

Bowman, David J. ed.
U.S. Catholic ecumenism
ADX 4668

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME LIBRARY

MAY 1975

Ecumenical movement

U.S. CATHOLIC ECUMENISM— TEN YEARS LATER

PART I: Data from 130 respondents, with
Commentary

PART II: Studies from 16 areas in the U.S.A.

Edited by
REVEREND DAVID J. BOWMAN, S. J.
Associate Director
of the
Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism, National Council of
the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
MEMORIAL LIBRARY

MAY 13 1979

COLLEGE LIBRARY
VERTICAL FILE

"Today, in many parts of the world, under the inspiring grace of the Holy Spirit, multiple efforts are being expended through prayer, word, and action to attain that fullness of unity which Jesus Christ desires. This sacred Synod, therefore, exhorts all the Catholic faithful to recognize the signs of the times and to take an active and intelligent part in the work of ecumenism." (Decree on Ecumenism, #4, in **Documents of VATICAN II**, Walter M. Abbott, S.J., General Editor, 1966, p. 347.)

"The ecumenical spirit too should be nurtured in the neophytes. They should rightly consider that the brethren who believe in Christ are Christ's disciples, reborn in baptism, sharers with the People of God in very many riches. . . .

To the extent that their beliefs are common, they can make before the nations a common profession of faith in God and in Jesus Christ. They can collaborate in social and in technical projects as well as in cultural and religious ones. Let them work together especially for the sake of Christ, their common Lord. Let His Name be the bond that unites them! This cooperation should be undertaken not only among private persons, but also, according to the judgment of the local Ordinary, among Churches or ecclesial Communities and their enterprises." (Decree on Missions #15, *Ibid.* pp. 602-03)

"We Catholics believe that the one church of Christ subsists in the Roman Catholic Church but cannot be perfectly identified with it, because other Christian communions have developed and manifested church-building elements which are Christian means of salvation. In meeting with these churches, the Catholic Church can also receive the authentic Christian heritage which they have treasured and fostered in separation. Catholic ecumenical life, then, does not look to a return to the past but searches for a reconciliation in the future." (Jan Cardinal Willebrands in **Consultation on Church Union: A Catholic Perspective**, USCC Publications Office, Washington, D.C., 1970, p. 19)

U.S. CATHOLIC ECUMENISM— TEN YEARS LATER

PART I: Data from 130 respondents, with
Commentary

PART II: Studies from 16 areas in the U.S.A.

Foreword by
ARCHBISHOP WILLIAM W. BAUM
Chairman of the
Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs

Edited by
REVEREND DAVID J. BOWMAN, S. J.
Associate Director
of the
Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism, National Council of
the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Also available from the:
Department of Publication Services
Room 552
National Council of Churches
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

1975

Publications Office
UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page no.
Foreword by Most Reverend William W. Baum.	iii
Introduction. Reverend David J. Bowman, S. J.	iv
PART I. The Opinionaire: Tabulation of Data and Commentary.	
Reverend Arleon L. Kelley, Reverend David J. Bowman, S.J. Sister Carmelita Marie Roche, S.N.D.deNamur	1
PART II. Reports/Studies	
State: Montana Association of Churches. Reverend James H. Provost.	14
Louisiana Interchurch Conference. Reverend Monsignor Charles J. Plauché.	18
Metro: Kansas City, Missouri. Most Reverend Charles H. Helmsing.	21
Cardinal's Commission on Human Relations, Philadelphia. Reverend Charles Devlin.	25
Louisville Area Interchurch Organization for Service. Reverend Stanley A. Schmidt, Reverend Gerald B. Dentinger, Reverend Thomas H. Quigley.	28
Metropolitan Area Religious Coalition of Cincinnati. Reverend Carl K. Moeddel.	34
County: San Diego Ecumenical Conference. Reverend Monsignor John R. Portman.	38
Christians United in Mission, Albany, N.Y. Mr. Joseph A. Powers.	41
Dutchess Interfaith Council, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. Reverend Ernest R. Falardeau, S.S.S.; Ms. Martha Miller.	46
Genesee Ecumenical Ministry, Rochester, N.Y. Reverend Henry A. Atwell.	53
York County, Pa., Reverend Clair A. Redding, Reverend Harold B. Statler.	57
City: Charleston, S. Carolina. Most Reverend Ernest L. Unter- koefler.	63
Bridgeport, Connecticut. Reverend Thomas J. Driscoll, Reverend Richard L. Rooney, S.J.	67
South Bend, Indiana. United Religious Community of St. Joseph County. Reverend Daniel E. Piel, Reverend John E. Gaus.	71
Parish: Southbridge, Massachusetts. Covenanted Parishes. Rev- erend Raymond J. Page, Reverend Edward A. Cobden.	75
Personal: 15 Churches United for a Better Manhattan, New York. Reverend James J. Gilhooley.	81
Afterwords: Reverend Peter Sheehan, Reverend Harry C. Wallace, Rev- erend Nathan H. VanderWerf, Reverend David J. Bow- man, S.J.	87

FOREWORD

In 1966, Dr. Edwin Espy, General Secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, Dr. Cynthia Wedel, Director of Division of Christian Unity, and Father William Norgren, Director of Department of Faith and Order, discussed with me their desire to have a Catholic on the staff of the NCC. I recommended Father David J. Bowman, S.J., as a man whose academic competence and practical wisdom in the field of ecumenism is accompanied by a deeply-rooted obedience to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and a spirituality which is the fruit of a profound faith. His appointment at that time to the Department of Faith and Order of the Division for Christian Unity of the NCC was therefore a source of great satisfaction to me.

For this reason it is a great pleasure for me to recommend to you this booklet, edited by Father Bowman, who is now the special assistant to the General Secretary for Ecumenical Services of the National Council of Churches.

The material found in these pages is a great source of information and direction concerning the present condition of regional and local ecumenical activities. It provides standards of comparison and contrast that will undoubtedly contribute to the growth of ecumenical dialogue at this crucial level. As such this booklet can be used for study and discussion by ecumenical groups throughout the country.

In ordering this study to be made, the Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism of the NCC has rendered a welcome service to the cause of Christian unity. Although all Christians do not yet share a full communion of life, we yearn for it with every heartbeat of our life in Christ Jesus. We all acknowledge Him as our Saviour. We have all been baptized into His mission. Thus we can come together to grow in the understanding of what our faith entails and pray to our common Father to help us undertake with greater fidelity its challenges. This is the purpose of our ecumenical activities, for it is only through this greater fidelity to Him that we can heal the divisions that keep us apart and achieve that reconciliation and that unity which is His gift to the earth.

✠ William W. Baum
Archbishop of Washington

The Epiphany of Our Lord, 1975

INTRODUCTION

In a story "Where the Action Is" of the NC News on November 1, 1974, Jerry Filteau gave an optimistic summary of Roman Catholic local ecumenism ten years after the Decree on Ecumenism of Vatican II. As examples he listed: Roman Catholic Ecumenism in local churches, Adult Education courses, social action projects, prayer, pulpit exchanges, sharing of facilities, ministerial associations, Living-room Dialogues, committees of all kinds, covenanted parishes, ecumenical agencies of of sorts, seminary clusters. Steady progress at every level of church life has occurred, according to Mr. Filteau.

The inevitable "but" ensues. He adds a few more realities. Popular enthusiasm has waned, as RCs learn how difficult it is for ingrained habits of isolation and exclusiveness to change. Apathy is another enemy. "Leave it to the experts; don't bother us" is the cry of both laity and clergy. He concludes: "Compared with the vast effort still needed, the existing structures of local ecumenism are still spotty and inadequate."

This study is an attempt to extend the ecumenical "spots" and to enable some movement toward greater adequacy. It concerns local structures of varying sizes and kinds. It hopes to serve as both information and inspiration—the first as a solid basis for action, the second as a motive for movement. The Holy Year theme "Renewal and Reconciliation" is surely suited to such an attempt, and a document encouraging regional and local ecumenism is expected soon from the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity in Rome.

A Methodist professor and friend has a favorite saying: "If all the statisticians in the world were placed end to end . . . it would be a good thing!" If you share his thought, read on anyhow.

Part I does concern statistics. It makes no claim to finality, of course. "In the kingdom of the blind, the one-eyed is king" seems especially applicable here. In the realm of RC local ecumenism, no data were available. (Yes, Virginia, it's a plural noun.)

So when in January 1973, the 50 members of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.'s Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism voted "Roman Catholic Relations" as tied for the most important area of the Commission, I took them seriously. By June a proposal was ready for the Executive Committee of NCC, which approved its being presented to the October Governing Board meeting, through the Section on Christian Unity. Mr. William Thompson, Stated Clerk of the United Presbyterians, U.S.A., as chairman of the Section, guided

it through to a successful issue: a mandate from the NCC to do the study within the year 1974. The Raskob Foundation of Wilmington, Delaware, granted some financial help; this enabled me to visit almost all the localities personally.

Some may wonder why such a study would be done in NCC, to which the Roman Catholic Church does not belong. Answer: for nine years NCC has assigned me, a Jesuit priest, to work closely with CORLE and the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs in the area of RC relations at all levels: national, diocesan and parish. I have visited almost every state, have spoken about ecumenism under Catholic or ecumenical auspices more times than I like to remember, and have become convinced, of course, that RC involvement in all kinds of ecumenical life is not only necessary (Vatican II decree) but highly desirable. My colleagues concur.

To implement this, I sent a letter on November 5, 1973, to the 165 RC dioceses and to about 250 ecumenical agencies around the country, asking for volunteers to do local studies. The response was marvelous; at least 200 replied on the self-addressed postcard, indicating interest. Rather than confine the efforts only to ten case-studies as the first plan envisaged, Rev. Nathan VanderWerf, Rev. Dr. Arleon Kelley and I, staff of CORLE, decided to reply to such a response with a survey of the national situation by means of an opinionaire. Arleon, a professional in this field, formulated this data-instrument, which was sent out in January to the same 415 people. By March we had 130 opinionaires back, enough to tabulate as a valid sample from which to draw inferences. This booklet, then, has two main divisions: first, data from the national opinionaire and some interpretation; second, sixteen descriptions of varying local RC situations, done by the people concerned.

Lest this Introduction squeeze out much of the body of data, here are the facts. Rev. J. Peter Sheehan of BCEIA and Rev. Harry Wallace of the National Association of Diocesan Ecumenical Officers helped me choose sixteen RC situations at four levels: state, metropolitan, county, small city. We spread them out geographically; we chose situations of varying success for Catholic ecumenism.

We ascertained that we had an RC in each place who would undertake the successful pursuit of the project, and that she or he had a good working relationship with the ecumenical executive of the area. Any study of a **relationship** must deal fairly with each side; a merely RC report would be useless, like a description of a friendship by only one of the friends. The data, therefore, are ecumenically balanced.

The manner of reporting on the sixteen situations varies in length and details; it reflects differing methods on the part of the local people. I regard this variety as enriching far more than confusing; enough of a consistency is maintained to enable a careful reader to make comparisons and contrasts easily.

A caution: we do not hold up any one form or practice as "the best" or even as necessarily desirable; we simply report responses from people grappling with problems and seizing opportunities "out there." The discerning reader will judge.

She/he may wonder whether a low-profile stance in a community is really enough, since it keeps the churches out of trouble but may also keep them out of effective community life. Correlatively, repeated ringing public statements on social issues may be counterproductive, even though they seem helpful at the time. Courage and prudence are old-fashioned names for initiative and know-how; a combination seems always in order.

We hope that everyone will find useful examples of ecumenical experience in this booklet. Consult the Afterword for the rest of this Introduction, please.

Part I

OPINIONAIRE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF MODELS OF LOCAL CATHOLIC ECUMENISM

The Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism of the National Council of Churches (Fr. David J. Bowman, S.J.), assisted by the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs (Fr. J. Peter Sheehan) and the National Association of Diocesan Ecumenical Officers (Fr. Harry Wallace) is undertaking a project for a better understanding of current Catholic involvement in local and regional ecumenism. This project is *entirely distinct* from any study of Roman Catholic possible membership in the National Council of Churches, though the two are obviously related.

The first step in our process is this *Opinionaire*, constructed carefully by Arleon Kelley of CORLE and edited by the troika. We hope it will take *no more than forty minutes* of your time—but let us know about how long it actually takes. Please express your personal observations on each item. The information will be kept confidential.

Send it to David Bowman, S.J., at Room 850, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027. We hope to have them back by March 1, 1974, so that a report can be given on March 10-13 at the National Ecumenical Workshop in Charleston, South Carolina.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Your Name; Address; Phone _____

Agency; Address; Phone _____

1. Please rank each group in the following list in order of its numerical strength in your area. (a = largest group; b = 2nd largest group, etc.)
Results: varied.
1. ___ "Main line" Protestants; 2. ___ Roman Catholics; 3. ___ Evangelicals (including Southern Baptists) 4. ___ Orthodox; 5. ___ Jewish; 6. ___ If other, which?
2. Size of Community Served by your Ecumenical Agency (check one)

1. 0 Rural, Town, Village	5. 20 Metro Area 500,000-1 million
2. 3 Rural County	6. 10 Metro Area of 1 million or more
3. 25 Urban County/Small City	7. 32 State
4. 37 Urban Area 100,000-500,000	8. 3 Region

For purposes of this report, Rural County, Region and Urban County are counted as "county", "Metro" includes large and small metro areas.

N.B. Note carefully the different ways of collating the data, in each of the four Sections. Also, totals vary, due to some omissions/duplications in replies. It is printed here just as it went out but with results inserted.

SECTION I: In this Section, #3-11, the first of the paired numbers refers to the *entire group*, including RCs; the second number in *bold face*, refers to Catholics as a *sub-group*. The five pairs refer to the four geographic areas surveyed: State, Metro, County, City, plus the totals for all four. Cf. 3.



3. The predominant ecumenical organization in our area: (check one in each set)

	State	Metro	County	City	Totals
3.1 has full Catholic participation	17-4	15-10	17-3	9-2	58-19
has some Catholic participation	12-3	8-1	8-2	23-9	51-15
has Catholic observers only	3-2	4-0	2-1	3-0	12-3
has no Catholic involvement	0-0	3-0	4-0	2-0	9-0
	32-9	30-11	31-6	37-11	130-37
3.2 has full Jewish involvement	2-2	4-0	3-0	4-0	13-2
has some Jewish involvement	6-1	12-6	6-1	13-5	37-13
has Jewish observers only	2-1	3-0	0-0	2-0	7-1
has no Jewish involvement	20-4	11-5	14-3	13-4	58-16
we have no Jewish community	2-1	0-0	8-1	5-1	15-3
	32-9	30-11	31-5	37-10	130-35
3.3 is comprised of congregations only	0-0	7-1	18-1	18-3	43-5
congreg./neighborhood clusters	0-0	3-0	1-0	5-2	9-2
judicatories only	19-3	10-5	4-1	2-0	35-9
community agencies only	0-0	0-0	0-1	1-0	1-1
congregs./clusters/judicatories	6-3	5-3	5-3	6-4	22-13
congregs./judicatories	7-2	11-3	2-0	4-2	24-7
if other, what?	0-0	0-0	3-0	3-0	6-0
	32-8	36-12	33-6	39-11	140-37

3.4 involves only laity on board 0; only clergy on board 10; women 65; involves clergy & laity on board 120; if other, what? —

4. Do minorities and the powerless have significant involvement?

	State	Metro	County	City	Totals
Yes	9-9	14-6	12-2	6-2	41-19
No	7-2	1-5	17-2	10-8	35-17
Don't know	2-0	0-0	5-2	2-2	9-4

5. If you have Catholic involvement, who took the initiative? (check one)

	State	Metro	County	City	Totals
No Catholic involvement	0-0	1-0	3-3	1-0	5-3
Protestant initiatives (but not by ecumenical agency)	5-1	4-1	4-1	5-0	18-3
Catholic Bishop initiative	4-2	4-2	3-0	3-1	14-5
Diocesan Ecumenical Commission initiative	4-3	4-2	6-3	8-4	22-12



	State	Metro	County	City	Totals
Initiative by a <i>priest</i> or group of <i>priests</i>	1-2	1-1	2-1	11-5	15-9
Lay Catholic initiative	0-0	1-0	2-1	3-0	6-1
Initiative by <i>ecum.</i> agency	20-4	13-6	10-0	17-2	60-12
We just found each other	7-3	0-0	1-0	2-0	10-3
If other, what?	0-0	1-0	1-0	0-0	2-0
	41-15	29-12	32-9	50-12	152-48

6. If you have Catholic involvement, did the involvement begin

	State	Metro	County	City	Totals
No Catholic involvement	1	1	2	1	5
Around a <i>community</i> issue?	12-3	14-6	8-3	12-5	46-17
Around a <i>Faith & Order</i> issue?	5-4	6-5	1-4	7-9	19-22
From <i>Living Room</i> dialogues?	4-2	5-0	4-1	6-1	19-4
If other; what?	9-0	5-0	11-0	8-0	33-0
	31-9	31-11	26-8	34-15	122-43

7. How do those in the academic, business, civic and cultural community feel about the ecumenical agency? (check one in each column)

	Academic				Business			
	S	M	Co	Ci	S	M	Co	Ci
indifferent	4-1	10-1	3-1	6-2	4-1	3-0	7-2	7-4
enthusiastic	7-3	4-4	12-3	8-4	3-2	4-3	9-0	5-2
little or no indication	4-5	1-7	14-2	6-6	8-7	8-6	13-4	7-7

	Civic				Cultural			
	S	M	Co	Ci	S	M	Co	Ci
indifferent	4-1	6-4	5-2	4-3	5-2	5-2	3-0	5-3
enthusiastic	6-3	5-2	14-2	11-3	4-1	2-1	13-3	7-2
little or no indication	6-6	4-5	9-2	4-6	7-7	7-7	12-3	7-7

8. I see the relationships among community groups as:

	State	Metro	County	City	Totals
Poor	2-1	1-0	2-0	1-1	6-2
Fair	9-3	7-7	13-1	6-6	35-17
Good	6-5	6-4	15-5	12-5	39-19
Excellent	1-0	1-0	3-0	0-0	5-0

9. The style of our ecumenical agency is predominantly

	State	Metro	County	City	Totals
Conciliar	8-8	11-8	18-3	10-6	47-25
Conciliar/consortia	8-1	1-1	5-2	2-0	16-4
Task Force	7-2	5-0	5-1	6-0	23-3
Coalitional/consortia	4-3	1-0	4-1	2-3	11-7
JSAC	0-0	1-0	3-1	2-1	6-2
Other	1-0	1-1	3-1	1-1	6-3

10. I would rate the effectiveness of our ecumenical agency as

	Spiritual Ecumenism			
	S	M	Co	Ci
Very effective	1-2	0-5	7-2	3-1
Somewhat effective	8-7	8-6	18-2	15-10
Somewhat ineffective	2-0	4-1	8-2	1-0
Ineffective	1-1	0-0	0-0	0-1

	Social Witness Ecumenism			
	S	M	Co	Ci
Very effective	4-5	5-2	14-1	7-4
Somewhat effective	5-3	6-7	10-2	12-5
Somewhat ineffective	1-2	1-3	6-2	1-3
Ineffective	0-0	0-0	2-1	0-1

	Academic Ecumenism			
	S	M	Co	Ci
Very effective	0-1	0-2	3-3	0-2
Somewhat effective	5-6	6-6	16-3	9-5
Somewhat ineffective	4-3	3-5	5-0	6-5
Ineffective	1-1	1-1	7-0	3-1

11. How often does your administrative board meet each year? Monthly to quarterly

Give dates of 1974 meetings: Variety of answers

SECTION II. In #12-15, the first series refers to replies from ecumenical agencies *alone*; the second refers to RCs *alone*. The sequence is the same as in Section I. Topics are those most often mentioned.

12. List the three most important things which are *impeding* ecumenical progress in your community or state or region.

State: 23 Ecumenical Agencies, 9 RCs replied.

Denominationalism	16-5	Lack of money	4-0
Leaders' attitudes	15-5	No clear goals	0-4

Metro: 20 Ecumenical Agencies, 12 RCs replied.

Denominationalism	7-8	Fundamentalism	4-2
Leaders' attitudes	5-9	Lack of money	2-5

County: 25 Ecumenical Agencies, 6 RCs replied.

Indifference	16-3	Clergy Indifference	8-3
Denominationalism	8-2	Lack of money	4-4
Fundamentalism	6-3	Distances	2-2

City: 17 Ecumenical Agencies, 13 RCs replied.

Denominationalism	13-1	Poor organization	0-6
Apathy	10-5	Parochialism	4-1
Abortion	4-2	Lack of money	8-0

13. List the three issues which are most *divisive*.

State: 23 Ecumenical Agencies, 9 RCs replied.			
Abortion	13-6	Indian Ministry	2-1
Parochialism	6-3	NCC (!)	2-0
United Farm Workers	3-3	Social legislation	2-0
Metro: 20 Ecumenical Agencies, 12 RCs replied.			
Abortion	3-6	UFC	2-2
Denominationalism	2-3	Indifference	2-2
Racism	2-2	Amnesty	2-0
County: 25 Ecumenical Agencies, 6 RCs replied.			
Abortion	7-4	Racism	3-0
Parochialism	2-2	NCC	2-0
UFW	2-2	InterCommunion	2-2
City: 17 Ecumenical Agencies, 13 RCs replied.			
Abortion	15-5	Racism	7-1
Parochialism	8-3	NCC	3-0
Outdated theology	4-2	InterCommunion	1-2

14. List the three issues which you have dealt with most *successfully*.

State: 23 Ecumenical Agencies, 9 RCs replied.			
Prison Chaplaincies	3-2	United Farm Workers	2-0
Legislation	4-2	Migrants	4-0
Welfare	4-1	Farah Strike	0-1
Metro: 20 Ecumenical Agencies, 12 RCs replied.			
Housing	2-2	Care of Aging	3-2
Civil Rights	3-1	Spiritual Ecumenism	0-3
County: 25 Ecumenical Agencies, 6 RCs replied.			
Spiritual Ecumenism	5-2	Housing	4-1
Prison Chaplaincies	4-1	Care of Aging	6-0
Drugs program	2-0	Leisure Ministry	0-2
City: 17 Ecumenical Agencies, 13 RCs replied.			
Penal Reform	7-1	Racism	3-1
Housing	7-2	Migrants	3-1
Spiritual Ecumenism	0-6	Chaplaincies	4-4

15. List three important issues which you are *currently* dealing.

State: 23 Ecumenical Agencies, 9 RCs replied.			
Criminal Justice	8-2	Housing for Aged	4-0
Help for Strikers	2-1	Religion in Public Schs.	3-0
Ecum. guidelines	0-2	Legislation	4-1
Metro: 20 Ecumenical Agencies, 12 RCs replied.			
Criminal Justice	4-2	Faith and Order	0-3
Housing	3-3	Aging	2-0
Chaplaincies	6-1	Welfare	3-0
County: 25 Ecumenical Agencies, 6 RCs replied.			
Religion in Pub. Schs.	3-2	Aging	3-1
Schs. for Exceptional Children	2-1	Help for Alcoholics	2-0
Criminal Justice	2-1	Abortion	0-1
City: 17 Ecumenical Agencies, 13 RCs replied.			
Prison Work	9-2	Racism	5-1
Housing for Aged	8-2	Legislation	2-0

The following issues were mentioned more than once, but not often: Christian-Jewish Relations; Israel; Leisure Ministry; Charismatics; Consultation on Church Union; Intercommunion; Holy Year 1975; Living Room Dialogues; Faith & Order; Gambling; Alcohol—though one ecumenical agency with obvious relish said one of their greatest benefits from RC membership was having some “spirited joy” at their annual meetings now!

SECTION III. In this Section, #16-50, the pairings indicate yes/no, according to the same geographical sequence as in Sections I and II. “RCs” here have already been included in the ecumenical groupings, but are also collated separately for purposes of comparison.

Following is a series of statements. Answer yes or no.

