

From Waterloo to Windsor:  
the Proposed Anglican Covenant  
in Light of Anglican-Lutheran Co-operation in Canada

Alan T Perry  
Cardiff University  
15 August 2006

## *Introduction*

In July 2001, meeting simultaneously in different venues in Waterloo, Ontario, the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada and the National Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada each adopted a resolution giving effect to an agreement known as the Waterloo Declaration, creating a relationship of Full Communion between the two churches.<sup>1</sup> In October 2004, the Lambeth Commission on Communion issued a report, the *Windsor Report*, which included a proposal for a covenant to be adopted by the member churches of the Anglican Communion.<sup>2</sup> This essay will explore the proposed Anglican Covenant in light of the Waterloo Declaration.

## *The Waterloo Declaration*

The Waterloo Declaration consists of three parts: an extensive Preface; a Joint Declaration; and a Conclusion. The Preface rehearses at some length the history of dialogue between the Anglican and Lutheran Churches, both internationally and in Canada, culminating with an agreement for interim eucharistic sharing begun in 1989<sup>3</sup> and renewed in 1995<sup>4</sup> as a step toward full communion. The Preface also provides a definition of full communion, which involves maintenance of autonomy by each partner church, formal mutual recognition of each other as authentic churches with valid orders, and, most interestingly, a series of freedoms. These freedoms include: “transferability of members;

---

<sup>1</sup> *Called to Full Communion (The Waterloo Declaration)*. Waterloo, Ontario: National Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada and the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, 2001. Cited hereafter as *Waterloo Declaration*.

<sup>2</sup> The Lambeth Commission on Communion, *The Windsor Report 2004*, London: Anglican Communion Office, 2004, pp. 65ff. Cited hereafter as *Windsor Report*.

<sup>3</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph 6.

mutual recognition and interchangeability of ministries; freedom to use each other's liturgies; freedom to participate in each other's ordinations and installations of clergy, including bishops; and structures for consultation to express, strengthen, and enable our common life, witness, and service, to the glory of God and the salvation of the world."<sup>5</sup>

The Joint Declaration section of the text begins with a series of affirmations regarding the full authenticity of both churches, using phrases developed at the Reformation and contained in the Augsburg Confession and the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion.<sup>6</sup> It goes on to affirm the authenticity of faith<sup>7</sup> and validity of the episcopacy of both churches,<sup>8</sup> and of the other ordained ministries.<sup>9</sup> Significantly, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada agrees to understand episcopal installation as ordination for life, notwithstanding its continued practice of election to a term in office.<sup>10</sup> This was obviously a matter of concern for Anglicans in the negotiations. The Joint Declaration contains a statement that declares the two churches "to be in full communion"<sup>11</sup> and then includes a series of commitments to exercise the above-enumerated freedoms, "to work towards a common understanding of diaconal ministry,"<sup>12</sup> another Anglican concern, and to develop the relationship

---

<sup>5</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph A1.

<sup>7</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph A2.

<sup>8</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraphs A3-A4.

<sup>9</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph A5.

<sup>10</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph A6c.

<sup>11</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph B.

<sup>12</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph C3.

through “consultation and collaboration”<sup>13</sup> and development of structures for implementation of the Declaration.<sup>14</sup> The final commitment made by the two churches is “to continue to work together for the full visible unity of the Church of God.”<sup>15</sup>

The Waterloo Declaration concludes with an expression of thanksgiving to God for what has been achieved and an engagement to undertake the mission that has been enabled by the new relationship between the two churches.<sup>16</sup>

A few points concerning the Waterloo Declaration should be noted. First, although it uses the language of doctrine, the Declaration does not specify in detail any doctrinal position for either of the two partner churches. It is not a confessional document in nature, nor does it require propositional assent of the partners. The Declaration indicates at least one area of ongoing discussion - the nature of the diaconate - the absence of agreement on which does not preclude entering into a relationship of Full Communion. A second point is the relatively short length of the Declaration. Much more could be said about commonalities between the two churches, but the authors of the Declaration seem to have opted to say less, rather than more, about the beliefs and practices of the two churches, focusing instead on a detailed history of collaboration between the two churches, both internationally and domestically. The third point is related to that history of collaboration, for the Declaration is the product of many years of dialogue, discussion, co-operation

---

<sup>13</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph C5.

