

National Council of the Churches of Christ
in the United States of America
e.2 Report on possible... ADE9775

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
MEMORIAL LIBRARY

FEB 13 1979

COLLEGE LIBRARY
MERTON H. SILL

REPORT
ON POSSIBLE
ROMAN CATHOLIC MEMBERSHIP
IN THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

by

The Study Committee on the Relationship

of the

National Council of Churches

and the

Roman Catholic Church

in the

United States of America

Ecumenical Movement

3175/610

**REPORT
ON POSSIBLE
ROMAN CATHOLIC MEMBERSHIP
IN THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES**

by
The Study Committee on the Relationship
of the
National Council of Churches
and the
Roman Catholic Church
in the
United States of America

1972
UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

FOREWORD

It has been our pleasure for the past two years to serve as co-chairmen of the Joint Study Committee on Roman Catholic Membership in the National Council of the Churches of Christ. This committee succeeded the Joint Working Group which sought to facilitate cooperation between the Council and the Roman Catholic Church from 1966 until 1969.

The following report investigates both in depth and considerable detail the matters which must be taken into consideration prior to further decisions concerning the future of Roman Catholic-Conciliar relationships. Since developments on the national scene parallel those on the world level as well as in dioceses and congregations, we offer this document as a help to consideration of ecumenical life at all levels of the Church.

In completing this report the study committee has been assisted by a distinguished body of members with extensive ecumenical experience.* We are grateful to them for the attentive and dedicated service they have given to the task set before us by the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and by the National Council of Churches.

Our assignment was one of study and research, not of decision making. The report we have submitted does in no way commit the Council or the Churches to any particular course of action, but seeks to provide information that is indispensable for the Roman Catholic Church in the U.S. and for the Council in order to chart the future of their relationships.

For this reason we are happy to submit this report to widespread study and scrutiny. We welcome the serious review of this study by those who test its findings. We are convinced that the people and leadership of all our churches are sensitive to the need in our time to find ways to more and more effective ecumenical witnessing and collaboration. We hope that this report may be of use in extending the ecumenical life of all the churches.

In all of these endeavors, of course, our ultimate hope is to serve the fuller unity of the People of God.

December 1, 1971

✠ Charles H. Helmsing

John Coventry Smith

* Names in appendix A.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

REPORT ON POSSIBLE ROMAN CATHOLIC MEMBERSHIP
IN THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

By
The Study Committee on the Relationship
of the
National Council of Churches
and the
Roman Catholic Church
in the
United States of America

1. *The Historical Context*

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America (NCC) came into being in 1950, continuing, combining and extending the interests and functions of fourteen general agencies and cooperative services of the churches. It is now made up of thirty-three member communions which have agreed to the Preamble to the Council's Constitution:

Under the Providence of God communions which confess Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Savior, in order more fully to manifest oneness in Him, do now create an inclusive cooperative agency of Christian churches of the United States of America to show forth their unity and mission in specific ways and to bring the churches into living contact with one another for fellowship, study and cooperative action.

Only a national communion can join the Council. Neither a local or regional body nor a national body which does not represent the whole communion (such as a Roman Catholic diocese,

religious order, or a unit of the United States Catholic Conference) can be a member of the Council as a whole. However, such bodies under certain conditions can be members of or related to various units of the NCC, such as departments, divisions, commissions or offices. In addition to constituent membership, non-member organizations such as state and metropolitan councils, boards, agencies and related movements which have distinctly Christian purposes can be given recognition and participate in the Council's work in accordance with the Constitution and By-laws.

Though the NCC is presently going through a period of self-examination looking towards possible reorganization, it currently functions in the following way: Its basic governing body is the triennial General Assembly, which has approximately 850 members, representative of the member churches on a proportional formula. The General Board, consisting of approximately 250 members and meeting three times a year, is the governing body of the NCC between meetings of the General Assembly. These determine the basic policies and priorities of the NCC. In addition to these two bodies, each of the four divisions of the NCC has a Program Board. Although each board is subject to the policies of the NCC as a whole, each has a large degree of autonomy in planning and conducting programs. For a fuller description of present NCC units, see Appendix A.

The main work of the NCC is the carrying out of regular services to member communions in their basic tasks of evangelism, education, mission and social welfare. The NCC provides interdenominational conferences on such themes as the Church and the family, Christian colleges, lay ministries, urban church problems and economic issues. It plans, produces and publishes along interdenominational lines materials to serve the communions—especially study courses for missionary education, and various periodicals. It furnishes a center for study and research in major areas of Christian concern. It serves as an instrument of joint administration in projects that call for combined resources and unified direction, as in Bible translation, emergency relief, refugee resettlement, and the initiation of radio and television programs. It is a stimulus to experimentation and pioneering in new types of interdenominational religious work, as in urban centers which have been built *de novo*. The NCC further serves member communions as a voice in matters of public concern;

statements by the General Assembly and the General Board are offered to the churches for their study and use. The NCC keeps in touch with religious bodies not in its membership, and with secular agencies concerned about human welfare.¹

Only the churches themselves initiate steps toward union by entering into negotiations with one another. The NCC does give some assistance to the churches. It provides them with information concerning steps being taken by various churches toward closer unity with one another. It offers occasions for consultation among those whose churches are engaged in union negotiations. It conducts studies of related questions. Moreover, all the work undertaken jointly by churches through the NCC has surely helped to prepare the climate for their discussions about unions.

The member communions of the NCC are now all of Protestant, Anglican or Orthodox background, but there has been increasing cooperation of the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) with the NCC. In a statement dated January 27, 1970, the General Secretary of the NCC, Dr. R. H. Edwin Espy, enumerated many areas of increasing Roman Catholic-National Council cooperation. Among the items listed were these:

- Official observers and fraternal delegates at NCC events

- Interrepresentation at one another's public occasions

- Catholic priests and religious on the NCC staff (presently five)

- Increasing consultation between the presidents of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the NCC

- Establishment of the Interreligious Committee of the NCCB, the NCC and the Synagogue Council of America

- Action of the General Board of the NCC announcing its recognition of the RCC in the U.S.A. as being in accord with the Preamble to the Constitution of the NCC (1966)

- An NCC delegation of six churchmen . . . conferred for four days in March, 1969, with the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity

Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, former General Secretary of the NCC, has reviewed the growing cooperation between Roman Catholics and the NCC, stressing especially the contacts through the Council's Faith and Order work, the publication of Living Room Dialogues, and the membership of the Medical Mission Sisters in the Council's Division of Overseas Ministries.²

An important background factor in the discussion of possible Catholic membership in the NCC is the fact that similar considerations are going on at the world level between the World Council of Churches (WCC) and the RCC. In 1965 a Joint Working Group (JWG) was established; Dr. Espy, General Secretary of the NCC, Bishop Joseph L. Bernardin, General Secretary of the USCC and the NCCB, are members. The task given to the JWG was "to work out the principles which should be observed in further collaboration and the methods which should be used." Not competent itself to make decisions for the churches, it has prepared the way for such decisions by drafting recommendations. It has dealt with theological problems arising in connection with the ecumenical movement as a whole and encouraged practical cooperation in social and international affairs. Originally made up of 14 members, three years later the number in the JWG was increased to 24. Cooperation between the RCC and the WCC has grown measurably.³

Among the many specific achievements on the world level are these: the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity is jointly prepared and celebrated; nine Roman Catholic theologians have become members of the WCC Commission on Faith and Order; a joint committee on Society, Development, and Peace (SODEPAX) carries on an extensive program; there is joint work in emergency relief and development aid; and, finally, the question of Roman Catholic membership in the WCC has been clarified and advanced.

In an address delivered at the Fourth Assembly of the WCC at Uppsala in 1968, Father Roberto Tucci, S.J., spoke directly to the possibility of closer structural relationships between the WCC and the RCC. The Council in response adopted at Uppsala a Statement Concerning Relations with the RCC, which states, in part:

The Assembly encourages the Joint Working Group to continue to give attention to the question of the membership of the Roman Catholic Church in the World Council of Churches. Membership depends on the initiative of individual churches willing to accept the basis and the agreement of the member churches according to the constitution. The World Council of Churches reaffirms its eagerness to extend its membership to include all those Christian churches at present outside its fellowship.⁴

Dr. Lukas Vischer, Director of the WCC Commission on Faith and Order, commenting on this response, remarks:

The Assembly . . . made it absolutely clear that from the side of the World Council of Churches there was, in principle, no obstacle to the membership of the Roman Catholic Church in the Council. The Assembly also, for the first time, expressed the desire that a complete manifestation of the one ecumenical movement might actually be realized. The realization of this desire may still take a long time, but at least the task has now been made explicit.⁵

In an allocution at the WCC Headquarters in Geneva on June 10, 1969, Pope Paul spoke favorably of the cooperation that had developed, but noted that the question of Roman Catholic membership in the WCC "contains serious theological and pastoral implications" and requires profound study and commitment to a way that could be long and difficult. Yet conversations are progressing, and it seems possible that the RCC will develop a more formal relationship to the WCC by its next General Assembly. Affirmative action on the international level will depend, in part, on the degree of interest shown on the national and local levels.

