would lead to recommended steps for entering into full communion. The dialogue has devoted 14 meetings in all to rigorous discussion of the proposal. A final agreed statement was approved at the January 1991 meeting and transmitted to its sponsoring bodies (the SCER for the Episcopal Church and the Standing Committee of the Office of Ecumenical Affairs for the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America) for review and appropriate action.

In the resolutions that follow, the SCER calls upon the Episcopal Church to enter into a three-year study the goal of which is full communion between the Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The definition of full communion used herein is that of the Anglican-Lutheran Joint Work Group, Cold Ash, Berkshire, England, 1983: "By full communion we here understand a relationship between two distinct churches or communions. Each maintains its own autonomy and recognizes the catholicity and apostolicity of the other, and each believes the other to hold the essentials of the Christian faith." The SCER believes this definition to be consonant with the *Declaration on Unity* enacted by the 66th General Convention.

The first of the resolutions calls for a three-year churchwide study of the proposed *Concordat of Agreement* which, if adopted, would lead to full communion, including the reconciliation of the ordained ministries of our two churches. The theological and scriptural basis for the *Concordat* is contained in the accompanying report titled *Toward Full Communion*, which is also recommended for study.

A second resolution calls upon the General Convention to recognize *Implications of the Gospel* to be “a faithful witness to the gospel and . . . a step beyond the Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982 toward the goal of full communion.” Based upon response to the study conducted during the triennium 1988-91, the SCER affirms *Implications of the Gospel* as an important first step towards the goal of full communion. However, the SCER wishes it to be understood that this vote is preliminary to the full communion envisaged in the *Concordat* itself.

Resolutions identical with the two mentioned above have been commended to the 1991 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

The significance of what is being proposed extends beyond our two churches. The proposed *Concordat of Agreement* (together with the accompanying documents) constitutes a historic step forward, one which has positive implications for other ecumenical dialogues.

Three additional implementing resolutions call for referring the LED report to the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons, to the Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers, to the Anglican Consultative Council, to churches in full communion, and to other ecumenical partners in dialogue, whose counsel and assistance will be important if the journey toward communion is to bear fruit.

As we enthusiastically commend this *Concordat of Agreement* and accompanying documents for study by this Church, we do so with humility as we recognize the movement of the Holy Spirit in the process. It is our hope that we as Episcopalians will be stretched by this study to look anew at our call by God, our life in Christ, and our journey together with others who follow Christ.

The presentation for study of the *Concordat of Agreement*, together with *Toward Full Communion* and the earlier *Implications of the Gospel*, is indeed a historical step forward in our search for unity and we believe a highly responsible approach for our churches to consider as we earnestly seek full communion guided by the Holy Spirit.

May we continue to cultivate the common discipleship to which we have been called in one body, by one spirit, through one baptism, thankful to the one lord, our savior Jesus Christ, with whom we have received one faith, one hope, “one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all, and in all” (Eph. 4:3-6).

—from *Toward Full Communion*

Proposed
CONCORDAT OF AGREEMENT
Between
The Episcopal Church and
The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Preface

The Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue Series III proposes this Concordat of Agreement to its sponsoring bodies for consideration and action by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church and the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in implementation of the goal mandated by the Lutheran-Episcopal Agree-

ment of 1982. That agreement identified the goal as “full communion (*communio in sacris*/altar and pulpit fellowship).”¹ As the meaning of “full communion” for purposes of this Concordat of Agreement both churches endorse in principle the definitions agreed by the (international) Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group at Cold Ash, Berkshire, England, in 1983,² which they deem to be in full accord with their own definitions given in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America’s working document, “Ecumenism: The Vision of the ELCA” (1989), and given in the “Declaration on Unity” of the Episcopal Church, General Convention of 1979. During the process of consideration of this Concordat of Agreement it is expected that our churches will consult with sister churches in our respective communions (through, for example, the Anglican Consultative Council and the Lutheran World Federation) as well as those with whom we are currently engaged in dialogue.

CONCORDAT OF AGREEMENT

1. The Episcopal Church hereby agrees that in its General Convention, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby agrees that in its Churchwide Assembly, there shall be one vote to accept or reject, as a matter of verbal content as well as in principle, and without separate amendment, the full set of agreements to follow. If they are adopted by both churches, each church agrees to make those legislative, canonical, constitutional, and liturgical changes that are necessary and appropriate for the full communion between the churches which these agreements are designed to implement, without further vote on the Concordat of Agreement by either the General Convention or the Churchwide Assembly.

¹Cf. the complete text of the 1982 Agreement on pp. 2-3 of the Report which accompanies this proposed Concordat of Agreement.

²*Anglican-Lutheran Relations: Report of the Anglican-Lutheran Joint Working Group, Cold Ash, Berkshire, England — 1983*, in William A. Norgren, *What Can We Share?* (Cincinnati, Forward Movement Publications, 1985), pp. 90-92. The relevant portion of the report reads as follows:

By full communion we here understand a relationship between two distinct churches or communions. Each maintains its own autonomy and recognizes the catholicity and apostolicity of the other, and each believes the other to hold the essentials of the Christian faith:

- (a) subject to such safeguards as ecclesial discipline may properly require, members of one body may receive the sacraments of the other;
- (b) subject to local invitation, bishops of one church may take part in the consecration of the bishops of the other, thus acknowledging the duty of mutual care and concern;
- (c) subject to church regulation, a bishop, pastor/priest or deacon of one ecclesial body may exercise liturgical functions in a congregation of the other body if invited to do so, and also, when requested, pastoral care of the other’s members;
- (d) it is also a necessary addition and complement that there should be recognized organs of regular consultation and communication, including episcopal collegiality, to express and strengthen the fellowship and enable common witness, life and service.