	State	Metro	County	City	RCs
16. Relationships between our ecumenical agency and the political forces in our community have been strained.	8/24	11/19	7/25	8/27	7/34
17. Our ecumenical activities have been enhanced by encouragement from the business leaders.	11/20	16/16	20/11	21/15	19/22
18. There is a positive feeling about community life in our area.	28/4	22/9	24/7	26/10	33/7
19. Our ecumenical agency exhibits creativity.	29/2	25/6	24/6	26/9	29/13
20. We have avoided dealing with the hard issues like abortion, parochial schools, gambling, alcohol problems, etc.	13/18	17/15	16/14	17/19	20/20
21. Much of our community ecumenical life is organized around events like the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, Pentecost, Thanksgiving.	14/18	15/17	18/13	17/20	24/17
22. The vitality of our ecumenical life is the result of the enthusiasm of a few key persons.	21/11	24/8	23/8	20/16	32/8
23. We have involved minority groups in our decision-making and programs.	16/16	23/8	23/8	20/16	22/18
24. Common prayer has become central to our ecumenical experience together.	18/14	16/12	21/9	21/15	31/9
25. Effective ecumenical life should have common prayer as its foundation.	16/12	31/1	30/1	32/5	41/0
26. Our ecumenical life is largely social-issue oriented.	18/14	17/14	17/13	26/20	16/24

	State	Metro	County	City	RCs
27. A major proportion of those involved in our ecumenical agency are lay persons.	11/21	10/21	19/20	21/15	13/26
28. Our denominations/churches are seriously attempting to do nothing separately which they could do together.	7/25	10/21	10/21	10/27	16/26
29. Theological dialogue is central to our ecumenical agency's life.	8/24	9/22	8/23	6/30	15/24
30. The resources of seminaries, theological schools and colleges in our area are frequently utilized in our ecumenical life.	14/18	18/13	17/14	19/19	24/20
31. We have had little theological study on controversial issues like abortion, parochial schools, gambling, alcohol, sexual promiscuity, ecology.	26/6	22/10	22/9	28/9	31/10
32. Sometimes I feel that our ecumenical agency is living with an uneasy truce, which doesn't really face the hard issues of ecumenical life.	15/17	19/12	16/15	23/14	26/15
33. Our ecumenical organization style is open enough that initiation of discussion around a concern can come from anyone. It need not come through channels.	26/3	29/2	28/4	34/3	36/5
34. Prospects for ecumenical life in our area in the future are poor.	2/30	4/26	4/26	3/36	5/38
35. Our ecumenical agency has a bright future in 1974-75.	25/7	25/6	25/7	27/11	31/11
36. We have tacitly agreed to ignore those issues on which there is little consensus.	15/17	12/19	16/14	16/20	24/15
37. A few persons who trust one another almost like a covenant community are crucial to an ecumenical life together.	28/4	24/6	26/5	31/6	31/8
38. Most other community agencies seem to ignore our ecumenical agency when dealing with community-wide issues.	16/15	14/17	14/27	13/23	20/20

	State	Metro	County	City	RCs
39. We do not frequently seek out other community agencies when planning to deal with community-wide issues.	9/22	8/22	9/22	8/29	15/24
40. Our real success has been in dealing with community issues, like housing welfare, etc. rather than in theological or ecclesial issues.	18/13	24/7	16/14	23/14	40/1
41. We are not really aware of the new findings of recent bi-lateral conversations between Protestant communions and Roman Catholics.	17/15	16/15	18/13	16/21	15/26
42. We are always responding to action and give little time to understanding our common theological foundations.	18/13	20/11	17/13	20/17	20/20
43. Roman Catholics have had only token relationships with the ecumenical agency in our community.	10/22	8/25	9/21	16/21	9/30
44. The future of Protestant-Catholic relations in our area is good.	28/4	29/3	28/3	34/3	40/1
45. Our monetary support has diminished over the past 2-3 years.	11/20	16/16	7/24	12/25	13/27
46. Faith and Order dialogue needs the assistance of professional theologians.	25/7	26/5	22/9	23/14	31/9
47. Capable ecumenical agency staff-members are the key to ecumenical success.	23/9	26/5	19/12	29/8	30/12
48. Without active task-groups and effective committees an ecumenical agency cannot succeed.	27/5	28/3	27/2	33/1	37/3
49. Christians who take opposite sides on issues like birth control and abortion, usually share a common concern for human life, and differ only regarding applications of Christian principles.	24/6	24/7	29/2	32/4	29/11

50. Rather than consider merely enlarging membership of our present ecumenical agency, we prefer to plan for a new ecumenical life together, whatever the organization changes may be.
- | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 21/9 | 16/14 | 13/16 | 22/13 | 27/13 |
|--|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

SECTION IV. From the 43 Roman Catholic respondents only.

- a. Does your diocese/archdiocese have an organized Ecumenical Commission?

State (9) Metro (15) County (6) City (13) Total (43)

- | | | | | | |
|------------|---|----|---|----|----|
| Yes | 8 | 15 | 4 | 13 | 40 |
| No | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Don't know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
- b. If yes, please answer the following: Does it have a staff person?
- | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| Yes | 5 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 22 |
| No | 3 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 17 |
| Don't know | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
- c. If yes, please answer the following: Is the staff person
- | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1) lay | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| clergy | 4 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 21 |
| religious | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 2) full time | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| part time | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 17 |
- d. Are Catholics members of the ecumenical agency in your area?
- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|----|----|
| Yes | 8 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 38 |
| No | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
- e. Who took the initiative?
- | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| We did | 5 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 31 |
| Other parties | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| Don't know | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
- f. Has the experience been
- | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|----|
| Good | 7 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 27 |
| So-so | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 15 |
| Poor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
- g. What budget does your Commission have?
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|
| | State | Metro | County | City | Total |
| Good | 5 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 19 |
| Little | 3 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
| None | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
- h. Who would you say are the Key Catholic leaders in your area?
 Named were:
 Bishops, pastors, nuns, laywomen, laymen, —variety

COMMENTARY UPON THE OPINIONAIRE AND ITS RESULTS

by

Rev. Dr. Arleon Kelley and Rev. David J. Bowman, S.J.

The Opinionaire was constructed to raise a variety of questions around seven or eight concern-areas which were identified from our broad ecumenical experience. This commentary attempts to sort out the response to these themes and provide insight into the experiences across the country in these concern-areas. Roman Catholic ecumenism, like all ecumenical life, seeks to relate the churches to existing **social systems** present in a community, county, city, metropolis, region or state. There are systems, to be sure, in other levels of American society; but we have selected the four that appear in this Opinionaire as most representative and probably easiest to deal with. (#7, 8, 10) Thus, the data for the concern-areas represent returns from the regional, county, city and state social systems levels.

Catholic participation exists in 93.4% of the 130 agencies which responded; 45.2% of them have full Catholic membership and participation. Initiative in more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the cases came from the ecumenical agency already existing. Churches came together around community issues 35.7% of the time, around Faith and Order issues 16% of the time and through Living-room Dialogues 14.6% of the time. (#3, 5, 6) There is plenty of room for improvement in these areas. It exists also in regard to having women on ecumenical boards and representatives of minority communities. (#3, 4)

The issues that **divided** are much as expected: abortion at all levels, parochialism at state, county, city. (#12) Issues that **impede** are mainly connected with denominationalism, the excessive attention to the internal structure and working of a church; this exists, unfortunately, in practically all churches in America and is a temptation at all levels. Apathy is another curse, leading to the very low priority usually given to ecumenical life. Fear is its twin. And poor organization of the ecumenical agency, with vague means to achieve vague goals is too often a problem. (#13)

Each level reports some **success** in activities proper to it. State agencies deal with migrants coming across their territory, with state chaplaincies in prisons and hospitals. Metropolitan agencies have succeeded in institutional ministries, in housing efforts and with the aged. County agencies report success in ecumenical prayer, in leisure ministries such as parks, in dealing with prisons, housing and the aged. City agencies report much the same as the county ones, adding racism as one issue dealt with successfully and often. (#14)

Current issues, considerably at all levels, are: religion and the public schools, clergy education, criminal justice matters, the Holy Year, abortion, housing, the aged, welfare, chaplaincies, prison reform, and, too infrequently, Faith and Order issues. (#15)

In the seemingly uncoordinated questions from #16 to #50 lie six clusters of questions on six areas of ecumenical life. The first concerns **motivations** for such shared life. (#21, 26, 28, 32, 34, 35, 37, 40, 43, 49, 50)

Roman Catholics, like most other Christians, feel a bit uneasy about the way we face the hard issues of ecumenical life, but optimistic about the future, and above all, see ecumenism as a covenant community. They see ecumenical life much more with the undergirding of spiritual ecumenism than other Christians seem to do who stress social action more. There is a 20% difference between Roman Catholics and the others here, and it is a significant difference which must be dealt with in coming to a better understanding of how local ecumenical life can succeed. For Catholics, a better balancing of action with prayer; for others, a better balancing of prayer with action.

Most Roman Catholics accept the good-will of other people who differ from them on abortion and birth control, so this augurs well for the ability of local communities to share in many aspects of ecumenical life even though they might not feel in conscience that they can so share in some very important matters of the quality of human life. Catholics show more concern for theological study and motivation arising from it, in regard to "pro life" issues. This should certainly be taken into account by ecumenical agencies.

One form of the "Lund principle" is #28. We wish we could find the one-third of the respondents who say that their church or denomination is seriously attempting to do nothing separately which could be done together! This would be an amazing phenomenon, and a completely serendipitous one. It could be that the respondents misunderstood the question, or it could be that this represents the aspirations of these communions rather than actual performance.

The second area of concern explored in the Opinionaire is **ecumenical community relations**. (#16, 17, 18, 36, 38, 39) Here there is much agreement. It seems worth noting that many Roman Catholics feel that their ecumenical participation has included a tacit agreement to ignore issues where consensus within the ecumenical agency does not exist. In our opinion, such tacit agreements should be brought to voice and probably to vote; they do not seem to help the ecumenical movement more than they hinder it, at least in the long run.

The third concern-area is **spiritual ecumenism**. (#24, 25, 29, 31, 41, 42, 46) There is basic strong agreement that common prayer should be the basis for ecumenical life, but that there is actually little theological study undergirding that life locally. There is significant difference of opinion in regard to the other questions between Roman Catholics and the other Christians. For instance, 20% more Roman Catholics say prayer is central to ecumenical life; more of them know about the bilateral theological conversations and try to apply theology to social action. This greater stress on theological and spiritual ecumenism

simply must be taken into account when ecumenical agencies or churches are considering inviting Roman Catholics into more active participation.

The Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, theological dialogue including Living-room Dialogues, the discipline which Catholics call "moral theology" and Protestants usually term "Christian ethics," and a method which would include prayer, study and social action together—all of these seem strongly indicated whenever Catholics are moving into greater participation in ecumenical life. Since the communities are likely to differ on their relative stress of these matters, some decent negotiations seem to be both necessary and in order. *Verb. sap. sat.*, as we used to say.

The fourth concern-area explored concerns **organizational styles**. (#3, 1, 9, 19, 20, 33, 44, 48) There is fairly general agreement about avoiding hard issues, the openness of the organization, its creativity (an encouraging evaluation, for sure) and the need for Task Forces to implement decisions. The disagreement on future prospects are only in kind; 75% of the entire group thinks prospects are good, whereas 90% of the Catholics do. The data indicate the need for the organizations to work at common issues, with strong theological underpinnings for this work, and often in Task Force style.

The fifth area of concern is **leadership style**. (#22, 23, 27, 37, 47) Note #37: It is absolutely crucial that the local group trust one another somewhat like a covenant community. There is strong agreement from all sides on this. The same strong agreement concerns the necessity of having capable staff for any ecumenical agency that exists. "Capable" must include having the time and the resources to do the job, not merely being a competent person. The evidence in #22, 23 and 27 seems to indicate that Catholics tend to let the clergy do it, and rely less on the laity. All agree that a few key persons with enthusiasm are absolutely necessary for the success of local ecumenism; the even stronger Catholic affirmation of this may well be a reflection of the episcopal structure of Catholic dioceses. Similarly, the failure to involve minorities may reflect the fact that few Hispanic-Americans are included in the survey. Again, we remark that improvement in the situation of laity and minorities is very much needed.

To summarize this section, ecumenical leaders should provide capable agency staff, able to generate enthusiasm and to form a covenant community of committed people, with minorities and laity strongly involved. This is an ideal seldom achieved so far.

The sixth area concerns **resources**. (#30, 45; Cf. #7, 8, 10) Only half the respondents said that academic resources are frequently used, so this is an obvious area for consideration and improvement. The fact that $\frac{2}{3}$ report no lessening in financial support is very encouraging and somewhat surprising. The larger community must become knowl-

edgeable about the ecumenical agency, as it must about the churches. To be effective, the ecumenical agency surely needs good relationships and interaction with the various systems on its level.

A special section of the Opinionaire was designed to elicit information from the Roman Catholic respondents. Of the 43 Roman Catholics in the mix, the following is noteworthy: some 95% of the respondents reported they have ecumenical commissions. (There are 165 dioceses in the U.S. with about 109 commissions as of a report in 1972.) Only 51% of these 43 persons in the sample reported that their diocese had a staff person assigned to the commission and of these, 87% are clergy. Of those dioceses having staff, 80.9% are part-time. There are obvious dangers and inadequacies lurking in all these facts and factors. Of the 43, only four knew of full-time Catholic ecumenical workers.

Some 88% of the sample dioceses are participants in ecumenical agencies. About two-thirds (65%) of the sample reported that Roman Catholics took the initiative for participation in the ecumenical organization. Three out of five (62.7%) reported that their experience in the ecumenical agency had been a good one. However, if the remaining two-fifths have had a bad experience, this augurs ill for the public relations of the ecumenical movement.

Another omen of evil is the fact that only 44.2% of the diocesan commissions report they have a "good budget." As noted above, capable people are absolutely necessary to the success of the ecumenical movement in its organized form. This means a competent person, with time to devote to it and a budget to support the work. This is obviously a rare thing among Roman Catholics.

Yet our final word must be appreciative and optimistic. Roman Catholic ecumenical life is vital and growing. They often take initiative and join ecumenical agencies. Their experience is usually good, and their resources are often adequate for at least the first difficult steps.

We look forward to hearing from many people who will use this booklet and inspect these data. The interpretations given in this short piece are accurate insofar as we can project them, but we realize that others may interpret statistics quite differently from our way. If the publishing of these will lead to a better survey of the country along the same lines, and a better analysis of the data published, then we surely will have accomplished a large part of our purpose. Christ calls us to manifest the unity which He gives, at every level of church life. We hope and pray that these data will enable many people better to express that unity in Christ that is the mark of His community; a concerned, sacrificing love for one another, especially for those who feel helpless in one or other system.

Part II

REPORTS AND STUDIES

MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF CHURCHES

The brevity of this Report on what participants familiarly term "Big MAC" is directly disproportionate to the time and care that went into it. It is a fine précis, and my only concern is that others may not hear the overtones of enthusiasm that are so evident in the Montana people. Big MAC sets an example for all of us.

Dioceses: Great Falls, Helena

Bishops: Most Rev. Eldon B. Schuster, Helena; Most Rev. Raymond G. Hunthausen, Great Falls

Agency: Montana Association of Churches, 681,021 people, 115,403 RCs

Address: Rocky Mountain College—Kimball Hall, Billings, Montana 59102

Phone: (406) 252-5138

Executive: Mr. Cecil Gubser

RC Participant: Rev. James H. Provost, P.O. Box 1729, Helena, Montana 59601, 406: 442-5820

Agency's composition: Am. Bapt. 3%; ALC 19%; Christian (Disciples) 1%; Epis. 3%; LCA 3%; RC 45%; UCC 5%; U.Meth. 14%; U.Presbyt. 7%

Annual Assembly membership: 48 designated members; 11 church executives; 9 other Board Members (Board = Executives, officers, at-large)

HISTORY

From invitations extended to Roman Catholics and American Lutherans by the Montana Council of Churches in 1968, various observers were exchanged and an initial effort launched in 1969 to form a broader based ecumenical effort. While failing of its over-all goal, it did produce a Joint Christian Education Commission for the State.

In 1971 the same churches held a Consultation of Christians which resulted in a Statement of Intent to work together more closely and to reexamine the possibility for a more inclusive ecumenical agency. An ad-hoc committee reported the next fall with a proposed constitution, and at a

third Consultation of Christians in 1973 the Montana Association of Churches was formed, including most of the former Council of Churches members and the two Roman Catholic Dioceses with the American Lutheran Church in addition.

After a year of operation, MAC has made significant progress using the Minnesota model for legislative activity. The Montana Religious Legislative Coalition, with official participants named by each member ecclesiastical unit of MAC, researches issues significant to the churches, prepares position papers, and submits these for MAC approval. Passed by the Association's Board they are approved in the Assembly either by majority vote or, if desired by the Coalition, Board or Assembly members, according to a special procedure. This procedure applies to more sensitive issues and requires each member ecclesiastical unit to caucus and cast one vote per ecclesiastical unit. A vote must be unanimous to bind the Association.

Cooperative ministries in resort areas and new mining developments are being fostered by a Committee of MAC. The Association sponsors a Junior Citizens Camp for disturbed children during the summer.

A Social Ministries Committee has been attempting to meet the crisis in marriage and family life with pilot projects of "Family Centers" in two Montana communities using an ecumenical approach.

The Christian Unity Committee handles Faith and Order projects. For 1975 these include a pilgrimage of Church Executives to major communities across the State, inviting people in outlying areas to join at each Pilgrimage Stop for common witness of the executives to their concern for Unity, and to discuss what is happening locally and within the State. The Committee held a retreat for the Association's Board in 1974, which proved to be an important step in building closer working relationship within the group and a deeper awareness of each other's commitment to Unity.

Staff for the Association consists in an Executive-Director who works part-time; secretarial assistance to him on demand; and an information person hired part time by the Montana Religious Legislative Coalition to promote its positions with appropriate State officials.

Although only a little over a year old, the Montana Association of Churches has already raised considerable hopes in the hearts of many main line Christians in the State. It has still to reach out effectively to Christians of other traditions, but shows promise of developing sufficient self identity to provide a vehicle for continued work and prayer toward Christian Unity.

Analysis of Responses in Montana to the Opinionaire

1. The Opinionaire was sent to approximately 50 Roman Catholics and Protestants involved in the Montana Association of Churches Board, the two Roman Catholic Ecumenical Commissions, and some local ecumenical bodies.

Seven Roman Catholics replied, twelve Protestants.

The results were tabulated and submitted to the members of the Board of the Montana Association of Churches and the two Ecumenical Commissions. Eleven persons responded with their analysis of what is significant in the nineteen returned Opinionaires.

2. Three of the analyses indicated the response was so small as to question its significance or reliability. However, with this in mind, there are some matters which do surface even in this small sampling.
3. Minorities and the powerless do not have significant involvement in ecumenical activities in Montana. The predominant group this would refer to are Native Americans, or Indians.

Why? Several analyses raised this question, but offered no answer.

4. There is a difference in how Roman Catholics and Protestants see the relationship of their ecumenical endeavors with the general community. Generally, Roman Catholics experience the general community as indifferent, while Protestants experience it as enthusiastic.

This may easily be the most significant difference between Roman Catholics and Protestants surfaced in the study, but again the question of why is difficult to answer.

5. Generally, both Roman Catholics and Protestants felt the ecumenical agencies they were involved with are somewhat effective. This is an important finding, and is interpreted by several analysts as an indication of improving ecumenical understanding and "climate" in the State.
6. Protestants and Roman Catholics have general agreement on the significant issues which divide them and the factors impeding ecumenical progress, but report a wide variation on what they think is successful or being currently handled.

Factors impeding ecumenical progress are indifference and distance in the state (first and third respectively for both Protestants and Roman Catholics). Several analysts find indifference among the clergy as the most significant item to tackle. As one pointed out, laity are reluctant to become involved until there is a favorable action on the part of clergy.

Catholics see education as the second most important impeding factor, while Protestants named denominational loyalties. Are these related? It is not clear, but is worth investigating. Fear is also recognized by both Catholics and Protestants as an important factor.

The three major divisive issues are birth control, abortion and gambling according to both Protestants and Roman Catholics.

7. Protestants see Christian unity efforts as already involving more theological (or faith) dimension than Roman Catholics perceive. Yet, Protestants disagree that Faith and Order work needs the help of professional theologians, while Roman Catholics agree professionals are needed. It could be that Roman Catholics and Protestants have different understandings of what "theological" dimensions mean, and differing expectations of the level of theological involvement to be desired (Protestants seeing it as already achieved, Catholics looking for something more).

8. Some random remarks give a flavor of the analysts' general reaction.

There is need to publicize successful programs more. On 35 statements concerning the practice and hopes of Christian Unity in the State, there is 80% agreement between Protestants and Roman Catholics on how they perceive things standing now. There is a general feeling of hope that the Montana Association of Churches will provide a leadership vehicle for ecumenical activities, and that visible working together "at the top" will stimulate greater local level ecumenism. Indeed, one noted that grass roots ecumenism may be "folksy" and "spiritual," but it does not lead to involvement beyond the immediate locality—for this, common witness from a larger "top level" group is needed.

Protestants are generally more excited and hopeful about having Roman Catholics involved in unity work, than Roman Catholics are. However, Protestants are also concerned over the lack of involvement of non-main line churches, according to one Protestant analyst. A Roman Catholic analyst perceived just the opposite: more Roman Catholic concern for this, and some reluctance on the part of main line Protestants.

A suggestion was included by one analyst that a similar study be conducted in several years to see if there are any significant changes.

Next steps: 1. Pilgrimage of all Church executives (in "Alpha" and "Omega" teams) to major centers throughout the State during the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, with all Christians invited to Pilgrimage Stops.

2. Study of implications of "hard data" study by RC Ecumenical Commissions and Board of MAC.

Imitable aspects: Voting on most issues at the Assembly is by majority, but for more important matters a majority vote can call for special procedure of caucus by member ecclesiastical unit, one vote per unit, with unanimous vote to pass.

Before a matter can be acted on by the Assembly as binding on the Association, it must be researched under direction of Board of Directors and a recommendation made by the Board to the Assembly (avoids hasty decisions with inadequate homework).

LOUISIANA INTERCHURCH CONFERENCE (L.I.C.)

Montana is still in its first burst of enthusiasm. Louisiana went through that, but was not nearly so well prepared for the longer haul. We wanted to describe both experiences, for the sake of reality. Msgr. Plauché writes with his unique combination of candor and disarming good-humor as he says, "... our difficulties represent challenges, not obstacles." That spirit can only be of the Holy Spirit.

State: Population 3,729,428 in all; Roman Catholics 1,206,258

Dioceses: Archdiocese of New Orleans—Most Rev. Philip M. Hannan
Alexandria—Most Rev. Lawrence P. Graves
Baton Rouge—Most Rev. Joseph V. Sullivan
Lafayette—Most Rev. Gerard L. Frey

Ecumenical Agency: Louisiana Interchurch Conference, 1122 Broadway,
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118, 504: 866-0700

Executive Director: Rev. Dr. Robert F. Harrington (U.M.)

RC Participant: Reverend Msgr. Charles J. Plauché, St. Frances Xavier
Cabrini Church, 5500 Paris Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122,
504: 288-4224

HISTORY

"In His unfailing providence, God our Father calls us to demonstrate the oneness we already share through faith in Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. The Holy Spirit summons us to that perfect oneness which Jesus wills for His people. In joyful response we do hereby constitute ourselves into the Louisiana Interchurch Conference as a contemporary instrument of our obedience."

Thus, in resounding terms, did the heads, or their representatives, of eleven judicatories from among the Christian communions of Louisiana join together in a new Covenant. The date was February 20, 1970; the place, The First Presbyterian Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The signatories represented:

- The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
- The Episcopal Diocese of Louisiana
- The Lutheran Church in America
- The Presbyterian Church, U.S.
- The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New Orleans
- The Roman Catholic Diocese of Alexandria
- The Roman Catholic Diocese of Baton Rouge
- The Roman Catholic Diocese of Lafayette
- The United Church of Christ
- The United Methodist Church
- The United Presbyterian Church U.S.A.

L.I.C. was not the dream child of any one person of great vision, nor was it a remarkable innovation. It was born of many circumstances and events—the very successful initiation of a program, "Operation Understanding," for reciprocal visitation of houses of worship among Catholics, Protestants, Orthodox and Jews in 1964 and 1965; the feeling among members of the Louisiana Council of Churches, already renamed the Louisiana Interchurch Conference, that they represented a small minority of Louisiana Christians and much desired Roman Catholic moral and financial support; the example of our neighbor State of Texas, and many other factors. More than that, the great ecumenical movement among Protestant and Orthodox Christians had made itself felt, and the more recent effects of Vatican Council II's 1964 Decree on Ecumenism were filtering through to the Roman Catholic Community.