On the national level, the RCC has been forging positive relationships with councils of churches in many parts of the world. The RCC is already a full member of the National Council of Churches in Belize (British Honduras), Fiji, Finland, Guyana, Jamaica, the Netherlands, New Hebrides, Sudan, Trinidad-Tobago, and Uganda. It has observer status in the United States and in many other countries, including Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.⁶ In many countries, such as Canada

and Great Britain, membership in their national councils is being actively considered. In Great Britain a British Council of Churches-RC Joint Working Group has been established "to facilitate Roman Catholic entry into the BCC and to act in the interval as an official meeting ground of the two bodies, where matters of interest to either can be tackled."⁷

On the regional and local level in the United States, many Roman Catholic parishes and dioceses have become members of interchurch agencies. Roman Catholic judicatories (dioceses and archdioceses) have joined state councils (or conferences) of churches in eleven states (Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont) and in the Delmarva Peninsula (Wilmington). Roman Catholic dioceses have also joined councils in three metropolitan areas (Kansas City, Pittsburgh, Columbus, Ohio). In addition to this judicatory membership there is parish membership in some 70 to 100 local councils throughout the country. In many other ecumenical agencies Roman Catholics are in active cooperation, especially in Faith and Order.

On the national level in the United States, Roman Catholic relationships with the NCC and related bodies have made great progress in the past few years. In harmony with the traditional Roman Catholic interest in the work of Faith and Order, and with the Roman Catholic membership in the World Council of Churches Commission on Faith and Order, the NCCB in its November, 1970, meeting voted to approve Roman Catholic membership in the NCC's Commission on Faith and Order. At the time of writing five Roman Catholics have become members of the Commission.

In January, 1966, an historic conference in Baltimore brought together leaders of the NCC member communions with members of the Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs (as it is now named; abbreviation BCEIA). Out of this meeting came a Joint Working Group which met for several years to promote closer cooperation. The question of possible RCC membership in the NCC came to the fore, so that in the fall of 1968 it was decided to dissolve the Working Group. In its place the NCC and the BCEIA set up a Joint Study Committee on the Relationship of the NCC and the RCC in the U.S.A. (For a list of participants, see Appendix B.) The Study Committee met on April

8, 1969, on January 27, May 18 and September 29, 1970, and on May 19, 1971. To facilitate its work the Study Committee in the fall of 1970 set up the following five task forces: Rationale for Membership, Policy Determination and Policy Statements, Finance, Representation and Staff Operations. The terms of reference of the study were explained to the task forces as follows:

There are two matters which the Study Committee wishes to keep distinct in a discussion of possible membership in the National Council. The first is the question of whether or not the Roman Catholic Church should apply for membership. The question belongs more properly to the Roman Catholic Church and is not a matter to be resolved by the Study Committee. The second matter is the working through of the practical, pastoral and theological problems which are envisioned in the event of Roman Catholic application for membership. The second consideration properly belongs to the Study Committee and is its concern.

Accordingly, the Study Committee is to address itself specifically to the question of membership, working under the hypothesis of a Roman Catholic application for membership in the present National Council. To a certain degree our study will be conducted in the midst of variables. From the Roman Catholic side such a decision to apply has not yet been made. From the National Council side, the present structure of the Council is undergoing study and discussion. Nevertheless, the discipline of taking the present National Council and the hypothetical Roman Catholic application for membership as a point of departure will aid both the Roman Catholic Church in its decision and the National Council in its reappraisal.*

* Various options for the restructuring of the NCC have been considered in recent years. A model which provided for a greatly decentralized ecumenical structure failed acceptance by the General Board in January, 1971. A Committee on Future Ecumenical Structure was then appointed to develop a proposal providing for a strong representative body with an advocacy function, centralized development of priorities with concomitant budget accountability, empowerment of minorities at every level, and a flexible and facilitative style of staff leadership. This proposal, copies of which are available from the NCC, was submitted by the General Board in September, 1971, to the member churches for their official approval. It is foreseen that the NCC structure would be further affected and new responsibilities would open up if the RCC should become a member.

The present Report combines the results of reports prepared by the five task forces and subsequent discussion in the Study Committee.

2. *The State of the Question*

The possibility of Roman Catholic membership in the NCC commands consideration at a time when the RCC increasingly recognizes itself as a part of what is often now called "the one ecumenical movement."⁸ In the Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis redintegratio*, Vatican II acknowledged that the ecumenical movement is "fostered by the grace of the Holy Spirit" (UR 1, p. 342)⁹ and went on to exhort "all the Catholic faithful to recognize the signs of the times and participate skillfully in the work of ecumenism" (UR 4, p. 347). The question before us, therefore, is not whether the RCC should participate in the ecumenical movement—this we take for granted—but rather what kind of relationship to the NCC would be an appropriate implementation of its commitment to the ecumenical movement.

In theory, the RCC could take any of four positions:

- a) It could continue the collaborative relationships it now has, adding some and subtracting others as the situation seems to demand, without formal membership;
- b) It could apply for membership in the NCC without demanding prior changes in the Council as preconditions for such application;
- c) It could apply for membership on condition that certain specified changes were made in the NCC;
- d) It could recommend that the NCC be dissolved and replaced by a new fellowship of churches with a different status.

Correspondingly, it is evident that the NCC might adopt similar positions with regard to Roman Catholic membership.

In accordance with the questions put to the present committee, this Report concerns itself primarily with the second and third of these possibilities. If an affirmative answer is reached regarding either of these possibilities, the first and fourth possibilities would therefore be automatically excluded. If the answers to these possibilities are negative, the other two would have to be considered.

As a first indication in favor of an affirmative response to the second and third possibilities, one may mention the fact that the NCC has for the past twenty years played a unique role in the ecumenical movement in the United States. It is, on the national scene, the closest equivalent and partner to the WCC on the world scene. As consideration is being given to RCC membership in the WCC, it seems natural that the same question should arise with respect to the NCC in the U.S.A., especially since the RCC has joined eleven other national councils of churches.

The aims and objectives of the NCC closely resemble the goals of the ecumenical movement, as described, for example, in the documents of Vatican II. The purposes of the NCC, as set forth in Article II of its Constitution are as follows:

1. To manifest more fully the oneness of the Church of Christ according to the Scriptures and to further the efforts of the member churches in proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the end that all men may believe in Him.
2. To continue, combine, and extend the interests and functions of the following general agencies and cooperative services of the churches (here various service, missionary, student, laity, educational and communications commissions are listed).
3. To encourage the study and use of the Bible.
4. To carry on programs for and with the churches by which the life of the Church may be renewed and the mission of the Church may be fulfilled.
5. To foster and encourage cooperation, fellowship, and mutual counsel among the churches for the purposes set forth in this Constitution.
6. To assist the churches in self-examination of their life and witness in accordance with their understanding of the will of God and of the Lordship of Jesus Christ as Divine Head of the Church.
7. To further works of Christian love and service throughout the nation and the world.

8. To study and speak and act on conditions and issues in the nation and the world which involve moral, ethical, and spiritual principles inherent in the Christian Gospel.
9. To encourage cooperation among local churches and to further the development of councils and other organizations in agreement with the Preamble of this Constitution, and to maintain cooperative relationships with such bodies.
10. To establish and maintain consultative and cooperative relationships with the World Council of Churches; other international, regional, and national ecumenical organizations; and with agencies related to the churches in the United States.
11. To establish specific objectives and to carry forward programs and activities for achieving the purposes herein stated.

If the affirmative stance toward the ecumenical movement expressed in the documents of Vatican II may be taken as a true indication of the present attitude of the RCC, it seems evident that the RCC could not fail to approve, in substance, the objectives of the NCC. From the NCC side it has been made clear in numerous ways that it regards Roman Catholic membership as both feasible and desirable. The majority of the goals of the NCC, as just quoted, could be matched by specific quotations from Vatican II. The close parallelism of purposes suggests the likelihood that the RCC in the United States might appropriately seek to become a member of the NCC, and that it would be welcomed in this capacity. But certain questions and difficulties arise, especially in view of the special traditions, history and doctrinal tenets of Roman Catholicism. It is with these difficulties that the remainder of this report will be primarily concerned.