To be in full communion means that churches become interdependent while remaining autonomous. One is not elevated to be the judge of the other nor can it remain insensitive to the other; neither is each body committed to every secondary feature of the tradition of the other. Thus the corporate strength of the churches is enhanced in love, and an isolated independence is restrained.

Full communion should not imply the suppressing of ethnic, cultural or ecclesial characteristics of traditions which may in fact be maintained and developed by diverse institutions within one communion.

A. ACTIONS OF BOTH CHURCHES

Agreement in the Doctrine of the Faith

2. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Episcopal Church hereby recognize in each other the essentials of the one catholic and apostolic faith as it is witnessed in the unaltered Augsburg Confession (CA), the Small Catechism, and the Book of Common Prayer of 1979 (including “Episcopal Services” and “An Outline of the Faith”), and as it is summarized in part in *Implications of the Gospel and Toward Full Communion between the Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*, the reports of Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue III,³ and as it has been examined in both the papers and fourteen official conversations of Series III.⁴ Each church also promises to require its ordination candidates to study each other’s basic documents, i.e., the Augsburg Confession, the Small Catechism, and the Book of Common Prayer, upon which this recognition is based.

Joint Participation in the Consecration of Bishops

3. In the course of history many and various terms have been used to describe the rite by which a person becomes a bishop. In the English language these terms include: ordaining, consecrating, ordering, making, confecting, constituting, installing.

What is involved is a setting apart with prayer and the laying-on-of-hands by other bishops of a person for the distinct ministry of bishop within the one ministry of Word and Sacrament. As a result of their agreement in faith, both churches hereby pledge themselves, beginning at the time that this agreement is accepted by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church and the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to the common joint ordinations of all future bishops as apostolic missionaries in the historic episcopate for the sake of common mission.⁵

Each church hereby promises to invite and include on an invariable basis at least three bishops of the other church, as well as three of its own, to participate in the laying-on-of-hands at the ordination of its own bishops.⁶ Such a participation is the liturgical form by which the church recognizes that the bishop serves the local or regional church through ties of collegiality and consultation whose purpose is to provide links with the universal church.⁷ Inasmuch as both churches agree that a ministry of *episkope* is necessary to witness to, promote, and safeguard the unity and apostolicity of the church and its continuity in doctrine and mission across time and space,⁸ this participation is under-

³Cf. The working document, “Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” D,1 and 2, adopted by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America on August 25, 1989, “to offer provisional and interim guidance for this church during the 1990-1991 biennium”; and the “Declaration on Unity” adopted by the 1979 General Convention of the Episcopal Church.

⁴The list of papers of the fourteen meetings is omitted in this printing.

⁵Cf. Richard Grein, “The Bishop as Chief Missionary,” in Charles R. Henery, editor, *Beyond the Horizon: Frontiers for Mission* (Cincinnati: Forward Movement Publications, 1986), pp. 64-80.

⁶*The Niagara Report* (London: Church House Publishing, 1988), Pars. 91 and 96; The Council of Nicaea, Canon 4.

⁷Michael Root, “Full Communion Between Episcopalians and Lutherans in North America: What Would It Look Like?” (Unpublished Paper, LED III, June, 1990), pp. 10-16. Cf. Michael Root, “Bishops as Points of Unity and Continuity” (Unpublished Paper, Lutheran-United Methodist Dialogue, May, 1986).

⁸*The Niagara Report*, Par. 69; The Pullach Report, Par. 79; The Lutheran-United Methodist Common Statement on Episcopacy, Par. 28.

stood as a call for mutual planning, consultation, and interaction in *episkope*, mission, teaching, and pastoral care as well as a liturgical expression of the full communion that is being initiated by this Concordat of Agreement. Each church understands that the bishops in this action are representatives of their own churches in fidelity to the teaching and mission of the apostles. Their participation in this way embodies the historical continuity of each bishop and the diocese or synod with the apostolic church and ministry through the ages.⁹

B. ACTIONS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

4. In light of the agreement that the threefold ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons in historic succession will be the future pattern of the one ordained ministry of Word and Sacrament in both churches as they begin to live in full communion,¹⁰ the Episcopal Church hereby recognizes now the full authenticity of the ordained ministries presently existing within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The Episcopal Church acknowledges the pastors and bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as priests within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as chief pastors exercising a ministry of *episkope* over the jurisdictional areas of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America in which they preside.¹¹

5. To enable the full communion that is coming into being by means of this Concordat of Agreement, the Episcopal Church hereby pledges, at the same time that this Concordat of Agreement is accepted by its General Convention and by the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to begin the process for enacting a temporary suspension, in this case only, of the seventeenth century restriction that “no persons are allowed to exercise the offices of bishop, priest, or deacon in this Church unless they are so ordained, or have already received such ordination with the laying on of hands by bishops who are themselves duly qualified to confer Holy Orders.”¹² The purpose of this action will be to permit the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all Evangelical Lutheran Church in America pastors as priests or presbyters and all Evangelical Lutheran Church in America deacons as deacons in the Episcopal Church without any further ordination or re-ordination or supplemental ordination whatsoever, subject always to canonically or constitutionally approved invitation (see Pars. 14, 15, and 16 below). The purpose of temporarily suspending this restriction, which has been a constant requirement in Anglican polity since the Ordinal of 1662,¹³ is precisely in order to secure the future implementation of the ordinal’s same principle within the eventually fully integrated ministries. It is for this reason that the Episcopal Church can feel confident in taking this unprecedented step with regard to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

⁹Cf. Resolutions of the 1979 and 1985 General Conventions of the Episcopal Church, The Canterbury Statement, Par. 16, of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America’s provisional statement, “Ecumenism: The Vision of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” D.3.