Thus it was that when, on a hot July day in 1968, a delegation from the then all-Protestant and Anglican Louisiana Interchurch Conference, headed by the Rev. Arch M. Tolbert of University Presbyterian Church of Baton Rouge, called on Archbishop Philip H. Hannan at his office in New Orleans to ask for the formation of an all-inclusive Christian group, the Archbishop unhesitatingly agreed and immediately appointed the author of this article to work with representatives of the other Catholic Dioceses and the Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox communions toward the writing of a new constitution.

In the fall Mr. Tolbert and I invited representatives of every Christian Communion in Louisiana to a meeting at Notre Dame Seminary in New Orleans, at which time we explained our general purposes and invited participation. Of this meeting was born the Joint Committee on Christian Cooperation, with Tolbert and Plauché as co-chairmen.

The balance of 1968 and most of 1969 were devoted to meetings of the committee. It was an interminable process, and very many full days were spent in pondering, discussing and debating. The group reduced itself to a hard core of a dozen or so clergymen, who undoubtedly moved too slowly, but did at least establish firm bonds of mutual understanding, honesty and great friendship as a result of their shared deliberations and meditations.

Drafts of the constitution were periodically sent out to Communion heads and many other persons for their comments and suggestions. Finally, toward the end of 1969 a consensus of the eleven present members was reached.

Great regret was experienced when the all-black communions of African Methodist Episcopalians and A.M.E. Zion saw fit, perhaps because of the black separatist movement of the times, not to join us. However, we decided that several of our Communions had many black members, so that we could never be deemed to be lily-white. In fact, it was pointed out that almost one quarter of all black Roman Catholics in the United States belong to the three Dioceses of South Louisiana. Nor did we overlook the many black Methodists, Episcopalians and others.

It was also unfortunate that the Louisiana Baptist Convention, because of its constitutional structure, was unable to participate in L.I.C. as a judicatory. However, cordial relations do exist between the two groups.

In any event, a constitution was finally agreed upon. It provided for **ex officio** membership of all Communion heads on the board and for equal clergy and lay membership in the general assembly.

In planning the constituting assembly, the Joint Committee had to outline a program, at least in the rough, and to recommend officers. The Episcopal representative stated that his Bishop would favor the choosing of a Roman Catholic as first president. After it was decided that it might be best not to choose the Archbishop or one of the Bishops, someone asked, "What about you, Charlie?" and I replied, "Well, if you're looking for a second-rate Roman Catholic, you have one here." And so it was done. It proved an unwise decision.

The constituting assembly, holding its sessions at the Catholic Life Center and its worship service and Covenant signing at the First Presbyterian Church in Baton Rouge, was a grand affair. It was something new in Louisiana. The clergymen met in a spirit of great euphoria and warm fellowship, and the lay people were thrilled and charged with emotion.

Unfortunately, it almost all stopped right there. The program plans, in spite of some real input from the assembly members, remained vague, and we still had no director to carry the ball and bring it over the goal line. Thus the whole first year was nearly lost. I say only **nearly**, because much time was spent in charting out programs in local ecumenical development, in Church and society concerns, and in Faith and Order. Nor was this time spent in vain. For instance, several Faith and Order Seminars under the guidance of the present Episcopal Bishop of Northwest Texas, Willis F. Henton, were quite successful in a modest way, and the committee appointed to find an executive was busy amid many frustrations.

Finally, late in '70 we found the Rev. Lewis Wilkins, a Presbyterian U.S. clergyman of impeccable credentials, and he took over as executive director at the start of '71. Lew put some order into the organization, studied the programs projected and offered us many alternatives and possibilities. Finally on September 15, 1971, at Lafayette, Louisiana, as a hurricane began to close in on a board meeting, we decided to concentrate on prison or corrections reform as our main program for the year.

This was approved at the January 1972 assembly, which elected Bishop Iveson B. Noland of the Episcopal Diocese of Louisiana as president. He and director Wilkins secured the services of Msgr. Alexander O. Sigur as head of a Corrections Reform Committee, which has achieved wide success and much public exposure, together with the cooperation of civil authorities.

During the 2-year incumbency of Bishop Noland, Sigur's committee continued to do its work, and will remain active for the indefinite future. In the meantime, plans were laid last year for a new program for the aged. Lutheran Pastor Frank Kirchner proposed his plan at the 1974 January assembly, which elected United Methodist Rev. J. Woodrow Hearn as president. Kirchner's program was accepted, and co-chairmen are now hard at work on the matter. Efforts at serious multilateral and bilateral theological dialogue are also under way now under the gentle but firm leadership of Woodrow Hearn.

In the meantime, Wilkins has gone to another assignment and L.I.C., after an exhaustive search, has chosen Dr. Robert F. Harrington, a black United Methodist, as director. Much is expected of him.

L.I.C. is pleased to have a black executive, who was chosen from among several applicants on his own merits and on no other grounds.

At a most recent meeting of an L.I.C. Committee many questions were raised: Should this be only a union of heads of judicatories? If not, where exactly do the ordinary members, clerical and lay, who meet only once a year, fit in? Are we really reaching the people? and so on.

We do have problems, but we believe the right questions are being asked about them. We mean every word that is in the Covenant and the constitution of which the Covenant is preamble. We mean to continue and persevere, under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, and so our difficulties represent challenges, not obstacles.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Bishop Charles Helmsing, Chairman of the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, 1969-1973, and Co-chairman of the International Anglican-Roman Catholic theological commission (ARCIC), graciously taped his personal reflections on the state of ecumenism in his diocese. We share it as received.

Diocese: Kansas City-St. Joseph. c. 1,250,000 people; 130,000 RCs
Bishop: Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing, P. O. Box 1037, Kansas City, Missouri 64141, 816: 531-1475

The Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph is a member of three ecumenical clusters: **MICA**, the Metropolitan Inter Church Agency of Greater Kansas City; **MERM**, the Midland Empire Regional Ministry, located at St. Joseph, Missouri, embracing much of the surrounding area both in Kansas and Missouri; and **ICC**, the Inter Church Council located at Clinton, Missouri, and embracing a number of counties, approximately 100 miles south of Kansas City, and including territory in three Roman Catholic territories, the Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph, the Diocese of Springfield-Cape Girardeau, and the Diocese of Jefferson City.

1. The Metropolitan Inter Church Agency of Greater Kansas City grew out of an effort to expand the Metropolitan Church Council which was

a cluster of various Protestant denominations in existence many years before my arrival in Kansas City in 1962. MICA is structured for membership on the judicatory level, and after its constitution was worked out, it took in Roman Catholics of both Kansas City-St. Joseph Diocese and the Kansas City, Kansas, Archdiocese, as well as a number of conservative Evangelicals and Protestant bodies that had not previously been in the Metropolitan Church Council.

In MICA, each judicatory is represented by two members who make up the agencies' cabinet, and really govern the ecumenical cluster.

MICA operates through its executive secretaries and their office force, tackling problems on an *ad hoc* basis through various task forces. Judicatories join these task forces on a voluntary basis.

Judicatory heads meet very rarely, and this is, perhaps, a weakness, but understandable because of the many demands on their time and their travel. The judicatory representatives on the cabinet constitute a body which really builds up friendships and enables the judicatories to face problems together or in dialogues among themselves.

Initially there was great zeal for various social action programs, but ultimately these were taken over by a small group of judicatories and sometimes ended by being the sole responsibility of one judicatory. There was initial zeal for various programs under the Council of Religion and Race. Currently, racial justice in housing has become the sole responsibility and expense of the Roman Catholic judicatory in Kansas City, Missouri, aided by personnel assistance from the Jewish Community and the Presbyterians. Considerable responsibility has fallen on the Roman Catholic group for Project Equality. The result has been that our Diocesan Pastoral Council has found it impossible to fund the Social Action Programs, and at the same time give adequate support to MICA as well as the larger judicatories in the Metropolitan Area. Our contribution has currently dwindled to \$4,000.00 a year, whereas we were asked to give a proportionate share amounting approximately to \$15,000.00 a year. This has been a bit embarrassing for us, but we hope, understandable on the part of our associates in MICA.

When MICA first organized, there was a recognition that statements, especially on an advocacy basis, could be a source of division rather than unity. It was consequently part of the original agreement, which still holds, that MICA would not issue any statements unless they were unanimous. Individual judicatories, or groups of judicatories could still be responsible for statements, especially on an advocacy basis. It was thought prudent that the best witness would be service, and that is what the Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph aims at doing through its own social action programs, and, it was hoped originally, on an ecumenical basis.

Some violation of the regulation that there be no statements unless they are unanimous, has been the occasion of some difficulties in MICA.

Newcomers in the cabinet, and those who do not remember the original agreement, are apt to be at fault in this matter.

MICA's current difficulties can be summed up in the lack of tangible results. This can be a source of embarrassment for the staff, who feel that they must give evidence of their efficient work. Members of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph have sensed at times that MICA seems inclined to become a "super-church" or the equivalent of another chancery office, both in its operation and in its expense.

As for the future, it would be tragic to think of dissolving MICA, and therefore efforts are being made to strengthen the various task forces. One task force recently activated is that on Faith and Order. Hope has been expressed that the extensive and productive work done in the various bilateral dialogues among the various churches and communions might be fruitfully brought down to the level of the parish ministers, and through them to the laity.

MICA has had its difficulties and tense moments. We are constantly examining ourselves as to what we might do to better MICA's presence in our community and its catalyzing influence for the unity of all Christians. MICA's relationship with the Jewish community is largely on the basis of observer status, or *ad hoc* action or statements, provided unanimity can be achieved.

2. MERM. Midland Empire is a popular term for the area surrounding the City of St. Joseph, fifty miles north of Kansas City. MERM is an ecumenical cluster ostensibly on the judicatory level, but much less pretentious than its counter-part, MICA, in Kansas City. The Roman Catholic presence in MERM is largely through the initiative of the pastors of the Roman Catholic parishes in St. Joseph, Missouri, although there is some interest on the part of pastors in the surrounding rural area.

MERM operates on a very small budget of voluntary contributions of the local parishes, and a small contribution from the Diocese.

Appraisal of its efficiency is largely on the basis of its constituting a forum for communication among the various denominations of this area. Its part-time secretary has been efficient in listing calendars of events of ecumenical import, especially those of spiritual ecumenism, and tries to keep the various pastors of all denominations aware of the sick in the local hospital. Those working closely with MERM feel that it would be a mistake to try to dissolve it even though it is so very loosely structured.

Like its counterpart, MICA, in the Kansas City area, MERM has experienced that zeal for social action has led to some very wonderful work on the community basis for the poor and underprivileged. MERM was a catalyst for the merging of two large social service agencies, Catholic Family and Community Services of the Roman Catholic Diocese, and Wesley Services, Inc. These joined forces under one constitution. This merger of Catholic Charities and Methodist Services was so suc-

cessful that it was joined the first part of January of this year by the Presbyterians and the United Church of Christ. Services, Inc., is the new agency funded by the United Fund and reaching out in a multiplicity of social action efforts that show a united Christian front to the whole community. Services, Inc., however, is totally distinct from MERM.

Ongoing dialogue is trying to face the question, "Should MERM be absorbed by Services, Inc., or vice versa?" Consensus at the moment seems to be that both continue to serve a useful purpose. Initially, MERM suffered somewhat from the efforts of a few conservative evangelical groups to use it as a forum for proselytising. This alienated some Roman Catholic pastors initially and dulled their appetite for ecumenism. Hopefully, that is a problem that has been eliminated.

3. ICC. The Inter Church Coordinating Council, located at Clinton, Missouri, is an ecumenical cluster on the judicial level with little backing of the clergy but largely kept alive by some of our Roman Catholic laity, notably the current secretary, Mrs. Ralph Clary.

ICC seems to be largely action-oriented, and has been responsible for a number of significant projects in the rural area. ICC, for instance, was responsible for a very good land reclamation law by the Missouri Legislature requiring strip mining operations to replace the land. ICC has been responsible for outpatient mental health clinics. It has been responsible for meals-on-wheels, and a whole variety of volunteer services for the poor, the aged, and the underprivileged. ICC has been studied by Father Bernard Quinn, of CARA.

Since the Roman Catholic presence in the area is a very small percentage, the interest of Roman Catholics is also very small. Those who are interested, however, do contribute significantly to the success of the ecumenical cluster. A very modest sum is donated by the Diocese for the support of ICC.

I hope that the above will be of some service to you. I have tried to make my observations objective, though I admit some of my judgments, perhaps, are personal. As I indicated, representation on the judicatory level prevents the bishop from becoming personally involved to the extent that he would like. However, I suppose that the inability to be personally involved by the judicatory is one of the limitations of such representation.

(MICA) Rev. James O. Leffingwell, Executive Director, Metropolitan Inter-Church Agency, 3501 Campbell, Kansas City, Missouri 64109, 816: 842-0054

(MERM) Ms. Nancy E. Sandehn, Midland Empire Regional Ministry, 303 N. 7th Street, St. Joseph, Missouri 64501, 816: 232-2082

(ICC) Dr. Donald W. Zimmerman, Interchurch Coordinating Council of West Central Missouri, 102-B South Main Street, P. O. Box 211, Clinton, Missouri 64735, 816: 855-5976

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

We chose Philadelphia as a major metropolitan area where Roman Catholics are not members of the ecumenical agency, but are co-operating with it in a number of ways. Bishop Lohmuller frequently represents the Archdiocese in ecumenical life.

Archdiocese: Philadelphia, Pa. 3,900,000 people; 1,375,000 RCs

Bishop: Cardinal Archbishop John Krol

Roman Catholic Agency: The Cardinal's Commission on Human Relations

Director: Rev. Charles Devlin; Associate Dir. Sr. Gloria Coleman, SHCJ,
222 N. 17th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103, 215: 587-3760

Ecumenical Agency: Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia, 1520
Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102, 215: 563-7854

Director: Rev. Rufus Cornelsen (LCA)

Agency's Composition: Judicatory membership; some Roman Catholic participation; Jewish too; Task Force style; with coalitions; inviting greater RC collaboration, willing to adapt

Data: Initiative has lain with the ecumenical agencies, and usually community issues have drawn people together; the civic community exhibits unusual enthusiasm for ecumenical events; optimism prevails about ecumenical futures; most feel they have been addressing the difficult issues, but have not been doing so with theological resources; strong need is felt for mutual trust.

ISSUES IMPEDING:

Clerical apathy and distrust; Lack of communication and trust
Lack of coordinated planning at top levels

ISSUES DIVISIVE:

Abortion, Birth Control, Parochialism, Racism

ISSUES SUCCESSFUL:

Vietnam Peace Action, Pro-life, National Health Insurance, Christian Unity, Welfare Issues, Correctional Justice

ISSUES CURRENT:

Gangs, Health, Fuel Crisis, Bicentennial

HISTORY

The task of implementing the Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council and the promotion of Christian Unity was mandated to the Cardinal's Commission on Human Relations by His Eminence John Cardinal Krol, who created the Commission in May of 1964 to pursue the dual apostolate of racial harmony and ecumenical/interfaith affairs. In 1969 Dr. Rufus Cornelsen assumed the role as Executive Director

of the Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia (MCCP) whose structure was reorganized from a loose ministerial conglomerate to a Board on which the various Protestant denominations in Philadelphia are represented by their Judicatory Executives. An excellent relationship between the MCCP and the CCHR of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia has developed. When the Cardinal's Commission was formed, the Most Reverend John J. Graham, Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia, was appointed Chairman, and Msgr. Philip J. Dowling was appointed as first Executive. The present Executive Director is the Reverend Charles V. Devlin.

Numerous projects have been conducted both at the judicatory level and at grassroots levels as cooperative efforts of the MCCP and the CCHR. In 1965 special emphasis was placed on the local observance of the Church Unity Octave. During the years 1966-68 three Ecumenical Retreat weeks were held. During the week, groups of selected Catholic and other clergy came together for prayer, theological and social study, and discussion. The most significant of these was held in the spring of 1968 at the Dominican Retreat House at Elkins Park, PA. The opening theological presentation on the Eucharist by three theologians representing various eucharistic traditions provided an inner dynamic to the Conference which resulted in a deep and lasting spiritual experience. Approximately thirty-five clergymen attended each of these retreats.

Archdiocesan Ecumenical Guidelines were drawn and published in 1968 to promote a singleness of purpose in all ecumenical activities.

Singular among the major ecumenical activities was the hosting of the National Workshop for Christian Unity held in 1969, and sponsored by the Archdiocese. Great cooperation in the development of programs as well as attendance was given by the Protestant denominations. As many as 800 Roman Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Ecumenists attended the general sessions which centered on the theme, "Christ, Sign of Prophecy and Unity to a Broken World." The keynote speech was delivered by Jan Cardinal Willebrands at the opening session, attended by local and national leaders. Preliminary to the National Workshop, preliminary Regional or grassroots workshops were held in twelve areas of the greater Philadelphia region, attended by 6,000 people. These Regional Workshops met for five weeks on five different themes: The Call to Unity; Prayer and Worship; Witness: Its Meaning; Me: the Change of Heart Necessary; and We: the Community Response.

Another annual major event in which there was Protestant and Catholic cooperation was the annual Peace celebration on the World Day of Peace each year. At these services the heads of denominations came together to participate in ecumenical worship. Although there is no formal membership of the Archdiocese in MCCP, representatives have attended meetings occasionally on an informal basis. There also has been some structural movement toward a more formalized coopera-

tion. For example: regional coordinators were appointed by the Archdiocese to develop the ecumenical apostolate and similar regional directors have been appointed by other denominations, especially the Lutheran Church. More recently there have been meetings involving the Catholic Bishops and Judicatory Executives, who meet now regularly four times a year to discuss issues and to develop programs and methods of cooperation.

Church Unity Octave '74 was observed with a special program of Theological Seminars, programs for Youth, Clergy and Religious Women and Laity. The major theme of the Week "The Christian Community Views Its Differences" was treated in subthemes "Unity and Diversity in New Testament Ecclesiology"; "Faith and Ministry Relating to Life and Social Issues," and "Respect Life," which included, Capital Punishment, Abortion, Prison Reform, and Aid to Education.

During the Holy Year of 1974, services of renewal and reconciliation were held in several areas as the result of grassroots initiative. On June 16th a major Ecumenical Observance of the Holy Year entitled "The Pilgrimage of Hope" took place. The Pilgrimage was jointly planned by an inter-faith committee. The Pilgrimage began outside City Hall where a Declaration of Purpose was delivered, and proceeded to the outside of the Arch Street Methodist Church, to the Monument in memory of the six million Jewish martyrs of the Holocaust and to the steps of the Cathedral. A short prayer service was held at each of these stations. The Pilgrimage then proceeded by candlelight to the Art Museum where the concluding ceremony took place. Among those making the Pilgrimage were all the Catholic Bishops, including John Cardinal Krol, the Executives of the various Protestant Judicatories, the President and representatives of the Board of Rabbis and some seven thousand clergy, religious and laity who participated despite extremely bad weather. The major presentation at the concluding ceremony was made by Mother Teresa of Calcutta who also walked the entire route of of Pilgrimage. The simplicity of her person and message, will have a lasting effect on the work of interfaith cooperation for years to come.

Of particular significance is the development recently of bicentennial coordinators for each of the Christian communities. They have been authorized by the Catholic Bishops and Judicatory Executives to develop programming for the bicentennial and to advocate for it, but with relationship to the general body of Bishops and Executives. We are currently looking forward to the celebration of the International Eucharistic Congress in Philadelphia in 1976 during the first week of August. Preliminary plans are being made for structural input by the Protestant Community. We hope to share the Ecumenical benefits of the Congress throughout the Philadelphia area and indeed throughout the nation.

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

This is a favorite place, partly because they seriously studied the 1972 Report on Possible RC Membership in NCC, and sent an excellent summary in—something that few dioceses have done as yet. Partly because they made the Opinionaire an essential part of their work. Mainly because they have been anticipating the thrusts of the booklet so effectively. Witness the setting up of a diocesan Office of Ecumenical Affairs on November 21, with Fr. Dentinger as full-time director. Witness Fr. Schmidt's remaining as a staff-person with responsibilities for Christian-Jewish relations and as a contact for Charismatics. Witness Archbishop McDonough's strong support of these men, with office and funding. Witness.

Diocese: Archdiocese of Louisville; 1,200,000 people; 189,000 RCs

Ecumenical Officers: Rev. Stanley A. Schmidt, 501 Cherrywood Road, Louisville, Ky. 40207, 502: 897-5207. Rev. Gerald B. Dentinger, 512 Breckinridge Lane, Louisville, Ky. 40207, 502: 896-0241

Ecumenical Agency: Louisville Area Interchurch Organization for Service (LAIOS), 520 West Magnolia, Louisville, Ky. 40208, 502: 637-2591

Ecumenical Executive: Rev. Thomas H. Quigley (Christian Church-Disciples)

LAIOS: Has full RC membership, no Jewish membership; is comprised of judicatories and congregations with coalition-style operation.

ISSUES IMPEDING:

Apathy; Lack of funding; Denominationalism; Lack of participation by Southern Baptists; Lack of time; Low visibility of LAIOS in church and community

ISSUES DIVISIVE:

School busing; Racism; Welfare; Housing; Abortion

ISSUES SUCCESSFUL:

Meeting immediate human needs; Worship; Senior Citizens Counselling service; United Campus Ministry at Jefferson County College

ISSUES CURRENT:

Busing; Housing; Senior Citizens; Welfare; Soviet Jewry; Linkage to Congregations; Improvement of chief judicatory executives

DATA SHOW:

Strongly positive attitude to ecumenical life
very optimistic view of future developments
avoidance of hard issues, with little theological study of them

determination to pray more together, as a basis for better cooperative life
openness to the community, for service

SIGNIFICANT CONCLUSIONS:

Archdiocese participation was probably essential for the creation and initial support for LAIOS

NEXT STEPS:

1. Mission priorities suited to community needs.
2. New process for better involvement of denominational staff.
3. Enabling individuals to share actions by agencies and judicatories.

HISTORY

The story of Roman Catholic ecumenical involvement in Louisville and the story of the emergence of the ecumenical agency which now serves the Louisville metropolitan area are closely linked. The commitment to ecumenical involvement by the Archdiocese and the creation of the Louisville Area Interchurch Organization for Service (LAIOS) are both products of the turbulent sixties.

The civil-rights movement, the anti-war movement, the alienation of young people, the deepening split between conservatives and liberals in the Church, the changes brought about by Vatican II, urban riots, and the growing urban sprawl all had their effects on ecumenical life in Louisville.

The principal ecumenical vehicle in Louisville prior to 1970 was the Louisville Area Council of Churches. In the earlier sixties, the Council underwent some major changes in direction and philosophy. Attempting to respond creatively to the civil-rights movement, the Council began to lead the local Protestant community into the struggle for human rights and racial equality. This was clearly a move away from a program primarily concerned with delivery of service. The Council was becoming a community organizing and social action agency. One effect of this shift was the loss of some support from the conservative churches and an almost total loss of non-church financial support from local business and industry. By 1968 the Council of Churches was in serious trouble financially and ideologically. Its constituency was becoming more and more limited, to the point that it was dominated almost totally by the white, main-line, middle-class Protestant communions. The evangelical churches, including the Southern Baptist community (over $\frac{1}{3}$ of the local church population) were no longer supporting the Council to any significant extent. The predominantly Black denominations and the Roman Catholics had never been and were not participating in the Council of Churches. Several of the major programs of the Council—the chaplaincy programs and a counseling center—were being cut back

significantly. Financial needs were high. Funds were not available. The life of the Council itself was endangered.

In the same period the local Roman Catholic community was responding, not only to the social upheaval of the nation, but also to the impact of Vatican II upon the life of the the Catholic Church. In March of 1966 Archbishop John Floersh formed the Ecumenical Commission of the Archdiocese. The present chairman, Father Stanley Schmidt was one of the original members.

For several years the Commission's efforts were mainly centered around two dialogues, one with Episcopal priests, another with Lutheran pastors. In the parishes, the Vatican II impact was being felt as parish priests began to participate in local ministerial associations. A number of "Living Room Dialogues" were formed. For many, the planning process which preceded these dialogues was the first opportunity for Roman Catholic and Protestant clergymen to come together to plan a joint project.