3. Overcoming Christian Divisions

One of the better reasons for joining the NCC might be the contribution that this step would make to the cause of Christian unity. In a working paper prepared in 1963, a Faith and Order Study Commission declared:

Councils of churches provide readily available channels for the churches to fulfill the clear imperatives to seek

unity. They are important means for bearing witness to the unity we have and enlarging our concepts about the unity we seek. They are structures by which congregations and denominations join together in the quest for Christian unity.¹⁰

These objectives are highly congenial to contemporary Catholicism, at least as expressed by Vatican II. But the question must be asked whether councils such as the NCC are in fact overcoming divisions among their member churches. As the Faith and Order working paper remarks, councils in the U.S. "grew up during a period when less attention than is now deemed necessary was paid to certain questions about the true nature of the Church; in many quarters it was often assumed that questions of faith and order could be safely ignored, detoured, or postponed."¹¹ There is therefore a danger that councils of churches may at times evade the hard questions with regard to genuine unity. "Institutionalized cooperation may become fixated and thus be a hindrance to more advanced steps of church unity."¹² There is a real risk, in our opinion, that by working within the structures of the NCC the churches might lose their interest in questions that challenge the continued dividedness of the churches in teaching, polity and worship. As Lukas Vischer has written, "The fact that a union could disturb the balance of a Christian Council can lead, consciously or otherwise, to resistance."¹³

But this danger can be, and perhaps is being, partly obviated. We note with satisfaction that the position of Faith and Order in the NCC has been one of increasing importance. A recent reorganization, which shifts Faith and Order from being a department within the former Division of Christian Unity to the status of a Commission reporting directly to the NCC General Board, with its Director reporting to the General Secretary, is a welcome improvement. There is hope that the various divisions of the NCC and Faith and Order will be able to communicate effectively, to the mutual benefit of Faith and Order and the divisions. Thus Faith and Order would be kept in sufficient contact with the program and administrative work of the Council and would not be lost in abstract considerations that fail to advance beyond debates no longer actual.

With the increased dignity given to Faith and Order within the NCC there is reason to hope that the NCC may give greater attention not only to theological and doctrinal questions but also to the "spiritual ecumenism" which Vatican II singled out as the "soul of the whole ecumenical movement" (UR 8, p. 352). In speaking to the General Board of the NCC in January of 1971, Bishop Bernardin stressed the centrality of prayer and renewal of heart to the whole ecumenical effort. The upgrading of the Faith and Order component in the NCC may be expected to focus greater attention on prayer, worship and spiritual renewal.

Even though the NCC has no authority to negotiate church unions, it undoubtedly makes a contribution by building up a common fund of experience, a common vocabulary, a sense of solidarity in mission, and a fruitful interchange of ideas and attitudes. All these developments may pave the way for an ultimate reconciliation in God's good time.

The entire task of promoting Christian unity obviously cannot be thrust upon the NCC alone. Even after the RCC joins the NCC, if it should decide to do so, the various member churches will need to maintain certain kinds of bilateral or multilateral conversations among themselves and with outside groups, in order to foster increasing mutual recognition of creeds, ministries and sacraments, and possibly to unite in larger federations and unions.

4. *The Critique of Institutionalism*

Many observers in recent years have noted a decline in support for institutionalized ecumenism. It is often objected that centralized structures inevitably become bureaucratic, that they are not responsive to the dynamics of the true Christian community, that they get out of touch with "grass roots" level needs, and that they tend to impede free and spontaneous initiatives on the local level.

While this objection contains some merit, we do not feel that it demands the dissolution of the NCC or prohibits the RCC from entering the NCC. Ecumenism may be expected to go forward on several different levels, some more centralized than others. In our time, when rapid communications are improving and the world

is contracting, the churches cannot effectively discharge their full mission unless they maintain agencies enabling them to tap their best talent and resources and to bring these promptly to bear on new needs wherever these arise. In order to accomplish anything significant in our complex industrialized society, it is imperative to have some visible institutional base or, as some have put it, to occupy some "sociological space." And so the ecumenical movement must be implemented, not only locally but also on the national and world levels, by appropriate offices and structures.

There is really no conflict between an institutionalized framework and a healthy measure of free initiative. The NCC need not be, and in our judgment has not been, an impediment to pluralism and flexibility. Applying the principle of subsidiarity, it has effectively promoted local ecumenism. Illustrations are CROP (name of the Community Hunger Appeal of Church World Service), Living Room Dialogues (LRD), the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity (WPCU), field work of the Division of Christian Life and Mission (DCLM), and distribution of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) of the Bible. The recently established Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism (CORLE) has the task of collecting and disseminating information concerning local developments in such a way that the best results achieved in one locality may be an example and encouragement for other local communities.

The theological explorations of the Faith and Order Commission can be of great assistance to local ecumenical initiatives. For example, the recent NCC ecumenical study on the eucharist may pave the way for appropriate common worship, at least among certain communities which are able to recognize one another's ministries. Theological studies concerning the nature of the Church often serve to focus attention on the local *ekklesia*. By its recommendations and reports, the NCC promotes restructuring of churches in accordance with God's will for them at the present time. The critique of institutionalism itself owes much to the collaborative studies on institutionalism conducted within the framework of the WCC. Thus organized ecumenical activity, far from subjecting the churches to inherited structures, often suggests ways in which these structures can be changed so as to become more functional.

5. *Recognition of Other Churches*

As stated in the preamble to its Constitution, quoted above, the NCC understands itself as a "cooperative agency of Christian churches"; its constituent members are churches (or "communions") rather than private individuals or boards, councils, etc. This fact raises for the RCC the question whether it can, consistently with its own ecclesiology, enter a body in which it would find itself on an equal footing with other bodies which also claim to be churches. Would this be, in effect, a repudiation of the traditional claim of the RCC to uniqueness? If so, can and should such a repudiation be made?

Questions of this character have been discussed in the WCC almost since its inception. The classic answer remains to this day the statement of the Central Committee of the WCC issued at Toronto in 1950. Crucial are the fourth and fifth "assumptions" that, according to the Toronto declaration, underlie the WCC:

4. The member churches of the World Council consider the relationship of other Churches to the Holy Catholic Church which the Creeds profess as a subject for mutual consideration. Nevertheless, membership does not imply that each Church must regard the other member Churches as Churches in the true and full sense of the word.

5. The member Churches of the World Council recognize in other Churches elements of the true Church. They consider that this mutual recognition obliges them to enter a serious conversation with each other in the hope that these elements of truth will lead to a recognition of the full truth and to unity based on the full truth.

The Toronto statement, while it refers directly to the WCC, appears to be fully applicable to other similar organizations such as the NCC.

From the point of view of Roman Catholic theology, there is no difficulty in recognizing that elements of the true Church exist in the various member churches of the NCC. The Decree on Ecumenism, the most official recent expression of the Roman Catholic view on this matter, declared that "some, even very

many, of the most significant elements or endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church herself can exist outside the boundaries of the Catholic Church" (UR 3, p. 345). The same Decree went on to say that the separated brethren also perform sacred actions of the Christian religions and "in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or Community, these actions can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation" (UR 4, p. 346). Even if the RCC could say nothing more positive than this about the other member Churches, these declarations would seem to be sufficient recognition to satisfy the conditions laid down by the Toronto statement.

Whether the RCC can go further and recognize other communions as churches "in the true and full sense of the word" is a more subtle and difficult question and one which, in our opinion, does not need to be settled in the present report. It may, however, be relevant to say a few words on the subject. Vatican II stated quite clearly that some of the communities separated from the Roman See are "Churches" as distinct from "ecclesial communities. In Article 19 of *Unitatis redintegratio* it spoke of some of the communities arising in the West since the Middle Ages as being "Churches" in this sense. Many Roman Catholic theologians would restrict the term "Church" to bodies having a ministry recognized by Roman Catholicism as being in the apostolic succession—and thus would prefer not to call Protestant communions "Churches."¹⁴ But even if the RCC were to hold that none of the present members of the NCC is a church in the theological sense (and we know of no Roman Catholic theologian who would be so restrictive), this would not be a bar to joining, since the conditions of the Toronto statement could nevertheless be satisfied.

It may be pertinent to note in this connection that the Orthodox, who have much the same problem as the RCC does in recognizing the authenticity of other "Churches," have found it possible to be members of the WCC and the NCC. From the point of view of the WCC and the NCC, the ecclesiology of the Orthodox has not proved a bar to fruitful collaboration.

6. Ecclesiological Status and "Basis" of the NCC

Another reason for hesitation on the part of the RCC might be the ecclesiological implications of the NCC as a council of churches. To what extent does the Council itself purport to possess the properties of a church? Is there a danger that the councils of churches will absorb the functions of the Church, and thus reduce the member churches to a subsidiary position? The RCC would understandably be reluctant to merge its identity into a larger unit that is, in effect, a superchurch.