<sup>14</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraphs C4-C7

<sup>15</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Paragraph C8.

<sup>16</sup> *Waterloo Declaration*, Conclusion.

and negotiation. It is both the end of a process of growing together and the beginning of a new process of growth in partnership.

### *The Proposed Anglican Covenant*

The proposed Anglican Covenant was offered by the Lambeth Commission on Communion as a discussion document,<sup>17</sup> a model of the sort of agreement that might bring canonical clarity to the nature of the Anglican Communion, given tension between the principle of provincial autonomy, on the one hand, and communion on the other.<sup>18</sup>

It is important to note that the Anglican Covenant is not offered as a fully-formed document for adoption by the Provinces. *The Windsor Report* warns that “this is only a preliminary draft and discussion document, and at this stage it would be premature for any church to adopt it.”<sup>19</sup> Notwithstanding this warning, at least one church has already indicated a willingness to adopt the draft covenant in its current form.<sup>20</sup>

Following a brief Preamble, The Anglican Covenant consists of five Parts, containing a series of twenty-seven Articles. The first Part, labelled “Common Identity” rehearses aspects of the similarities among the Provinces of the Anglican Communion, including faith, sacraments, ministry

---

<sup>17</sup> *Windsor Report*, p. 48.

<sup>18</sup> See *Windsor Report* pp. 34-38.

<sup>19</sup> *Windsor Report*, p. 48.

<sup>20</sup> “Communiqué from the Episcopal Synod of the Church of Nigeria (Anglican Communion)” *Anglican Communion News Service* bulletin 4162, 4 July 2006.

and mission, understanding and autonomous polity.<sup>21</sup>

The second Part of the Covenant outlines the nature of Communion, as a “gift of God, who is a communion of three persons.”<sup>22</sup> Communion is seen as a process toward an eschatological reality which will “never [be] perfected until God’s Kingdom is all in all.”<sup>23</sup> It is described as a “pilgrimage towards truth” undertaken by the member churches in light of “the mutual acknowledgement ... of their common identity.”<sup>24</sup>

The third Part of the Covenant lists a series of commitments which flow from the mutual responsibility inherent in the nature of Communion<sup>25</sup>. These commitments include, working for the common good of the Anglican Communion “in all essential matters of common concern,”<sup>26</sup> maintaining the “faith, order and tradition, and moral values and vision of humanity received by and developed in the fellowship of member churches,”<sup>27</sup> continuing the administration of the Dominical sacraments and welcoming participation therein by members of the other member churches,<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> *Windsor Report*, pp. 65f.

<sup>22</sup> Article 6(1), *Windsor Report*, p. 66.

<sup>23</sup> Article 8(1), *Windsor Report*, p. 66.

<sup>24</sup> Article 8(1-2), *Windsor Report*, p. 66.

<sup>25</sup> “Communion involves responsibilities so that each church may be more fully completed in, through and by its relations with other member churches, having regard for their common good.” Article 8(3), *Windsor Report*, p. 66.

<sup>26</sup> Article 9(2), *Windsor Report*, p. 67.

<sup>27</sup> Article 10(1), *Windsor Report*, P. 67.