As this stage of development was nearing its end, the Archdiocese found itself welcoming a new Archbishop, Thomas J. McDonough. The new day of ecumenical relationship in Louisville was symbolized by the participation of Randall Dew, Executive Director of the Louisville Area Council of Churches, in the installation service for Archbishop McDonough.

The search for a new ecumenical vehicle for Louisville began in 1969 within two separate but related spheres of activity. One involved the struggle of the Louisville Area Council of Churches to maintain its institutional life. The other involved the attempts by denominational chief executives to get to know one another.

On March 24, 1969, Bishop Gresham Marmion of the Episcopal Diocese of Kentucky wrote to his counterparts in the other denominations, expressing his concern about the need for cooperative mission planning. In his letter to Archbishop McDonough, he wrote:

"As I look at what's going on in the world around us, and see what's happening in the churches, I've become convinced that we must begin to do a more effective job of working together if the Church is to speak with any meaning or move with any effectiveness in our day. I see the need to begin serious conversations regarding cooperative planning and mission strategy and church extension. All of us are engaged in cooperative work to some extent, through councils of churches and the like, but given the realities of our day, I think that most of this work is fairly limited."

A note from Bishop Marmion's file indicates that the Archbishop's response was "immediate and positive." Bishop Marmion proceeded to convene a meeting of executives on May 15, 1969.

The sphere of activity regarding the future of the Council of Churches was perhaps the more crucial of the two, but there is no doubt that the trust-building and friendships which were developing among the denominational executives did much to facilitate later formal agreements among the denominations.

On March 19, 1969, (five days before Bishop Marmion's letter) two representatives of the Council of Churches met with Archbishop Mc-Donough to discuss the future of the Council. Rev. John McLaney, the new Executive Director of the Council, and Henry Huff, the Council President, proposed and requested some official involvement of the Archdiocese in a process which would decide the future of the Council of Churches.

A committee of the Council of Churches had been meeting to discuss the situation of the Council and to study alternatives for its future. It had been determined fairly early in the process that the Council of Churches, as it was then structured, was inadequate to meet the needs of the community. The leadership was concerned that the Council had become a predominantly white, middle-class, Protestant effort. Moreover, one-third of the religious community, the Roman Catholics, were not involved at all. Another third, the Southern Baptists, were involved only marginally. With an awareness also that the Black churches were not significantly involved, the Council felt its impotence in the face of pressing community needs and rapid social changes.

Correspondence with ecumenical agencies in Columbus, Kansas City, Rochester, and Portland had revealed that the experiences in Louisville were not significantly different from those of other communities across the nation. The traditional patterns of ecumenism centered in local councils of churches were proving to be inadequate in more and more cities in the nation. The Louisville Council came to the belief that basic changes needed to be made. The local ecumenical vehicle needed to be more inclusive. It needed to have more solidly based community support. It needed to deal from a position of strength rather than weakness. No face-lift of the Council would be adequate and no overhaul sufficient to do an adequate job for the religious community. No pre-determined model was projected for the future but a commitment was made to gather all potential participants to explore new models together.

Following the March, 1969, meeting with the Archbishop, the Council of Churches received a favorable reply to its request that the Archdiocese participate in the process to determine the Council's future. On April 4, 1969, the Archbishop wrote to the Council President to report that the Archdiocese was ready to go and needed only to see a date set. Father Stanley Schmidt and Father Gerald Dentinger, appointed by the Archbishop to represent him in these discussions, have been constant and key figures.

Consultation with Rev. Richard Hughes, then of Rochester, New York, brought out these points:

The most important new element is the willingness of the Catholic Church to consider participation in the Council; the most important concept of ecumenism is neighborhood or grass roots ecumenism; the new organization must be structured denominationally through judicatories rather than congregationally.

Following the Hughes report, the Council decided to issue invitations to all local judicatories and denominational bodies to participate in a Consultation on Ecumenical Mission. This was the final decision which would bring down the curtain for the Council and set the stage for something altogether different.

The Consultation began its work in September and moved rather rapidly towards a choice for a new model for ecumenical mission planning. Rev. John McLaney was asked by the Council of Churches to serve as staff for the Consultation. Reverend Nathan VanderWerf of the Metropolitan Area Church Board in Columbus, Ohio, and Rev. Randolph Thornton of the Metropolitan Interchurch Agency of Kansas City, Mo., came as consultants.

The third meeting of the Consultation in December, 1969, decided to draft a working paper, which was presented on January 20, 1970. Subsequent meetings to rework the draft were held on February 26 and April 2. By late Spring 1970 a model for the "Louisville Area Interchurch Organization for Service" (LAIOS) was prepared and ready for formal consideration by the denominations.

The new ecumenical agency, LAIOS, was born in March, 1971. Seven different churches were committed to the new endeavor. These included Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Disciples, United Church of Christ, Untied Methodists, and Roman Catholics. The delegates elected Father Stanley Schmidt as their first president. The Archdiocese began and has continued to be one of the strongest participants in LAIOS, providing leadership, resources, and funding for most LAIOS related ministries. The current LAIOS president is Father Gerald Dentinger.

During its first three years, LAIOS had to struggle to find its best identity. Since it was a totally new style of ministry for the community, LAIOS needed to feel its way along very slowly. With practically every proposal brought to the Forum, something else new in the way of procedural questions had to be faced. Furthermore, its very nature as a facilitating body, rather than as an action-oriented or position taking body, kept LAIOS in a situation of minimal visibility in the religious community. Not only did LAIOS remain something of an unknown among Roman Catholics; it was similarly little known within the Protestant member denominations.

As part of its determination to be of valuable service to the member Churches, LAIOS has sponsored two major workshops during 1973 and

1974. In May of 1973 key decision makers in each member denomination were invited, along with their representatives on the LAIOS Forum to help expose and examine the principal factors which were impeding ecumenical cooperation. They looked for these obstructions both within the operation of LAIOS and within their own denominational structures. This effort resulted in a strong mandate to the members to come together again to meet a single urgent need: to develop a common set of priorities for ecumenical cooperation and to facilitate a commitment from the churches to working together on the established priorities. This "Priorities Consultation" was held during February and March of 1974. Two new task forces have been formed as a consequence of this effort. Hopefully, they will be working from a different and stronger ecumenical base. One task force is zeroing in on a need in the area of Christian Education. The other is concerned with human welfare. Both threaten to be successful to a new degree.

In both of these the Roman Catholic Archdiocese is a strong participant. The same holds true for two other task forces that were formed in the first half of 1974 to meet emergency situations: the court order to desegregate the public school systems and the April 3 tornado. Both of these efforts have the broadest participation of the local religious community. They demonstrate both the need and the viability of LAIOS as an agency in service of the religious community. They demonstrate both the possibility and the need for Roman Catholic participation and leadership.

To date, LAIOS has struggled toward and reached a certain degree of maturity. It is still searching, at the present time through an effort to thoroughly examine and rework its process for handling proposals. There is no reason to doubt that LAIOS will soon be able to give an even more satisfactory and efficient response to proposals set before it. Participation has run both hot and cold. Some of the weakness has certainly been prompted in the past by the immaturity of the operation itself. At the present time, however, we feel that future difficulties may result more from the weakness of individual denomination's commitment to that which ecumenism is all about. If any one significant conclusion is to be drawn from all that has happened in the Louisville religious community during the past several years, it might be this: it is now clearly time for each denomination to examine its own beliefs and structures and to vigorously remove everything which feeds a denominationalism which contradicts the Gospel itself. It may well be that the extent to which this kind of renewal takes place may be the measure of what we may hope for the future of the Louisville religious community.

METROPOLITAN AREA RELIGIOUS COALITION OF CINCINNATI (MARCC)

This is the story of Roman Catholic participation in the Metropolitan Area Religious Coalition of Cincinnati (MARCC), an inter-religious body of judicatories. It pro-exists with the ecumenical organization, the Council of Christian Communion in Cincinnati, whose executive is Reverend Tecumseh X. Graham and whose members are Protestant congregations. It therefore gives us an example of an interfaith style in a metropolitan area.

Diocese: Archdiocese of Cincinnati: 2,670,000 people; 518,000 RCs

Archbishop: Most Rev. Joseph L. Bernardin

Agency: Metropolitan Area Religious Coalition of Cincinnati (MARCC), 920 Provident Bank Building, 632 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, 513: 721-4843

Executive Director: Reverend Duane Holm (United Presbyterian)

Administrative Assistant: Mrs. Kay Cassidy (Roman Catholic)

Roman Catholic Participants: Reverend Carl K. Moeddel—Mr. Daniel Kane (Members of Executive Board)

Agency's Composition: Fourteen (14) Member Groups

Each group has equal representation in MARCC's governing bodies.

The Constituency that these Groups would represent in the Metropolitan Area would be approximately the following:

Archdiocese of Cincinnati	20%
Episcopal Diocese of Southern Ohio	5%
Methodist (Cincinnati District)	15%
Jewish Community	5%
Presbytery of Cincinnati	10%
United Church of Christ	5%
Disciples of Christ	5%
Others	5%

Annual Assembly Membership: c. 140 Delegates

Each Member Group is permitted ten or more delegates

Since Member Groups vote as a Unit, emphasis is placed on a minimum number of delegates requested rather than maximum number permitted.

HISTORY

The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Cincinnati was one of the founding members of MARCC. The Archdiocese had participated actively in ecumenical and interfaith dialogue since 1963 when it centered mainly

around social action efforts. In 1966 the "Cincinnati Interfaith Commission" came into existence and involved the Protestant, Jewish and Roman Catholic Communities. It was this organization that was succeeded by the establishment of MARCC in 1968.

MARCC was born out of a desire of the religious communities to speak and act more effectively together in addressing the affairs of the metropolis. Its mission is: to listen, to act cooperatively, and to speak in a united voice to the community.

Roman Catholic involvement and support have been constant since MARCC's inception.

In its history MARCC has addressed a variety of issues such as: health care delivery, public and private education, cable television, adequate corrections facilities, county government reform, housing, voter registration and other similar matters. MARCC's style in facing these issues has been that of an enabler, a reconciler, a "broker" in bringing together decision-makers with data and values needed for their decisions. This style, although normally the one employed, is not the only style of operation of MARCC, since MARCC's approach has been dictated by the issues to be faced.

MARCC's emphasis has been on addressing the systems of our society but it has also provided a forum for theological discussion. The positions of MARCC are taken and enunciated in the framework of the values of the Judeo-Christian tradition.

A recent survey taken among Roman Catholics involved in MARCC and selected other participants in MARCC revealed no significant new data. Issues raised, opinions offered and convictions enunciated were the same as those with which MARCC has been dealing since its beginnings.

MARCC has attracted those who are interested in social involvement and those with a low level of tolerance for discussion simply for the sake of exchange of ideas. The latter has been a by-product of the action-oriented thrust of MARCC, but it is not a goal. Thus we were not surprised by the lack of knowledge of or interest in the bi-lateral theological conversations.

MARCC has always struggled with its "style" of operation and the survey indicated that the tension of a low-key style and attempts to garner a broader base of support are still with us. Most indicated that the issue faced must determine MARCC's style rather than vice-versa.

Prayer for MARCC is contextual, that is, prayer services are not held at certain times of the year but have been held for certain events and in times of crisis or decision-making. Prayer is always a part of MARCC's gatherings. The respondents to the survey seemed content with this approach.

The results of the recent survey did not alter MARCC's intentions for the future. This is mainly due to the fact that MARCC has an open system for arriving at goals and objectives, inviting the participation of everyone interested. This system involves an annual planning conference and an annual meeting for the setting of goals and objectives, plus a monthly delegates' council meeting and weekly executive committee meetings for the adoption of specific strategies.

Three elements in MARCC have made its existence and its mode of operation somewhat different than other forms of conciliar ecumenism in our area. They are:

- 1) Full participation of the Jewish Community in the founding of and participation and involvement in MARCC. Christians who have previously experienced forms of conciliar ecumenism that were inter-Christian have found that they were enriched by this participation of the Jewish Community.

- 2) On all issues the membership votes by judicatory membership, i.e., one vote for each member group (e.g. Roman Catholic delegation). Issues are faced, strategies adopted, statements issued, etc., by MARCC only when a consensus is achieved. When consensus is not achieved MARCC does not act in its own name but does enable like-minded persons to form a coalition or task-force. We have found this methodology advantageous especially in assuring commitment and in being faithful to the stewardship given to us.

- 3) In general the thrust of MARCC has been in the direction of addressing the systems of our society with the voice of our Judeo-Christian tradition. We have, we think, been able in this way to do more effectively that which none of us could do separately but which all of us feel called to do.

The following brief description of MARCC was recently presented at a Planning Conference by our current President, the Reverend Paul R. Long.

"MARCC is a coalition of fourteen Protestant, Catholic, Jewish and other denominations for dealing with systems and issues in metropolitan Cincinnati.

MARCC is the way the religious communities work together to help systems serve responsibly and effectively the people of metropolitan Cincinnati.

MARCC sets priorities at its annual Planning Conference, develops policies at its monthly Delegates Council, and works out strategy at its weekly Executive Committee meetings.

In MARCC's Fall Planning Conference, the religious communities of metropolitan Cincinnati decide which systems or issues they should work on in the coming year.

- 1971 Planning Conference at Grailville voted for involvement in housing and education.
- 1972 Planning Conference at Rockdale Temple voted to work on Corrections, and internal communications and theological rationale.
- 1973 Planning Conference, omitted and combined with the Annual Meeting, voted for involvement in public education.

The Fall Planning Conference decides which systems or issues MARCC ought to work on. The Delegates Council decides which of these systems and issues MARCC **can** work on. Circumstances and events in the community decide which of these systems and issues MARCC **will** work on.

There are always more things to do than MARCC can do. To decide on one involvement is to decide against others. Over the years MARCC has developed some rules-of-thumb about which systems and issues we will work on:

- moral, religious concern
- capable of local resolution
- willing to commit own staff, research
- separate MARCC identity, accountability
- consensus

September 1974 MARCC Executive Committee gathered each denomination's priorities for itself and for MARCC for the coming year. October 1974 we combined and divided them into continuing ("back-burner") involvements, current involvements (still going on), and possible new involvements. Following today's presentations, judicatories will be asked to rank all these involvements for the coming year."

This recent Planning Conference surfaced the following priorities for MARCC for 1975: Public Education, Hunger and Malnutrition, Health Care, and Juvenile Justice.

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

A west coast diocese . . . a metro-county area . . . an Ecumenical Conference recently replacing an all-Protestant Council of Churches . . . a Roman Catholic president of the Conference who would oversee the Report . . . the prospect of first publicizing this Study at the San Diego National Ecumenical Workshop in February, 1975 . . . , such are external reasons for choosing this area. Even without them, internal reasons would suffice: effective, limited programs; flexibility and constant self-evaluation; clear understanding of the special function of an ecumenical agency which serves its community by enabling its members to work together on important issues.

Diocese: San Diego, California: 2,801,000 people; 547,000 RCs

Bishop: Most Rev. Leo T. Maher

Ecumenical Agency: San Diego County Ecumenical Conference, 1875
Second Avenue, San Diego, California 92101, 714: 232-6385

Executive: Reverend Melvin H. Harter

RC Participant: Rev. Msgr. John R. Portman, De Sales Hall, Alcalá Park,
San Diego, California 92110, 714: 291-6480

Agency's Composition: 1% Advent Christian; 1% African Methodist Episcopal; 1% African Methodist Episcopal Zion; 6.7% Christian (Disciples of Christ); 1.9% American Lutheran Church; 7% Lutheran Church in America; 18.2% Roman Catholic; 18.2% United Church of Christ; 21.2% United Methodist; 12.5% United Presbyterian; 1% Misc.

Annual Assembly Membership: 624

When the Conference was constituted in January of 1970, there were 89 member congregations, of which 17 were Roman Catholic. Present membership is 104, of which 21 are Roman Catholic. The Annual Assembly is held during January Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. Each congregation is entitled to five delegates in addition to its ministerial staff. Attendance has always exceeded 300. Membership is reviewed each year to drop those that have not participated in programs or financing, with exceptions being allowed for hardship situations.

HISTORY

Antecedents centering around Christian Education were crystalized by formation of the San Diego County Council of Churches on January 30, 1945. The Rev. Dr. Alfred Tonnes was Executive Director from 1945 to 1949 and the Rev. Dr. Wayne A. Neal served from 1950 to 1963. The Council was restructured soon after the Rev. Harold B. Keir assumed this office in March of 1964 to include Faith and Order Dialogue Committee. After first appointing an observer to this committee in January of 1965, Catholic Bishop Francis J. Furey named Father John Quinn and Father John Portman as full members in October of 1966.

At its Annual Assembly June 10, 1968, the Council of Churches

responded positively to a letter from Father John Portman as Chairman of the Catholic Diocesan Ecumenical Commission proposing that each name five persons to a committee which would explore possibilities for establishing a council of churches in which Protestant and Catholic churches would jointly engage. The action had been preceded and was to be followed by dialogue and joint celebrations.

At the Council Assembly May 4, 1969, the Joint Task Force for Restructuring and the Faith and Order Committee co-chaired by Father William Gold and Pastor Jack Lindquist presented a proposal for forming a new organization for Christian churches which was approved. At this meeting the resignation of Chaplain Roland Faulk (USN Ret.) was accepted after 14 months of service and the Rev. Melvin Harter was named as replacement.

The Faith and Order Committee absorbed the By-Laws Committee under the leadership of Rev. Jack Lindquist, assisted by Father William Gold. By August this group had completed recommendations for By-Laws of a proposed San Diego County Ecumenical Conference, when Bishop Francis Furey was named Archbishop for San Antonio, Texas. At the September 19 Board meeting, Father John Portman read a letter from Bishop-designate Leo T. Maher approving the proposal and the new By-Laws. The Ecumenical Conference was constituted on January 26, 1970.

Data: Answers supplied were those given by consensus of our Ecumenical Relations Program Area, representing a cross-section of Conference participation. These indicate that trustful relationships have been established and that progress is being made in dealing with issues. New developments since answers were given on June 6, 1974, are: appointment of committee for self-study and evaluation of the Conference; acceptance by Ecumenical Relations of a request to deal with controversial issues, with dialogue on THEOLOGY OF MAN AND CREATION.

Conclusions: While the Conference is aware of the need to involve more people, particularly Assembly delegates, in continuing programs, it is gratified that participants are increasing steadily. The attitudes of pastors largely determine the amount of ecumenical involvement. A by-product of the Conference is the significant involvement of Roman Catholics in neighborhood ecumenism, such as Church Women United, FISH, programs for senior adults, and ministerial associations—even when these parishes are not members of the Conference. Also, the Jewish community has named official representatives to Social Concerns.

It is true, however, that a good deal in ecumenism is taking place at the parish level. We like to believe that it is because of the atmosphere created by the presence of the Conference that these things are happening. For example, just two weeks ago two Catholic member parishes (members of the Conference) combined forces and had an ecumenical panel on Evangelization. The panel included ministers from the American Baptist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Lutheran

Church Missouri Synod and a Roman Catholic priest. Although the Conference did not initiate this program it would probably not have taken place were it not for the ecumenical spirit created by the Conference. This is one of many examples of the type of thing taking place throughout certain areas of the diocese.

A "Spin-off" of the Conference is the "Inner City Church Council" which involves the Roman Catholic Cathedral, First Lutheran, First Presbyterian, Central Christian. It deals with grass roots problems. Also, the first Roman Catholic-Lutheran dialogue begins with the Cathedral Parish and First Lutheran participating over a period of months.

Then two projects are seen to be the result of the Conference's encouraging this type of development.

After four years together, the Conference is undertaking a self-study and evaluation. This is a most important element. After being in existence since January 25, 1970, it is time that we did some basic evaluations. One of the major difficulties with the Conference, and with ecumenism in general when carried on in the conciliar form, is the lack of participation by the average person in the parish. The Conference is not immune to this weakness. The same people seem to do everything.

The flexibility of the Conference permits non-member congregations and judicatories to participate in its Program Areas, particularly Social Concerns and Ecumenical Relations. For the past three years, the Ecumenical Conference has sponsored an outstanding celebration of "Finest City Week," called FOLK FAIRE, which brings eighteen ethnic groups together to share their cultural heritage and gives financial assistance to the Conference. Its success has been largely due to Roman Catholic leadership.

The Ecumenical Relations study of the Eucharist is being considered for publication by the World Council of Churches. The naming of the Bishop of the newly created Episcopal Diocese of San Diego and naming a Chicano as Auxiliary Bishop for the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego were the occasions for receptions given by the Ecumenical Conference which involved prominent community leaders. A Law and Justice Committee is being formed to create a community awareness of problems in this field. Also, a conference is being planned on problems of Vietnam veterans with the Conference involving a broad spectrum of community organizations.

The Conference has helped to create the ecumenical climate that would cause the new Episcopal Bishop to be consecrated in a Catholic Church (The Immaculata, of which our president is pastor). As Chairman of the Diocesan Ecumenical Commission, Monsignor Portman has hosted many meals after business meetings that have helped develop personal friendships. The Conference benefits most from those judicatories that officially name a person or committee to be responsible for ecumenicity *per se*.

CHRISTIANS UNITED IN MISSION, INC. (CUM)

ALBANY AREA

A Catholic *layman* as both ecumenical officer of the diocese and executive of the ecumenical agency . . . surely an unique situation in the U.S.A.! Joe Powers has the vision of Vatican II; he writes:

"This has been a very worthwhile, though at times harrowing, experience for me. Writing the report has forced me to bring some of our continuing problems more clearly into focus. God willing, we'll be able to handle them."

Diocese: Albany, New York

Bishop: Most Rev. Edward A. Broderick

Agency: Christians United in Mission, Inc., 40 No. Main Avenue,
Albany, New York 12203, 518: 438-6681

Executive: Mr. Joseph A. Powers, Exec. Sec. (RC)

Composition: Local Judicatories of nine Christian churches (AB, Christian, E, LCA, RC, RCA, UCC, UM, UPUSA)

Geography: Four counties of New York State's Capital District: Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady

RC Participation: From the beginning to the present, full and equal partnership with other member judicatories

Aspect Worth Imitating: Time allowed for "founding fathers" to grow in mutual understanding, trust, and confidence

Conclusion: The study has brought some of our "continuing problems," e.g., interagency relationships, grassroots communication, more clearly into focus. Hopefully we'll be able to handle them.

HISTORY

In the fall of 1967 a conference dealing with urban ministry was presented by the New York State Council of Churches at Thornfield, New York. Thornfield is located some miles from New York State's Capital District. A number of Capital District denominational executives attending the Thornfield Conference opined that "we cannot go on meeting like this!" or, more soberly, raised the question: "how can we work together more consistently as a metropolity?"

At about the same time that this question was being raised, meetings among representatives of the three major councils of churches of the Capital District (Albany, Schenectady and Troy) were being held to examine the possibilities of expanding the relationships among the councils.

An unsigned document dated 2/28/68 and designated as "Draft 1" incorporates an invitation to "representatives of the Christian Communions of the area (Capital Area) to consider creating a cooperative vehicle for the following purposes:

1. An improved ministry in Health and Hospital services
2. A new ministry in Industrial Relations
3. New ministries in lay theological training
4. An expanded ministry in Communications
5. An effective ministry in Housing
6. A relevant ministry to Political Structures
7. A significant ministry to Academic institutions
8. A concerned ministry to Community Organizations
9. An area-wide ministry in Church Planning
10. A pastoral Ministry in Counselling

Finally, on June 13, 1968 there was the first meeting of the "Capital Area Inter-Church and Inter-Council Consultation." Represented at this meeting were the following denominations: American Baptist, Episcopal, Lutheran Church in America, Reformed Church of America, United Methodist, United Presbyterian USA, and councils of churches: Capital Area (Albany), Schenectady, Troy, New York State.

Among the actions reported from this meeting were:

- 1.—commitment to the creation of a metropolitan ecumenical structure;
- 2.—determination to invite the participation of additional judicatories including the Roman Catholic Diocese of Albany;
- 3.—appointment of a permanent chairman of the consultation;
- 4.—appointment of a committee to analyze functions and explore the difficulties in developing ecumenical structures.

By the time of the second meeting of the Consultation on October 2, 1968 denominational representation to the consultation had been expanded to include Christian Church (Disciples), Roman Catholic, and United Church of Christ participation. Contacts had been established with the Orthodox Church and with Black Churches. The planning committee had been appointed and had begun to function. The consultation began to review some of the problems to be dealt with in establishing a metropolitan ecumenical structure.