The Toronto statement of 1950, and several other major statements issued by WCC authorities, explicitly deny that the WCC regards itself as a superchurch or as the *Una Sancta*. The Faith and Order study on *The Ecclesiological Significance of Councils of Churches* declares: "Though the reality of the Church is expressed in certain ways in councils of churches, the councils of churches are not themselves churches. Councils of churches do not normally have creeds or determine theological issues, and do not administer the sacraments or ordain."¹⁵

It is by no means easy to state accurately what is involved in the "expression" of the "reality of the Church" which is here ascribed to councils of churches. One might say, perhaps, that such councils participate in certain ways in three central functions of the Church—those of witness, worship and service—and to that extent participate also in the reality of the Church herself. Thus the NCC, although it does not formulate doctrine, does bear witness to Christ by its corporate life and pronouncements. Though it is not itself a liturgical assembly or eucharistic community, it does sponsor gatherings at which there is common worship. Though it does not issue orders or commands to its member churches, it recommends policies and jointly administers projects requiring common resources. In these ways it extends the service rendered to mankind by member churches in the name of Christ. Each of these three functions of witness, worship and service may now be examined in somewhat more detail.

(a) The idea that there should be a measure of common witness to the Christian faith by the separated churches and communities is, in our age, widely accepted. Vatican II, in its Decree on the Missions, called for "common profession of faith in God

and in Jesus Christ" (AG 15, p. 602). The Decree on Ecumenism contains the exhortation, "Before the whole world, let all Christians profess their faith in God, one and three, and in the incarnate Son of God, our Redeemer and Lord (UR 1, p. 342).

The two last quotations are implicit references to the Basis of the WCC as it has stood since the New Delhi Assembly of 1961. The WCC here defines itself as "a fellowship of Churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit." As is well known, this richer, trinitarian formula was introduced into the WCC in 1961, replacing a merely Christological formula, to satisfy the desires of several churches first entering the WCC at that time.

The NCC, according to its present constitution, is an agency of churches which "confess Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Savior." Beyond this, the Constitution lays down no theological requirement for membership. From the standpoint of Catholic theology this formula offers no positive difficulty, but it falls short of bearing witness to the common trinitarian faith of the member churches. Since those who accept the divinity of Christ commonly admit also the divinity of the Holy Spirit, it would presumably be possible for the NCC, like the WCC, to shift to a wording that makes its trinitarian basis and scriptural foundation more explicit. We think that the new Basis should even seek to go beyond New Delhi by adding express mention of the true humanity as well as the divinity of Jesus Christ, according to the model of the Chalcedonian definition. Such a revision of the Basis would be welcomed by many of the present member churches and the RCC. The amendment of the Basis, however, does not seem to be a matter of such importance that on this ground alone the RCC should hesitate to apply for membership in the NCC. Without violence to its convictions, the RCC could accept the Basis of the NCC as it presently stands.

(b) The *worship* functions of the NCC are presently very restricted, and offer no apparent theological difficulty. The problem to what extent Roman Catholics might be able to take part in common worship at NCC meetings could be worked out, as particular questions arise, in accordance with the general guidelines

for ecumenism, as found in the Decree on Ecumenism and the Ecumenical Directory.

(c) The *service* to the world rendered in the name of Christ by the NCC as an ecumenical organization would seem to be fully in accord with Roman Catholic principles of ecumenism. In a paragraph which deserves to be studied in its entirety, the Decree on Ecumenism declares that "cooperation among all Christians vividly expresses the bond which already unites them, and it sets in clearer relief the features of Christ the Servant" (UR 12, p. 354). The Decree on Missions calls upon Roman Catholics to collaborate with the separated brethren "in social and 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 one 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" (AG 15, pp. 602-603).

In conclusion therefore, we may say that the kind of corporate ecclesial existence implied by entrance into the NCC would appear to be in harmony with the ecclesiological and ecumenical principles of the RCC as expressed by its most authoritative documents. Membership in bodies such as the NCC would help to carry out the common witness, worship and service appropriate to the actual ecclesial situation as understood both by the RCC and by the present member churches of the NCC. Roman Catholic membership would also make it possible for the NCC more adequately to carry out its objectives.

7. Common Policies and Programs

Entrance into the NCC by the RCC would presumably involve participation in both the central policy-making bodies and in the program units of the NCC. From the standpoint of the RCC, participation in an ecumenical body such as the NCC offers both liabilities and assets, which must be measured against one another. On the liability side one may list:

(a) The possibility that the Council or its units might adopt some policies and programs which are not welcome to the RCC. (The divergence might possibly be found with regard to such

complex issues as abortion, population control, divorce, public aid to church-related schools.) Even though it could formally dissociate itself from such actions, the RCC might be embarrassed by its membership in a body which advocated such unacceptable measures.

(b) In some cases there could be delays in the adoption of joint policies or programs which if done separately, would require less time and consultation. For launching a project such as the present Campaign for Human Development through an agency such as the NCC, long negotiations and delays would presumably be involved.

(c) There is a risk that some common statements and decisions would be too bland. Prophetic vigor is difficult enough to achieve in official statements of the RCC alone; and the difficulty might often be increased if it were necessary to obtain the support of the NCC as a whole, since it is made up of very heterogeneous bodies. (The same objection could be raised from the standpoint of the NCC: its statements might be weakened by the need for obtaining RCC support.)

On the asset side, one can see clear advantages in having common policies and programs that are not the sole responsibility of the RCC:

(a) Interdenominational studies and staff work could probably be conducted with greater expertise, with wider sharing of the relevant information, and with less duplication of effort by parallel agencies. While the RCC presently has some of the advantages of common studies through its informal relationships with the NCC, membership in the NCC would regularize this type of cooperation and would not add to the actual cost of such studies. It would give the RCC an appropriate share in the burdens and in responsible leadership.

(b) There would be a wider basis of support and understanding in the American community for positions taken not by the RCC alone, but by the NCC with the RCC as a member. This would make for more effective presentation of such policies and programs to the general public and to governmental and other agencies. Parallels can often be found between policy statements issued in the past by the NCC and those issued by the Roman Catholic bishops in the United States.¹⁶

(c) In recent times the RCC has repeatedly expressed its commitment to dialogue. The discipline of making Roman Catholic positions plausible to other Christian groups often leads to greater precision of theological understanding by Roman Catholics themselves. It often gives other Christians a greater understanding of the rationale behind the traditional Roman Catholic views regarding controversial subjects such as Christian education, abortion and divorce. We believe it would be a distinct advantage to all concerned if the divisive issues could be discussed ecumenically.

Various proposals are under discussion in the NCC to improve the methods it uses to advocate positions. Some examples are that the NCC should express itself less frequently, with greater competence, at different levels and not simply through the General Board, and in more varied ways than mere statements. This Study Committee suggests that on issues where there are significant minority positions among member churches, these positions should normally be incorporated in NCC statements.

Meanwhile it is essential to be in possession of an accurate understanding of the present system of policy determination and policy statements in the NCC. Much of the information is available in considerable detail in the official documents, especially the Constitution and the Standing Rules of the NCC (available on request). A prominent part of the work of the NCC has been the production of policy statements intended to speak to the Christian conscience or to governmental or other bodies on issues in society and in the Church. A policy statement is a position or an affirmation of conviction formally approved by the General Board or General Assembly. It expresses a substantial preponderance of opinion that there is a strong weight of ethical, moral or religious principles in support of the view expressed. A policy statement is presented to member communions for their consideration and use. Through these statements the representatives of the member communions speak together as the Council to their churches and to the general public and guide Council program operations.

The process by which *policy statements* are formulated can be summarized¹⁷ as follows. A member communion, a division or committee, or an individual representative (who must obtain

10 signatures) may offer a proposed policy statement. Accompanied by a data sheet and supporting documents, the text must be sent to members six weeks in advance of the General Assembly (or to a first reading of the General Board) and is then referred to a committee of reference. The committee has several options, and if the policy statement is presented for action (as written or amended), it must be approved by at least a two-thirds vote of members present and voting, and must receive the affirmative vote of at least one-fourth of the total votes of the members. When issued, a policy statement must be accompanied by an analysis of the voting of the General Assembly or the General Board, including the number of approvals, disapprovals and abstentions. (There is an extraordinary procedure by which the General Assembly or General Board may waive any or all requirements with the consent of nine-tenths of the members present and voting, so that immediate action may be taken.)

Resolutions are formulated in a similar procedure and must be based upon policy statements. *Messages* must be consistent with policies of the NCC and be within the field of work of the body issuing them. *Study documents, consultation reports, and study conference reports* are clearly identified as such and are not to be construed as expressions of the NCC. It is not clear to what extent statements issued by the Executive Committee or the President may constitute problems for the RCC.

