

The Lambeth Conference 2008

Self Select Session on ‘Growing Together in Unity and Mission: Avenues for Cooperation’ (1)

Drawing from the recent Anglican – Roman Catholic Agreed Statement *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*, this session considered ‘the story so far’ and reflected on practical examples of the sort of joint action in mission to which our shared faith invites us.

The session was chaired by the Rt Revd Ted Gulick, Bishop of Kentucky, and contributions were made by Cardinal Cormac Murphy O’Connor, Dame Mary Tanner, European President of the World Council of Churches, and the Most Revd David Moxon, Bishop of Waikato and Co-Presiding Bishop of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand & Polynesia.

1. Contribution from Cardinal Cormac Murphy O’Connor:

‘Dead in the Water’ or ‘Money in the Bank?’

I want to take advantage of this kind invitation to reflect on my experiences: of what has been going on over these last four decades while we have been in dialogue with each other, and especially in the years when I was intimately involved in the work of ARCIC. There are people on both sides who have become sceptical about this whole enterprise, but I am not one of them.

1. Some ‘biography’

First, a bit about myself. I’ve been involved with the search for unity, and with ARCIC’s work in particular, for a large part of my priestly life. I was appointed Co-Chair of ARCIC 26 years ago and presided over its work with Bishop Mark Santer until 1999. After I stepped down, I have continued to be involved: particularly as a participant in the Mississauga Meeting of Anglican and Catholic bishops which took place in Canada in 2000; and by attempting to implement some of what came from that meeting in the shape of the IARCCUM commission and the proposals in its document, *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*. Here in England and Wales, for example, we had the first joint meeting of Anglican and Catholic bishops a while ago.

When I look back at the time when I started my work with ARCIC it sometimes seems like a different age. They were ‘heady days’. You remember this was back in 1982:

- ARCIC had just published its *Final Report*, which had brought together all the Statements it had produced since it began in 1970: the statements and elucidations about Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry and Ordination, and Authority in the Church.

- All this was very new. Engaging in this sort of dialogue was itself new, and people were genuinely amazed and delighted by what had been done over 12 short years.
- Pope John Paul II was still in the early years of his long papacy. In 1982 he had just paid a landmark pastoral visit to the Catholic community in this country. How well I remember when he visited this city and Archbishop Runcie welcomed him to Canterbury Cathedral. People witnessed that extraordinary sight of the two of them processing down the nave and praying together for unity.
- And here in this city, they had also declared publicly that there was going to be a new ARCIC commission, a second phase of dialogue of which I was to become a co-chair.

Back then, many people were expecting a quick and positive evaluation of ARCIC I's work – after all, the initial hope had been that some concrete intermediate steps on the way towards full communion might result. We were early on in this new enterprise of ecumenical dialogue – and maybe people had not yet fully reckoned with what reception of such documents might require. Even 'high-level' official reception takes time, and it did. A careful process of discussion in the Provinces prepared the way for Lambeth 1988 to recognise the Eucharist and Ministry statements as 'consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans' and the work on Authority as a good basis for further dialogue, especially over the concept of a universal primacy. In the Catholic Church it took even longer before the full Catholic Response came out at the end of 1991 – largely positive about Eucharist and Ministry, and also acknowledging 'remarkable' progress on 'authority'.

One thing we have gradually come to realise is that the reception of any dialogue document involves far more than just its publication or even an official response. It takes time and discussion at every level of the life of the Church, as the path taken by your own 1997 Virginia Report and its proposals shows. And some or all of the contents can prove not to be accepted or received. I know some of our Christian partner communions have had anxieties when the Catholic Church has closely analysed or even questioned some of what has been proposed in dialogue statements. But that has to be an integral part of the process of receiving what a dialogue commission may propose.

2. The changing atmosphere during the time of ARCIC II

While this was going on, ARCIC began its second phase – but the atmosphere was changing. What do I mean by that?

In several respects, when we look back now we can easily see how much in those years was positive: Pope John Paul produced his Encyclical Letter on Commitment to Ecumenism in 1995, for example, the first time such authoritative teaching on ecumenism was given by the Pope. As I hope you know, it is full of a zeal for unity, and rich perspectives flowing from the Second Vatican Council that people are still unpacking a dozen years later; and it contains his remarkable appeal for others to enter into dialogue about how his Petrine ministry may 'accomplish a service of love recognised by all'

(UUS, 95). Two years before that he had issued the Catholic Church's *Ecumenical Directory*, a handbook full of the key principles and guidelines to help every member of the Church engage in the search for unity – and I believe we remain the only Church to have produced such a thorough and positive handbook. And what we had applauded here in Canterbury back in May 1982 revealed what would be one of the main priorities in the Pope's many visits across the world: while he was healthy, and even after he became ill, Pope John Paul met, got to know, and prayed with other Church leaders. Meetings with the Archbishop of Canterbury – seemingly so daring and even controversial back at the outset – have as a result become fraternal and frequent. No longer are they limited to the solemn 'set piece' meetings such as that of Archbishop Coggan in 1987, but have become more informal and increasingly normal.

But the atmosphere had also begun to change, as I said – we gradually became aware that the path to unity might be longer than we had imagined at first, and that some shadows were spreading over our relationship.

- It became increasingly clear that the ordination of women priests and bishops in a growing number of provinces has presented what is for the Catholic Church a major stumbling block to the hoped-for reconciliation of ministries. If our Church does not believe that it can ordain women, in what way is the issue of Anglican ordinations to be overcome? Or to put the matter another way, and this is not meant to be polemical, if Anglicans themselves disagree over this development, and find yourselves unable fully to recognise each other's ministry, how could we?
- It doesn't need me to enlarge upon the divisiveness of some issues of morality. If anybody ever thought that such questions concerned only the individual conscience and had little ecclesial (let alone ecumenical) consequence, events have shown otherwise.