The direction for continuing development by the consultation was established with the adoption of a set of "Principles of Operation for a New Ecumenical Structure" on January 20, 1969:

1.—Constituency

It is recommended that, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, a structure be devised as a vehicle of cooperation for those bodies accepting the Lordship of Christ.

2.—Coalition Efforts

Though this structure is necessary to reflect our theological identity as Christians, we welcome appropriate opportunities to cooperate with other communities in coalitions for specific tasks.

3.—Judicatory Basis

It is affirmed that our desire is to bring into being a Metropolitan Ecumenical Structure primarily based on membership by judicatories.

We envision a Metropolitan Ecumenical Structure based primarily on membership by judicatories, functioning as appropriate, on both a metropolitan basis and through local ecumenical clusters of congregations.

As a general working principle, the primary target areas are Albany, Schenectady, Rensselaer, and Saratoga Counties. Where judicatories envision special needs, services, and programs which should be extended beyond this area, this organization will serve as a vehicle for such ecumenical activity.

4.—An Autonomous Entity

The Metropolitan Ecumenical Structure we envision shall be an autonomous body which will cooperate with other groupings of churches as appropriate.

5.—The New Ecumenicity

The necessity for a new ecumenical structure is made apparent, not only by the new concern for mission among the judicatories of traditions whose congregations have cooperated in the past, but also by the scope of a "new ecumenicity" which makes it possible for the total Christian community (Protestant, Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Orthodox) to engage together in mission.

At this same meeting there continued to be consideration of the effort to elicit the participation of Black churches and the matter of raising developmental funds was initiated. An interim name for the consultation was accepted: Metropolitan Ecumenical Consultation of the Capital Area (MECCA).

From this beginning to the present time, the history of Christians United in Mission can be seen as evolving through three stages:

- 1.—**June 13, 1968 to June 20, 1971**—the stage of consultation. From an institutional point of view, this stage could be characterized as a period given to the discovery and examination of the many complex issues and questions involved in the establishment of a broadly representative metropolitan ecumenical structure. From a human point of view, the period might be characterized as a time during which a group of ecumenically interested church executives grew to become a core of trusting, loving and committed persons;
- 2.—**June 21, 1971 to April 2, 1972**: the stage of phasing into operation. This stage was initiated by the commitment to membership in a new ecumenical structure of nine judicatories together with the establishment of an interim board of directors. The Interim Board of Direc-

tors was charged to build upon the work of the Consultation and to move toward the incorporation of CUM. The basic questions to which the interim board of directors addressed itself were: What is to be the structure of the organization? What are to be the functions of the organization? What specific steps need to be taken to bring the new metropolitan ecumenical structure into being?

- 3.—**April 3, 1972 to April 3, 1977:** the stage of incorporation and realization. This stage began with the filing of the certificate of incorporation with the Secretary of State of New York State and with the first meeting of the Board of Directors of Christians United in Mission, Inc. From its beginning the Board of Directors of CUM, Inc. has been further refining and implementing the directives of the Consultation and the Interim Board of Directors. A constitution and by-laws have been prepared and accepted, a structure has been set up, and functions are being carried out.

It is noteworthy that the Board of Directors had included in the Constitution a "self-destruct clause", i.e., Christians United in Mission, Inc. ceases to exist effective April 3, 1977 unless prior evaluation has determined that needs continue to exist that warrant re-incorporation of the organization. (This self-destruct clause has been included because of the belief that, while the Church is often adept at the establishment of something, it is not equally adept at disestablishing those things that deserve disestablishment.)

Concluding Remarks

Throughout this report negligible specific reference has been made to Roman Catholic participation in the development and continuing operation of Christians United in Mission for the simple reason that throughout the development, practically speaking from the very beginning, Roman Catholic participation has been on the basis of full and equal partnership with the other representatives. Whether in the Consultation, Interim Board of Directors, or Board of Directors, the Roman Catholic members, representing more than 250,000 communicant members in the four-counties area, have sat together with the Christian Church Disciples members, who represent 300 communicant members in the area.

There is, of course, the fact that Roman Catholic Diocesan representation on the Board of Directors stands at 8 while the Christian Church Disciples representation is 2. Still, to date, there has not been block-voting on issues before the Board, either by Roman Catholics or Disciples.

In the four-counties area, Roman Catholic church membership is more than double the membership of the eight other CUM members; it is eight times greater than the membership of the next largest judicatory. This is a fact that produces a dilemma. Because of the size of the Diocese, much can and should be expected of diocesan

participation. At the same time, it has been necessary to guard against the Diocese's participation being overwhelming. So far the dilemma has for the most part been satisfactorily resolved through the sensitivity of the participants to this potential problem.

One measure of the extent to which there has been positive Roman Catholic support of the metropolitan ecumenical structure may be found in the history of CUM's staff. The Consultation's initial staff was a person employed by the Roman Catholic Diocese to serve simultaneously as staff for CUM and for the Diocese's Commission for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs. This person continues to function in this shared way but with CUM now sharing the wages for the staff person.

Among continuing problems to be dealt with are the following.

- 1.—The development of CUM depended heavily upon the committed efforts of judicatory executives. With the establishment of the organization, these executives were able to terminate their active engagement with CUM as they moved ahead to meet other of their responsibilities. The organization, then, has had to grow in self-dependence and self-reliance. Presumably this is part of a natural maturing process and is a matter to which attention must continually be given.
- 2.—Learning to coexist with pre-existing agencies and organizations has required and continues to require a good deal of consideration and effort. It would seem that the essential ingredient here is the development of trust and service.
- 3.—A judicatory-based organization shares with judicatories the need for continuous communication with the grassroots, with the person in the pew. This, too, requires intensive and continuing attention.
- 4.—There needs to be frequent remembering that there is an ultimate goal for efforts undertaken within the framework of the Ecumenical Movement and that that goal is Christian Unity.

DUTCHESS INTERFAITH COUNCIL

This booklet reflects the Church and the Ecumenical Movement fairly accurately in at least one way: *women are not very prominent in it*. Dutchess Interfaith Council is one ecumenical agency where a woman is the executive, and therefore deserves notice. More importantly, she has a lot of good things going there, imitable by others. Recommended: imitate not only the programs, but also the style. We need more women executives. Nuns and laywomen have a splendid opportunity to serve.

Archdiocese: New York

Auxiliary Bishop: Most Rev. Joseph M. Pernicone

Agency: Dutchess Interfaith Council, Inc., 75 Market Street, Poughkeepsie, New York 12601, 914: 471-7333

Executive: Mrs. Martha S. Miller

RC Participant: Rev. Ernest R. Falardeau, S.S.S., Eymard Preparatory Seminary, Hyde Park, New York 12538, 914: 229-2142

Agency's Composition: Anglican 13; Protestant 46; Catholic 14; Jewish 3; Unitarian 1; Salvation Army 1; Christian Science 1; Vassar College Chapel 1; Non-parochial Clergy 16.

Annual Assembly Membership: 275/300

Significant conclusions:

It is possible to address Christian unity concerns in an interfaith council framework. Indeed there is greater potential for ecumenical dialogue and social action within such a framework. We have found prayer somewhat more difficult in the interfaith setting. More Roman Catholic participation especially by clergy and by financial commitment is needed.

We hope to continue to expand our membership. We are especially eager to involve the Orthodox Churches. We have a lot of theological homework to do.

One of our greatest strengths is organization. We have just about maximum flexibility at the Committee level. We are fully incorporated. We have a full-time, salaried Executive Director and a half-time secretary (ideally full-time) and a centrally located office. Our committee structure is "in place" and functioning. We have established a goal-setting and priority determination process.

We think we have a tremendous organization. With even greater Roman Catholic participation we can continue to grow and be effective in bringing about significant ecumenical and interfaith understanding and social change.

HISTORY

The creation of the Dutchess Interfaith Council resulted from a long experience of ecumenism of Protestant churches in Dutchess County, N.Y., and their desire to extend their ecumenical effort to new dimensions. It was an outgrowth of the ecumenical spirit and potential of the Second Vatican Council. It was also, and importantly, the result of a mutual desire on the part of both Christians and Jews to be involved together in addressing community concerns. The Interfaith Council also met the need of other religious groups for a vehicle to bring their humanitarian concerns into a united effort.

The Dutchess County Council of Churches

The Dutchess Interfaith Council owes its beginnings in large measure to the Dutchess County Council of Churches. Founded in 1946 with 16 churches, the county-wide organization had grown to over 50 Protestant churches when it was dissolved in 1972 to make way for the Dutchess Interfaith Council.

Another important factor in the creation of the DIC was the personal interest in local ecumenism of Bishop Joseph M. Pernicone, Roman Catholic episcopal vicar for Dutchess County. In January 1970, Bp. Pernicone appointed Rev. Karl Bauer as the Roman Catholic Observer at meetings of the Council of Churches' Board of Directors. One year later, at the Council's Annual Assembly Bp. Pernicone voiced his desire to see greater cooperation and a more permanent liaison with the Dutchess County Council of Churches established.

The Ecumenical Joint Study Committee

In January 1971 an Ecumenical Joint Study Committee was established by the Council of Churches and Bp. Pernicone, to explore what might be done to expand the activity of the Council of Churches and to involve Roman Catholic Churches in the work of the Council. Three Roman Catholic Priests, Frs. Karl Bauer, Peter Cody, and Ernest Falardeau, met with officers of the Council of Churches, Revs. Hugh Miller, Richard Parker, and Francis Steeves. Revolving chairmanship for the subsequent meetings were agreed upon.

Several points emerged from the early discussions of this group. First, they realized that a great deal of cooperation and amity already existed among the clergymen in Dutchess County. The Dutchess County Ministerial Association, founded in 1924 by Protestants, early in its history invited Jewish participation. Since 1965, R. C. clergymen have been a part of the Association's fellowship and sharing. Frequently the Ministerial Association had felt the need for joint action in the face of different emergencies. But no single agency existed which might speak for all religious groups represented in the Ministerial Association (now the Clergy Association). Thus the need for a broad-based ecumenical agency became more and more evident.

Second, the Ecumenical Joint Study Committee decided it was most important for the Black Community and its churches to be represented on the Committee. The Rev. Walter Henderson of Ebenezer Baptist Church, Poughkeepsie, was then invited to join as a member of the Committee.

Third, the Ecumenical Joint Study Committee decided to invite the Jewish community to be included in the discussions. Their response was favorable, and Rabbi Henry Bamberger became a member of the committee. It should be noted that overtures were made to the Orthodox churches but they did not wish to respond at that time.

The question of whether to continue the Council of Churches and/or to create a new agency parallel to it was now of great importance. The creation of a new agency to replace the Council of Churches was gradually explored and finally chosen as the better course. The charter of the Council of Churches was Protestant in tone and conception, thus a major change was seen to be necessary in any case.

Long discussions were held by the now-expanded Ecumenical Joint Study Committee about the shape of the new agency. Should it be essentially a Christian organization with Jewish participation, or interfaith, with all participants on the same footing?

Although there were few fully structured interfaith groups to use as examples, an interfaith organization seemed best to meet the needs and aspirations of the constituent groups. An interfaith model also had the advantage of opening the organization to groups like the Unitarians and Christian Scientists which are not Protestant.

During the summer of 1971 members of the Study Committee worked in subcommittees on financial arrangements and on by-laws. By the fall of 1971 agreement had been reached on structure and by-laws, and a working financial arrangement had been agreed upon. (Each member congregation was to be asked to contribute $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% of operating costs, exclusive of those for parish schools, to the DIC annually).

Between January and May, 1972, the most important task was that of public relations to attract member congregations and public support. Members of the Ecumenical Joint Study Committee were interviewed on radio, visited lay boards of congregations, and scheduled talks before various organizations. Enthusiasm grew.

The Constituting Assembly

On May 2, 1972, some three hundred delegates and observers gathered at Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Church in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., to establish the Dutchess Interfaith Council. Delegates from 54 member congregations to the Constituting Assembly were of two kinds: non-parochial clergy, and representatives from congregations. The latter included two lay persons chosen by their congregation plus the clergy.

Nationally famous ecumenical and interreligious leaders were invited, as well as the local civic community. The event was a high point for the interfaith movement in Dutchess County and a historic moment for its

people, their churches and synagogues. Represented were Anglicans, Protestants, Catholics, Unitarians, Christian Scientists, and Jews (Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform). The Dutchess Interfaith Council was now formed! A nominating committee was chosen to propose a slate of officers at the first regular assembly in the fall, and the by-laws were approved.

In September 1972, the Dutchess County Council of Churches held a concluding assembly at which it voted to dissolve itself and to turn over its assets, office and equipment to the newly formed DIC. The DIC held a Fall Assembly at which officers were elected. Mrs. Martha Miller, Acting Executive Director was asked to continue in that capacity for the newly-formed DIC, thus providing a smooth transition from the past to the present. She now serves the organization as Executive Director.

Charter membership was kept open until January, 1973, when 70 congregations received membership certificates as charter members. In January, 1973, the DIC was incorporated in the State of New York.

Organization of the DIC

Much of the DIC's success to date is attributable to the painstaking and time-consuming work of organization which went into the DIC at the outset.

The highest DIC authority rests with the Assembly, which meets at least twice annually. This body consists of delegates who are non-parochial clergy plus delegates and clergy from member congregations.

The DIC is composed of the following committees:

- A. Standing Committees: Personnel, Finance, Ways and Means, Public Relations, Rules.
- B. Task-force Committees: Correctional Chaplaincy, Project Gateway, Housing, Migrants, Aging, Education, Young Adult, Media, Public Worship.
- C. Ad Hoc Committees: Interfaith trip to Israel and Rome, Bicentennial, Christian Unity, etc.

The Early Achievements of the DIC

Project Gateway—Among the concerns inherited by the DIC from the Council of Churches is the criminal justice system in Dutchess County. One of the first task-force committees to be formed was the Correctional Chaplaincy and Rehabilitation Committee. Its purpose was to coordinate the chaplaincy program at the County Jail, and to do what it could to make the local criminal justice system more human. At its very beginning, the DIC agreed to complete the terms of a contract with the Poughkeepsie Model Cities Agency funding a post-release program for inmates of the County Jail. After Model Cities funds were no longer available, the DIC proposed a similar program to be funded under a federal grant through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. For this proposal, the previous Model Cities program was re-evaluated

and certain correctives made. Project Gateway, as the L.E.A.A. program was called, was fully operational as of January 1, 1974, and will have an expanded staff and program in 1975.

As of December 1, 1974, Project Gateway had served approximately 75 people who had been incarcerated in the Dutchess County Jail. Thirty five of them had been related to Correctional Volunteers, who assisted them with their immediate needs of food, clothing, and shelter, and their long-term needs related to employment, vocational training, and education. Correctional Volunteers for this work were trained on at least four occasions during 1974. At this time, a second-year Grant Application for Project Gateway had been forwarded to the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services to continue our post-release assistance program and to expand it to pre-release visiting/counseling inside the Jail. If funded, this increased work will begin March 1, 1975.

The Committee has also encouraged a team approach to the chaplaincy at the County Jail, as well as appointing a Women's Assistant Chaplain. Necessary research work is currently being done on a bail project.

Migrant Ministry—Another concern inherited from the Council of Churches is ministry to migrant workers. When this ministry began three decades ago, concern was not widespread, as it now is, and the migrant workers were greatly in need of all kinds of assistance. The Committee on Migrant Ministry continues to assist migrants who come to work in our area, and to work for legislation that will improve their wages and better their living and working conditions.

Housing—Several congregations of this area have a history of involvement in programs for adequate housing for low income families. Thus one of the committees formed early in the life of the DIC was the Housing Committee. In addition to exploring avenues to low-income housing programs, the Committee also investigated new avenues of service. The Housing Committee focused attention on a project for a senior citizen total-care retirement facility for middle income persons. The project has advanced steadily and rapidly because of the great interest of several members of the Committee. A feasibility study has found such a facility is needed in the area. A non-profit corporation is being formed, under Dutchess Interfaith Council auspices, to carry out this project.

Ecumenical Singles—"The Ecumenical Singles" was established at the request of young adults themselves by the DIC Committee on Young Adults to answer a real need of post high school age persons. "The Ecumenical Singles" provides young adults with opportunities for social and religious sharing. Picnics, parties and dances, as well as group attendance at services in churches and synagogues are scheduled. In most cases, no single congregation could sustain such a program, but this is possible under DIC auspices.

Media—The Interfaith Council welcomed an invitation from the Poughkeepsie Cablevision station director to provide programs dealing with religion from an interfaith perspective. Wishing to grow with the industry, the DIC agreed to air two monthly programs on prime evening time.

A weekly Mid-Hudson religious news broadcast on one local radio station, and a weekly hour-long worship service broadcast from a different member-congregation each month on another, are being aired Sunday mornings. A series of good-will messages for Hannukah-Christmas and Passover-Easter have also been prepared for spot announcements on local radio stations. Every effort is being made to communicate our interfaith concerns and developments as more broadcast-time is available.

The DIC also has a Speaker's Bureau which provides names and makes arrangements with churches, synagogues, service clubs, and other groups wishing to avail themselves of its services.

Christian Unity—DIC's bylaws provide that groups of congregations may band together for common projects. Thus, an ad hoc committee on Christian Unity has been formed to continue in-depth dialogue and cooperation among Christian churches. This was one of Bishop Pernicone's concerns from the beginning. During January 1974 five churches in Poughkeepsie hosted worship services in their distinctive traditions open to the whole community, with discussion following. These were Anglican, Presbyterian, Catholic, Orthodox and Black Baptist churches. The general consensus was that much was accomplished through this sharing.

The DIC also sponsors two **Living-Room Dialogue** groups. In the intimacy of the home much is being learned about the faith and life of others.

The Future of the DIC

The DIC has been fully operational for two years at this writing. Over 250 persons are involved as delegates to the Assembly and approximately 150 persons at the committee level. Many persons are assisted through the DIC task-force Committees. It is difficult to assess the effect of the DIC on the community at large. There is reason to believe that DIC's impact on the entire county community has been extensive.

"Love has gathered us together" became the motto of the Interfaith Council at its Constituting Assembly. The DIC began as an act of faith and trust. The DIC has had financial problems. The survival of the DIC and its growth depend on the interfaith spirit of the individual religious congregations, and their willingness to support the programs of the DIC financially and through the active participation of its members.

The DIC is unique in many ways because it is one of the few fully structured truly interfaith organizations in this country. The DIC chose to be interfaith rather than less broadly ecumenical because it felt it could do more under such a structure. By being interfaith, the DIC

centers religious dialogue on what is essentially human. Little can be achieved in dialogue until basic human trust, understanding and love are present. In addition, America's religious situation is pluralistic and requires an exchange that goes beyond the Christian churches. Finally, a genuine appreciation of the faith of others is a prelude to and necessity for interfaith work. The Jewish contribution and perspective is especially profitable for Christians. A true understanding of Christian roots requires a study of the Jewish faith, both contemporary and ancient. Likewise a good grasp of Christianity is very helpful to Jews for an understanding of their history and the contemporary world. Thus, all have much to learn from each other. It has become apparent that an interfaith council has a great deal of theological homework to do.

Hopefully, this history of the DIC will be useful to those who are considering the creation of a similar agency. The early achievements and the promise of the DIC should encourage leaders of every denomination and faith to support similar efforts. Indeed the support of this leadership will be of no small importance to the success of such ventures.

APPENDIX.

Roman Catholic Participation in the DIC

The effect of the Vatican Council in creating a new spirit for Roman Catholic participation in local ecumenism cannot be overstated. Fully sharing in this spirit, and understanding the thrust of Vatican II, Bp. Pernicone did much to assist and facilitate the creation of the DIC. His personal contribution was truly significant. Also significant was the participation by Fr. Karl Bauer and Fr. Ernest Falardeau, SSS., who became the first president of the DIC.

Lay Roman Catholic participation in the DIC has been substantial at the Board and Committee level. What is wanting, however, is wider interest and participation by Roman Catholic parochial clergy. According to the bylaws of the DIC, every parish clergyman is a delegate to the Assembly. If clergy participation is weak—and it is—this immediately weakens the entire organization. Also, clergy leadership is especially needed where Roman Catholics are concerned. Ecumenism is a new concept and experience for the Roman Catholic laity. Many of them maintain a protective and apologetic attitude in their relationships with people of other faiths. Clergy leadership would do much to stimulate and facilitate lay participation. Clergy participation is also closely linked to a congregation's financial commitment to the DIC.

In conclusion, the lack of interest and participation by some Catholic clergy of the mid-Hudson area has kept the DIC from realizing its full potential, and has deprived some parishes of an awareness of the interfaith spirit breathing in America. Hopefully, the enthusiasm and vision of Bp. Pernicone and others will become contagious, and thus Roman Catholics in Dutchess County will take their full share of responsibility for the work of the DIC in time to come.

GENESSEE ECUMENICAL MINISTRIES

An ecumenical agency with a Catholic priest as full-time director. Sister Christine Athans, B. V. M., heads the North Phoenix Corporate Ministry, but not many more are known to us.

Diocese: Rochester, New York: 1,439,600 people; 358,850 RCs

Bishop: Most Rev. Joseph L. Hogan

Agency: Genesee Ecumenical Ministries, 17 South Fitzhugh Street, Rochester, New York 14614, 716: 232-6530

Executive: Rev. Henry A. Atweil, 108 Prospect Street, Avon, New York 14414, 716: 926-2100; Assoc. Director: Rev. Marvin Chandler

Agency's Composition: Baptist, Episcopal, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian Reformed, Roman Catholic, United Church of Christ, Disciples of Christ, judicatories and Rochester Area (Black) Ministers Conference.

ISSUES IMPEDING:

Denominationalism; Failure to reach congregations

ISSUES DIVISIVE:

None so far!

ISSUES SUCCESSFUL:

Judicial process reform; participation by black churches; planning for New Town

ISSUES CURRENT:

Jail ministry; quality of public education; campus ministry

HISTORY

Genesee Ecumenical Ministries is the four-year old successor to the Rochester Area Council of Churches. It is both a re-structuring of the former Council and an all-new organization. It is one of the few ecumenical agencies with a Catholic priest as director. Here is some of his personal story:

"One of the first tasks of the newly organized Genesee Ecumenical Ministries in 1971 was to secure an executive director. A search was initiated but after a year's effort, the nominating committee was still at a loss to recruit what they thought would be the most appropriate candidate. They invited me to a lunchtime meeting and asked if I would accept the position.

My initial reaction was to say no. I had only three years before been named pastor of St. Agnes Church, Avon, N.Y., an historic and pleasant village in the heart of the scenic Genesee Valley area south of Rochester. Prior to that I was fourteen years editor of the **Courier Journal**, the diocesan weekly newspaper. During that time, the Church experienced probably its most drastic changes in so short a time in all its previous history.

During those years, we had Pope Pius XII, Pope John XXIII, and Pope Paul VI. We went through the stern opposition to Communism to

the moment when Pope Paul greeted the Soviet delegate at the United Nations, through the Second Vatican Council, from Latin liturgy to vernacular, from prohibiting Catholics even to attend sessions of the World Council of Churches to close collaboration with it. In the Rochester diocese, we experienced the transfer of power from a beloved and pastoral bishop, Bishop James E. Kearney, to the colorful, front-page and television prelate, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen.

It was also the time of extensive Catholic building projects—churches, schools, colleges, hospitals—a time of much political pressure to obtain tax-paid funds for Catholic schools.

I had been a desk priest writing and editing for fourteen years, and by 1967 I was happy to be a parish priest once again, a pastor on my own. But the new Genesee Ecumenical Ministries was attractive; it offered opportunities to test in practice the theories and the ideas I had editorialized about for so long. With the agreement that I could be both GEM director and Avon pastor, and knowing that Rev. Marvin Chandler, my friend and very competent associate director from the former Rochester Area Council of Churches, would be my associate, I accepted the position of director."

Genesee Ecumenical Ministries has changed the ecumenical focus from the city of Rochester to a regional, ten-county outlook. Membership is by judicatory (diocese) rather than by individual congregations and includes Roman Catholics rather than an exclusively Protestant membership as in the old Council.