Priorities are established and the balance between study and program is determined in the NCC by overall policy and by the eleven purposes stated in the Constitution, but implementation is determined by the availability of funds.

The Council has no authority or administrative control over member communions. The sole authority of a policy statement is its intrinsic value, which in turn may influence the statements of the member communions, be used in preaching and teaching, stimulate leaders in the churches and assist them to make statements, and may also be used in testimony before government agencies.

In the event that the RCC as a member were to disagree with a proposed policy statement, it might have enough votes to stop passage. Even if this were not the case, as with other communions, it could either abstain or make a minority report.

In a period of tension, transition and pluralism, policy statements are often controversial and open to legitimate criticism. Some criticism is irresponsible and not based on facts (e.g., accusation of Communist influence or of disregard of the Gospel), but much criticism represents difference of responsible Christian opinion. Where genuine differences exist, they appear in all communions and therefore reflect tensions within all member churches. This situation also exists within the RCC and therefore should cause no hindrance to membership.

NCC statements are significant influences on ecumenical thinking. Each member communion contributes from its own wisdom to the policy statements. Sometimes a breakthrough in one communion in turn is passed on to the NCC, giving others the benefit of new formulations and implications of the faith. Some Roman Catholic bishops may be concerned lest their unique teaching position and its acceptance by Catholics be obscured by this broader process, but no communion accepts the NCC as an authoritative teacher or confuses the NCC statements with its own teaching. We see no insurmountable difficulty in clarifying this within the member communions and to the general public. As the process of mutual exploration continues, any psychological barriers to membership should be eliminated.

The process by which *policy statements* are produced does not seem to provide any barriers to participation by the RCC. We suggest for consideration only modification of the process, a change in the majority required for passage from 2/3 to 3/4. This would allow the RCC to exercise a restraining influence if it is united in its opposition.

Concluding this section of our report we may say that the RCC, if it joins the NCC, must be on guard against allowing its own prophetic voice to be muted. It will have to maintain its own agencies to express the distinctive stands of Roman Catholicism. The RCC would have ways of disengaging itself from NCC policies to which it takes exception. This, however, is a problem for all member churches of the NCC, it would also be an argument against the existence of the NCC. If this problem were a valid reason for the RCC to keep aloof from the NCC, it would also be an argument against the existence of the NCC. It is precisely because Christians have clear differences that they bear a re-

sponsibility to face these issues together. The fact that the RCC, like other churches in the NCC, has to perform certain tasks on its own does not preclude its membership. In accordance with the Lund principle that the churches should "act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compel them to act separately,"¹⁸ the RCC could appropriately participate in the policy bodies and program units of an ecumenical body such as the NCC.

8. *Relations with Other Constituencies*

Before it could responsibly join an agency such as the NCC, the RCC would have to consider what effect this action might have on the relationships of both the RCC and the NCC with other bodies. Special attention would have to be given to the reactions of other religious groups, such as the Jews and Moslems, and to Christian churches that are not now members. The same is true of ethnic groups such as Blacks and Hispanic-Americans, and also secular groups anxious to preserve the principle of separation of Church and State.

The possibility must be recognized that groups now outside the NCC might feel that Protestants, Catholics and Orthodox were establishing a gigantic power bloc that might be used against them. On the other hand, they might feel that it would be to their advantage to be able to deal with a single agency that would put them in touch with such a broad spectrum of American Christianity. Responsibilities would have to be assigned within the NCC for liaison with other groups, both religious and secular, so that lively interchange could be cultivated. In view of the special ties between the Christian and Jewish communities, consideration might be given to establishing a distinct desk in the NCC charged with the responsibility of liaison with the Jewish communities. The Churches coming together through the enlarged NCC must not do so as a Christian party with the intention of pressuring other groups in American society.

Some Protestant bodies presently outside the NCC, facing theological issues rather similar to those to which this report addresses itself, might be assisted in overcoming some of their objections to joining the NCC if the RCC were to reach a judgment in favor of joining.

The effect of Roman Catholic entrance upon the present member churches of the NCC would also have to be taken into account. Some might feel that the NCC was being weakened in its capacity as a spokesman for a predominantly Protestant conciliar tradition at present making progress in dialogue between its Black and its White constituents. At the same time, many of the present member churches might find their ecumenical commitment deepened by the broader role of the NCC that would result from the accession of the RCC.

9. The Roman Catholic Church in the United States

The By-laws of the NCC specify that a member church "shall have identity as an autonomous and stable church body with corporate existence within the United States" (I, 1, b). As applied to the RCC, this provision raises several possible difficulties.

In the first place, it may be asked whether the RCC in this country is sufficiently autonomous. The international commitments of the RCC are of course in some ways unique, but many member churches of the NCC are strongly conscious of their unity with and responsibility to their fellow Christians in other nations. For example, The Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., which defines itself as "a constituent member of the Anglican Communion," is a member. Furthermore, when the Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church in North and South America applied for membership, its dependency upon the Moscow Patriarchate did not constitute a bar to its acceptance by the NCC. Though these churches do not understand themselves simply as national churches, they have established a national identity sufficient to enable them to participate as members of the NCC (See Appendix C).

Since the NCC does not seek to control the internal lines of authority in its member churches, the unity of American Roman Catholicism with the Pope and the worldwide college of bishops does not appear to impede it from fulfilling the commitments of a member church of the NCC. In some ways the relationship of American Catholicism to the worldwide structures of the RCC may equip it to add a dimension of universal concern that could be of benefit to the NCC, particularly as regards the NCC's commitments to overseas ministries and to international peace and

justice. Representatives of the NCC have themselves expressed this view.

In the second place, it may be asked whether the RCC in this country is sufficiently a national entity organizationally to enable it to become, in a meaningful sense, a member of the NCC. In this connection, the question may be raised as to what, if any, body on the national level has power to commit the RCC to membership in the NCC.

For the sake of clarity, it will be well to keep these two questions distinct. Whoever makes the decision and commits the RCC to join, it should be clear that it is the RCC in this country (rather than any organ of the church) that would become a member of the NCC. The body joining, therefore, would be the communion of local Roman Catholic churches throughout the United States. The reality of this communion is manifested by many Roman Catholic organizations on the national level.

In the nineteenth century the communion of the local churches was made evident in provincial and later in plenary councils at the national level. In the twentieth century it was manifested by the annual meetings, initially of the metropolitans, and later of all the bishops. Today it is manifested by the NCCB, which is defined as "a kind of council in which the bishops of a given territory jointly exercise their pastoral office by way of promoting that greater good which the Church offers mankind" (CD, no. 38).

Another manifestation of the RCC at the national level is the civilly incorporated agency known as the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC). Its role is "assisting the Bishops in their service of the Church in this country by uniting the people of God where voluntary collective action on a broad interdiocesan level is needed. The USCC provides an organization, structure, and the resources needed to ensure coordination, cooperation, and assistance in the public, educational, and social concerns of the Church at the national or interdiocesan level."¹⁹

In addition to these episcopal organizations, there are numerous national Roman Catholic organizations of priests, religious and laity.

We believe it is clear in Roman Catholic polity that the Catholic church comes into being in and from the individual churches, that is, the local churches united with the bishops who are their pastors and representatives (*LG* no. 23 and *CD* nos. 36-38). Thus it is somewhat questionable whether one may technically designate Roman Catholicism in the U.S.A. as a "national church." But this reservation, we believe, would not be an impediment to membership in the NCC. Many Protestant churches that are already members of the NCC are likewise unions of local churches. For example, the American Baptist Convention, as described in the Year Book for 1969-70, allows full freedom for its member churches to order their own life "in accordance with the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit" in worship, witness, and ministry.

The appropriate authority for making a decision to join quite properly is the highest duly constituted ecclesiastical body in the country. It is clear, we believe, that the American bishops of the RCC have this authority. In the United States, the NCCB is the duly constituted episcopal conference with the powers specified by Vatican II (*CD*, 38) and in the Apostolic Letter, *Ecclesiae sanctae*, issued by Paul VI in 1966.

The fact that the NCCB, at its November, 1970, meeting, took the step of approving Roman Catholic membership in the NCC Commission on Faith and Order indicates that the NCCB regards such measures as falling within its competence. In several other countries the RCC has joined national councils of churches through the episcopal conferences.

As a matter of pastoral prudence, and in view of the significance of membership in the NCC to the total membership of the RCC (including priests, religious, and laity) in all the dioceses, others in addition to NCCB members should be involved in the decision. Concurrence of the appropriate organs of the USCC should presumably be sought and there should be considerable preparation on the "grass roots" level in the individual dioceses. This is largely a matter to be determined by the bishops themselves with appropriate consultation within the RCC. Probably they might wish to refer the matter for consideration to the Advisory Council of the USCC or, if a National Pastoral Council should come into existence sufficiently soon, to that body also. From the

NCC side, it has indicated its full understanding of the diversity of organization within the RCC in the United States and its desire for a basis of eventual membership in the NCC that will reflect the richness of the many facets of Roman Catholic life in this country.