3. The underlying issue in ARCIC II

But I think something else is now emerging which has been hidden in these shadows, something even more fundamental, which is the question of ecclesiology. How do we understand the Church? Where is the Church to be found? Is it a loose federation with a common history and family kinship? Is it a more closely-knit body with developed structures of authority? Moreover, with what instruments does the Spirit enable the Churches to reach binding decisions where necessary? – decisions which can provide clear and focussed guidance about the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and about the moral decisions church members face as they try to follow the Gospel.

These, and questions like them, have emerged in most of our ecumenical dialogues and they have become increasingly pressing within the ecclesial lives of our dialogue partners as well.

What I hope you have noticed is that such matters have been central to all of ARCIC's work:

- The specially written Introduction to *The Final Report* (no.6) already pointed this out: ‘The theme of *koinonia* runs through our Statements, In them we present the eucharist as the effectual sign of *koinonia*, *episcopate* as serving the *koinonia*, and primacy as a visible link and focus of *koinonia*.’
- Those who regarded the Statements of the second phase as rather a ‘ragbag’ failed to notice that what was emerging through them was a deepening doctrine of the Church as *koinonia*. All through the specific themes, the ecclesiology of communion runs like an undercurrent: it’s there in ‘Salvation and the Church’, in ‘Church as Communion’, in ‘Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church’, in ‘The Gift of Authority’ of course and, yes, even in the latter paragraphs of ‘Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ’. ARCIC may have been ahead of the field in seeing just how crucial this is.

It is precisely this issue of ecclesiology which has come to dominate so much discussion within Anglicanism of late. At the heart of *The Virginia Report*, the Covenant process, and in many discussions at this Conference (and indeed at the recent gathering in Jerusalem) is the question of bonds of communion. What are they? How necessary are they? Do they have sufficient strength to be able not only to hold people together but, even more vitally, to deepen communion?

It is this same issue which has impacted on our relationship as well, because our ecumenical journey has in the end to be a journey towards full communion. If we are to make progress through dialogue we must be able to reach a solemn and binding agreement with our dialogue partners. And we want to see a deepening not a lessening of communion in their own ecclesial life.

4. ARCIC II revisited?

ARCIC II’s work has certainly not yet had anything like the same impact as the work of ARCIC I – maybe some disillusion has set in, and certainly the Statements have not been as widely read. But I believe there is great worth in them – and I believe they will yet prove to have been very timely. ARCIC has been addressing *the key issue* – communion, *koinonia*. It’s my hope that people will revisit *Church as Communion*, for example, and also not be too quick to dismiss the concerns approached in *The Gift of Authority* and *Life in Christ*.

Is what was offered in *Church as Communion* really as *obvious* as some thought when the Statement appeared? Was the Commission just calmly discussing, and hopefully deepening, an issue that was ultimately uncontroversial for Anglicans and Catholics? Surely its subject matter touches not only on what we need to resolve together but also on those very issues that Anglicans are now grappling with as a communion. I am not going to go through the document in detail. But take a look again at what it says is needed in paragraph 40, for example: ‘Just as the church has to distinguish between tolerable and intolerable diversity in the expression of the apostolic faith, so in the area of life and practice the church has to discover what is disruptive of its own communion’ – those are words agreed by theologians officially commissioned to represent our two churches.

Or later on in paragraph 43 the Statement says: ‘For all the local churches to be *together in communion*, the one visible communion which God wills, it is required that all the constitutive elements of ecclesial communion are present and mutually recognized in each of them. Thus the visible communion between these churches is complete and their ministers are in communion with each other.’

Then paragraph 45 gives a profound definition, part of which I shall read: ‘it is now possible to describe what constitutes ecclesial communion. It is rooted in the confession of the one apostolic faith, revealed in the Scriptures, and set forth in the Creeds. It is founded upon one baptism. The one celebration of the eucharist is its pre-eminent expression and focus. It necessarily finds expression in shared commitment to the mission entrusted by Christ to his Church. It is a life of shared concern for one another in mutual forbearance, submission, gentleness and love; in the placing of the interests of others above the interests of self; in making room for each other in the body of Christ; in solidarity with the poor and the powerless; and in the sharing of gifts both material and spiritual (cf. Acts 2:44). Also constitutive of life in communion is acceptance of the same basic moral values... For the nurture and growth of this communion, Christ the Lord has provided a ministry of oversight, the fullness of which is entrusted to the episcopate, which has the responsibility of maintaining and expressing the unity of the churches.’

Much in *The Gift of Authority* too is about communion, including this: ‘The mutual interdependence of all the churches is integral to the reality of the Church as God wills it to be. No local church that participates in the living Tradition can regard itself as self-sufficient’ (no.37). Those words arising out of dialogue are meant to be expressive of the inner life of our churches even before they can be a blueprint for restored full communion between us. So I really do hope that people will return to reflect more closely on all that ARCIC has tried to say during the long years of its second phase.

5. Has it been worth it?

It is forty years since *The Malta Report* set Anglicans and Catholics on the way towards unity. Throughout these years, the Catholic Church has always sought dialogue with the Anglican Communion as a whole, with all the challenge that your treasured diversity can sometimes bring to the table. So our Church takes no pleasure at all to see the current strains in your communion – we have committed ourselves to a journey towards unity, so new tensions only slow the progress. But they do seem to concern matters that are very important. These discussions are about the degree of unity in faith necessary for Christians to be in communion, not least so that they may be able to offer the Gospel confidently to the world. Our future dialogue will not be easy until such fundamental matters are resolved, with greater clarity.

People sometimes ask me: ‘Has it been worth it?’ ‘You’ve given a great deal of your life to this work and yet where are the results? Are we any closer yet to being united?’ My answer is ‘Yes, it has.’ I have said many times that I believe the path to unity is like a road with no exit for those who genuinely seek unity and are also seeking the conversion

it requires. That's because I know it is Christ's will that we be one, and however long it takes that has to be our goal. Pope Benedict again and again comes back to this as at the heart of what he is working for.