Twelve task forces were set up in 1970 to explore areas for possible cooperative ministry. Three of the twelve proposed programs were adopted:

1. **Hanover House**, a complex of seven buildings, each seven stories high, in Rochester's inner city, home for 395 families with more than 700 children. Rev. John Jones, a graduate of Colgate Rochester Divinity School, conducts a ministry of concern, counsel and practical help. He assists people in affiliating with existing nearby churches rather than conduct religious services himself for the residents.
2. **Urban Education**: a ministry to develop a consensus for quality education in public schools. Rev. Larry Witmer, a part-time GEM staff worker from the Monroe (County) Baptist Association, coordinates a ministry which includes public forums on issues in public schools, a seminar titled "Why Schools?" conducted at the local level, as also newsletters and speakers.
3. **Judicial Process**: a ministry to correct the inequities and dehumanization resulting from present judicial procedures and to de-fuse explosive situations in police-community relations or in jails and prisons. Mrs. Virginia Mackey, coordinator of the Judicial Process Commission, has also arranged a wide-ranging variety of activities including a weekly bring-your-own-lunch series of well-attended forums, an informative newsletter and special bulletins and speakers.

GEM's Associate Director, Rev. Marvin Chandler, aided pastors of 45 churches of Black congregations to form their own United Church

Ministry. These churches range from store-front ministries through the traditional denominations—Baptist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic.

The Judicial Process Commission was instrumental in forming a coalition of more than 20 community groups to win community participation in the selection of a new Public Defender, a proposal approved by the Monroe County Legislature by an overwhelming 27 to 2 vote.

GEM's Urban Education Commission is also playing the enabling role in a local high school to form a student government that will include representatives of diverse racial and ethnic groups rather than simple "majority rule" which had been the source of endless friction and occasional violence.

GEM has continued the former Council's cooperative role with Church Women United, a spiritual and social action program; Campus Ministry at the University of Rochester, Rochester Institute of Technology, Monroe Community College, New York State University Colleges at Geneseo and Brockport; Pastoral Counselling a service to individuals and couples or families; hospital and nursing home chaplaincies. GEM also continues the Council's extensive audio-visual resource center.

GEM sponsors the VISTA program in Rochester, largest such program in the nation. The VISTA program is also uniquely structured in Rochester in that GEM coordinates through Rochester Action Coalition the service of approximately 50 VISTA volunteers in neighborhood and community organizations.

Other projects assisted by the GEM process include religious planning for New Towns at Riverton, a community under construction for 30,000 people, and at Gananda, with an expected population of 90,000 by the end of the century. Both communities are about ten miles from the city of Rochester, one south, the other east. Emergency aid was provided to victims of flooding in the Elmira-Corning area and to residents along Lake Ontario when high water level and storms did extensive damage there.

Ecumenical religious services have been arranged for Thanksgiving, Ash Wednesday, Holy Week, and on other occasions, and Catholic Mass is celebrated every Thursday noon at St. Luke's Episcopal Church in downtown Rochester.

I had mentioned to the nominating committee that I would probably succeed more with Protestants than with Catholics in the ecumenical mission. This soon proved true. Catholics, especially priests, were still inexperienced in working in any programmatic way with Protestants. Catholic priorities simply did not coincide with Protestant priorities.

Catholic money was being spent enormously for Catholic schools. Catholic representatives on the GEM board had no contact with diocesan officials; they received neither direction from the diocese nor reported to it. They operated in a vacuum.

As a Catholic priest on the ecumenical scene, I was an all-new phenomenon for Protestants. Invited to one church after another, I spoke in at least one hundred Protestant churches within the first year

or so—at Sunday services, at mid-week forums, at meetings of vestries, sessions and councils.

Bishop Joseph L. Hogan, successor to Bishop Sheen, was personally committed to Catholic membership in GEM. It was at his own request that the diocesan Priests' Council voted, rather reluctantly, to affiliate the diocese in the venture.

Aware that Catholic participation was wanting in so many ways, in June of 1974, he appointed Rev. Charles Latus to take over the inactive Eumenical Commission, giving it the new name of Commission for Ecumenical and Inter-Religious Affairs, and assuring thereby a bridge for communication between diocese and GEM. The diocesan Office of Human Development is linked quite firmly with GEM's Judicial Process Commission. Other diocesan agencies have utilized GEM resources in developing services to nursing homes, jail ministries and various neighborhood projects.

Observers of the GEM organization see its chief achievement to date as "a mood and a momentum" of Catholics to collaborate with other Christian churches and groups while still searching for the most effective way to do this in specific, day-to-day ministries.

Foundations have been made, relationships have been established, doors have been opened, horizons have been widened. I consider it a great blessing and a true joy to have been a part of this process which I consider nothing less than the work of God's Holy Spirit in our time.

IV. Significant conclusions:

Cooperation in mission is still a new experience for both Catholics and Protestants. Denominational habits and instincts survive despite ecumenical intentions and covenants. Several denominations are hurting from socio-political actions of the 1960's and are hesitant to engage in ecumenical activity in such matters. There is, nonetheless, a growing admiration (and sympathy) for the efforts individuals or special groups make in these matters.

V. Next steps:

An evaluation task force is currently asking the GEM member denominations whether GEM has fulfilled their hopes in establishing it, in what ways do they want it to go, do they see themselves as having lived up to their covenant agreement to do 'mission together' and do they consider that the other GEM members have fulfilled the covenant. Decisions will be made in terms of their answers.

VI. Imitable aspects:

GEM's Judicial Process Commission has certainly succeeded in drawing members of the various GEM denominations, as also individuals with other (Unitarian, Jewish) or no religious affiliation, into a remarkably alert and active agency for reform of the judicial system. GEM's Team on Urban Education has had a less spectacular success but has also bridged both religious and secular lines. In both cases, success seems to flow from having selected very clear, specific goals, and pursuing them through thorough factual knowledge of the actual situation rather than vague or emotional appeals.

YORK COUNTY, PA.

In a rather rural county with its traditional ways, the ecumenical movement develops at its own pace and in its own fashion. To report this adequately, the national Opinionaire was considered unsuited, so a "Special Questionnaire" was composed by the local committee. The questions are given, or at least can be discerned, in the answers.

Diocese: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; 300,000 people; 26,000 RCs

Bishop: Most Rev. Joseph T. Daley

Ecumenical Officer: Fr. Clair A. Redding, 231 South Beaver Street, York, Pa. 17403. Phone: 717: 848-2007

Ecumenical Agency Executive: Rev. Harold Statler, York County Council of Churches, 145 South Duke Street, York, Pa. 17403. Phone: 717: 854-9504

MAKEUP OF AREA:

Main line Protestants, Evangelical Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jewish, Orthodox

ECUMENICAL AGENCY:

Congregations only, conciliar style, with Task Forces; some Catholic involvement, stemming from Living-room Dialogues and Week of Prayer for Christian Unity; has taken initiative in approaching RCs, has met some response but no membership yet; does well on spiritual and social witness ecumenism but not well on academic.

ISSUES IMPEDING:

Lack of staff to cover large area; Fundamentalism in member churches; "Don't rock the boat" attitude

ISSUES DIVISIVE:

Abortion; Churches and Public Schools; Service to people—welfare, prisons et al.

ISSUES SUCCESSFUL:

Human rights statement
Crisis intervention—**CONTACT Teleministry**
(Cf. National Office, Robert E. Larson, Jr., 900 South Arlington Avenue, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17109, 717: 652-3410)

ISSUES CURRENT:

Religion in Public Schools; Abortion; Agency's survival!

HISTORY

(Excerpted from interview of Msgr. Carl B. Brady by Fr. Redding; and an account by Mr. Statler)

In 1932 the ecumenical spirit was nowhere in evidence. By 1962 a spontaneous change was at work, as Vatican II progressed. Rev. Chauncey Varner, Executive Secretary of the York County Council of Churches (R.I.P.) was a prime mover, along with Msgr. Harold Keller, Rev. Guy West and Fr. Anthony Kane. An "Interfaith" Community developed. (Ed.: 'interchurch' seems better, since all were Christians.)

In 1966 St. Matthew Lutheran and St. Rose Catholic parishes exchanged the use of adjoining buildings to the benefit of each, and developed close ties of friendship in the process. On February 12, 1967, the first Ecumenical Service was held in the auditorium of York College—a "neutral" place—for 1,000 people, with homilies by Msgr. William Keeler and Dr. Robert Moss, now president of the United Church of Christ. From 1968 on, the annual observance of the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity has been a highlight of the churches' year. YCCC and the RC York Deanery jointly plan and sponsor it.

In 1971 the YCCC requested a RC "participant-observer" related especially to its Department of Ecumenical Concerns. A pastor was named, but has not participated or observed much. This has adversely affected organizational cooperation, in the judgment of YCCC, who hope that some better arrangement will be soon forthcoming.

On April 10, 1972, Bishop Dean T. Stephenson of the Episcopal Diocese of Central Pennsylvania and Bishop Joseph R. Daley of the Catholic Diocese of Harrisburg issued a joint statement on the international documents on Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations. They asked all to study and comment. They concluded: "In reviewing the more than four hundred years of separation, we do rejoice at the progress of these last few years, progress which is amazing evidence of the work of the Holy Spirit.

"As we thank God for what has already been accomplished, we must work and pray for further progress in the many other areas which remain to be treated. We invite you to join with us in these common efforts."

This was a significant step, and the kind of example that motivates.

On November 3, 1974, a CROP Walk against Hunger was co-chaired by a United Church of Christ pastor, John E. Fureman, and Fr. Arthur McDonough. This very successful event involved 840 walkers, largest total ever, including 140 from York Catholic High School.

Ecumenical life has become expressed in a Campus Ministry at York College, participation by parishes in a common audio-visual library, the ministry to migrants, and a School of Christianity's adult education program. In 1974 special Task Forces concern the discussion of abortion and the teaching of religion in public schools.

In an interview with Fr. Redding, Dr. Gordon E. Folkomer, Pastor of St. Matthew Lutheran Church in York for over twenty-five years remarked that:

"Before Vatican II the feeling between RCC and Protestants was generally not friendly. There seemed to be mutual suspicion. When John XXIII put his spirit into the Council, there was a great change. Probably there were a number of priests waiting for official approval to reach out with an ecumenical spirit. The atmosphere created by the Council freed that type of priest, who already had formed his sense that there was greater unity than the official Church recognized. It freed him to openly and publicly extend a brotherly hand to his Protestant colleagues."

SPECIAL QUESTIONNAIRE—YORK COUNTY

An "Ecumenical Experience Questionnaire" was composed by the report-committee and sent out to 324 of the clergy. Seventy replied, along with 34 laity who were given copies by their clergy.

1. 90% have shared experience inclusive of RCs: e.g., worship; discussion-groups; adult education; CONTACT-Teleministry (serving a phone hook-up for crisis-callers.)
2. 93% found their experience valuable, both in worship and in community service. Frequency and depth seemed correlative. e.g., Mass and luncheon for other clergy; training-sessions for CONTACT-Teleministry; "shared weddings" and RC Mass in Lutheran church for York College; priest's sermon in United Methodist Church; School of Christianity planning-faculty-program.
3. 87% denied that their differing traditions caused feelings of disunity. Those who thought they did were probably thinking of prayer-services during the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity. (This unbalanced answer probably results from hearing from the already convinced.)
4. 50% attributed the experience to their own initiative; of the other 50%, about half were approached by Catholics.
5. Has the Decree on Ecumenism changed the attitude:
 - a) Of RCs to other Christians?
RCs: 5 yes, 5 no.
Others: 37 yes, 20 no.
 - b) Of other Christians to RCs?
RCs: 3 yes, 5 no.
Others: 49 yes, 25 no.
 - c) To one's own Church?
RCs: 3 yes, 6 no.
Others: 26 yes, 42 no.

6. 85% think the Roman Catholic Church's official position affects the action of local RC pastors, toward more ecumenical life, e.g., ecumenical weddings, attending other churches, Lutheran-RC dialogues, hospital work of clergy, opening up in many ways.
7. State one thing that you think is most unifying among Christians.
 - a) The shared, common experience of a personal encounter with Jesus Christ is the single most unifying manifestation of unity, because it places doctrinal and theological differences in perspective (27)
 - b) Service in meeting human needs in the name of Christ. (18)
 - c) Christian Unity Services and other common worship experiences. (17)
 - d) The Bible. (5)
 - e) Growing trust and understanding of each other. (5)
 - f) Holy Spirit (as bond of ecumenical community). (4)
8. State one thing that you think is a great obstacle to unity among Christians.
 - a) Ignorance and arrogance (pride, prejudice, narrowmindedness). (24)
 - b) Traditions and doctrine that are systematically reinforced, which makes difficult the achievement of officially sanctioned change. (22)
 - c) Rigid, exclusive practices (Eucharist, R.C. concept of Church and authority). (12)
 - d) Denominational identity that gets into the way of our common humanity in Christ. (10)
 - e) A continued lack of information about Catholic and Protestant positions and practices which perpetuate fear, distrust and suspicion. (7)
 - f) Widely divergent views of Christians on social issues and legislative advocacy. (5)
 - g) The central position and power of the Pope in Roman Catholicism. (4)
 - h) The very low priority which ecumenical work has in the practical planning of most churches. (4)
9. 67% read about ecumenism rarely; one-third, regularly.
10. 85% of the clergy respondents belong to a local ministerium. Of these, $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Roman Catholics do.
11. 70% have participated in a York County Council of Churches' program.
12. 60% would like to be more involved.

Subsequent to the Questionnaire Summary, Facts, History and Personal Testimonies, Clair Redding, and Harold Statler met for a round-up. The following was prepared in looking to the future.

STUDY CONCLUSIONS:

- 1) Liaison between the YCCC and the York Deanery/Diocese seems uncertain and may suffer from confusion. The Diocese-designated Participant-Observer serves effectively at one key point of collaboration and communication—the annual Christian Unity Service. The other expectation of involvement in the Council's Board/Department sessions has been scant. Parish responsibilities may be too extensive or demanding. Perchance a misunderstanding of expectations and role contribute to the limited participation. This could be accentuated by the residence of the Diocesan ecumenical officer as assistant pastor in the parish of the participant-observer. Through the latter, planning of joint ventures, consultation or mutual interests and recruitment of Roman Catholic personnel for YCCC task forces have been more frequent. This observation is not pointing fingers of blame—it highlights an area needing airing.
- 2) The openness between the Roman Catholic and Protestant clergy has shown amazing growth. The overtures and invitations for dialogue and cooperation from mainline Protestant clergy has been generally evident. Response by Roman Catholic clergy has been spotty and slower. This situation in part relates to the fewer Catholic parishes and the multiplicity of the dominant Protestant community; this makes such broader contact and involvement more difficult for the Catholic.
- 3) The Catholic Charismatics Prayer groups have evidenced an openness for full Protestant participation, except for shared Communion. Good will is reinforced in these prayer group relationships among the laity.
- 4) The YCCC early on has indicated practical ways for RC involvement in various cooperative ventures. This has never been forced, and response has been in keeping with Catholic concerns and growing trust in this broader Christian community.
- 5) Although the YCCC officially is open to RC parish membership and this is an evident dominant attitude of the Council's constituent congregations, for RC leadership this is a non-issue, one that is extraneous to their current parish planning. RC leadership is intensively preoccupied with "keeping the ship afloat," survival of the parish and all that involves. There is also a fear on the part of some Catholic priests that to associate with the YCCC will dilute the Christian message as Catholics believe themselves to possess it.
- 6) There are continuing areas of social policy disagreement clearly evident among York County christians. These differences have some historical rootage in what has been traditionally called

"Protestant" and "Roman Catholic" positions. At this time these differences may continue to be symbolized by the traditional sources, but in practical terms convictions show significant evidence of cross-fertilization.

- 7) Where the spirit of openness and trust is building among Roman Catholics and Council-related congregations, experiential ingredients are evident: a) an awareness of the common encounter with the person-Jesus Christ, b) a number of shared experiences among clergy and laity that have led each to view the other as persons—sharing their common humanity, and c) an awakening to the reality of common discipleship and witness to the Gospel that is possible and essential without compromising distinctive traditions and doctrines.

NEXT STEPS:

- 1) Institute Diocesan policy and procedures for role expectation and reporting to the Ecumenical Officer by the Participant Observer assigned by the Diocese to relate to local and regional ecumenical agencies.
- 2) Continue official overtures by the Council for RC participation at points wherein their interests may be served or their involvement would benefit the larger witness. In addition, Protestant overtures on an informal basis in their church clusters, and invitations for specific congregational programs or events should be encouraged.
- 3) The Council will make known its availability to present its life and work to the York Deanery and to individual Catholic parish councils. This presentation would not be a "sell job," but would seek to interpret the ecumenical movement and the function of the local ecumenical agency in relation to the local situation.
- 4) Continue communication by the Council with individual RC priests (and selected laity) on issues of institutional concerns or social witness. This may involve invited participation in consultation, study or action. In addition, where the Council voices a stance on an issue, RC priests (and parishes) will receive direct communications as information. Where joint statements can be arranged, efforts will be initiated by either group as is appropriate. Further, in approaching this area of collaboration or conflict of views, care needs to be taken by all parties not to presume the convictions of each other according to traditional images and recognize the pluralism that exists even with denominational consistency.
- 5) Provide increasing occasions for person-to-person, small group and festival experiences among all Christians in the county, affirming and building mutual respect and good will.

CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Bishop Unterkoefer has given a personal as well as factual account of his and the situation in Charleston, a small city with a minority Catholic population—perhaps 10%. He prefaces it with a short account of the state-wide situation, where Catholics are about 2%, and where the diocese is a full member of the Christian Action Council.

Diocese: Charleston, South Carolina

Bishop: Most Rev. Ernest L. Unterkoefer, 114 Broad Street, Charleston, South Carolina 29401. Phone: 803: 722-8505

Ecumenical Agency: Related, with Bishop Unterkoefer as ex officio delegate. Christian Action Council (15 churches in the state), 907 Richland Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201. Phone: 803: 254-1679

Ecumenical Agency Executive: Rev. Howard G. McClain—judicatories of 15 denominations, so only clergy on Board; little involvement of civic minorities; coalition style; fairly effective for spiritual and social action ecumenism; not so for academic.

ISSUES IMPEDING:

Apathy, moral issues, fundamentalism

ISSUES DIVISIVE:

Abortion

ISSUES SUCCESSFUL:

Prayer, race, marriage

ISSUES CURRENT:

Health areas, clergy education, welfare

A. The Statewide Scene

Since the Diocese of Charleston embraces the entire State of South Carolina, it is related directly with the judicatories of our separated brethren at the State level. Twice a year, the heads of the judicatories, black and white, meet for common purposes and ongoing agenda. There has been a balance between religious and social concerns. All the major churches are represented, with the exception of the Greek Orthodox Church, which has a number of congregations throughout the State.

The chief results of these meetings have been a developing mutual trust and an awareness of common problems, e.g., clergy, finances, programs, laity. Statewide, the Church leaders have made a significant impact on the progress made in the civil rights area, including desegregation of schools.

There is a Christian Action Council which brings together the officers of the various churches at a statewide level.

The "Working Agreement" of the Council reads as follows:

"The Christian Action Council is the churchly instrument through which the works with other denominations in South Carolina for witness, service and action on those tasks of Christian discipleship in which we share a common concern.

"The Council, as a cooperative church agency always seeking to witness to Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord, will be sensitive to the Christian concerns of the churches and develop responsible programs which will both strengthen the appreciation of and relationships between Christian bodies and extend Christian influence in our common life in South Carolina. The Council will submit an annual report of its work.

"The will participate as a member of the Council, appoint representatives to the decision-making Boards which determine program and work, contribute financially and provide moral and leadership support for effective implementation of programs.

"The shall be our liaison with the Council."

Full Roman Catholic participation took place only about five years ago. Before that we shared together and had representation at all meetings. The Council had a Southern Baptist origin (675,000 Southern Baptists in South Carolina) for the purpose of promoting total abstinence from alcohol. It has an entirely different character today.

Our major problem with the Council is in the area of moral and human values; abortion on demand, parimutuel betting, gambling, morality of war, capital punishment, civil rights, and the like.

Though disagreement is sharp on such issues, it has so far not severed our common willingness to move together.

B. The Charleston Scene

Both statewide ecumenical endeavors have significant expression in the Charleston metropolitan area of 300,000 people. The ecumenical activity is centered chiefly around bilateral relationships, ministerial association and Concerned Clergy. The laity are very receptive to shared prayer on Thanksgiving Day, Ash Wednesday and the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity.

Individual and personal relationships among the clergy across church lines are stronger than any organizational relationships. There is no metropolitan ecumenical agency.

Ecumenism and ecumenical activity are now familiar words. Ten years of deliberate initiative in a community that is predominantly Southern

Baptist have brought fruitful results. These results are evident in 1974 among the Churches of the major Christian communities.

1. Relations of the Roman Catholic Church and the **Episcopal Diocese:**

- a. Clergy conference and **clericus** addressed by the Roman Catholic Bishop and the Episcopal Bishop.
- b. Mutual meetings on the subject of marriage and ecumenical relationships.
- c. Interchange of invitations to lay-conventions and assemblies.
- d. Official agreement between dioceses on preparation of and celebration of marriage between Roman Catholics and Episcopalians.
- e. Days of dialogue and conversation.

2. Relations of Roman Catholic Church and **Southern Baptists.**

In the first half of the decade, relationships with the Southern Baptists were rather difficult. The major leaders were not attuned to the new relationships of churches in the community. Dr. John Hamrick, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Charleston, South Carolina, did respond affirmatively to ecumenical invitations from the Roman Catholic Churches. During the second half of the decade, 1964-74, the advance of ecumenical activity accelerated in dialogue, conversations among several congregations, exchange of preaching invitations, common worship on Thanksgiving Day with other major churches. Dr. Paul Pridgen has been a leader in opening up new relationships with the Southern Baptist community.

3. Relations with the **Lutheran Church.**

From 1965 onward, individual priests and Lutheran ministers have developed a friendly relationship. In accord with No. 10 of the Diocesan Ecumenical Guidelines, priests are urged to become acquainted with the clergy of other communions in their area and to work with them for the common good. Exchange of invitations to prayer services, to meetings and celebrations have become standard procedure. Dialogue and consultation exist and relate in general to bringing the documents of the U.S. bilateral Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue to the local level. Cooperation has been ongoing in the area of Continuing Education of the Clergy. With the Lutherans, as well as other communions, **reciprocity** is a cardinal principle. This is one of the chief reasons why we mutually prohibit inter-communion. Joint services of prayer between Catholic parishes and Lutheran congregations are very acceptable.

4. Relations with the **Methodist Church.**

The singular feature with Methodists has been in the area of social concern. Much more activity is evident among black Methodist ministers

and the Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Bishop has addressed the annual Methodist convention of clergy. There is a frequent interchange of prayer services.

The relationship with black ministers of all churches has been intensive in the area of civil rights, labor disputes, moral issues facing the community, e.g., abortion. The cooperation has been an evangelical sign to the consciences of the leadership of the community that the Gospel teaching of a way of life sets standards of morality, and that to follow Jesus together we must live in love with one another and proclaim justice for the oppressed and the poor. This was witnessed in the Poor People's challenge in 1969. The ecumenical response came from the Roman Catholic Church and the black churches. Ecumenism strengthened the prophetic role of the Church in the community. Catholic priest and black Methodist minister went to jail together for the sake of the poor.

5. Relations with the Jews.

We have frequent interchange of ideas in meetings, mutual exchange of visits, cooperation on strengthening of the Sabbath, aid to refugees in time of war. Jewish support of Catholic initiatives for racial justice is moderate. We have frequent meetings at clergy conferences.

I find that my ten years of deep involvement in ecumenism at the international, national and local levels have given me an understanding of the problems of humanity and some of the rich contributions that we and our separated brethren have made to the life of our nation. The promotion of Christian Unity will attract many to Christianity who formerly failed to understand the vitality and dynamism of the Gospel.

At no time do I feel that anyone attempted to coerce or to bring about a compromise in the essentials that pertain to my personal Roman Catholic expression of faith in Christ, the Gospel and the Magisterium of the Church. A deeper respect for Roman Catholic belief appears to be increasing, although at the same time those things that pertain to public debate like Catholic education and Christian morals have caused some long silent interludes. When we discuss matters that pertain to Christian morals, we must do so in the spirit of Christian charity and the spirit of Christian community, despite the grave divergence in our approaches and conclusions.