10. *Images of the NCC*

In many quarters the NCC is popularly identified with a type of liberal social-action-oriented Protestantism. In some sectors, however, there is a feeling that the NCC with its slow, bureaucratic structures and with its white Anglo-Saxon predominance is hopelessly conservative. Such identifications might make many of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity reluctant to see the RCC join the NCC. The problem is real, but, we feel, not insoluble. In the first place, the NCC is quite conscious of this problem, which complicates its relationships to many of its present constituent communions, and is therefore considering ways of restructuring its agencies so as to clarify accountability for social and political statements. Secondly, many Catholics, as well as many Protestants, feel that the leaders of the NCC deserve credit for their courageous leadership in social action, much of which is in full accord with papal encyclicals from *Rerum Novarum* to *Populorum Progressio*. Roman Catholics who are familiar with these encyclicals are often favorably inclined toward many of the social and political stands which the NCC has taken. Thirdly, by joining the NCC, the RCC in this country could have a voice in the formation of NCC policy, and therefore make this even more consonant with Roman Catholic principles. Thus the present criticisms directed against the NCC do not seem to be a decisive reason for the RCC to decide against joining.

11. *Staff, Representation and Finance*

The professional staff of the NCC are elected by the General Board and subject to its personnel policies. Roman Catholics already serve on the staff but their number would undoubtedly increase substantially in the event of Roman Catholic membership.

It is impossible to determine the amount of time that a given staff member of the USCC, NCCB or any other Catholic organization might devote to the work of the NCC if the RCC were a member. This would depend upon the degree of involvement,

for instance, of a USCC unit in the work and programs of the appropriate NCC unit. USCC staff could be elected to NCC committees, could work on NCC projects either at the NCC or in the USCC. USCC staff could even be seconded part-time from present assignment at the USCC to a specific project in the NCC in which they have special competence. All of this activity would, of course, be subject to appropriate approvals within the USCC, the limitations of USCC personnel and budget and mutual agreement with the NCC.

Thus Roman Catholic membership in the NCC does not imply that units of the USCC or the NCCB would be eliminated or merged into their counterpart at the NCC. Units of the USCC or the NCCB would continue to function and carry on their activities. However, in some areas, it might be that a USCC or NCCB unit might discharge some of its responsibility for programming in a certain area, not by producing its own program, but by cooperating with other Churches through the appropriate unit of the NCC. Wasteful overlapping of agencies of the NCC with Roman Catholic agencies would need to be avoided. This is a problem felt by all the member churches of the NCC and would not be unique for the RCC. Further research is needed on the relations to the NCC of Catholic organizations other than the USCC and the NCCB. It is the conclusion of the Study Committee that on the level of staff operations there are no obstacles to membership in the NCC.

Proportionate representation of the member churches in the General Assembly, the General Board and major units of the NCC is determined by agreed formulae. In the event of Roman Catholic membership, the present formula would need to be replaced, simply because the resulting bodies would be too large to function adequately (see Appendix D). Development of a new formula for each of those bodies would require a determination of their nature and purposes, with attention to the balance required between the gifts and perspectives which can be brought by young people, minority groups, women and persons of specialized competence, on the one hand, and decision makers with greater authority and financial resources in the member churches, on the other hand. While this is a subject for future consultation, in light of the membership strength of the RCC, the Study Committee proposes as a working principle that the RCC have not more than

a third of the representatives and not less than a fifth in the top policy-making bodies of the NCC.

Financial support for "general operations" of the NCC is expected from member churches based on a set of criteria mutually arrived at, a formula determined by financial capacity rather than membership. The percentages are determined by a three-year average of total contributions for local, regional, national and world programs of the national church body. Included in the general operations budget at the present time are the General Secretary and his immediate assistants, expenses of the General Board and General Assembly and their committees, a Washington office, an office for administration, an office for communications, an office for planning and program coordination, and liaison with regional and local ecumenical bodies.

In addition, member churches are expected to provide support for major program units and their sub-units as they participate in them, generally from related program agencies in the member church. This is known as "cognate funding." Representatives of such cognate agencies participate in making the program decisions and in providing the financing for such programs. The major portion of the NCC budget is made up of such program funds.

The Study Committee is of the opinion that the maximum expected from a single member church for the general operations budget should be 25%. This suggestion is related to our suggested norms for representation and the judgment that any one church should not be overburdened with financial responsibility. Askings for the program units would be set as participation is planned. Some of these askings are based on the general formula but others are based on a series of factors and still others on membership. (For further details on the general operations and program budgets see Appendix E.)

Conclusion

In the judgment of this Study Committee, the question whether the RCC should join the NCC can be broken down into two sub-questions: whether the NCC (or some near-equivalent)

should continue to exist and, secondly, whether, if so, the RCC should be a part of it.

To the first of these questions we answer in the affirmative. While we recognize that the ecumenical movement is much wider than the NCC, that there are many things that the NCC cannot accomplish, and that the NCC does not have a perfect record in the spheres in which it is competent, we nevertheless believe that the NCC has made, and can continue to make, a major contribution as an organ of the ecumenical movement and as a service organization of the member churches. The common ecumenical experience of the member churches over the past twenty years through the NCC and even earlier through previous cooperative church organizations is a precious heritage from which American Christianity should continue to draw profit. If the NCC were to be dismantled without an effective successor, great harm would be done to the cause of ecumenical Christianity in the United States.

To the second question we would reply, in substance, that nearly every argument in favor of the continuance of the NCC (or a comparable successor) is also an argument for Roman Catholic membership. We believe that if the documents of Vatican II are a valid expression of what the RCC is and intends to be—as can scarcely be denied—Roman Catholic ecclesiological principles are in substantial accord with the aims and methods of the NCC. This being so, it would seem that the arguments for Roman Catholic membership in the NCC are as strong as the arguments for membership in the case of many of the other member churches. But the ultimate decision as to whether these arguments are sufficiently weighty to bring about an application for membership in the NCC must of course be made by the responsible leaders of the RCC after due consultation with their own constituencies on various levels.

In order to pave the way more smoothly for a favorable decision, we recommend the following three changes on the part of the NCC:

First, we believe that the Commission on Faith and Order should continue to be upgraded to the point that it is able to penetrate all the activities of the NCC with a theologically based concern for the unity of Christ's Church in faith, polity and mission.

Secondly, we believe that the present study provides an auspicious occasion for the NCC to reexamine its Basis, and to remove from the formulation anything that savors of an exaggerated "Christomonism" or tends to obscure the true humanity of Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, we believe that in the future, statements should be drawn up in such a way as to manifest the diversity as well as the unity found within the Council.

Further, we believe that as steps are taken that might lead to membership of the RCC, special attention should be given to the following points:

1. It is of very great importance that the future expanded NCC should neither be nor seem to be a giant lobbying force that would use its influence in a way that could legitimately be feared or resented by other religious, ethnic or civic groups. To this end it will be important to assure adequate minority representation in the NCC and to maintain effective liaison with non-members of the reorganized NCC. Particular care will have to be taken to be receptive to the sensitivities of groups strongly committed to the principle of separation of Church and State.

2. Within the RCC, it would seem to be of the greatest importance that the decision to join should not be taken without previous broad appreciation of the NCC and its purposes, so that the decision will enjoy a high degree of grass-roots understanding and support. We therefore recommend that the materials in this Report, or materials of a similar nature, be made available for public dissemination.

3. As progress is made toward a decision on application by the RCC for membership in the NCC, further and more detailed studies will have to be made regarding the financial responsibilities, the number and mode of selection of representatives, etc. The detailed solutions to these questions will have to be made in the light of changes now occurring in both the RCC and the NCC.

Properly prepared for, the entrance of the RCC into the NCC, in our judgment, might rekindle the ecumenical enthusiasm of many Roman Catholics, which has somewhat subsided since the days of Vatican II, and at the same time strengthen the commitment of the present member churches of the NCC to the aims

and purposes of the ecumenical movement. The reception of the RCC into the NCC would also have important repercussions for conciliar ecumenism on the local level in the United States, on the national level in other countries and on the world level.

It is perhaps pertinent to add one final observation. While we recognize that careful study and committee work are necessary to shape the structures used by Christian churches, we share the impatience of many Christians who feel that it is desirable, as soon as possible, to get beyond this kind of discussion and to work for more substantive goals. The entrance of the RCC into the NCC, while important, will not in and of itself be a major ecumenical achievement. It becomes so as it rapidly leads to a more concerted action on the part of all the churches involved, thus bringing the healing power of the gospel to God's pilgrim people and a distraught and divided world.