<sup>28</sup> Article 11, *Windsor Report*, p. 67.

maintaining “the historic threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons” and recognising the orders of the other member churches,<sup>29</sup> and otherwise co-operating in the work, prayer, liturgical celebrations and mission of the other member churches and their members.<sup>30</sup>

Part IV of the Covenant defines the autonomy of the Provinces, reflecting the tension between the legitimate exercise of autonomy<sup>31</sup> and the “fiduciary duty” of each member “to exercise its autonomy in communion.”<sup>32</sup> Autonomy serves the need of each member church for “the greatest possible liberty to order its life and affairs, appropriate to its Christian people in their geographical, cultural and historical context” and is to be respected by the member churches.<sup>33</sup>

The fifth Part of the Covenant establishes procedures for “management of communion issues”, in effect constituting a dispute-settling mechanism.<sup>34</sup> “Communion issues” are defined as “those essential matters of common concern to the member churches of the Communion”.<sup>35</sup> The determination of whether a given matter is a communion issue is left to the Instruments of Unity.<sup>36</sup> The Instruments of Unity are described, their collective role being “to discern our common mind in

---

<sup>29</sup> Article 12, *Windsor Report*, p. 67.

<sup>30</sup> *Windsor Report*, pp. 67f.

<sup>31</sup> Article 19, *Windsor Report*, p. 69.

<sup>32</sup> Article 21(1), *Windsor Report*, p. 69.

<sup>33</sup> Article 22, *Windsor Report*, p. 69.

<sup>34</sup> *Windsor Report*, pp. 70f.

<sup>35</sup> Article 23(1), *Windsor Report*, p. 70.

<sup>36</sup> Article 23(3), *Windsor Report*, p. 70.

communion issues.”<sup>37</sup> A new position is mandated for every member church for an Anglican Communion Liaison Officer, whose role is “to defend the bonds of communion expressed in this Covenant”<sup>38</sup> and a process is established for that Officer to submit “any contentious communion issue” to the Archbishop of Canterbury for guidance or for referral to the other Instruments of Unity.<sup>39</sup> Finally, the Archbishop of Canterbury is given the authority to interpret the Covenant, subject to approval by the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates’ Meeting and Anglican Consultative Council.<sup>40</sup>

As noted above, the proposed Anglican Covenant is more of a discussion paper than a concrete proposal. As such, any analysis of the Covenant is inevitably hypothetical. Although there has been substantial support for the idea of some form of Covenant in the Communion,<sup>41</sup> any covenant ultimately adopted might be very different from the proposal in the *Windsor Report*. Any Covenant which might be arrived at will necessarily be the product of a process of discussion, debate and negotiation. The proposal now before the Communion is in fact not the Covenant as published, but the idea of a Covenant which might look something like that contained in the *Windsor Report*. With that caveat, a few comments are in order.

---

<sup>37</sup> Article 24, *Windsor Report*, p. 70.

<sup>38</sup> Article 25, *Windsor Report*, p. 70.

<sup>39</sup> Article 26, *Windsor Report*, p. 70.

<sup>40</sup> Article 27, *Windsor Report*, p. 71.

<sup>41</sup> Joint Standing Committee, *Towards an Anglican Covenant: A Consultation Paper on the Covenant Proposal of the Windsor Report*, London: Anglican Communion Office, March 2006, p. 1. Cited hereafter as *Towards an Anglican Covenant*.

The proposed Covenant emerges from a period of heated dispute over the formal approval for a rite to bless same-sex unions in one diocese in the Communion and the election and subsequent consecration of an openly gay man as bishop in another.<sup>42</sup> Thus, although a Covenant can be described as serving a variety of purposes,<sup>43</sup> the original purpose is clearly to “assist the process of reconciliation post-Windsor.”<sup>44</sup> The extensive discussion of the common identity of the member churches<sup>45</sup> is analogous to a marriage counsellor encouraging a couple in conflict to list the various positive qualities of each others’ characters and areas of commonality in their relationship. The mere process of producing such a list may help the couple, or the member churches of the Communion, to recall what brings them together in the first place, and to become more open to resuming dialogue.