¹⁰Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 4.

¹¹*The Niagara Report*, Par. 94. Cf. Raymond E. Brown, *Priest and Bishop: Biblical Reflections* (New York: Paulist Press, 1970), pp. 83-85.

¹²Preface to the Ordinal, The Book of Common Prayer, p. 510.

¹³Cf. *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John Booty (SPCK/Fortress, London/Philadelphia, 1988), pp. 149, 151, 238, 290, 304-305; Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal* (London, SPCK, 1971), Chapter 6.

6. The Episcopal Church hereby endorses the Lutheran affirmation that the historic catholic episcopate under the Word of God must always serve the gospel,¹⁴ and that the ultimate authority under which bishops preach and teach is the gospel itself.¹⁵ In testimony and implementation thereof, the Episcopal Church agrees to establish and welcome, either by itself or jointly with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, structures for collegial and periodic review of its episcopal ministry, as well as that of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, with a view to evaluation, adaptation, improvement, and continual reform in the service of the gospel.¹⁶

C. ACTIONS OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

7. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America agrees that all its bishops will be understood as ordained, like other pastors, for life service of the gospel in the pastoral ministry of the historic episcopate,¹⁷ even though tenure in office of the churchwide bishop and synodical bishops may be terminated by retirement, resignation, or conclusion of term however constitutionally ordered. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America further agrees to revise its rite for the "Installation of a Bishop"¹⁸ to reflect this understanding. In keeping with these principles the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America also agrees to revise its constitution (e.g., 16.51.41.) so that all bishops, including those no longer active, shall be regular members of the Conference of Bishops.¹⁹

8. As regards ordained ministry, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America affirms, in the context of its confessional heritage, the teaching of the Augsburg Confession that Lutherans do not intend to depart from the historic faith and practice of catholic Christianity.²⁰ The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America therefore agrees to make constitutional and liturgical provision that only bishops shall ordain all clergy. Presbyters shall continue to participate in the laying-on-of-hands at all ordinations of presbyters. It is further understood that episcopal and presbyteral office in the church is to be understood and exercised as servant ministry, and not for domination or arbitrary control.²¹ Appropriate liturgical expression of these understandings will be made.²² Both churches acknowledge that the diaconate, including its place within the threefold minis-

¹⁴*The Niagara Report*, Par. 91, Augsburg Confession Article 7, Article 28.

¹⁵Cf. Joseph A. Burgess, "An Evangelical Episcopate," in Todd Nichol and Marc Kolden, editors, *Called and Ordained* (Minneapolis: Augsburg/Fortress Press, 1990), p. 147.

¹⁶Cf. *The Niagara Report*, Pars. 90, 95, and especially 100-110 as examples of the questions and concerns involved in such evaluation. Cf. also *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, Ministry Par. 38.

¹⁷Cf. *The Niagara Report*, Par. 90.

¹⁸*Occasional Services* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982), pp. 218-223.

¹⁹We understand the term "regular" to mean "according to constitutionally regulated provisions." A revised constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America may, for example, give voice but not vote in the Conference of Bishops to bishops who are no longer actively functioning in the office of bishop by reason of retirement, resignation to accept another call, or conclusion of term.

²⁰Augsburg Confession, Art. 21 (Tappert, page 47); cf. *Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope*, Par. 66 (Tappert, p. 331).

²¹Cf. II Cor. 10:8; also *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), pp. 13-14, and *ARCIC, The Final Report* (London: SPCK and Catholic Truth Society, 1982), pp. 83 and 89.

²²Cf. *The Niagara Report*, Par. 92.

terial office, is in need of continued study and reform, which they pledge themselves to undertake in consultation with one another.²³

9. In light of the above agreements and of the actions of the Episcopal Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America hereby recognizes now the full authenticity of the ordained ministries presently existing within the Episcopal Church, acknowledging the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Episcopal Church all as pastors in their respective orders within the Episcopal Church and the bishops of the Episcopal Church as chief pastors in the historic succession exercising a ministry of *episkope* over the jurisdictional areas of the Episcopal Church in which they preside. In preparation for the full communion that is coming into being by means of this Concordat of Agreement, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America also pledges, at the time that this Concordat of Agreement is accepted by the Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the General Convention of the Episcopal Church, to begin the process for enacting a dispensation for ordinands of the Episcopal Church from its ordination requirement of subscription to the unaltered Augsburg Confession (Constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 10:21) in order to permit the full interchangeability and reciprocity of all Episcopal Church bishops as bishops, of all Episcopal Church priests as pastors, and of all Episcopal Church deacons as may be determined (see Par. 8 above), within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America without any supplemental oath or subscription, subject always to canonically or constitutionally approved invitation (see Pars. 14, 15, and 16 below). The purpose of this dispensation, which heretofore has not been made by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America for the clergy of any other church, is precisely in order to serve the future implementation, in the full communion that will follow, of the agreement in the doctrine of the faith indentified in Paragraph 2 (above) of this Concordat of Agreement.