Moreover, I am sure that the dialogue Statements of ARCIC, whether or not they are accepted in their entirety, do signal real convergence. We now have the substantial consensus between us on Eucharist and about Ministry, indicated by ARCIC's work. To the extent that we have achieved genuine convergence in these and other matters, to that extent we are also drawing nearer to the truth together. If truth really is expressed in these agreements they must sooner or later bear fruit. They are 'money in the bank', whose value will one day be clearly seen. We can already notice one result of this – in the changed relationships of these years, and the ways Anglicans and Catholics can sometimes work together with greater confidence in the faith we share.

So I am not gloomy. Dialogue will continue in some form. Even if we sometimes find it hard to discern just how to go forward we cannot give up on seeking the unity Christ wills. As *The Gift of Authority* puts it so well, 'Only when all believers are united in the common celebration of the Eucharist will the God whose purpose it is to bring all things into unity in Christ be truly glorified by the people of God' (paragraph 33).

2. Contribution from Dame Mary Tanner

The story of IARCCUM begins in the heady days after Vatican II when in 1996 Archbishop Michael Ramsey made that historic visit to Pope Paul VI. Their meeting was a collision of hopes and dreams for the future re-union of our two Communion. They spoke in their Common Declaration of their intention to set up a theological dialogue and also to promote practical contacts and collaboration.

Their idea for a twin track approach was filled out in greater detail by a small preparatory Commission in the *Malta Report*. The Commission envisaged advances in doctrinal agreement and in lived relations going hand in hand, advancing in step like fashion. New stages of relatedness would be established and celebrated at the highest degree of authority on the basis of the agreements and convergences in faith reached. Convergence in faith would be expressed in new forms of shared life, convergence in life. The first stage of phased *rapprochement* had already taken place in the meeting of the Pope and Archbishop and their setting out of the high degree of shared faith that already exists in their Common Declaration.

The ARCIC conversations began, a number of national ARCs were set up to guide and stimulate local co-operation and work was done on mixed marriages.

The theological conversation of the Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission progressed with great speed, producing statements on Eucharist, Ministry and Ordination and Authority. The documents were prepared in conversation with the two Communion. And Elucidations were prepared to answer questions raised in the conversation. The Agreed

Statements, together with Elucidations were published in *The Final Report* which was introduced with a reflection on communion, *koinonia*.

The Final Report of ARCIC was published in 1982 and sent to the churches with two questions :

Can you recognise in these agreed statements the faith of Anglicans/the faith of the Catholic Church – and if you can what are the next concrete steps that might be taken?

The bishops at the 1988 Lambeth Conference were ‘to articulate the mind of the Anglican Communion’. The resolution passed was based upon a collation of the responses of the majority of Provinces. It was here in the story that the plot began to be lost and the vision of Michael Ramsey and Pope Paul VI was forgotten. We can speculate on why this was so. Perhaps because there was no official response of the Roman Catholic Church on the table when the Lambeth bishops came to formulate their response, only the first rather negative reactions in *Observations* from the CDF. Also the matter of women and the episcopate was thought to have a negative effect on the possibility of making progress in lived relations, particularly on two matters which concerned many people, namely Eucharistic sharing and recognition of ministries. The bishops at Lambeth 1988 concentrated almost exclusively in their response on the first theological question and not the question of praxis.

When the Roman Catholic response was issued several years later, the same was true. Theology and not praxis was the emphasis of the response.

ARCIC II was set up and so began another round of intensive and lengthy theological conversations. Perhaps because of fatigue with the study of ecumenical documents there was no conversation with the churches as the documents were formulated. Agreed statements were produced on :*Salvation and the Church; Church as Communion; Morals Communion and the Church; The Gift of Authority; Mary Grace and Hope in Christ*. By this time many lay people had lost the enormous enthusiasm they had had and their hopes for eucharistic sharing evaporated.

In 2000 Archbishop Carey, together with Cardinal Cassidy and the Pope’s blessing called together 13 pairs of bishops (Primates and Heads of Episcopal Conferences) from around the world where Anglicans and Roman Catholics live in the same area. Some came knowing one another and clearly already worked closely, others hardly had met before. The bishops were there to pray together, to exchange their experience of relations at home, to review the state of the theological dialogue and the goal of the dialogue and then to look to the future. Where are we where are we going? It was certainly one of the most moving and extraordinary, meetings I have ever been at. At the end of their time the bishops issued a statement *Communion in Mission*, in which they said that even the things that divide us can’t be compared to all that unites us. They recognised the particular vocation that bishops have in energising the work for unity. The baton was passing from the hands of the ARCIC theologians to the bishops. The bishops called for the setting up of a new Commission – a bishops’ Commission to oversee the preparation

of a Joint Declaration to turn the theological convergence of the theological dialogue into action. So the original Malta vision was back on target.

There was huge enthusiasm for the task among the bishops appointed to serve on the international Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission on Unity and Mission (IARCCUM). The Commission worked swiftly envisaging a Declaration that would sum up the fruit of the 30 year dialogue would highlight remaining areas of difference and then set out a programme for moving together in service and mission. What the bishops envisaged was a Declaration that would be signed at the highest level in both churches and once signed would lead into a new stage of *rapprochement* between the two Communion. Sadly events in the Anglican Communion following the last Lambeth Conference led to a halt being called in the work of IARCCUM as the Roman Catholic Church, understandably, began to ask questions of its partner in dialogue – you say these things about the church and its structure and life and then you act in ways that seem to contradict what has been said in our agreed statements. Little is known of the story of the correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal Kasper of the PCPCU which led to the setting up of a small group of theologians to consider what had happened in the Anglican Communion against the template of the Vision in the ARCIC statements of discernment in communion. After conversations between theologians and letters between Archbishop Rowan and Cardinal Kasper, IARCCUM completed its work in *Growing Together in Mission and Unity*. But the text was no longer seen as a possible declaration to move us into a new stage of evangelical *koinonia* but neither was it simply issued as a study guide. It was published as an Agreed Statement of the group of bishops that composed it.