### *Waterloo and Windsor*

The Waterloo Declaration is a bilateral agreement between two similar denominational churches of different heritages which occupy the same territory, and thus substantially share the same geographical, cultural and historical contexts. The proposed Anglican Covenant, and indeed any Anglican Covenant, would be a multi-lateral agreement between churches which share the same heritage but which occupy different territories and thus find themselves in very different geographical, cultural and even historical contexts. Whilst it would be equally true to say that a Canadian Anglican is in a relationship with a Canadian Lutheran and in a relationship with a Nigerian Anglican, the points of contact and the nature of the two relationships are very different,

---

<sup>42</sup> Described as “surface symptoms” of illness in *Windsor Report*, pp. 16ff.

<sup>43</sup> *Towards an Anglican Covenant*, p. 3.

<sup>44</sup> *ibid.* See *Windsor Report*, pp. 118ff.

<sup>45</sup> Anglican Covenant, Part I, *Windsor Report*, pp. 65f.

even setting aside any consideration of tensions in the latter relationship.

Where Waterloo speaks of acquiring and exercising new freedoms, as a result of removing barriers to co-operation, Windsor speaks of exercising restraint in the use of autonomy. Thus the proposed Covenant is much more detailed in respect to the commitments of relationship and the necessary restraints on the exercise of autonomy than the Waterloo Declaration. The commitments in Waterloo are to worship, work and meet together in order that a relationship may flourish. The commitments in Windsor are to maintain and uphold the faith, continue to administer the sacraments, maintain the three-fold orders of ministry and to avoid causing disunity. The concern in Waterloo is to foster a new relationship; the concern in Windsor is to re-establish an old one, or to prevent it from disintegrating. Where Windsor contains a process for “Management of Communion Issues”, described above as a dispute-settling mechanism, Waterloo makes no such provision.

If it is true that “canon law is applied ecclesiology”<sup>46</sup> then it is essential to understand the ecclesiological assumptions underlying any Covenant. And here we may have a clue as to the fundamental issues at stake in the Communion. The Windsor Report correctly notes that the presenting issues of disagreement about sexuality are in fact “surface symptoms” of a deeper disagreement.<sup>47</sup> But perhaps even the six “deeper symptoms” of theological development, ecclesiastical procedures, adiaphora, subsidiarity, trust and authority identified by the Windsor

---

<sup>46</sup> Robert Ombres, “Why then the law?” *New Blackfriars* 1974, p. 296 at 302.

<sup>47</sup> *Windsor Report*, pp. 16ff.

Commission<sup>48</sup> are not yet at the base of the current conflict. It is tempting to see the current conflict as a conflict between scriptural authority and cultural context, or between two competing methods of scriptural interpretation, or even between authority and autonomy. In fact, the fundamental dispute is a conflict between two different ecclesiologies, one of which prefers centralised authority, usually in the service of conformity, and the other of which favours decentralised authority, usually in the service of diversity. These two ecclesiologies have long cohabited in Anglicanism.

Formally, Anglicanism values diversity and includes provincial autonomy as a necessary servant of that diversity, to the extent that diversity arises from geographical and cultural context. Thus, for example, it is possible for Anglicanism to allow for a limited acceptance of polygamy in provinces where that is culturally appropriate, without encouraging it in provinces where it is not already culturally entrenched, as “[t]his Conference upholds monogamy as God’s plan, and as the ideal relationship of love between husband and wife.”<sup>49</sup> But diversity arises not only as a result of cultural and geographical context, but also from theological, liturgical and perhaps even psychosocial preferences. These sources of diversity cut across provincial lines. Furthermore, at least some provinces, Canada notably among them, are multicultural in nature. Thus, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has recently noted, “[t]he divisions don’t run just between national bodies at a distance, they are at work in each locality....”<sup>50</sup> At times of dispute, particularly when the limits of diversity or autonomy are being tested, there is a temptation to seek to invoke a centralised authority, such

---

<sup>48</sup> *Windsor Report*, pp. 20ff.