D. ACTIONS OF BOTH CHURCHES

Joint Commission

10. Both churches hereby authorize the establishment of a joint ecumenical/doctrinal/liturgical commission to moderate the details of these changes, to assist joint planning for mission, to facilitate consultation and common decision-making through appropriate channels in fundamental matters that the churches may face together in the future, to enable the process of new consecrations/ordinations of bishops in both churches as they occur, and to issue guidelines as requested and as may seem appropriate. It will prepare a national service that will celebrate the inauguration of this Concordat of Agreement as a common obedience to Christ in mission. At this service the mutual recognition of faith will be celebrated and, if possible, new bishops from each church will be consecrated/ordained for the synods or dioceses that have elected them, initiating the provisions hereby agreed upon.

Wider Context

11. In thus moving to establish one ordained ministry in geographically overlapping episcopates, open to women as well as to men, to married persons as well as to single

²³*Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, Ministry Par. 24. Cf., James M. Barnett, *The Diaconate: A Full and Equal Order* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1981), pp. 133-197; John E. Booty, *The Servant Church: Diaconal Ministry and the Episcopal Church* (Wilton, CT, Morehouse-Barlow, 1982); and J. Robert Wright, "The Emergence of the Diaconate: Biblical and Patristic Sources," *Liturgy*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Fall, 1982), pp. 17-23, 67-71.

persons, both churches agree that the historic catholic episcopate, which they embrace, can be locally adapted and reformed in the service of the gospel. In this spirit they offer this Concordat of Agreement and growth toward full communion for serious consideration among the churches of the Reformation as well as among the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches. They pledge widespread consultation during the process at all stages. Each church promises to issue no official commentary on this text that has not been approved by the joint commission as a legitimate interpretation thereof.

Existing Relationships

12. Each church agrees that the other church will continue to live in communion with all the churches with whom the latter is now in communion. Each church also pledges prior consultation about this Concordat of Agreement with those churches. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America continues to be in full communion (pulpit and altar fellowship) with all member churches of the Lutheran World Federation. This Concordat of Agreement with the Episcopal Church does not imply or inaugurate any automatic communion between the Episcopal Church and the other member churches of the Lutheran World Federation. The Episcopal Church continues to be in full communion with all of the provinces of the Anglican Communion, and with Old Catholic Churches of Europe, with the united churches of the Indian sub-continent, with the Mar Thoma Church, and with the Philippine Independent Church. This Concordat of Agreement with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America does not imply or inaugurate any automatic communion between the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the other provinces of the Anglican Communion or any other churches with whom the Episcopal Church is in full communion.

Other Dialogues

13. Both churches agree that each will continue to engage in dialogue with other churches and traditions. Both churches agree to take each other and this Concordat of Agreement into account at every stage in their dialogue conversations with other churches and traditions. Where appropriate, both churches will seek to engage in joint dialogues. On the basis of this Concordat of Agreement, both churches pledge that they will not enter into formal agreements with other churches and traditions without prior consultation with each other. At the same time both churches pledge that they will not impede the development of relationships and agreements with other churches and traditions with whom they have been in dialogue.

E. FULL COMMUNION

14. Of all the historical processes involved in realizing full communion between the Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the achieving of full interchangeability of ordained ministries will probably take longest. While the two churches will fully acknowledge the authenticity of each other's ordained ministries from the beginning of the process, the creation of a common, and therefore fully interchangeable, ministry will occur with the full incorporation of all active bishops in the historic episcopate by common joint ordinations and the continuing process of collegial consultation in matters of Christian faith and life. Full communion will also include the activities of the joint commission (Par. 10 above), as well as the establishment of "recognized organs of regular consultation and communication, including episcopal collegiality, to express and strengthen the fellowship and enable common witness, life and service."²⁴

²⁴The Cold Ash report, paragraph d. See footnote 2, above.

Thereby the churches are permanently committed to common mission and ministry on the basis of agreement in faith, recognizing each other fully as churches in which the gospel is preached and the holy sacraments administered. All provisions specified above will continue in effect.

15. On the basis of this Concordat of Agreement, at a given date recommended by the joint commission, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and the Episcopal Church will announce the completion of the process by which they enjoy full communion with each other. They will share one ordained ministry in two churches that are in full communion, still autonomous in structure yet interdependent in doctrine, mission, and ministry.

16. Consequent to the acknowledgement of full communion and respecting always the internal discipline of each church, both churches now accept in principle the full interchangeability and reciprocity of their ordained ministries, recognizing bishops as bishops, pastors as priests and presbyters and *vice versa*, and deacons as deacons. In consequence of our mutual pledge to a future already anticipated in Christ and the church of the early centuries,²⁵ each church will make such necessary revisions of canons and constitution so that ordained clergy can, upon canonically or constitutionally approved invitation, function as clergy in corresponding situations within either church. The churches will authorize such celebrations of the Eucharist as will accord full recognition to each other's episcopal ministries and sacramental services. All further necessary legislative, canonical, constitutional, and liturgical changes will be coordinated by the joint ecumenical/doctrinal/liturgical commission hereby established.