In ecumenical dialogues, we are at the edge of facing up to moral problems of our present time. The strength of ecumenical advances in the United States will be tested more in the next four or five years than it has been in the past decade. The road ahead is bright and optimistic, but it will take courageous, stronghearted, amiable, reconciling representatives of all the Churches to raise the values inherent in morality to a high level in the awareness of our nation.

BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

Some call them accidents; others attribute them to God's providence. The plane to Charleston for the National Ecumenical Workshop on March 10, 1973, brought Fr. Driscoll and me together. Result: he graciously agreed to do this report, after hearing that we needed one from a middle-sized city. Of set purpose, the ecumenical agency is concerned almost solely with "secular ecumenism"; Catholic participation is therefore lessened. The more theological and religious side of ecumenical life is done outside the ecumenical agency, as is evident from this report.

Diocese: Bridgeport, Connecticut; 818,000 people; 327,000 RCs

Bishop: Most Rev. Walter W. Curtis

Agency: Ministry for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs for Greater Bridgeport, 250 Waldemere Avenue, Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604. Phone: 203: 367-3631

Agency's RC Director: Rev. Thomas J. Driscoll; Executive Sec'y.: Rev. Richard Rooney, S.J.

Ecumenical Agency: Greater Bridgeport Council of Churches. Congregations only. Social Action projects; little Faith & Order.

Agency Director: Rev. Roger Floyd, Council of Churches of Greater Bridgeport, Inc., 3030 Park Avenue, Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604
R.C. observer only: Rev. Thomas Driscoll

MAKE-UP OF AREA:

40% Roman Catholics; 35% Protestants; 15% Jews; 10% other

ISSUES IMPEDING:

Apathy on part of clergy and laity; Fear; Racism; Multiplicity of interests; Poor communication

ISSUES DIVISIVE:

Moral (abortion, premarital sex, gambling); Faith & Order matters untouched; Christian-Jewish relations

ISSUES SUCCESSFUL:

Spiritual ecumenism; Concern for Israel; Bible School; Blood Bank; Social Witness (peace, housing, aged, jail)

ISSUES CURRENT:

Housing, communications, ecumenical marriage, inner-city needs

HISTORY

Responding to the call of the Second Synod of Bridgeport Diocese for the creation of special ministries, Bishop Curtis together with the Priests' Council in October, 1972, established the Ministry of Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs. Director for the Ministry is Reverend Thomas

J. Driscoll, S.T.L., Vice-Chancellor and Secretary to the Bishop. At this point the earlier Ecumenical Commission, made up of 25 members—priests, religious and laity—under the direction of Father Martin J. O'Connor, was dissolved. The Executive Secretary for the Commission, the Reverend Richard L. Rooney, S.J., became Executive Secretary for the new Ministry, and for the latter an executive committee was formed made up of the Director and six other priests.

Perennial Activities

The new Ministry, has a regular slate of programs. A service office has a library of 140 books on matters ecumenical, and 18 ecumenical journals and periodicals, as well as filmstrips and tape recordings of ecumenical interest, available for borrowing.

From 1969 to 1972 the newsletter "Keeping Posted" and its successor since 1972 "Outreach" have been sent to all priests by our ecumenical officers as organs of information and inspiration, of theory and practice, "what-to-do and how-to-do-it suggestions."

The Ministry promotes the annual Week of Prayer for Christian Unity, varying the approach from organizing large programs in 1969 and 1970 to suggesting smaller local church observances in the years 1971 through 1975. These programs and observances held by single parishes draw a small but earnest number of the Faithful into prayerful participation. Thanksgiving Eve and Good Friday Ecumenical Prayer services have been held in the various cities of the diocese.

Of special interest has been the annual Anglican/Roman Catholic "Day of Study and Prayer" for priests, religious and lay people of both the Diocese of Bridgeport and the Episcopal Diocese of Connecticut. From 1969 through 1972, this was promoted jointly as a consequence of the continuing Dialogue maintained by ecumenists of the two dioceses. In 1973 and 1974, the program was widened to include participation by representatives of the two other Catholic dioceses in Connecticut—the Archdiocese of Hartford and the Diocese of Norwich. About 125 persons participated, including the five Roman Catholic bishops and the two Episcopal bishops.

Some of the ecumenists of our diocese have participated in all the annual National Ecumenical Workshops for Christian Unity, as well as many other meetings and gatherings of ecumenical groups.

Occasional Activities

The former commission on ecumenism played an important role in the Bridgeport Synod discussions which resulted in the Synod document on ecumenism.

A major accomplishment of the new Ministry was the issuance in 1973 of "Ecumenical Guidelines for Priests." This replaced the interim guidelines issued by the Commission in 1965. Connected with this is

the work of this Ministry in the New England Association of Catholic Ecumenical Councils: three years of meetings, writing and re-writing have produced two documents, "Pathways to Unity" and "Guidelines for Priests" which are common texts for use in all the dioceses in the New England region of the United States. These texts were recently accepted by all the New England Bishops.

A very significant ecumenical event which received national attention took place on Sunday, December 3, 1973: an exchange of pulpits between priests of 33 Roman Catholic and 33 Episcopal churches in Fairfield County. With the special permissions of the respective bishops, the 33 Catholic priests preached at the principal Sunday service of the Episcopal churches and the 33 Episcopal priests preached in the Catholic churches. In accordance with Church discipline, there was no intercommunion. On January 12, 1975, the event will be repeated.

Catholic-Jewish Relations

The Ministry maintains membership in the Jewish-Christian Intergroup of Bridgeport, with semi-monthly meetings. One ministry member attended the first National Catholic Jewish Workshop in Dayton, Ohio, in 1973. Prior to that the Ministry co-sponsored with the American Jewish Committee of Connecticut in four separate colloquia. Several times members of this Diocese together with Protestants and Orthodox have joined with Jews in issuing statements of protest against violations of the human and civil rights of Jews.

A Catholic-Jewish Seminar co-sponsored by our Ministry and the local rabbinate took place in Stamford, Connecticut in 1971. In April, 1973, the diocese participated in a Sabbath remembrance of the Holocaust.

Educational Initiatives

Ecumenical personnel participated in the religious education convention of the New England region in the summer of 1969. They have also lectured often on ecumenism in various parts of the diocese in connection with adult education programs. Frequently ministry members have given talks on ecumenism in parishes, to parish and vicariate councils throughout the diocese.

Secular Ecumenism

Greater cooperation between religious groups exists in the social sphere. Our Second Synod charges the Ministry for Social Concerns "to mobilize Catholics to initiate, or join in, ecumenically sponsored efforts to eradicate discrimination on neighborhood, parish and diocesan levels—especially in housing, education and employment." (Second Synod, Ecumenism, Chapter IX, Par. 20) One outstanding response to this call is the Bishop's Commission on Human Rights whose membership includes non-Catholics; the Commission has spoken out and worked

in a number of problem areas. Likewise, individual Catholics and Catholic groups have cooperated with other agencies to promote justice and harmony in our communities.

In spite of all the efforts of our ecumenical ministry, it is a disappointing fact that our clergy and laity by and large are not engaged in much spiritual or religious ecumenism—prayer services, study groups, grass-roots dialogue—although there are a few noteworthy examples of such activity.

Data Opinionaires were sent to 15 priests, of whom 7 returned them and to 8 laity, of whom 4 returned them.

Week of Prayer for Christian Unity helps greatly;
'hard' issues have not been dealt with;
prospects are felt to be quite good for ecumenical life;
development of deeper collaboration is a felt need;
priests and laity followed much the same patterns, with clergy
being more optimistic in general.

Significant conclusions:

Need for education of all clergy in area;
Extension of agency through lay participation;
Ecumenical Social Action done through our Ministry of Social Concerns is good;
Needs for greater funding for common projects;
Exploration of ecumenism through liturgical cooperation.

Next steps:

Seminars—for clergy.
Better training of Parish Council Ecumenical Committees.
Closer affiliation with local Ecumenical Agencies and Rabbinical Associations.
Roman Catholic/Anglican Dialogue and Pulpit exchange.
Social Concerns—concerted action via clusters.
Jewish-Christian "Inter-Group."

UNITED RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY SOUTH BEND, INDIANA

In this small urban-county community, a crisis occurred in 1968, as it did in so many strife-ridden areas of America. Out of that crisis came a strong interreligious organization, led by Rev. John Gaus and a succession of priests from the Society of the Atonement, the Franciscan community in Graymoor, New York, which is totally dedicated to Christian Unity. The example of Graymoor should be noted by other religious women and men; generosity to the *catholic* church will help greatly the *one* church. Full-time ecumenical work is much too rare for Roman Catholics; still rarer is full-time work in ecumenical agencies.

Diocese: Fort Wayne-South Bend; 973,937 people; 159,076 RCs

Bishop: Most Rev. Leo C. Pursley

Ecumenical Agency: United Religious Community, 319 South Main, South Bend, Indiana 46601, 219: 282-2397

Executive Director: Rev. John E. Gaus; Associate: Rev. Bernard R. Palka, S.A.

RC Participant: Rev. Daniel E. Peil (Ecumenical officer), 58790 Locust Road, South Bend, Indiana 46614, 219: 287-0225

Agency's Composition: congregations, one of them Bahai, and two Catholic hospitals; initiative was taken by the ecumenical agency around community issues; task-force style, with good community relations but little academic activity (surprising in the hometown of Notre Dame University which is strongly ecumenical and community-oriented.)

ISSUES IMPEDING:

parochialism, apathy, poor communications.

ISSUES DIVISIVE:

abortion, pro-life, parochialism

ISSUES SUCCESSFUL:

hospital chaplaincies, juvenile justice, racism in schools

ISSUES CURRENT:

neighborhood centers, welfare reform, drug abuse, clergy education

HISTORY

The Council of Churches of St. Joseph County (CC) came into being in 1929. During the succeeding forty-two years it was the vehicle of the common concerns of over fifty Protestant congregations. The year 1968 was a year of crisis for the Council of Churches, from which it emerged with a determination to carry out a self-examination leading to a redefinition of its mission.

In order to implement this resolve the Council's board authorized the establishment of a Conciliar Development Committee (CDC) whose sole responsibility was to recommend what the Council should strive to be in the 1970's. It was characteristic of Reverend Milton D. Willford's

fresh outlook as executive secretary that several Roman Catholics were invited to become members of the CDC and that they accepted.

In 1968 the Council had appointed, as a full-time Ecumenical Education Coordinator, the Reverend Charles E. Murphy, a Catholic priest from the Society of the Atonement. This was probably the first time that a Roman Catholic priest became a full-time member of the staff of a local Council of Churches.

The CDC held its organizational meeting on February 24, 1969. The process was to become a prolonged enterprise. Yet as early as October 1969 people realized that the CC in its older sense was outgrown, and that the CDC might well be an agency for achieving a transition to an organization more broadly ecumenical.

Throughout 1970 the CDC wrestled principally with two questions: (1) How ecumenical should the new organization be: open to all religious organizations, or only to Christian ones? and (2) What should be the desired balance between social action on the one hand, and activities designed to promote interdenominational understanding and worship services on the other hand?

Of decisive importance was an overnight live-in meeting held at Geneva Center. Eleven persons (five Catholics, three Protestants, and three Jews) participated and produced the following statement:

It is a paradox that as the influence of religion in our society declines, many of the religious bodies are taking a more concerned and realistic attitude toward society's most pressing problems. Thus, there is a greater possibility than ever before in St. Joseph County for the formation of a more comprehensive religious community than that which is realized by the parallel existence of many congregations. This religious community could make a substantial contribution to meet many of the problems of the whole community, especially those with a moral dimension. During the last four years we have seen several spontaneous, concrete expressions of ecumenism of a social and moral dimension. The two most prominent are the Greater South Bend Housing Corporation and Project Commitment.

Historically, the Council of Churches of St. Joseph County has comprised an association of some 75 Protestant congregations. It is the firm conviction of the CDC that the Council of Churches, because of its history and background in ecumenical efforts, should provide the initiative and necessary staff and personnel resources to help bring the religious community of St. Joseph County into self-conscious realization. It is also our conviction that this broadly based religious community, given the necessary resolve, could more effectively identify and address itself to the problems of the community than could any single religious organization now in existence.

Therefore the CDC requests that the Board of Directors of the Council of Churches of St. Joseph County authorize this committee to take the following actions leading toward the implementation of the purposes stated above:

1. to add to its number such persons and representatives of religious groups as it would determine consistent with the implementation of the purpose stated above.
2. to extend an invitation to each religious group or congregation in St. Joseph County to come together to respond to the challenge of fulfilling their responsibility of being the religious community in St. Joseph County; and that the Council of Churches serve as the temporary organizational framework of such a group until an organization and name can be agreed upon which would uniquely serve the purposes of a more inclusive religious community; and
3. to initiate both long-term and short-term plans for increasing membership and inclusiveness and for determining the priorities and actions which would give witness to the religious presence and concern for the entire community.

This statement was transmitted to the board of directors of the CC which approved it. By November 26, 1970 the draft of a "United Religious Community" (URC) had been completed. It was to be open to ". . . all those religious bodies located in St. Joseph County which wish to be members." "The Board of Directors of URC, elected at the annual meeting, would be responsible for: (a) activating and supporting the two operational entities of URC; (b) hiring staff; (c) financing the entire operation." "The mission of the URC would be the support of a Commission on Research and Planning (CRP), intended to minister to the entire community." An Urban Training Center was also described as the second operational entity.

The overall idea was presented on February 17, 1971 at Temple Beth-El to the approximately two hundred congregational representatives who accepted invitations to attend. At the Annual Meeting of the Council of Churches, on May 12, 1971 at the First Christian Church in South Bend, the CC voted to dissolve and to take legal steps to transfer its assets to the URC.

In August, 1971 Reverend Willford left the community and the day to day affairs of both CC and URC were capably handled by Reverend Arthur F. Gouthro, S.A. (successor to Father Murphy) and Mrs. Betty Byers.

While the main thrust toward the United Religious Community came from members of the local Council of Churches and local Catholics, both lay and religious, the "climate" in South Bend and the state of Indiana was conducive to such an ecumenical organization, as was the atmosphere in the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend.

Participation at the state-wide level was evident in many areas between the newly formed Indiana Catholic Conference and the Indiana Council of Churches, with the most notable being the formation of the Indiana Interreligious Commission on Human Equality which brought together twenty-eight Protestant, Catholic and Jewish judicatories working in the fields of social justice and human relations.

The Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend's Commission on Ecumenism helped to provide a working liaison between the ordinary of the diocese, the Most Rev. Leo A. Pursley, D.D., and those working toward the United Religious Community in South Bend. Also involved with the South Bend development was Bishop-elect Joseph R. Crowley who was to become the Auxiliary Bishop of the diocese, living in South Bend.

On July 17, 1971, Bishop Pursley sent the following letter to the pastors of the South Bend area:

Dear Father:

I am writing to you about an ecumenical body that is taking shape in St. Joseph County to be called the United Religious Community. A committee composed of Catholics, Jews and Protestants has been planning the organization for over two years. When it comes into being it will, among other things, succeed to the functions of the Council of Churches of St. Joseph County.

In my estimation the development of the United Religious Community will be a major step forward. It exemplifies the spirit of unity and cooperation that we should all enjoy as God's people. At the same time it will not detract from the identity and integrity of any of the churches, congregations or parishes which choose to join it.

I would appreciate it if you would pass this information on to the lay leadership of your parish because it is my understanding that you and they will be contacted shortly concerning possible membership in the United Religious Community. This decision is, of course, one which each parish is free to make for itself.

If you have questions about this undertaking, I am sure the Catholic representatives most closely associated with its development will be glad to answer them. They are Bishop-elect Crowley, Fathers Guertin and Gouthro, Thomas Broden, James Danehy and Dr. Frank Toepp.

Devotedly in Christ,

✠ Leo C. Pursley

Bishop of Fort Wayne-South Bend

Finally, on February 1, 1972, in St. Andrew's United Church of Christ, Mishawaka, the United Religious Community came into being with forty-two congregations signing the Declaration of Intention to become a part of the United Religious Community. On May 4, 1972, the Council of Churches of St. Joseph County had its final annual meeting and ceased to be. A few moments later, at the same location, the URC had its first general assembly and elected its first officers and board of directors. There were 49 congregations who signed Declarations of Commitments to become the charter members of the URC—40 Protestant, 6 Roman Catholic, 1 Reformed Jew, 1 Bahai Faith and 1 Greek Orthodox. In 1974 there are 62 members—45 Protestants, 11 Roman Catholic parishes, 2 Roman Catholic hospitals, 1 Reformed Jewish Temple, 1 Bahai Assembly, 1 Greek Orthodox congregation, and 1 Episcopal congregation.

This is the most unusual mix of all those reported in this study.

COVENANTED PARISHES SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., WORCESTER

The phenomenon of "covenanted parishes" seems to be an entirely American one so far. It is spreading rapidly, in Kansas City, Mo., in Providence, R.I., in Charleston, W. Va., among Episcopalian-Roman Catholic parishes, and made news recently in a Lutheran-Roman Catholic covenant in Wyandanch, Long Island. We give this account as fairly typical; local circumstances will of course control the process wherever it occurs.

The following account is in narrative form, so the reader will have to note facts parallel to those in the previous reports as they occur. It was written in March, 1974; since then, Fr. Page has transferred to a new parish. Cf. P.S.

Diocese: Worcester, Massachusetts

Bishop: Most Rev. Bernard J. Flanagan

Ecumenical Officer: Sister Therese Dion, S.S.A., 49 Elm Street, Worcester, Massachusetts 01609, 617: 791-7171

The authors: Rev. Raymond J. Page, Notre Dame Church, 61 Marcy Street, Southbridge, Ma. 01550, 617: 764-3863

Rev. Edward A. M. Cobden, Jr., Holy Trinity Church, 183 South Street, Southbridge, Ma. 01550, 617: 764-4422

Southbridge is a typical New England lower-middle class mill town of 18,000 inhabitants. We have four Roman Catholic Churches, three Orthodox churches and four Protestant churches. There is a long-standing, healthy ecumenical climate in our town. Typical of the ecumenical spirit is the fact that in 1967 the Southbridge Council of Churches dissolved to form instead an Ecumenical Fellowship in which Roman Catholic parishes could officially participate. Since that time, through the Ecumenical Fellowship, our parishes have cooperated in common worship, educational projects, social action programs for the poor, the elderly, drug and alcoholic rehabilitation, ministry to the sick in our local hospital.

A. CONDITIONS LEADING TO THE COVENANT

Fr. Raymond Page, pastor of Notre Dame Roman Catholic Church, and Fr. Edward Cobden, rector of Holy Trinity Episcopal Parish, believe that the best way to begin explaining the covenant in Southbridge is to describe the conditions which made it possible: to give an indication of the nature of the soil in which the seed was sown and the plant began to grow.

The most important factor was leadership. On St. Valentine's Day in 1971, the Episcopalian and Catholic bishops called clergy and people together in a festival service at the Roman Catholic cathedral in Wor-

cester, Massachusetts. The reason for remembering it was Valentine's Day was not because of what was said, but because of what was done. Bishop Stewart gave Bishop Flanagan a box of candy and asked if he and the people of his diocese would be the valentine of the Episcopal diocese of Western Massachusetts! The bishops followed up on this service that June, by offering a practical proposal to lay and clerical representatives of 16 selected pairs of parishes. The bishops and their ecumenical officers described the concept of "covenanting parishes."

We would emphasize that for us the **leadership of our bishops** was crucial. They made it possible for us to take advantage of the leadership which was being given on the national and international level, and which was embryonic on the local level.

Having underlined the leadership on the **diocesan** level, we would also stress the importance of leadership on the **parish** level—especially of the ordained leadership. The clergy need to give strong, clear, confident leadership. The lay people who are enthusiastic for an ecumenical program such as this look to the clergy for vision and inspiration as well as organizational help.

The second factor which made the covenant possible was the **personal conviction** of the leadership that Christ meant his church to be one, and the conviction that this covenant was a way of achieving renewal and reunion.

The third factor was the general and **longstanding** ecumenical climate. We felt this was true within the church at large; whatever gains are realized now, we know come only after a history of patient struggle in preceding generations. This ecumenical climate prevailed in our local community as well. A decade before, our parishes had participated in the Living Room Dialogues. For several years before the covenant the churches in our area, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, had worked together in an ecumenical council. Our two parishes in particular had a history of giving leadership in ecumenical reconciliation and cooperation.

The fourth condition which led us to make this covenant was the **pastoral** one. The divisions which separate our churches are a theological scandal and a pastoral outrage. At the crucial moments in our people's lives families who have divided ecclesiastical allegiance are hindered from receiving the full support from the church because of our divisions. It is especially painful when the Eucharist can not be shared at weddings, funerals and other such significant moments. We find that many of our people are ahead of the leadership of the church at this point. They see the ecclesiastical divisions as an historical anachronism and as an annoyance which must at best be patiently endured until we (i.e., those who represent the leadership of the church) do something to correct what is to them so obviously wrong.

B. THE PROCESS LEADING TO THE COVENANT

The above factors influenced Notre Dame and Holy Trinity parishes to enter into a covenant relationship. We would like to explain now how we proceeded to establish our covenant—and in doing so we would like to touch upon certain cautions of which we became aware as we proceeded.

The first step that set us on the road to a covenant was a positive and joint response of our two parishes to a mandate from our two bishops. On June 21, 1971, sixteen pairs of Anglican and Roman Catholic parishes had been invited to the interdiocesan meeting. It was at this meeting that the concept of a covenant first came to our attention. The impetus, then, really came from the top—our Bishops.

They were proposing that these sixteen pairs of parishes be yoked as sister parishes, so to speak, in a covenant which would commit them officially to work toward the reunion of our two communions. Notre Dame and Holy Trinity comprised one of the sixteen pairs. Both of us attended the meeting **with lay representatives** of our parishes. We came away from the meeting enthusiastic and in complete agreement that we should enter into a covenant and that we should do it soon.

We felt that the people in our town were ready to respond positively to the idea of a covenant. Timing, we thought, was important and we agreed that the time was right for us. As mentioned above, there was a longstanding ecumenical climate in our town in general and very good relations between our two churches in particular. Our people were ready for a follow-up, a next step, something concrete—perhaps even dramatic. The covenant was the natural thing for us to do.

Following the diocesan meeting in June of '71, our parish ecumenical commissions met jointly several times during the summer months to map out an educational program in preparation for the covenant. Though the timing was good, we felt that we still had an important and perhaps crucial educational project on our hands. The idea of a covenant was new. The word itself was strange to most ears, perhaps even misleading. We were reaching down to grass roots, to people—and people had to understand what we were asking of them and why.

But before we were ready to reach out to the people, we had to educate ourselves. By "we" is meant the clergy of both parishes, plus lay members of our ecumenical commissions. It was important from the start that the leadership of both parishes have a clear understanding of where we were heading, of our objectives and our expectations. We wanted to take every precaution not to arouse false expectations, to make certain that there would be no misinterpretation of what we were trying to do.

As a result of close dialogue at the parish leadership level, we were able to come to the following conclusions:

1. First of all, the covenant is **not a merger**. It has nothing to do with the merger of buildings, budgets or people. It does not threaten parish identity. Notre Dame would remain Notre Dame. Holy Trinity would remain Holy Trinity. Each would retain its own character, qualities and autonomy.

2. The covenant does **not solve all our differences**. We cannot at the local level ignore the theological differences which characterize our world-wide communions. Indeed, we were resolved from the start to proceed with a deep sense of ecclesial responsibility, with both parishes remaining true to their respective authorities, we were certain that we did not want to go off on our own. We knew we had to function within the bosom of the universal church—even if it meant we had to endure the pain of living with differences which we at the local level were quite ready to abandon. This became tremendously important later when we petitioned Rome and Canterbury for intercommunion.

3. We wanted to emphasize that having a close bilateral relationship between two churches, one Roman Catholic and the other Anglican, **does not preclude or hinder other bilateral relationships**. Living in a community, as we do, with several Roman Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox churches, with a reasonably good ecumenical climate, we wanted to make sure that the fact that we two were moving closer together did not mean that we were moving away from others. We kept reminding ourselves and others that this reconciliation between our two parishes was taking place in the context of the total movement towards unity, and that our joint efforts must in no way be divisive or isolationist, but must always be aimed at the total unity of the dismembered Christ. This is a point that we **had to stress constantly** during the ensuing months.