<sup>49</sup> Resolution 26, Lambeth Conference 1988, in Roger Coleman, ed., *Resolutions of the twelve Lambeth Conferences 1867-1988*. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1992, pp. 211f.

<sup>50</sup> Rowan Williams, “The Challenge and Hope of Being an Anglican Today: A Reflection for the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion.” 2006.

as the authority of scripture, or of the Lambeth Conference, or of the Archbishop of Canterbury to resolve the dispute. However, as Archbishop Williams has noted , “the idea of an Archbishop of Canterbury resolving any of this is misplaced, however tempting for many.”<sup>51</sup>

### *Toward a Covenant*

If an Anglican Covenant is to be adopted, then a number of steps must occur first. The first step is to consider the matter of instrument choice. The Windsor Commission has advanced an argument that a Covenant of some kind is desirable, but the debate on whether such a Covenant is in fact the correct instrument in the current climate is ongoing. The question to be addressed is what is hoped to be achieved. The authors of “Towards an Anglican Covenant” caution that “[t]he formulation and adoption of a covenant [will be] unable to resolve our current difficulties...”<sup>52</sup> Similarly, Bagshaw warns that “law cannot create a unity or coherence which does not otherwise exist. On the contrary, the use of legal processes as weapons is likely to further entrench and polarize conflict.”<sup>53</sup> Thus, the second question to be addressed, given that a Covenant is desirable, is whether, in the current climate of mistrust and even open hostility, the time is opportune for the formulation of such a Covenant. It may be that, in the absence of a prior cessation of hostilities there will be a misplaced hope that the Covenant can resolve the dispute. Another danger is that the Covenant will reflect the context of dispute more than the hope for a fruitful partnership in the future. This is clear in the current draft proposal, and all the more so when it is compared with the Waterloo Declaration.

---

<sup>51</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> *Towards an Anglican Covenant*, p. 3.

<sup>53</sup> Paul Bagshaw, “Doctrine, Law and Law Courts”, *Theology* CVIII number 845 p. 347 at 352.

A fundamental issue that must be tackled is a clear agreement on the ecclesiological foundations of the Anglican Communion, and which will underpin any Covenant that is negotiated. There will be a temptation to see the Covenant as a step toward a universal Code of Canon Law, along the lines of either the Latin or Eastern Catholic Codes, but both of these models are foreign to authentic Anglican ecclesiology. Rather than a universal species of law, the model called for in pursuit of a Covenant is in fact more akin to international law. The development of an international, multi-lateral and decentralised species of canon law, rather than the more familiar universal and centralised form, would be a significant step in the relations of the Anglican Communion, and ultimately perhaps an equally significant step in ecumenical relations. If this is the correct model, it would be salutary to include experts in international law in its development.

A fourth question that must be addressed is whether to opt to attempt to say rather less or more in the Covenant. As the authors of “Towards an Anglican Covenant” have warned, “[i]f the covenant were too detailed, it might prove too restrictive or inflexible to address unforeseen future challenges; if it were too general, it might commit the Communion to little or nothing: in either case, it would be inadequate.”<sup>54</sup> However, alongside the Archbishop of Canterbury’s suggestion that “[i]t is necessarily an ‘opt-in’ matter”<sup>55</sup> there is also a danger that erring on the side of saying too much will increase the likelihood that some provinces will be unable, or unwilling, to “opt in.” In the context of the current conflict, or in an immediate post-conflict context, this is a danger that should be avoided. If the development of an Anglican Covenant is truly seen as a first step in the development

---

<sup>54</sup> *Towards an Anglican Covenant*, p. 2.

<sup>55</sup> Williams

of a new species of canon law,<sup>56</sup> then perhaps first steps can afford to be modest in their ambitions, erring on the side of saying too little for the sake of including all members of the Communion. In this way the Covenant itself could function as a visible and effective, albeit modest, incarnation of the “fifth instrument of unity.”