CONCLUSION

We receive with thanksgiving the gift of unity which is already given in Christ.

He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities — all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the first-born of the dead, that in everything he might be pre-eminent. For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross. Col. 1:15-20

Repeatedly Christians have confessed that the unity of the church is given, not achieved. The church can only be one because it is constituted by the gospel in word and sacrament, and there is but one gospel. What Christians are seeking when they engage in the tasks and efforts associated with ecumenism is to discover how the unity they have already been given by the gospel can be manifested faithfully in terms of the church's mission.²⁶

We do not know to what new, recovered, or continuing tasks of mission this proposed Concordat of Agreement will lead our churches, but we give thanks to God for leading us to this point. We entrust ourselves to that leading in the future, confident that our full communion will be a witness to the gift and goal already present in Christ, "that God may be everything to every one" (I Cor. 15:28). It is the gift of Christ that we are sent

²⁵Cf. John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), pp. 171-208.

²⁶*Implications of the Gospel*, Par. 98.

THE BLUE BOOK

as He has been sent (John 17:17-26), that our unity will be received and perceived as we participate in the mission of the Son in obedience to the Father through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit.²⁷

Now to the one who by the power at work within us is able to do far more abundantly than all that we ask or think, to God be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations, for ever and ever. Amen. (Eph. 3:20-21)

Resolution #A048

Toward Full Communion

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That the 70th General Convention:**
- 2 **1. Receive with deep appreciation from the Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue, Series III,**
- 3 ***Toward Full Communion* and the *Concordat of Agreement* as the completion**
- 4 **of the mandate in the Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982;**
- 5 **2. Direct the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations to develop a process**
- 6 **of study throughout this Church, whenever possible in cooperation with the**
- 7 **Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, of the theological soundness and**
- 8 **ecumenical appropriateness of this work of dialogue; and**
- 9 **3. Request that a final report of the churchwide study indicating specific action on**
- 10 **the *Concordat of Agreement* be presented to the 71st General Convention in 1994.**

Resolution #A049

Implications of the Gospel

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
- 2 **affirm that certain document, *Implications of the Gospel*, as a faithful witness to the**
- 3 **Gospel and as a step beyond the Lutheran-Episcopal Agreement of 1982 toward the**
- 4 **goal of full communion between the Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran**
- 5 **Church in America;**
- 6 **Rejoice that the agreed statement confirms earlier agreed statements from Lutheran-**
- 7 **Episcopal Dialogues I and II, the Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations, and**
- 8 **the Anglican-Lutheran European Commission that the Episcopal Church and the**
- 9 **Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are in agreement on the Gospel;**
- 10 **Recognize that the agreed statement expresses the Gospel in new ways for both**
- 11 **traditions but is a statement standing under Scripture, the creeds, the Book of Com-**
- 12 **mon Prayer, and the Constitution and Canons of the Episcopal Church;**
- 13 **Call the Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America to**
- 14 **confirm and implement the specific recommendations in *Implications of the Gospel***
- 15 **as a further witness and testing of their common faith and mission, i.e.,**
- 16 **1. The use of appropriate language for the address of God in prayer and worship**
- 17 **(para. 29-31),**
- 18 **2. The identifications of the Church's matrix in Israel with recommendations for**
- 19 **our contemporary relationship to Jews (para. 42),**
- 20 **3. The renewal of the Eucharistic liturgy in the parish through conscious movement**
- 21 **toward celebration of the Eucharist every Sunday (para. 50),**

²⁷The Niagara Report, Pats. 25-26.

- 22 **4. Recommendations for cooperative activity between Lutherans and Episcopalians**
 23 **in order to manifest the unity we have been given (para. 100-104),**
- 24 **5. Common work in evangelization organized around the administration of holy**
 25 **baptism (para. 112),**
- 26 **6. Common attention to the ethical dimensions of the Christian life in the areas**
 27 **of stewardship, sexuality, vocation, social justice, and peace, (para. 114-124);**
- 28 **Direct the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations, with the concurrence**
 29 **of the Standing Committee of the Office for Ecumenical Affairs of the Evangelical**
 30 **Lutheran Church in America, to establish a Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Com-**
 31 **mittee to facilitate implementation of the recommendations and to promote relation-**
 32 **ships of the two churches locally, nationally, and internationally.**

Resolution #A050

Joint Committee

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
 2 **refer the proposed *Concordat of Agreement* to the Standing Commission on Constitu-**
 3 **tion and Canons for study and recommended implementing steps, with particular**
 4 **reference to matters having to do with the “Preface to the Ordinal” of the Book of**
 5 **Common Prayer; and be it further,**
- 6 *Resolved*, **That for purposes of the above study, there be appointed a joint committee**
 7 **of representatives of the Standing Commission on Constitution and Canons and the**
 8 **Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations.**

Resolution #A051

Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers Training

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That the Episcopal Diocesan**
 2 **Ecumenical Officers be asked, as a part of the churchwide study of *Toward Full Com-***
 3 ***munion and the Concordat of Agreement*, to give special attention to the training of**
 4 **those in each diocese who will lead this study, and where possible that this study be**
 5 **done jointly with representatives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.**

Resolution #A052

Consultation with Anglican and Ecumenical Partners

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That *Toward Full Communion* and**
 2 **the *Concordat of Agreement* be referred to the Anglican Consultative Council for con-**
 3 **sideration by the member churches of the Anglican Communion, to churches in full**
 4 **communion, and to other partners in dialogue, and that responses from these groups**
 5 **be sought.**

DIALOGUE WITH THE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH

In response to a request from the 69th General Convention, the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations is exploring the possibilities of dialogue with the Reformed Episcopal Church in cooperation with the Ecumenical Commission of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. Because these conversations are exploratory, and because of budget limitations, Episcopal Church representatives were chosen from the Middle Atlantic region. The committee expects to report back to the SCER in 1992.