It is a document written by bishops of our two Communion for bishops and for bishops to study and respond to with their clergy and people. As an episcopal document it is appropriate that it should have high profile here at Lambeth 2008.

Finally, to pick up on the title of Cardinal Cormac’s paper – Dead in the Water or money in the Bank? There is money in the bank – a lot of money, see the large degree of communion in faith – let’s spend it now in responding to the practical suggestions of IARCCUM part II.

3. Contribution from the Most Revd David Moxon

The Anglican - Roman Catholic dialogue internationally was greatly enriched by the papal encyclical of Pope John Paul II, “Ut Unum Sint” based on the words of Jesus in John’s Gospel Chapter 17, verse 11 “So that they may be one, as we are one”. The open generosity and hospitality of the encyclical encouraged many ecumenical partners throughout the world to engage with the question of the role of Peter within the international Christian community as a ministry of presidency in love. Although this engagement always has and continues to involve major challenges and significant obstacles, never the less the call from Jesus to seek deeper and deeper levels of oneness and greater degrees of communion goes on. In particular the 17th chapter of John’s Gospel provides us with a spirituality for exploring unity and communion that can be helpful even when we seem to have reached an impasse. The words “Sanctify them in the

truth; your word is truth. As you have sent me into the world, so I have sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, so that they also may be sanctified in truth” (John 17:17-19) offer us two ways forward: to sanctify ourselves and to be sent in mission, even when our unity is incomplete and problematic. In Aotearoa New Zealand the agenda of the Anglican - Roman Catholic Committee has sought to embody these two ways. We have sought to deepen our prayer life together as a form of sanctification, and we have sought to deepen our collaboration and mission together as a way of being “sent.”

In terms of “sanctification” through prayer we spend time in retreat each year guided alternately by Roman Catholic and Anglican retreat leader each year. We have sought to encourage and maintain nation-wide combined liturgies for the evening of Ash Wednesday at the beginning of Lent. This observance, in solidarity with Christ as He enters the spirituality of his desert time, is now in its tenth year and is widely observed throughout the country as a familiar and welcome opportunity to join Christ in His desert preparation for mission. We have also begun, somewhat tentatively, combined liturgies at the beginning of Advent for the blessing of Advent wreathes.

Our two churches are known for their mutual hospitality in terms of buildings, when buildings are needed by one partner for sacramental or liturgical purposes. There has also been willing collaboration over such programs as, combined Bishops Meetings, the Catechesis of the Good Shepherd, the Alpha Program, the mutual support of religious orders, the commemoration of churches dedicated to Mary, church school strategies, monastic hospitality, and local friendships of many kinds. When the Society of Mary recently sent a Marian Banner around all the churches dedicated to St Mary, they found that the majority were Anglican!

In terms of being “sent” we have sought to encourage collaboration and mission when there is real opportunity. Twice now in the last twenty years Anglican and Roman Catholic Bishops have either co-hosted or lead nation-wide initiatives on justice issues. In both cases extensive preparation logistically, politically and ecclesially resulted in many thousands of people engaging with the government on issues of poverty and human rights. On at least three occasions in recent years Anglican and Roman Catholic Bishops have conferred on matters of national and international justice and put out a number of joint statements to the New Zealand public.

There is a real place for the ongoing work of IARCCUM and ARCIC III, because the resourcing of initiatives such as those above is crucial, in the form of good international theological work and also internationally produced educational resources for mutual collaboration. DVDs, Lenten programs, and international news updates all greatly encourage and stimulate both our prayer and our mission together.

Full organic union between our two churches may seem a somewhat distant prospect, at this time, but ever increasing circles of prayer and ever deepening solidarity in mission will give the Holy Spirit the opportunity to move and indeed to surprise. There is no other way.

Self Select Session on ‘Growing Together in Unity and Mission: Avenues for Cooperation’ (2)

This second session was chaired by the Rt Revd John Hind, Bishop of Chichester, and contributions were made by Monsignor Donald Bolen of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (PCPCU), Dame Mary Tanner, European President of the World Council of Churches, the Rt Revd Lucius Ugorji, Bishop of Umuahia (Nigeria, RC), the Most Revd Anthony Farquhar, Auxilliary Bishop of Down & Connor (N Ireland, RC).

4. Contribution from Dame Mary Tanner:

This isn't a self select to tell the story of IARCCUM again. That was done in the first self select session. This is to concentrate on reviewing where and how life between Anglicans and Roman Catholics has been or might be intensified in the light of the suggestions made in the report *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* (GTUM).

First, one of the most important things for me about GTUM is that it is an agreed statement written by bishops and addressed to bishops. It is, therefore, appropriate that the bishops at Lambeth engage with it.

It's not possible to understand the challenge to deepen relations between Anglicans and Roman Catholics or how to respond to that challenge without understanding the provenance of GTUM.

The Common Declaration issued by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey in 1966, in the heady days after Vatican II, looked forward to Anglican – Roman Catholic relations developing along a twin track approach. The search for agreement in faith and deepening relationships in life.

The report of the Preparatory Commission endorsed this twin track approach and talked of moving in stages of phased *rapprochement* when the theological agreements and convergences would lead to intensified relations in life. Each new stage would be marked by a Declaration solemnly celebrated. The first phase of phased *rapprochement* had come in the Declaration of Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Michael Ramsey.