NOTES

¹ For more details, see Samuel McCrea Cavert, *The American Churches in the Ecumenical Movement: 1900-1968* (New York: Association Press, 1968), pp. 245-48.

² Samuel McCrea Cavert, *Church Cooperation and Unity in America: A Historical Review: 1900-1970* (New York: Association Press, 1970), pp. 280-300, gives a helpful survey of the developing relationships between U.S. Roman Catholics and the NCC.

³ See Lukas Vischer, "The Activities of the Joint Working Group Between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, 1965-69," *The Ecumenical Review*, vol. 22, no. 1 (Jan. 1970), pp. 36-69.

⁴ Text in Norman Goodall (ed.), *The Uppsala Report 1968* (Geneva: WCC, 1968), pp. 177-180.

⁵ Lukas Vischer, "The Ecumenical Movement and the Roman Catholic Church," in Harold E. Fey (ed.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, vol. 2, 1948-68 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), pp. 311-52, quotation from p. 352.

⁶ Peter Hocken, "Bilateral or Multilateral?," *One in Christ*, vol. 6, no. 4 (1970), pp. 496-524, esp. p. 499. (For up-to-date information on these matters one may consult Victor E. W. Hayward, Associate General Secretary for Relationships with Christian Councils, at the WCC offices in Geneva, Switzerland.)

⁷ From Heythrop Ecumenical Conference Report, July 1969, chap. 1. See also Bishop Kenneth Sansbury, "Growing Relations Between the British Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church," *One in Christ*, vol. 6, no. 4 (1970), pp. 490-95.

⁸ See the Second Report of the Joint Working Group of the WCC and the RCC.

⁹ In references to documents of Vatican II, the following abbreviations of the Latin titles will be used:

UR—*Unitatis redintegratio* (Decree on Ecumenism)

AG—*Ad gentes* (Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity)

LG—*Lumen gentium* (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church)

CD—*Christus Dominus* (Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office)

Page references are to W. M. Abbott (ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966).

¹⁰ *The Ecclesiological Significance of Councils of Churches* (New York: National Council of Churches, 1963), p. 21.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 23, quoting the WCC Commission on Institutionalism and Unity.

¹³ Lukas Vischer, "Christian Councils—Their Future as Instruments of the Ecumenical Movement," *Study Encounter*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1968), pp. 97-107, quotation from page 106.

¹⁴ For a lucid statement of this position see Yves Congar, "Note on the Words 'Confession,' 'Church,' and 'Communion,'" in *Dialogue Between Chris-*

tions (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1966), pp. 184-213. On page 206 Congar writes: "On any hypothesis, one thing is certain: a community which lacks the apostolic succession, which does not admit of degrees of its possession, cannot qualify even as a local Church in the strict theological sense of the word. If this name is accorded to it, it can only be in a descriptive or sociological sense for which some employ the word confession, but for which, as we shall see, it is preferable to employ 'communion.'" In opposition to this view, other Catholic ecumenists, such as Gregory Baum and Walter Kasper, would extend the term "Church," at least in an analogous sense, to Protestant communities. See James O. McGovern, *The Church in the Churches* (Washington, D.C.: Corpus, 1968), pp. 98-109.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.* (note 10 above), p. 19.

¹⁶ Dean M. Kelly, "The National Council of Churches and the Social Outlook of the Nation," (available from the NCC on request).

¹⁷ See Standing Rules, pp. 12-14.

¹⁸ Oliver S. Tomkins (ed.), *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1953), p. 16; reprinted in Lukas Vischer, *A Documentary History of the Faith and Order Movement, 1927-63* (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1963), p. 86.

¹⁹ Quoted from the description in *The Official Catholic Directory* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1970), p. 13.

APPENDIX A

Counterpart Staff

NCC	RCC
Office of the General Secretary	General Secretariat NCCB-USCC
Washington Office of the NCC	Office of Government Liaison Office of General Counsel
Division of Christian Life & Mission	Department of Social Development
Church and Culture Department	Bishops' Committee on Liturgy
Department of International Affairs	Department of International Affairs Division of World Justice and Peace
Department of Social Justice Delta Ministry Religious and Civil Liberties Hispanic-American Ministries Domestic Hunger	Division for Urban Life Division for Rural Life Division for the Spanish Speaking (National Conference of Catholic Charities) National Catholic Community Services
Division of Christian Education	Department of Education (National Catholic Educational Assn.)
Department of Educational Development	Division for Religious Education (CCD) Division for Elementary and Secondary Education Division for Campus Ministry Division for Youth Activities Division for Adult Education Division for Family Life
Department of Education for Mission	Division for Religious Education (CCD) (U.S. Catholic Mission Council)
Department of Ministry	Bishops' Committee on Priestly Formation Bishops' Committee on the Permanent Diaconate Division for Urban Life (Conference of Major Religious Superiors)

APPENDIX A (Cont.)

Counterpart Staff

NCC

RCC

Division of Overseas Ministries Africa Department E. Asia Department So. Asia Department Mideast Department Latin America Department	Catholic Relief Services Division for World Justice and Peace Division for Latin America
Department of Church World Service	Catholic Relief Services Division for Migration & Refugee Service
Department of Specialized Ministries	Department of Health Services Division for Chaplains' Services
Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism Commission on Faith and Order	Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs Bishops' Committee on Liturgy
Central Division of Communications Broadcasting and Film Commission Department of Information	Department of Communications Division for Radio and Television Division for Motion Pictures Division of Information NC News Service
Office of Planning and Program	Office of Research, Plans and Programs
Office of Administration	Office of Finance and Administration

APPENDIX B

Study Committee on the Relationship of the National Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church in the United States of America:

- The Most Reverend Charles H. Helmsing, co-chairman, Bishop of Kansas City—St. Joseph, Kansas City, Missouri
- The Reverend John Coventry C. Smith, co-chairman, General Secretary, Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations, The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., New York, New York
- The Very Reverend Maximos Aghiorgoussis, School of Theology, Hellenic College, Brookline, Massachusetts
- The Most Reverend William W. Baum, Bishop of Springfield—Cape Girardeau, Springfield, Missouri
- The Most Reverend Joseph L. Bernardin, General Secretary, United States Catholic Conference and National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, D.C.
- Mr. James A. Christison, Executive Secretary, The American Baptist Home Mission Society, American Baptist Convention, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania
- The Reverend Avery Dulles, S.J., Professor of Theology, Woodstock College, New York, New York
- Dr. R. H. Edwin Espy, General Secretary, National Council of Churches, New York, New York
- The Reverend Tracey K. Jones, Jr., General Secretary, Board of Missions, The United Methodist Church, New York, New York
- The Reverend Robert J. Marshall, President, The Lutheran Church in America, New York, New York
- The Reverend Richard McCormick, S.J., Professor of Moral Theology, Bellarmine School of Theology, Chicago, Illinois
- The Reverend Frederick McManus, Executive Secretary, Bishops' Committee on Liturgy, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C.
- The Reverend Randolph Crump Miller, Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut
- The Reverend Robert Moss, President, United Church of Christ, New York, New York
- The Reverend Edwin B. Neill, former Associate General Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, D.C.
- The Reverend Krister Stendahl, Dean, The Divinity School, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel, President, National Council of Churches, Center for Voluntarism, Washington, D.C.

Observers

- The Reverend T. E. Honey, General Secretary, The Canadian Council of Churches, Toronto, Canada
- The Reverend John Keating, National Office for Ecumenism, Canadian Catholic Conference, Toronto, Canada
- The Reverend Frederick W. Meuser, Executive Secretary, Division of Theological Studies, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., New York, New York
- The Reverend Herbert A. Meuller, Secretary, The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, St. Louis, Missouri
- The Reverend Frederick Schioltz, President (to 1970), The American Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- The Reverend Eugene L. Smith, Executive Secretary, World Council of Churches, New York, New York
- The Reverend Kent Knutson, President (from 1971), The American Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Staff

- The Reverend David Bowman, S.J., Special Assistant for Ecumenical Services, National Council of Churches, New York, New York
- The Reverend John F. Hotchkin, Director (from April, 1971), Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, D.C.
- The Reverend Monsignor Bernard F. Law, Director (to April, 1971), Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, D.C.; Vicar General, Diocese of Natchez-Jackson.
- The Reverend William A. Norgren, Executive Director, Commission on Faith and Order, National Council of Churches, New York, New York

Adjunct Staff

- The Reverend Gerald E. Knoff, Associate General Secretary, Division of Christian Education, National Council of Churches, New York, New York
- The Reverend James Rausch, Associate General Secretary, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C.
- The Most Reverend Francis T. Hurley, Bishop of Juneau, Alaska, former Associate General Secretary, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX C—Samples of Statements from Member Churches'
Constitutions or Similar Documents

1. *American Baptist Convention*

The American Baptist Convention, as a manifestation of the church universal, bears witness to God's intention to bring redemption and wholeness to all creation. American Baptists believe that God's intention can be sought and followed in local congregations and other gatherings of Christians and in associational, regional, national and world bodies as they receive from one another mutual counsel and correction. Since Jesus Christ is the head of the church, each body of Christians, seeking to order its life in accordance with the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has a proper responsibility under God for maintaining its life of worship, witness and ministry.