THE BLUE BOOK

The Reformed Episcopal Church is a small community, whose roots can be traced to certain theological and scriptural controversies within the Episcopal Church in the late 19th century. A theological seminary is located in Philadelphia.

Resolution #A053

Reformed Episcopal Church

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
- 2 **express appreciation for work underway to explore the possibility of a dialogue between**
- 3 **the Episcopal Church and the Reformed Episcopal Church.**

PARTICIPATION IN COUNCILS OF CHURCHES

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST

Since the last General Convention, the National Council of the Churches of Christ (NCCC) has gone through a major crisis and restructuring.

For a number of years the NCCC had been rethinking its mission and structure through the work of the Presidential Panel. This Panel reported in 1984, and their recommendations were in the process of being implemented. But in the fall of 1988, it became clear that this new structure would not work. Therefore, as the result of an emergency consultation, a special Action Committee of 15 (C-15) was authorized. It was charged to bring a new plan to the May 1989 meeting of the Governing Board.

Their task was to: (1) analyze the factors that contributed to this present crisis in the Council and in the communities of which the Council is an expression; (2) develop and test organizational principles and models with member communions, committees and commissions of the NCCC, regional and local ecumenical bodies, regional ecumenical bodies outside the United States, the World Council of Churches, and participating non-member communions; (3) refine the organizational principles and develop a structural design for the future; and (4) recommend a plan for implementation in appropriate stages.

The Episcopal Church was represented in the work of C-15 by the Rev. Dr. William B. Lawson, Rector of St. Stephen's Memorial Church, Lynn, Massachusetts, and a member of the Episcopal Church's delegation to the Governing Board.

Three basic reasons for this crisis were identified:

1. There were different visions and conflicting understandings of the basic nature of the Council as an instrument of the churches in fulfilling their ecumenical witness and vocation. Was the NCCC to be a "cooperative program agency" or a "community of Christian communions"?
2. There was conflict concerning authority, accountability and leadership. Where was authority lodged within the Council? Where did accountability lie between the various parts of the Council, the Governing Board and the member communions? What kind of leadership style was needed to enable the Council to become a community of communions?
3. There were overall financial constraints and concerns that often acted as a catalyst bringing to the surface deeper issues.

As a result of the monumental work of C-15, the vision of the Council as a community of Christian communions was reaffirmed, and a new streamlined structure was proposed. This was a very positive step responding to the concerns of many of the member churches. From our perspective it was a response to the recommendations that came out of a special committee appointed by the Presiding Bishop to evaluate our Church's

membership and participation in the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. That evaluation was reported in full to the 69th General Convention. In essence, this new plan places greater authority and responsibility upon four new units: Unity and Relationships; Church World Service and Witness; Prophetic Justice; and Education, Communication and Discipleship. It also gives a powerful coordinating role to the General Secretary and the Executive Coordinating Committee. (For a fuller treatment of this work, see The Report of the Committee of Fifteen as adopted at the Governing Board of the NCCC meeting in Lexington, Kentucky, May 16-19, 1989. This is available through the Office of the General Secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10115.)

The work of C-15 precipitated an additional crisis when it reported on its work in May of 1989. The recommendation of the committee and the subsequent decisions of the Governing Board led to the resignation of the General Secretary, Dr. Arie Brouwer.

A Council Transition Team (CTT) was appointed to carry out the plan of C-15 by fleshing out the transition process and bringing that to completion by January of 1991. The report of that committee was made at a meeting of the Governing Board in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in May of 1990. Some details of the plan have not been implemented, but by the end of 1991 it should be completed. The Episcopal Church was once again represented by the Rev. Dr. William B. Lawson. (Again, for a fuller treatment of the work of CTT, see The Report of the Council Transition Team as adopted by the Governing Board at Pittsburgh, May 15-18, 1990. This is also available through the Office of the General Secretary.)

A major part of the restructuring was completed with the election of a new General Secretary, the Rev. Joan B. Campbell of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), at the November 1990 meeting of the General Board (new name of the former Governing Board). In addition, Associate General Secretaries were elected for each of the four new Units.

In many ways, the future of the Council is now in the hands of the member communions. When C-15 originally analyzed the crisis, it referred to the problems of the Council as the problems of the member churches writ large. If the new Council is to work more effectively and is to be a more streamlined structure, then the member churches need to take the Council — including its funding — more seriously. It needs to be an integral part of the life of the Episcopal Church. We have already begun that process in the ways in which Executive Council has implemented many of the recommendations of the special committee to evaluate our membership in the National Council of Churches and World Council of Churches. There is a vast difference between churches *cooperating* together through a council of churches and churches *coordinating* their own ministry and mission through a council. We need in this day and age to share some of our denominational power and authority so that ministry of the whole Church may be enhanced and enabled.