There was rapid and considerable success in the work of ARCIC as well as the setting up of national and regional ARCs and work was done on mixed marriages. The Agreed Statements of ARCIC were prepared in consultation with the two Communion, and Elucidations was produced by ARCIC in response to the conversation with the two Communion. The statements on eucharist, ministry and ordination, and authority were published in *The Final Report*. The two Communion were asked whether they could recognise in *The Final Report* their faith and if so what next steps could be taken in Anglican - Roman Catholic relations. There were many Anglicans at that time who believed that some form of eucharistic sharing or some move towards the recognition of

ministries would be possible on the basis of the convergences of ARCIC. However events in the Anglican Communion to ordain women and the slowness of response from the Roman Catholic Church to *The Final Report* were perhaps the reasons why the bishops at Lambeth 1988 and also, later, the final response of Rome to *The Final Report* were concerned almost exclusively with the first theological question and left the second practical question unanswered. The result was that another 20 years of theological conversations began in the work of ARCIC II.

It was at the high level meeting called by Archbishop George Carey and Cardinal Cassidy that brought back together convergence in faith with convergence in life. The 26 bishops at the meeting in Mississauga began by reviewing lived relations in their dioceses, and then they examined the theological convergences of the ARCIC corpus. In the light of this they considered the goal of the dialogue – ‘full and visible communion’ - and asked what next steps should be taken towards that goal. They called for the setting up of a high level bishops’ commission in which the baton would pass from the theologians to the bishops, a commission that would harvest the results of the theological convergence of ARCIC, set out a practical programme for intensifying relations and then formulate a Common Declaration to move the two Communion into a new stage of relationship on the way to full, visible unity.

The new bishops’ Commission, the International Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission for Unity and Mission (IARCCUM), co-chaired by Archbishop John Bathersby and Bishop David Beutge, worked swiftly. However, the publication of their work suffered a set back following on the consecration of Bishop Gene Robinson and the work of the Commission was suspended for some time. When it was published it was no longer seen as a Common Declaration leading the two Communion into a new stage of intensified relation signed at the highest level of authority, but was published as an Agreed Statement of the Commission itself.

This history explains the format of GTUM. The first part sums up the convergences of the work of ARCIC, pointing honestly to the outstanding areas of disagreement and setting them out in boxed texts. These include boxes on the ordination of women, the exercise of authority, disagreements on moral issues, the Marian dogmas.

A few words about the first part of the statement before Donald leads us into the second practical section. Part 1 treats nine areas where Anglicans and Roman Catholics share a high degree of agreement in faith;

- God as Trinity (11-14)
- Church as communion in mission(15-32)
- Word of God (26-32)
- Baptism (33-38)
- Eucharist (39-49)
- Ministry (50-61)
- Authority in the Church (62-76)
- Discipleship and holiness (77-87)
- The Blessed Virgin Mary (88-92)

It is perhaps worth noting that there is much material here which could speak directly to the current situation in the Anglican Communion, for example what is said about the church as communion, ministry, authority in the church and discipleship and holiness.

At the end of their summary of agreement in faith the bishops say:

Genuine faith is more than assent: it is expressed in action. As Anglicans and Roman Catholics seek to overcome the remaining obstacles to full, visible unity, we the bishops of IARCCUM recognise that the extent of common faith described in this statement compels us to live and witness together more fully here and now. Agreement in faith must go beyond mere affirmation. Discerning a common faith challenges our churches to recognise that elements of sanctification and truth exist in each other's ecclesial lives, and to develop those channels and practical expressions of co-operation by which a common life and mission may be generated and sustained.

To go back to Cardinal Cormac's challenging question last week - 'Dead in the water or money in the Bank?' – There is money – a lot of money in the Anglican - Roman Catholic theological bank. The question is, how much of it can we spend now in intensifying Anglican – Roman Catholic relations everywhere in preparation for the time when we can fulfil God's calling to us to the visible unity of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church? How much of the IARCCUM programme can we put in place now, and do the bishops have the will to take the lead?

5. Contribution from Monsignor Don Bolen:

As Mary has just noted, from the very beginning of our dialogue, and clearly set forth in the *Malta Report* of 1968, there was a concern to move towards unity on a twin track: addressing the theological matters which would need to be resolved for us to enter into a relationship of full communion; and seeking ways in which our two Communion could grow more closely together in the present context, while still on the way to resolving doctrinal issues. Hence Malta proposed, among other things, that "In every region where each Communion has a hierarchy," there would be "an annual joint meeting of either the whole or some considerable representation of the two hierarchies" (§8); that we "share facilities for theological education, with the hope that all future priests of each Communion should have attended some course taught by a professor of the other Communion" (§9); that we pray and worship together in appropriate ways when possible, hold retreats in common, and work towards the preparation "of a common eucharistic lectionary" (§13; cf 10-12); that Church leaders at international, national, and local levels give common witness by issuing joint or parallel statements on urgent human issues (§14); and that we consult further about co-operation in mission (§15).

To some degree, practical initiatives along the lines mentioned above have been pursued at local and national levels, as our churches have grown together. But on an international level, while ARCIC proceeded to address theological points of controversy between us, little was done in terms of identifying practical initiatives. In the early 1970s, the focus was on getting theological agreements in place which would allow a reconsideration of *Apostolicae Curae's* negative judgement on Anglican Orders. Instead of asking at each

moment in time what was possible given the degree of faith we shared, the dialogue played for the big stakes, seeking to put in place that which would allow a recognition of orders and eucharistic sharing. That turned out to be more complicated than anticipated, not least, from a Roman Catholic perspective, because of the ordination of women to the priesthood in various provinces.

It was in 1996, during the visit of Archbishop George Carey to the Holy See, that a common declaration was signed, which invited a rethinking of the dialogue and its direction. The common declaration stated: “The obstacle to reconciliation caused by the ordination of women as priests and bishops in some provinces of the Anglican Communion has also become increasingly evident, creating a new situation. In view of this, it may be opportune at this stage in our journey to consult further about how the relationship between the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church is to progress.” As Mary has already related, this led to Mississauga, and then to the establishment of IARCCUM.