Archbishop Williams notes that, contrary to issuing decrees, “[t]he Archbishop of Canterbury presides and convenes in the Communion....”<sup>57</sup> If it is the role of the Archbishop as an Instrument of Unity to convene, an important role of the other Instruments of Unity is to gather in response to that convening.<sup>58</sup> Thus, the proposed Covenant includes a requirement that no bishop shall “unreasonably refuse any invitation to attend meetings of the Instruments of Unity.”<sup>59</sup> The temptation for one of the Instruments of Unity to marginalise, disinvite or exclude some participants, a temptation to which the Primates’ Meeting succumbed in 2005,<sup>60</sup> is for that Instrument to become one of disunity. Thus, if the Covenant is to be an effective force for unity, it must make itself as inviting as necessary for all provinces to become signatories. The Waterloo Declaration in its brevity says what needs to be said to remove barriers to co-operation, and not much more, creating maximum freedom to allow the relationship of Full Communion to flourish. This may be a salutary

---

<sup>56</sup> Future historians might see the Constitution of the Anglican Consultative Council as the first step, making the Covenant the second. For the Constitution, see *Handbook of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada* 14<sup>th</sup> Edition. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 2005, pp. 160-165.

<sup>57</sup> Williams

<sup>58</sup> Former Canadian Primate, Archbishop Michael Peers, was fond of quoting Archbishop Desmond Tutu that the nature of the Anglican Communion is that “we meet.” Archbishop Peers once reported that he had made this quote in the presence of Archbishop Tutu, who claimed never to have said it, though he wished he had.

<sup>59</sup> Article 13(2)(d), *Windsor Report*, p. 67.

<sup>60</sup> See “The Anglican Communion Primates’ Meeting Communiqué, February 2005” paragraph 14.

model for an Anglican Covenant.

The fifth question to be addressed is whether, and if so to what extent, a dispute-settling mechanism is desirable in a Covenant. It would be foolishly naïve to suggest that there will be no conflict in the Communion once the present conflict is settled. All relationships involve conflict. But, as Bagshaw suggests, “the use of legal processes as weapons is likely to further entrench and polarize conflict.”<sup>61</sup>

The question is whether inclusion of a dispute-settling mechanism would constitute provision of weapons with which to carry out conflict between provinces, or to be used for the internationalisation of intra-provincial conflicts, particularly in a province with a litigious culture. If such an eventuality is to be avoided, great care will have to be taken in including any form of dispute-settling mechanism.

Sixth, if some form of dispute-settling mechanism is to be included in a Covenant, care will have to be taken not to undermine the roles of the Instruments of Unity by involving them too closely in the mechanism. The Instruments of Unity must remain free to convene and to gather, and thus continue to be forces that draw the Communion together. Perhaps this can best be accomplished by attending to the usual question of separation of powers in governance, and establishing a fully independent body rather than the Council of Advice as currently envisioned.<sup>62</sup>

Seventh, defining “communion issues” is likely to be the matter of great contention, given the

---

<sup>61</sup> Bagshaw, p. 352.

<sup>62</sup> See Articles 24 and 27, *Windsor Report*, pp. 70f.

necessary absence of guidelines for deciding whether a given matter of controversy is actually a “communion issue.” Obviously the mere assertion that one Province has said or done something that offends another or, just as likely, the assertion by a minority within a Province that it feels aggrieved by a decision taken by that Province, is not enough to determine that the matter is truly a communion issue. In the end, it is likely to be similar to Canadian courts’ definition of pornography, as illustrated by the oft-quoted maxim that “we can’t define it precisely, but we know it when we see it.” Whilst it is salutary to remind autonomous churches in communion that “what touches all should be approved by all”<sup>63</sup> there will need to be substantial agreement on what truly does “touch all”.