Resolution #A054

National Council of Churches

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
- 2 **recommit the Episcopal Church to be a vital part of that community of Christian com-**
- 3 **munions which we know as the National Council of the Churches of Christ; we par-**
- 4 **ticularly give thanks for the commitment and vision of the Committee of 15 and the**
- 5 **Council Transition Team for their monumental work in streamlining and restructur-**
- 6 **ing the Council for a new day.**

THE BLUE BOOK

Resolution #A055

General Secretary of NCCC

- 1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
- 2 **send greetings to the Rev. Joan B. Campbell as she begins her ministry as General**
- 3 **Secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, and pledge to her our**
- 4 **cooperation and support in that emerging ministry.**

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The Episcopal Church has been a member of the World Council of Churches (WCC) since 1948. The Presiding Bishop is a member of the Central Committee, which directs the affairs of the Council between Assemblies. The Seventh Assembly of the WCC was held in 1991 from February 7 to 20 in Canberra, Australia. Its task was to worship, share information, discuss and review the Council's work in the eight years since the Vancouver Assembly and to give direction to the program for the next seven years. The Episcopal Church delegation was headed by the Presiding Bishop and consisted of six persons from the United States, three from Episcopal dioceses in Latin America and the Caribbean, and one from Asia (see Appendix). They joined 940 voting delegates from Orthodox, Protestant, and Anglican churches throughout the world. About one tenth of the total were from the Anglican Communion. In addition there were hundreds of nonvoting participants and accredited visitors in many categories, including representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and other non-member churches, other ecumenical agencies, guests from other faiths, a contingent of youth serving as stewards, staff, and media persons. (As this report had to be completed before the Assembly took place, the final results of the Assembly will be reported to the Church and to the General Convention by other means.)

Since the Vancouver Assembly, Episcopal Church participation in the WCC has grown. This Church had delegates at the four major consultations in this period: the Commission on Inter-Church Aid, Refugee, and World Service (CICARWS) at Larnaca, Cyprus; Resource Sharing at El Escorial, Spain; Mission and Evangelism at San Antonio, Texas; and Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation at Seoul, South Korea. This Church also provided two members of the 120-member Faith and Order Commission, as well as a participant in the working groups attached to sub-units of the major program units: Inter-Church Aid, Refugee and World Service; Dialogue with People of Living Faiths; Program to Combat Racism; Education; Women in Church and Society; and Theological Education.

Faith and Order has completed its evaluation and summary of the official responses of the world's churches to the agreed text *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Episcopal Church response in *The Blue Book*, 1985, pp. 50-54 and *Journal* 1985, pp. 489-90). To address concerns expressed in the churches' responses, major issues requiring further study are Scripture and Tradition, Sacrament and Sacramentality, and Ecclesiology. Other on-going studies are (1) towards the common expression of the apostolic faith today, focusing on the use and meaning of the Nicene Creed, and (2) the Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community.

At the 69th General Convention, the Executive Council and the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations jointly presented a major report on "Participation in the National Council of the Churches of Christ and the World Council of Churches." This past triennium was a time to begin implementing the recommendations in that report. The Presiding Bishop and Ecumenical Officer have sought to bring the mission priorities of the North American churches to the attention of the Council through meetings of the

U.S. Conference of the World Council. The Executive Council continues its work on racism in the light of the work of the Program to Combat Racism. The Executive Council has given attention to World Council statements on public issues. The relationship between the Anglican Communion with its several provinces and the World Council is on the agenda of the Anglican Consultative Council, assisted by an Ecumenical Advisory Group consisting of provincial ecumenical officers.

An area of great concern is the current financial crisis of the World Council, related in part to the sharp decline of the U.S. dollar. Spending has been reduced, but the U.S. member churches are asked to increase their grants to help offset the losses.

The Canberra Assembly program was built upon the work of the WCC in recent years as described above. The overall Assembly theme was “Come, Holy Spirit — Renew the Whole Creation.” This was the first assembly theme in the form of a prayer and the first to concentrate on the third person of the Trinity. Sub-themes dealt with the theological understanding of creation and its implications for a Christian response to the ecological crisis; new signs of the Spirit, activity and new forms of spirituality today; the interrelated concerns for justice, peace and the integrity or sustainability of the natural order; and the role of the Spirit in the search for both Christian unity and the unity of humankind. At the heart of the Assembly theme was the question of what it means to confess God as the author of life and to speak of the Spirit as the one who nourishes, sustains, sanctifies and renews life.

Plenary sessions presented testimonies from churches around the world on how they hear the Spirit speaking to them, showed the life and struggle of aboriginal Australians, and introduced such ecumenical topics as Christian unity; justice, peace and the integrity of creation (JPIC); the Ecumenical Decade — Churches in Solidarity with Women; and ecumenical sharing. Other plenaries were devoted to the war in the Persian Gulf and Assembly business — elections, finance, public issues, and WCC program policy.

For a full account of the many-sided work of the World Council of Churches and a more detailed introduction to the themes of the Canberra Assembly, see *Vancouver to Canberra, 1983-1991; Let the Spirit Speak to the Churches*; and the Bible studies, *Come, Holy Spirit — Renew the Whole Creation*, available through the WCC New York office at 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115.