For IARCCUM, the link between seeking unity and engaging in common mission is foundational to the whole project. Thus the second section of *Growing Together in Unity and Mission* (GTUM) is not an accidental appendix, but constitutive of the Commission’s aim and purpose. GTUM states clearly that current tensions in our relations do not eclipse the need to ask how and to what extent we can take practical initiatives and give ecclesial expression to the degree of shared faith which has been reached: “This present context, which adds to existing differences between our two Communion, is not the appropriate time to enter the new formal stage of relationship envisaged by the bishops at Mississauga. Nevertheless it must be acknowledged that the progress towards agreement in faith achieved through the theological dialogue has been substantial, but that in the past four decades we have only just begun to give tangible expression to the incontrovertible elements of shared faith. Even in a time of uncertainty, the mission given us by Christ obliges and compels us to seek to engage more deeply and widely in a partnership in mission, coupled with common witness and joint prayer” (GTUM §7).

The text was careful to state that not all suggestions would be appropriate in each context: “We, the bishops of IARCCUM, invite Anglicans and Roman Catholics everywhere to consider the following suggestions. They are offered as practical examples of the kind of joint action in mission that we believe our shared faith now invites us to pursue and which would deepen the communion we share. We also recognise, however, that the context and dynamics of relationships between Anglicans and Roman Catholics differ widely across the world. There may be compelling reasons why some of the suggestions and invitations set out below are neither appropriate nor feasible in some local contexts. Nevertheless the fruits of the dialogue between Anglicans and Catholics over forty years constitute an exhortation for all Anglicans and Catholics to consider how we may carry forward our commitment to full visible unity, and we commend the ideas and proposals set out below for careful consideration and reflection” (§99).

The second part of the document is divided into four sections, which treat the areas of common worship; joint study; common ministry and mission; and common witness. The

proposals mentioned attempt to build directly on the statements of agreement in the first section, but the list of proposals is far from exhaustive. It was the view of IARCCUM members that bishops, ideally in conjunction with their Anglican/Roman Catholic counterparts, would creatively discern what was appropriate in their particular regions. Working within current parameters of what is permissible, in order that everything proposed actually be replicable in different contexts, the Commission wanted to invite creative reflection on what aspects of the Church's life and mission could appropriately be shared at the present time.

On a local level, people often tend to be preoccupied with shared Eucharist with our fellow Christians - a step which from a Roman Catholic perspective we can't take, except in the circumstances and conditions identified in the Ecumenical Directory - instead of concentrating on a range of possible initiatives which are allowed and encouraged by the Directory, and made possible to the extent that we have identified areas of shared faith with other Christian communities. Bishops in their dioceses can, however, serve as something of a bridge between the international statements of agreement and the ecumenical situation in which they live.

We now hope to hear from particular local contexts, to hear of the initiatives and the challenges which are faced in Nigeria, Ireland and the United States, and then to hear from others present about A-RC relations in their regions.

6. Contribution from Bishop Lucius Ugorji, Nigeria:

Let me begin by recalling that the first wave of evangelisation in Nigeria was between the 15th and 18th centuries. Mainly the Capuchins and Augustinians from Portugal were involved in that initial effort. Unfortunately, the Christian community established during this period fizzled out before the colonial era. The second wave of evangelisation in Nigeria was about the middle of the 19th century when both Churches were founded in the country.

Both the Anglican Communion and Catholic Church have worked assiduously to transform the religious landscape of the nation since they were established in Nigeria. As elsewhere the Good News and Christian education brought by both Churches have helped in the formation of the inner man and in creating a healthy sense of sin as an offence against God. They have also contributed tremendously in the fight against idolatry, superstition and many social ills. It is also important to note that both Churches laid a solid foundation for education and development of the country through the primary and secondary schools they established.

This is only one side of the story. The other side of the story deals with antagonism and rivalry. The Irish and British missionary bodies that evangelised Nigeria brought bitter religious rivalries between Catholics and Anglicans into the country. These rivalries were pronounced in the areas of proselytizing, politics and education till the state take-over of voluntary agency schools in the 1970s. Memories are still fresh of the anti-Catholic and anti-Anglican songs of yester-years that characterised Catholic - Anglican relations, and

which manifested mutual disdain and disaffection. Memories of hate, hostility, prejudice, distrust and suspicion are still fresh and raw in some areas, particularly in the Eastern parts of the country.

Generally such painful and sad experiences have made Catholic - Anglican relations rather difficult in the East where antagonism was at its strongest. In the Western and Northern parts of the country, the relationship between both communions is varied, ranging from friendship to apathy. Although, when compared to the past, the present day relationship between both communions could be said to have improved greatly in most parts of the country, yet old animosities and prejudices still exist in some areas.

Factors that account for the existing poor relations in some places would include “holier-than-thou” tendencies, fear of the loss of identity, fear of domination, intolerance, fear of the loss of personal gains and status, superiority complex, etc.

However, Catholics and Anglicans as well as other Christian bodies have come together since 1976 under the umbrella of the Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN). Under this Association, they speak with one voice on national issues and fought together against the adoption of Sharia in some Northern States of the country. They helped in the formation of the Nigerian Inter-Religious Council, a body that brings both Christians and Muslims together to promote peace and harmony among Christians and Muslims in the country. In various states they have also worked together to fight against poor governance and corruption. Although some degree of ecumenism is practised under CAN, especially in the area of joint action, relationship within this body has not enhanced a bilateral dialogue between Anglicans and Catholics.