Finally, it must be noted that the task of formulating an Anglican Covenant is substantial, and will require time to do well. “Towards an Anglican Covenant” suggests a timeline of five to eight years for implementation.<sup>64</sup> This may be rather optimistic, not least because it will allow for only one consultation of the Lambeth Conference, and that only early in the process. For the Anglican Church of Canada, and perhaps for other member churches, even the process of approval of a Covenant is likely to take an absolute minimum of three or four years, to allow two meetings on its three-year cycle for the General Synod to consult with the dioceses and internal provinces. Implementation of the Covenant might take a further two cycles of meetings. Again, with respect to the Waterloo Declaration, it is worth noting that there is related legislation awaiting second reading in 2007, fully six years after the Waterloo Declaration was adopted by the two churches.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Article 20(3), *Windsor Report*, p. 69.

<sup>64</sup> *Towards an Anglican Covenant*, pp. 6f.

<sup>65</sup> See *Handbook*, p. 158.

## *Conclusion*

At its best, the Anglican Communion is a glorious project: a world-wide family of churches each of which seeks faithfully to incarnate the Gospel with attention both to its own particular context and to the wider Communion.<sup>66</sup> In recent times, the Communion has not been at its best, marked by disagreement, mistrust and even open hostility. If an Anglican Covenant is to be adopted, it will be important to attend to the balance between setting forth the vision of the Communion at its best and enshrining mechanisms to protect the Communion from itself at its worst. In the current climate, there is a very real danger that the latter could overshadow the former. If so, then an important opportunity risks being lost. An Anglican Covenant could be, and should be, a new and fresh instrument of unity, even a new species of international canon law, inspiring the member churches with a vision of the Communion at its best and calling them to continue to strive toward the perfect unity in respectful and creative diversity, not only of the Anglican Communion, but of the whole church, an eschatological reality which will be fully revealed when “God’s Kingdom is all in all.”<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> For a vision of this family of churches, see Williams, under the heading of “The Anglican Identity.”

<sup>67</sup> Article 8(1), *Windsor Report*, p. 66.

## *Bibliography*

### **Anglican Legislation**

*Handbook of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada* 14<sup>th</sup> Edition. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 2005.

### **Joint Anglican and Lutheran Legislation**

*Called to Full Communion (The Waterloo Declaration)*. Waterloo, Ontario: National Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada and the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, 2001. From <http://www.elcic.ca/docs/waterloo.html> as accessed 12 August 2006

### **Books and Articles**

The Lambeth Commission on Communion, *The Windsor Report 2004*, London: Anglican Communion Office, 2004.

Joint Standing Committee, *Towards an Anglican Covenant: A Consultation Paper on the Covenant Proposal of the Windsor Report*, London: Anglican Communion Office, March 2006.

“The Anglican Communion Primates’ Meeting Communiqué, February 2005” *Anglican Communion News Service* bulletin 3948, 24 February 2005, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/articles/39/00/acns3948.cfm> as accessed 13 August 2006

“Communiqué from the Episcopal Synod of the Church of Nigeria (Anglican Communion)” *Anglican Communion News Service* bulletin 4162, 4 July 2006, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/articles/41/50/acns4162.cfm> as accessed 12 August 2006

Bagshaw, Paul, "Doctrine, Law and Law Courts" *Theology* CVIII number 845 pp. 347-353.

Coleman, Roger, ed., *Resolutions of the twelve Lambeth Conferences 1867-1988*. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1992.

Ombres, Robert, "Why then the law?" *New Blackfriars* 1974, pp. 296-304.

Williams, Rowan, "The Challenge and Hope of Being an Anglican Today: A Reflection for the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion"  
[http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/sermons\\_speeches/060627%20Archbishop%20-%20challenge%20and%20hope%20reflection.htm](http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/sermons_speeches/060627%20Archbishop%20-%20challenge%20and%20hope%20reflection.htm) as accessed 13 August 2006