4. Specifically, the covenant must begin as a covenant of **prayer**. We pledged ourselves to weekly public prayers in our churches, for the reunion of our two communions envisaged by International Anglican Roman Catholic (ARC) bilateral discussions. We did not, at that time, choose to go into our covenant with a lot of joint projects proposed in detail for the future. We wanted to begin with an emphasis on prayer—official, public prayer as sister parishes, putting ourselves on the line, going on record saying to the world: We are tired of our divisions. We want to be one.

5. Our long-range goal must be the renewal of the **total church**. We would continue, as sister parishes and whenever possible with other parishes, our common efforts in those areas where we are already at work: common worship, theological dialogue, ministry to the sick and elderly. And especially we would be open to the Spirit and ready to move where He would lead us in response to our covenant prayer.

We think these five points just about sum up the mystique of our covenant approach. Once we had worked out the mystique, the

technique came quite easily. It was simply a matter of **good public relations**: presenting the proposal to our Parish Council and vestry, obtaining their endorsement and involvement, communication with our parishioners by letter and with Sunday homilies, carefully planned press and radio coverage, setting up committees for planning the liturgy and social hour for the public celebration of our covenant.

That celebration came on December first, 1972, in Holy Trinity Church. With the church jammed to the rafters, it was an unforgettable moment, a real family reunion which generated in our people a spirit of reconciliation which, after almost two years, is still very much alive and growing.

C. THE IMPACT OF THE COVENANT

What has been the result of our covenant?

First of all, we are still praying for each other at our principal services each week. We are convinced that it is in prayer that we begin to hope and to commit ourselves to the renewal and reunion of the church.

Secondly, we recognized from the start that we had a particular contribution to make in just explaining the covenant in the media, in correspondence, in meetings and speaking engagements.

The third result was our study project of the **Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine**. After weeks of studying and discussing the document, our people complied with the wish of the theologians at Windsor and notified the leadership of the church how a small portion of the people of God felt about the statement. Our petition to be able to share communion was denied. But in supplying the theologians with the datum that at least one group of parishes agreed with their work, we had done what we could. We achieved our short term goal.

The impact of the covenant and the petition on our community has been most gratifying. Religion, which had often kept our people apart, was now drawing them together. The ecumenical climate has given a sense of cohesiveness and joyful community in our town. This beneficial contribution was given expression when Frs. Page and Cobden were honored as "Citizen of the Year" by our local radio station. The success we have experienced in ARC has improved relationships between other denominations as well.

The most profound impact has been, of course, among the people of our two parishes. There is a special bond of affection between us. Even though we can not receive communion together—in a strange way perhaps because we share the pain of being deprived that privilege—we have better experienced what it is to be one in the spirit of Christ.

As pastors we feel this special warmth. On Ash Wednesday a Holy Trinity parishioner was recovering from surgery in the hospital. She was

grateful to learn that Fr. Page would be celebrating Mass over the closed circuit TV with which we have provided the hospital. She had asked Fr. Page to come by, knowing that she could not receive communion but wanting to receive his blessing. We may not be able to reciprocate our sacramental priesthood, but our people recognize and appreciate the ministry we are able to offer.

We do not know where we are going from here. There are little things we have to do. Our church will be sponsoring a vacation bible school this summer for the town. We have the usual worry about recruiting teachers. Last week a layman of Notre Dame who is training confirmands phoned; he wanted to know if it would be all right if our bible school be designated as one of the projects his 10th graders could support. Results: we are supplied with teaching aids! These are small things, but of such things is parochial life built.

Whether meeting a need with cooperative effort or creating a sense of community in our town, our ecumenical venture has been blessed with the joyful renewing and uniting power of Christ.

P.S. In a letter from Saint Ann's Rectory, P. O. Box 488, North Oxford, Massachusetts 01537, Phone (617) 987-8892, Fr. Page writes:

"In keeping with the spirit of personnel policies of our Diocese I requested a transfer from Notre Dame (after ten years as pastor) to a smaller parish. I had anticipated that this would eventually happen when we entered our covenant. You remember there was some discussion of this in Charleston.

My hope now is still as it was then that the people of both parishes are so deeply committed to the Covenant that it will continue and grow. Also, my successor, Father Donald Gervais, former secretary of Bishop Flanagan, is a young, enthusiastic priest, a native of Southbridge, well aware of the developments there and a strong believer in the ecumenical cause. I know he and Ted Cobden have already met and from all reports all goes well. Of course time alone will tell and this will be a good test! I am still convinced that strong leadership by the clerev is so essential."

THE 15 CHURCHES UNITED FOR A BETTER MANHATTAN

In addition to other styles of ecumenical life, the one-person style seems important and worth including here. Most effective programs start with one person in any case. Fr. Gilhooley's work will be imitable by some, admirable for all, inspirational for many. "Go thou and do likewise!" in some project fitted to your special talents and situation, as Fr. Jim has in his.

Agency: 15 Churches United for a Better Manhattan, 4271 Broadway, New York, New York 10033. Phone: 212: 795-6860

Agency's Directors: Father James J. Gilhooley; Mr. John F. Devaney

Agency's Composition: Parishes: 33 Roman Catholics; 3 Episcopal; 1 Unitarian; 1 Lutheran; 1 Dutch Reformed

I. What We Do and Have Done:

15 Churches United for a Better Manhattan is an ecumenical union of thirty-five Christian churches on Manhattan Island. We number Roman Catholic, Episcopal, Lutheran, Unitarian, and Dutch Reformed churches among us.

Our role is to act as Advocates for poor and working class people—black, brown, and white—through the medium of their elected officials. Most of our work is done in Manhattan's tenements. The "15 Churches" was born when we realized that New York City's housing agencies, paid by tax-payers to do a job for them, were in fact not doing so.

Ideally, we act as benign thorns in the sides of these elected public servants. I think that this "benign thorn posture" is one all churchmen should have toward politicians. If ever we become their house chaplains, we have been had and we cease to be an advocate. Periodically we should reflect on Mike Royko's line re Saul Alinsky and apply it to ourselves: "The City Council paid a great tribute to the late Saul Alinsky a few days ago. It refused to name a city park after him."

The rationale for our group is simple: Elected officials should not only be good legislators but also they should take an active interest in the everyday bread and butter problems of their constituents. If negative on either count, they should be turned out of office. It can be argued that if a public servant cannot get heat or hot water for a constituent, he or she may likewise lack the expertise in getting legislation passed which will demonstrably help constituents.

The "15 Churches" is now seven years old—a long time for such an organization as ours. We had the good taste to begin the "15 Churches" with the blessings and permission of the then Auxiliary Bishop Terence Cooke who, quite happily for us, has since become the Cardinal Archbishop of New York. The Cardinal remains very sympathetic to what we are attempting to do in Manhattan.

Some of the clout we possess comes from a slick, professional News-Letter we publish about every six weeks in English and Spanish. Our circulation: 14,000. The News-Letters are distributed through our member-churches at their Sunday services.

The most avid readers of this sheet are politicians themselves. For, if elected officials do a job for their constituents, we say so. If, on the other hand, they are either unwilling or perhaps unable, we say that also. In our most recent sheet, for example, we applauded the efforts of two congressmen, three state assemblymen, and one city councilman. We strongly criticized the constituent-effectiveness of a state-senator and two state assemblymen. E.g.: "Our Big Zero goes to State Senator Joseph Zaretzki of upper Manhattan. When people come to his assistants and ask for heat for their apartments, Zaretzki's helpers give the shivering tenants forms to fill out. At the bottom of the class we place Assemblyman George Miller. Says Mr. Miller: 'you can't ask me to be responsible for all of 121,000 constituents.' We didn't. We asked him to take care of fewer than 20 who needed help. He couldn't."

Incidentally, one needs very little money for such an operation as ours. Each member-church is charged one hundred dollars annually. That money is used to defray the costs of the News-Letter. New York Catholic Charities has been good to us, giving us a dollar for every dollar we raise. Our staff consists of myself and five volunteers. The caliber of people that one attracts as volunteers to this type of advocate-work is very high. I might add this type of operation can be duplicated almost any place.

Politicians and their friends react in different ways to criticism. Some get cracking and begin to work for their constituents. Others, working on the premise that the best defense is an offense, attack us. So, for example, one Assemblyman, using his "free postage privilege," took after us in a long letter to his constituents because we found his constituent work only "fair." Two other politicians evened a score by having a community newspaper take after us editorially—inviting us, basically, to remain in the sacristy and tell our beads. I am of course sure that the fact that the two politicians spent a great deal of money advertising in the paper had no influence on the paper's editorial judgment. At least one other has tried to even a score by at least twice taking care of me with my church superiors. And each time he has been rebuffed.

Politicians would much prefer that we leave them alone. They don't need favorable publicity from us. They have their own public relations people. However, they don't want unfavorable publicity from us. And that for at least two reasons. First, some of them hold their seats by a slim majority. In Manhattan some Assembly seats can be won or lost by less than one hundred votes. At the same time, some Manhattan parishes are distributing four thousand news-letters each Sunday. A politician finding his work held up for critical examination in such a sheet has good reason to be concerned.

Second, criticism from church groups somehow upset the guilt-psyche of politicians. Perhaps they have never gotten over Bing Crosby's portrayal of the priesthood in "Going My Way." Or perhaps, and what is more likely, criticism from us upsets their mind-set about clergymen in general—people belonging to a neuter gender, forever running about teaching cherubic young faces to sing "Silent Night." They welcome us to pray over their dinners, then gently push "the father" aside, and get on with the wheeling and dealing that is politics in 1974. The next time you pray over a political dinner you might bear in mind Joe Flaherty's line that "God should be spared the indignity of invocation over a system He has never sanctioned . . ."

Our work comes to us through several Little City Halls strung strategically through Manhattan. A good deal of work comes to us over the phone in my office. We ask each of the one hundred Manhattan parishes to mention our services of getting heat and hot water, apartments painted, rats routed, and so on in their parish bulletins. We also have been receiving a goodly deal of work from a complaint center run by TV Channel 13. In our judgment, the parish bulletin remains an unexploited weapon on behalf of people.

The whole thing sounds like a gargantuan piece of work. It is not. The numbers coming to us are not overtaxing. The poorer the section, the less people that come to us. The very poor work on the principle that they who expect nothing will not be disappointed. And usually they are not disappointed because usually they get nothing. In poor sections, therefore, we oftentimes have to make our own work.

This situation speaks of Oscar Lewis' culture of poverty or Paulo Friere's culture of silence—a culture which we do not understand. It's illustrated by the very few ghetto people registered to vote. Or by a recent report in the New York Times (2/6/74) that spoke of N.Y.C. Health Department's program of inviting parents of children entering kindergarten and the first grade to bring the youngsters to one of the 77 child-health centers in the city for a physical examination. The plans were a flop. Says the city: "Either the parents were too busy working or they didn't feel this was important enough." Or by the fact that very few ghetto fathers take on the city or fight for heat or hot water; more often than not, when anybody does complain, it is their wives.

In line with this, we would submit that mainline churches should be hesitant about calling themselves "the church of the poor." Our experience has taught us that the poor don't necessarily agree with that proud designation. This thought is pointed up by Jimmy Breslin's revolutionary heroine in **World Without End, Amen**: "There's no such thing as a Church anymore. There's just a lot of men in black clothes livin' in big stone houses." Or a few lines from a recent issue of *Commonweal* (3/30/73): "History will not say of us that we have hated

the poor. It will say we have only slept. When we woke up, it was too late. The poor had left without us."

What have six years' work produced? Possibly the most significant contribution we have made to the commonweal is that we have served notice on a relatively large number of politicians that they must give serious attention to their constituents' needs or else pay the price of that neglect in the printed page. We have also pointed out graphically the non-workability of some laws in the housing area and the need for fresh new ones. And if anybody doubted it, the ineptness of various municipal departments.

Our efforts over those last years have touched the lives of thousands of people directly or indirectly. We have secured heat and hot water for innumerable tenants and tenements on Manhattan Island. It is no longer possible to count the number of apartments we have had painted, the number of faulty roofs we have caused to be repaired, the number of rats we have put to rout, etc.

The "15 Churches United" has played a heavy role in the construction of one public library, two public parks, the raising of a substantial sum of money for the feeding of elderly people on Manhattan's East Side, the opening of additional Food Stamp Centers, the voter registration of 1100 East Harlem citizens in one summer period, etc.

We have obtained free legal counsel for a goodly number of people, appeared in various actions as a friend of tenants, have struggled successfully to keep public schools open at night in East Harlem and North Manhattan for teen-age recreational programs, and so on. We have successfully lobbied for two pieces of consumer legislation in N.Y.C.'s City Council. And we are currently lobbying for two pieces of tenement-oriented legislation. In desperation and frustration, we are walking into a new area for us—that of the rent strike; in many cases it is literally the "court" of last resort.

II. Why We Do It.

As citizens, we are deeply concerned about the condition of New York City, our state, and our country.

(a) One million people in New York City are living in what the city has officially described as **desperate** housing. A half-million of the city's three million housing units are estimated to be substandard or seriously deteriorating. E.g., 79% of the total housing in one area of Harlem has been declared unsound. Confronted with these facts, one sadly thinks of the "Catholic Charities Review" (Dec. '73) which reported: "In the Soviet Union, there are no slums or poverty as we know them."

(b) According to the standards set by the President's Commissioner on Income Maintenance Programs, 40 million of our fellow citizens

are ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed. In the U.S. there are 18.5 million children under six: two and a half million of this number live in poverty. While most European states provide special care for neglected children of this sort, we do not.

(c) N.Y.C. houses not only eight million citizens but also eight million rats.

(d) In one Manhattan community (East Harlem) there live 25 to 30 thousand people over 60 years of age. 75% of these "exist" on about \$100.00 monthly, which is \$50.00 per month less than subsistence level set by the Department of Social Services.

(e) The New York Times reported a short time ago "it now takes 71 steps through ten different agencies for the city to buy equipment such as a garbage truck or even worse, a desk."

To sum up: a recent edition of "Fortune" magazine said that the United States, but two centuries after its origins, is becoming a 2nd class power and a 3rd class place to live in.

As Christians, we are simply doing what Jesus asked of us. We are engaged in the corporal works of mercy—feeding the hungry, giving warmth to the cold, offering children an attractive place to play in and study in, providing decent living accommodations for those who otherwise would have to live in abominable conditions. Our motivation then is the Gospel and not politics as such. Nor, as some may allege, is our work a substitute for the Gospel but rather a consequence of it.

Nor is our work a work of pre-evangelization. If the people we help are drawn to Jesus the Christ, we of course can only compliment them on their good taste. But, if they are not so drawn, so be it. Our satisfaction will have to be that we have tried to carry out the prescriptions of Jesus recorded in the 25th Chapter of Matthew's Gospel.

I do not think that the work we do rates high on the priority-list of many of my fellow-clergymen. The era of the Social Gospel may be winding down again. Or to paraphrase Victor Hugo, we may well be working with an idea whose time has gone. There are many indications for this. Let me just mention a few briefly.

A young priest spoke for many of his contemporaries when he told me that my priesthood should be spent in announcing the "good news" and not carrying on as a social worker. There is a fresh stress on fundamentalism and pentecostal prayer-groups in the Roman Catholic Church. A high proportion of newly-ordained priests want to serve not in the city but in rural areas. Consider the overwhelming amount of publicity the national media has given our modest efforts. (Surely, if a goodly number of our clergymen were doing this type of work, our efforts would not be the "news" it seems to be.)

I think this rather abrupt aboutface is not entirely desirable. However, I would not want to find myself saying that my interpretation of church work is the only interpretation. Rather, I would prefer to borrow a thought from Ronald Knox and say our work is but a slice of the infinite variety of the Church. A slice—nothing more. But a slice that should not be condemned, ignored, or entirely disregarded.

The most serious critique of our work was voiced by a prominent historian who said our work was about as beneficial as a band-aid for a massive hemorrhage or as salutary as giving a pill to a leper. He said that our efforts were nothing more than middle-class clerical paternalism treating symptoms and disregarding causes.

However, while these major changes are coming about, I think we must keep in mind the point Malcolm Muggeridge made in his recent book about Mother Teresa of India called *Something Beautiful for God*. The band-aid critique was made against her work in Calcutta among the sick and dying. And Mr. Muggeridge retorted: "Christianity after all is an anti-statistical religion. Its founder is reputed to have said: 'There is more rejoicing in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine who have no need for repentance.'" One must beware of the principle: "If one can't feed everybody, one doesn't attempt to feed anyone."

How do we, generally speaking, propose to solve the mess all about us? We would borrow Saul Alinsky's thought as our answer. We need "Act II of the American Revolution." The spirit of Act II is, in our definition, called Populism—a movement as current as Ralph Nader and as old as Thomas Jefferson.

The two main planks of Populism are a more equal distribution of wealth and income and a decentralization of power to insure more citizen participation in making decisions. "15 Churches" is trying to do a very little of this. Are there any others like me out there?

AFTERWORDS

The Reverend J. Peter Sheehan, Associate Director, Bishop's Committee
for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs

From Canada to Mexico and from the Pacific to the Atlantic the People of God in the United States have grown to know one another during the past ten years. Catholics, to a great extent have opened their minds and hearts to their Protestant brethren. Walls separating them since post-Reformation times have been largely torn down in the wake of the issuance and widespread implementation of the historic **Decree on Ecumenism** of the Second Vatican Council. Protestants, in large numbers, have much different attitudes toward Catholics now than a decade ago. Old fears, prejudices, closed doors, strange suspicions have markedly vanished in vast areas of the nation; however, pockets of prejudice remain here and there among all people.

A healthy new respect for truth and freedom accounts, to a significant degree, for this change of attitudes and relationships among the People of God. Dialogues underway during the past ten years among officials, clergy, scholars, and laity have opened pathways of communication, understanding, eliminating misconceptions, and, to a great measure, bringing reconciliation. Unity, however, still remains a cherished goal.

The testimony contained in this document is evidence of an advance in Christian inter-relationships marked by fraternity, openness, and a continuing search for the unity for which our Divine Master prayed when He begged: "that all may be one." My burning hope is that this priestly prayer of Christ, together with cordial relationships between church leaders, acceptance of the theologically clarifying study documents of church scholars, growing awareness on the part of countless clergy of a common mission, plus developing cognizance of people considering themselves as part of the greater People of God will all blend to bring about a new unity among the People of God.

Rev. Harry C. Wallace, President, National Association of
Diocesan Ecumenical Officers

"What is going on in the ecumenical field?" Often this question is asked of us who are involved in the ecumenical mission of the Church. And very often it is hard for us to give detailed accounts of this most important christian commitment. This is why just two years ago the Catholic diocesan ecumenical officers initiated a national association—so that we could come together regularly and share with one another our personal experiences in local ecumenical work and encourage one another through this personal sharing.

This is also why, when I was contacted by Father Dave Bowman, S.J., with regard to our interest in a survey that he was undertaking to obtain

and publish facts and information about ecumenical activity on the local level throughout our great and vast nation, I reacted very positively and enthusiastically to this opportunity. I knew that our National Association of Diocesan Ecumenical Officers would be extremely grateful for such a report and sharing.

We are indeed most thankful to Father Bowman and his staff and also, to all of our ecumenical workers and diocesan officers throughout our country, who have labored together in order to put into meaningful written form this ecumenical booklet.

We can foresee many useful purposes for this publication—sharing vital detailed facts about what has been going on in the local areas over the past ten years, giving all of us a current appraisal of where we are today and finally, but not least of all, presenting to us models and examples of ecumenical successes which will inspire all of us for future ecumenical mission.

It is my personal prayer and wish that this booklet will enjoy the widest possible distribution and acceptance. That bishops, priests, religious, laymen and laywomen, who are involved in this missionary apostolate of Christ—so dear and loved by all, will make use of this inspiring tool. Then, when the question is asked again—"What's new and exciting in ecumenism?", they will be able to answer in very positive and hopeful words.

My prayers and thanks are extended to all who helped to make this booklet a practical reality in our lives. **May we all be one as He is one in God, Our Father and the loving Spirit.**

Nathan H. VanderWerf, Assistant General Secretary for
Regional and Local Ecumenism of the NCC, USA

The Basis for Christian Ecumenism is the love of God in Christ Jesus who calls us unto Himself in reconciliation and love of God and our brothers and sisters everywhere. As we hear His call and respond to His love we proclaim the Good News with our deeds of love as we seek for justice, liberation and human fulfillment for all creation. In this engagement we find one another and learn that God, through His Spirit, has led us in common yet separate traditions, the fullness of which is the sum which is greater than the parts in its richness.

As we view here the experience of Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox and inter-religious cooperation since Vatican II, no one can be so blind as not to observe the great strides which, put in historical perspective, represent the new Reformation. Thanks be to God and good Pope John XXIII. Still, it is to our shame we have not gone farther in our life together. The past would really suggest the necessity for a constant

consciousness for the question: "What is the next step in our life together?" Only the deepening of these relationships built on trust, dissatisfaction with past and present, commitment to be together in the future and **Spera in Deo**—Hope Thou in God—can adequately press us onward beyond the present. One of the clear maxims of ecumenism I have learned from experience is that it plateaus too easily and thereby drifts into boredom. Our Lord's prayer for oneness so that the World might know Him who was sent demands a better effort.

Seven principles of ecumenism seem to me to be useful to remember in our ecumenical pilgrimage:

- 1) Our life together is of God and in fellowship with Him, so it needs formulation and growth in prayer, worship and study.
- 2) Unity is not for its own sake but for mission, which calls us to act and witness together and not just be together.
- 3) The first two principles must have some balance of attention if the ecumenical pilgrimage is to survive and grow.
- 4) Ecumenism as a call by God is for the **whole people of God**, not for just hierarchies, the elite, or the clergy, or laity, or men or women, or white or black, or yellow or brown, or young or old. It must be experienced, not just studied, to be real and dynamic.
- 5) The Church in all its parts must fully participate in the ecumenical pilgrimage, encourage, support and not inhibit its life and growth in the faith and hope that it is of God, the future of which is in His hands, not ours.
- 6) The witness of the Church together must be an advocacy on behalf of the poor and oppressed, listening for the pain in the world, speaking and acting in love for justice.
- 7) There is no "one way to do it." Ecumenism must be indigenous and local, responding to the needs and dynamics of its locality. But it must not be parochial, forgetting that the world also is a locality, inter-related by the same needs and urging us to a larger perspective and broader concern. The Churches can share this concern in and through a broader "**Fabric of Ecumenism**" that relates at different levels and in different places in wholeness.

We hope this record of experience will be useful and used in the Councils, clusters, consortia, conferences of churches and inter-church agencies. The experience of the past should not necessarily be the only guide or manual for the future, but hopefully it can provide material for discussion and growth in our common life. The Commission on Regional/Local Ecumenism is grateful for the active participation of Bishop Louis E. Gelineau of Rhode Island, and to Fr. Peter Sheehan of the Bishop's Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, in the

Commission, and for the staff services for nine years of Fr. David J. Bowman, S.J. We look forward to the time when this relationship can be confirmed by membership in the Commission. We hope and pray that this study will contribute to the deepening of our friendships together and our common commitments to our common Lord.

David J. Bowman, S.J., Associate Director,
Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism, NCC, USA

As editor I have already said much, both directly and indirectly. This will therefore be brief.

Three of these agencies are inter-religious; they set a style needed in many localities, especially where Jewish and other religious communities are interested in cooperative public life. In all cases, ecumenical agencies must never be or seem to be a 'power bloc' in competition with smaller or other groups.

Forty-eight dioceses and hundreds of parishes manifest Catholic ecumenism by full membership in ecumenical organizations. My hope and prayer is that this booklet will help the process along for many others. Organizational ecumenism is only one way, of course; the Spirit of God brings about a Second Pentecost as and where He wishes. Personal ecumenism finds strength and stamina in organization, just as the gospel does. **Merely** spiritual ecumenism is not enough, just as a **merely** "spiritual" church is not.

The spirit shown throughout will help much in addressing the thorny issues such as parochialism and all the 'pro-life' areas which too often we allow to polarize us along secular divisions. Decent dialogue on such issues is one way to show we love one another.

Use of this booklet could help enlarge the base for greater regional and even national participation of the RC Church in organizational ecumenism. This need not mean membership in the NCC in a foreseeable future, but could mean a greater experience of witness together in the many areas of U.S. life where religious values are so obviously needed. 1974's Watergate was the temporal background of this study. Christ challenges us to bear witness to truth and kindness, justice and love, honesty and generosity—to bear witness together, more and more. That is what this booklet is all about.