Nevertheless as a follow-up to the consultation in Mississauga in May 2000, the Nigerian Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission (NARCC) was formed in 2001. The Commission aims at working towards a full and visible unity between both Churches as envisioned in the *Communion in Mission* #13, namely – “a Eucharistic communion of Churches: confessing the one faith and demonstrating by their harmonious diversity the richness of faith; unanimous in the application of the principles governing moral life; served by ministries that the grace of ordination unites together in an Episcopal body, grafted on to the company of Apostles, and which is at the service of the authority that Christ exercises over His Body”.

NARCC meets twice a year in an atmosphere of prayer, spiritual communion, friendship and study. Its meetings are rotationally hosted by both Churches and are moved from one part of the country to the other. When hosted by the Anglican Church, it begins with Solemn Vespers and conversely when hosted by the Catholic Church, it commences with Evening Song. As a way of expressing our brotherhood, based on our common baptism in Christ and communion in faith, the local Anglican and Roman Catholic communities are encouraged to participate in large numbers, and they do so.

The local communities of both Churches also participate in the official opening sessions of the Commission. This offers NARCC the opportunity to highlight important practical

issues in the *Malta Report; Communion in Mission; and Growing Together in Unity and Mission* that need implementation as a way of concretely expressing the spiritual communion we share. It also offers NARCC the opportunity to promote the study and reception of the ARCIC Agreed Statements and to encourage the local Christian communities to form their own local ARC. The local ARC helps in joint Bible Study, organising prayer for Christian unity, and fostering good relations between both Churches.

It is pertinent to observe that the House of Bishops of the Church of Nigeria (Anglican Communion) has been very supportive of the work of NARCC. The Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria (CBCN) is also favourably disposed towards NARCC. Its strong support for NARCC is an effort to rise to the demands of its Complementary Norms to c. 755, #2 which require that "Catholics regard non-Catholics in a humane and charitable way and establish dialogue with them, socialise with them; do not discriminate against them; avoid criticising them; prudently encourage associations that favour ecumenism; have special care for children of mixed-marriages, etc".

Permit me to add that it is heartening to note that the work of NARCC has produced rich fruits. There is a growing understanding and co-operation between Anglicans and Roman Catholics in different parts of the country. Nevertheless, there are challenges still facing both Churches. Notwithstanding our unresolved differences, the common faith we share impels us to joint witness and mission in the world. The continued impact of secularism and ethical relativism on core moral values in our times makes it necessary for both our Churches in Africa to join hands in bearing witness to Christian values, using the moral and spiritual resources of our different Christian traditions.

Service to the least of the brethren is the responsibility of all Christians, irrespective of denomination. We need not have consensus on all doctrine and moral issues to struggle together against injustice or to help those in need, irrespective of their creed. Both our communions need, for instance, to work together to address the rising incidence of poor governance, extreme poverty, endemic corruption and the HIV/AIDS scourge on the African continent. We need to come closer to one another so that jointly we can, in the light of the Gospel, give a Christian response to modern ethical questions on life and the family, especially in the wake of the Maputo Plan of Action to legalise abortion on demand in African countries. To face these challenges effectively, both our Communions cannot afford to speak with discordant voices on ethical issues.

We therefore look forward to the day when the House of Bishops of the Church of Nigeria (Anglican Communion) and the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria could meet to agree on more concrete areas. Both Conferences can work together to face the challenges that face us as a nation. Similarly we also look forward to a meeting between the Council of Anglican Provinces of Africa (CAPA) and the Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM) to work out areas where both our communions can join hands to witness together and render service to the least of the brethren on the African continent.

7. Contribution from Bishop Tony Farquhar, N Ireland:

I should like to begin with a few introductory comments about ecumenism and Ireland, particularly against the backdrop of international ecumenical trends. We have heard already of the work of IARCCUM, from its Mississauga roots, how it tried to take account of what ARCIC had achieved theologically and spiritually, and how in Part II, in its Report, *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*, it tried to embody those shared insights in the form of practical suggestions.

At the outset I would suggest that the situation in Ireland - especially in Northern Ireland - is slightly different from the universal one at which we have looked. As IARCCUM was gathering speed we in the North were coming down from a high peak of violence and civil strife. Although we always proclaimed loudly and clearly that this was not a religious war, Catholic v Protestant, (for historical/political reasons I place Anglicans in the Protestant mix) nonetheless, the frequently and conveniently expressed view of the media and international perception was undoubtedly that it was an inter-Church struggle. This misrepresentation did, however, have the beneficial effect of pressurising Church leaders into a strong form of togetherness - not so much bilaterally as multi-laterally; e.g. in Clergy Fraternal and in the national body, the Irish Inter-Church Meeting. This was a pragmatic and highly necessary development based on the felt need for visible signs of reconciliation and forgiveness rather than on the necessary consequences of the ecumenical Dialogues that were taking part elsewhere in the world.

Fortunately we have moved towards a more peaceful situation which I would suggest may have been the result of various factors, including: (i) war-weariness; (ii) the realisation on the part of the combatants that more could be achieved by other means and (iii) the realisation that more international adulation and subsequently retrospective admiration would be accorded if this were the path followed.

But we should not forget that the suspicion of ecumenism and cross-community contacts had been a means of gaining and sustaining political advancement in the late 60s, 70s, 80s and early 90s, rather than that dirty concept of ecumenism taking root. I think we should point out that these suspicions were rather by-passed on the way to this shared future that is in itself a highly laudable one. Hopefully, the comment of one of my Presbyterian Reformed colleagues will not prove to be totally accurate when he said that the end would be that the Churches would carry all the blame for the problems but bear none of the gratitude for the solutions.

I would suggest though that the high level of dignity and forgiveness - spiritually based - on the part of many people during the worst of our Troubles did act as a brake and prevent the situation tumbling downwards with an even greater ferocity. Many people reacted to pain, suffering and adversity with a grace and generosity that certainly would not "obstruct in proclaiming the Good News." (Paragraph 97)

So what I am really saying is that whereas IARCCUM is looking to see how the ecumenical insights of the past three decades can help us to come closer together, our

situation in Northern Ireland demands that we take the togetherness of these years as an inspiration to share greater ecumenical insights.