Resolution #A056

Seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches

Resolved, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
 1 **give thanks for the leadership provided by the Seventh Assembly of the World Coun-**
 2 **cil of Churches which, in prayer and deliberation, called member churches to focus**
 3 **our energies on the theme *Come, Holy Spirit — Renew the Whole Creation*; and be**
 4 **it further**

5 *Resolved*, **That this 70th General Convention reaffirm Section V, B (3,d) of the report**
 6 **adopted by the 69th General Convention, *Participation in the National Council of the***
 7 ***Churches of Christ and the World Council of Churches*: “The delegation [to the WCC**
 8 **Assembly] should report to the SCER and Executive Council, and individual delegates**
 9 **to groups in local areas”;** and be it further

10 *Resolved*, **That this 70th General Convention request that the Partnerships Committee**
 11 **of the Executive Council, in consultation with delegates to the Assembly, determine**
 12 **how recommendations of the Assembly may affect the mission imperatives of the**
 13 **Episcopal Church; and be it further**

THE BLUE BOOK

14 *Resolved*, That this 70th General Convention request the bishops and other leaders
 15 of the Episcopal Church dioceses in Central and South America, Mexico, and the Carib-
 16 bean region to determine how recommendations of the WCC Assembly may affect
 17 mission imperatives in these dioceses.

Resolution #A057

Ecumenical Decade in Solidarity with Women

1 *Resolved*, the House of _____ concurring, **That this 70th General Convention**
 2 **affirm its support for the Ecumenical Decade in Solidarity with Women, and urge the**
 3 **Executive Council to give attention to this World Council of Churches venture in secur-**
 4 **ing funding and participation by church leadership.**

FINANCIAL REPORT

	Authorized Budget	Actual Expenditures
Appropriated by the 1988 General Con- vention for the 1989-1991 triennium	<u>\$125,736</u>	
Budget as revised by the Joint Standing Committee on Program, Budget, and Finance, on recommendations of its General Convention Expense Section		
1989	\$ 49,814	\$ 47,345
1990	42,691	43,667
1991	<u>34,290</u>	<u>21,072*</u>
	<u>\$126,795</u>	<u>\$111,113*</u>

*through 1/31/91

REQUEST FOR BUDGET APPROPRIATION

Plenary Meetings of SCER (five to be held)	\$ 62,529
Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Consultation (three)	7,816
Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation (three)	15,632
Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation (four)	22,856
Consultation on Church Union Executive Committee (nine)	15,885
Consultation on Church Union, Unity and Justice Task Force (three)	3,530
Historic Black Methodist Episcopal-Episcopal Dialogue (three)	15,632
Lutheran-Episcopal Coordinating Committee (six)	14,120
Polish National Catholic-Episcopal Working Group (three)	7,060
Linkage with Episcopal Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (EDEO)	2,143
Consultation on the Church: Its Unity and Mission	<u>5,000</u>
	<u>\$172,203</u>

Resolution #A058

Request for Budget Appropriation

Resolved, The House of _____ concurring, **That the 70th General Convention**
appropriate for the work of the Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations dur-
ing the 1992-1994 triennium the sum of \$172,203 from the Assessment Budget of the
General Convention.

APPENDIX

EPISCOPAL CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES

The Seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches

United States

The Presiding Bishop
The Rev. Fran Toy
Ms. Judy Conley
Mr. Tolley Keith Estes
Mr. George McGonigle
Ms. Jennifer Rehm

Caribbean/Latin America

The Rt. Rev. James H. Ottley
Ms. Sarai Osnaya
Miss Virginia Norman

Asia

The Rev. Wang Hsien-Chih

The Governing Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ

The Presiding Bishop
The Rt. Rev. Craig B. Anderson
The Rt. Rev. Rustin. R. Kimsey (1988-1989)
The Rt. Rev. David B. Reed
The Rev. J. Carleton Hayden
The Rev. Barnett Jackson
The Rev. John Kitagawa (1990-1991)
The Rev. William B. Lawson
The Rev. William A. Norgren
Dr. Robert Bottoms
Mrs. Pamela Chinnis
Mrs. Glennes Clifford
Ms. Naomi Diaz (1988)
Mrs. Eugenie Havemeyer
Dr. Alda Morgan (1990-1991)
Mr. Albert Rodriguez (1988-1989)
Mrs. Anne Shire
Mrs. Joanna Fitts Ware

Anglican-Orthodox Theological Consultation

The Rt. Rev. David B. Reed
The Rt. Rev. Mark Dyer
The Very Rev. John H. Backus
The Rev. Julia Gatta
The Rev. William B. Green
The Rev. Lloyd G. Patterson, Jr.
Dr. E. Rozanne Elder
Dr. Paul Valliere

THE BLUE BOOK

Anglican-Roman Catholic Consultation
The Rt. Rev. A. Theodore Eastman
The Rt. Rev. Frank T. Griswold, III
The Rev. Bruce Griffith
The Rev. Eleanor McLaughlin
The Rev. Charles P. Price
The Rev. Philip Turner
Dr. Marsha Dutton
Dr. William Franklin

Consultation on Church Union
The Rt. Rev. William G. Burrill
The Rev. Alice Cowan

Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue
The Rt. Rev. William G. Weinbauer
The Rt. Rev. Mark Dyer
The Rt. Rev. Richard Grein
The Rev. L. William Countryman
The Rev. John R. Kevern
The Very Rev. William Petersen
The Very Rev. John H. Rodgers, Jr.