- (i) We must, I believe, face up to differences, such as the boxed sections of *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*.
- (ii) In the context of a shared future we must not fall into the trap of an over-apologetic fear of appearing divisive when we acknowledge the pride that we have in the richness of our own traditions.
- (iii) Although the present improved political situation may not be an ecumenical advance it is interesting to note the extent to which even the language of the Good Friday Agreement reflects the influence of inter-Church reports on violence from the earliest stages.
- (iv) We must stick by this process. We cannot drop our dealing with these inter-Church questions for the sake of establishing some sort of a vague shared future, even with a laudable inter-faith emphasis. I believe if we are to build that future we must work at how we deal with differences as well as commonalities, whether these be in Church or in inter-faith.

I hope that this brief, historical outline is not seen as irrelevant for I think it illustrates very clearly the various scenarios into which the suggestions proposed in Part II are made. 1 - There are situations of ecumenising where work needs to be done to ease historical fears and suspicions, often socio-economic and political. 2 - Situations where ecumenical commonalities can be securely advanced and built upon. 3 - Situations which are seriously influenced by more recent developments within a particular denomination. We need to acknowledge this range of situations. If we do not do so then the list of suggestions made in Part II could simply become a check-list of what is not being done - a check-list formulated by ecumenists who are disgruntled by the lack of speed towards establishing Christian unity.

The principle of subsidiarity does not just concern geographical spread outwards, it also applies to layers of discipline and doctrine at universal, national, diocesan and personal level. It is for all of us to see what we can do rather than what the others are not doing.

This is a long preamble but I hope worthwhile. I shall now dip very briefly, with a few Irish references, into the four areas of suggestions with a few Irish references.

1 - Visible expressions of our shared faith.

Many of these, as has been pointed out by Bishop Bernard Longley in his commentary on the document, are already supported by our own ecumenical directory.

I would pick out just four:

- (i) The presence at each other's Eucharistic celebrations. This, I think, must be accompanied by respect for each other's discipline.
- (ii) Pilgrimages: in Ireland most frequently pilgrimages have a strong Marian element which does undoubtedly present difficulties to some. But there is also a strong tradition of penitential pilgrimages, e.g. Lough Derg, where in recent years Methodist, Presbyterian and most recently a Church of Ireland Bishop have preached there.
- (iii) Processions - such as Good Friday Processions - one of our Clergy Fellowships has regularly done that in one of the largest parks in Belfast - a park where, in the early 70s, young loyalists had marched in paramilitary and quite intimidatory fashion. I hold that this is one area where joint Christian witness did almost reclaim for Christ space and territory that was open to a paramilitary stake-out.
- (iv) The document speaks of presence at Baptisms and Confirmations, inter-Church Weddings, Ordinations etc. Might I add to that Funerals - there were many tragic funerals of innocent victims over those thirty years. The visible inter-denominational presence of clergy of other denominations was a great source of support for the bereaved and provided a magnificent ecumenical witness and a source of personal support, even to the preacher, as I can personally testify.

2 - Joint sharing of our faith

Not a great deal of this but the Irish inter-Church Meeting has organised study days on topics such as: Luther and Justification, Dominus Jesus, inter-Church Dialogues - where Mary Tanner gave a significant paper. At a younger level, in schools, catechetical materials were prepared for a Core Curriculum, to which various denominations could add sections.

Laudable though the study areas may be, for example, national ARCS, our local situation is that a shortage of seminarians has been followed by a shortage of seminaries which has been followed by a shortage of theologians. But we have been involved in international Dialogues: the Methodist-Roman, the Joint WCC/RC, WARC and IARCCUM itself.

3 - Co-operation in Ministry

We do have a Standing Committee on Mixed Marriages officially appointed by the main Churches. It is a long-standing committee intended to help couples in their preparation for marriage. We would share IARCCUM's recommendation that there would be joint pastoral care of such couples. It is the role of members on that committee to deal with current discipline from the Churches but not to act as a lobbying group for the disciplines to be changed.

The four Church leaders co-operate well. They meet regularly and that is widely appreciated (although the editor of the Church of Ireland Gazette would be worried about the role of the Church leaders in usurping the official inter-Church bodies).

But much of the contact with our Anglican colleagues happens at local level. At the heights of the violence, I could run what I was about to say at one of those funerals, past one of my Church of Ireland episcopal colleagues for advice and guidance and that would be reciprocated on the occasion of his diocesan synod.

A few years ago I spoke to a meeting of all of the Church of Ireland bishops of the time, during their annual conference and retreat, and pointed out that to my amazement when I got there I realized that I had preached to, for or with every single one of them.

Attendance at each other's meetings and conferences - although I do recall at one of our Episcopal meetings where the media had been lobbying hard to be present, as we got bogged down in an internally boring circle, one of my colleagues whispered "It would serve the media right if we let them in to sit through this." That particular meeting - I wouldn't even do it to an Anglican.

4 - Shared Witness in the World

I am hopeful that much of what is suggested in Section 4 has been expressed in a shared witness at difficult times and difficult circumstances. This I tried to outline in my introduction. As regards Anglican-Roman co-operation in education, schools and training colleges, I think it should be pointed out that there are only two sectors in education in schooling with us in the North - one is the Catholic one and the other is the Protestant/State one. And as that State sector becomes more secular and humanist I think there is a question as to how the Christian identity can be best preserved in those schools and indeed the production of a Core Curriculum has been a contribution to that.

May I conclude quoting from Paragraph 125: "We are particularly mindful of the value of speaking with a common voice as Christians amidst situations of conflict, misunderstanding and mistrust."

I hope that what I have said about the particular situation in which our ecumenical contacts have evolved over the last years may be a small contribution to increased dialogue, especially in post-conflict situations.