In every area of their common life American Baptists, acknowledging the importance of creative diversity, seek such a balance of freedom and order as will keep all parts of the Convention open to the guidance of the Holy Spirit and at the same time enable them to work responsibly to carry out the common task of mission and ministry in our time.

The American Baptist Convention acknowledges that it shares a common faith in Christ with churches which may be quite different from it in history, polity and practice. Consequently, it seeks to share with them a common ministry and to express it faithfully.

The American Baptist Convention further acknowledges that God's will is also manifested in movements outside the formal structures of Christ's church, and that, therefore, it must respond faithfully to such disclosures.

In the light of this affirmation, the following, in the form of a statement of purpose of the American Baptist Convention, is intended to implement and not to alter the objects of the corporation as stated in the Act of Incorporation:

- to bear witness to the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the world and to lead persons to Christ;
- to seek the mind of Christ in moral, spiritual, political, economic, social, denominational and ecumenical matters, and to express to the rest of society on behalf of American Baptists, their convictions as to the mind of Christ in these matters;
- to guide, unify, and assist American Baptists in their witness in the world, in preparing members for the work of ministry, and in serving both those within and outside the fellowship of Christ;
- and to promote closer relations among American Baptist churches and groups, within the whole Body of Christ and to promote understanding with other religious bodies.

—Standing Resolution 1.80 (pp. 542-43)
Yearbook for 1969-70

2. *The Episcopal Church*

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, otherwise known as The Episcopal Church (which name is hereby recognized as also designating the Church) is a constituent member of the Anglican Communion, a Fellowship within the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces and regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, upholding and propagating the historic Faith and Order as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. This Constitution, adopted in General Convention in Philadelphia in October, 1789, as amended in subsequent General Conventions, sets forth the basic Articles for the government of this Church, and of its overseas missionary jurisdictions.

From the Constitution of the Episcopal Church.

3. *The United Church of Christ*

The United Church of Christ, formed June 25, 1967, by union of the Evangelical and Reformed Church and The General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States in order to express more fully the oneness in Christ of the churches composing it, to make more effective their common witness in Him, and to serve His kingdom in the world, hereby adopts this Constitution.

The United Church of Christ acknowledges as its sole Head, Jesus Christ, the son of God and the Saviour of men. It acknowledges as brethren in Christ all who share in this confession. It looks to the Word of God in the Scriptures, and to the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, to prosper its creative and redemptive work in the world. It claims as its own the faith of the historic Church expressed in the ancient creeds and reclaimed in the basic insights of the Protestant Reformers. It affirms the responsibility of the Church in each generation to make this faith its own in reality of worship, in honesty of thought and expression, and in purity of heart before God. In accordance with the teachings of our Lord and the practice prevailing among evangelical Christians, it recognizes two sacraments: Baptism and the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.

From the Preamble of the Constitution of the United Church of Christ.

4. *The United Methodist Church*

The Church is a community of all true believers under the Lordship of Christ. It is the redeemed and redeeming fellowship in which the Word of God is preached by men divinely called, and the Sacraments are duly administered according to Christ's own appointment. Under the discipline of the Holy Spirit the Church seeks to provide for the maintenance of worship, the edification of believers, and the redemption of the world.

The Church of Jesus Christ exists in and for the world, and its very dividedness is a hindrance to its mission in that world.

The prayers and intentions of The Methodist Church and The Evangelical United Brethren Church have been and are for obedience to the will of our

Lord that His people be one, in humility for the present brokenness of the Church and in gratitude that opportunities for reunion have been given. In harmony with these prayers and intentions these churches do now propose to unite, in the confident assurance that this act is an expression of the oneness of Christ's people.

From the Preamble of the United Methodist Constitution.

5. *Orthodox Churches in America*

Dr. Paul Anderson, consultant to the NCC on Orthodox affairs, suggests that "autonomy" for the Orthodox communions means the ability and responsibility to conduct their own internal affairs. "Autocephaly" includes this, and adds the ability and responsibility for choosing the supreme head of a particular church.

Two of the Orthodox jurisdictions in the United States are of special interest to Roman Catholics for the way in which they define their autonomy. The Antiochian Orthodox Catholic Archdiocese of Toledo, Ohio, and Dependencies quotes a Patriarchal Manifesto dated July 25, 1962, which indicates the separate and independent jurisdiction of the two Syrian Archdioceses in America, in order to prevent conflicting jurisdictions. Under Article 6. Authority: (B) Spiritual, we read:

The Archdiocese derives and upholds its Spiritual Authority to function from the Patriarch and Holy Synod of the Apostolic See of Antioch and all the East: the Hierarch of which is a member of the said Holy Synod duly appointed and consecrated, Archbishop under the canonical Praxis issued by His Beatitude, the Patriarch of Antioch and all the East.

In the case of an application for membership from The Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church in North and South America, the concern was to ascertain that this church recognized the autonomy of other member churches of the NCC and claimed no authority over them. The occasion was the presence of another Russian Orthodox body in NCC membership.

6. *The Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America*

The Orthodox churches do not have single head with authority similar to that of the Pope. Yet in each of the 16 Orthodox churches there is strict canonical structure, with a Patriarch (e.g., Moscow) or Archbishop (e.g., Cyprus) or a Metropolitan (e.g., Poland) as its head. Many of these "mother" churches have a diocese(s) outside of the mother country. As regards America, many of these dioceses or archdioceses are considered autonomous, i.e., have a right to manage all domestic affairs, including election and consecration of bishops, but the head of the American body must be confirmed, and in some cases appointed, by the head of the mother church. Thus Archbishop Michael Shaheen and Archbishop Philip, each having a body of Antiochian parishes, have autonomy for their flocks in America, while they still attend the Synod of Bishops of the Mother Church at Damascus.

Documents available at the NCC are: (1) Report of the General Constituent Membership Committee on the Application for Membership of Four Com-munions on December 5, 1966, (2) Information concerning the Antiochian Orthodox Catholic Archdiocese of Toledo, Ohio and Dependencies with the application for membership and supporting data, (3) Information about the Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church in North and South America with their application for membership and supporting data, (4) An Analysis of National Council procedure in considering application for membership, used in 1966, and still in force. Please write if you wish a copy of one or the other of them.

APPENDIX D—Representation in the National Council of Churches

1. Following is a list of member communions and their representatives on the General Assembly and General Board in the current (1969-1972) triennium. The detailed formula for selection of communion representatives for the General Assembly is stated in the Constitution, Article VI, Section 2 and 3; and for the General Board, Article VIII, Section 2.

DENOMINATION	<u>Repre- sentatives General Assembly</u>		<u>Potential General Board</u>		<u>EACH Pro- gram Board</u>	
	<i>Basic</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Basic</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>DCU-DCLM</i>	<i>DOM-DCE</i> <i>CDC</i>
African Methodist Episcopal Church	29	4	8	1	5	3
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church	19	2	6	1	4	2
American Baptist Convention	30	4	9	1	5	3
The Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of Toledo, Ohio and Dependencies in North America	8	1	3	1	3	1
The Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of New York and All North America	10	1	4	1	3	2
Armenian Church of America, Diocese of the (including Diocese of California)	10	1	4	1	3	2
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	31	4	9	1	6	3
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church	14	2	5	1	4	2
Church of the Brethren	11	1	4	1	3	2
The Episcopal Church	40	5	11	1	7	3
The Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church in North and South America	9	1	3	1	3	2
Friends United Meeting	9	1	3	1	3	2
General Convention The Swedenborgian Church	8	1	3	1	3	1
Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America	34	4	10	1	6	3
Hungarian Reformed Church in America	8	1	3	1	3	1
Lutheran Church in America	35	4	10	1	6	3
The Moravian Church in America	9	1	3	1	3	2
National Baptist Convention of America	46	6	13	2	7	4
National Baptist Convention U.S.A., Inc.	87	11	23	3	12	6
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends	8	1	3	1	3	1

DENOMINATION	Repre- sentatives General Assembly		Potential General Board		EACH Pro- gram Board	
	Basic	State	Basic	State	DCU-DCLM	DOM-DCE CDC
Polish National Catholic Church of America	12	2	4	1	3	2
The Presbyterian Church in the United States	22	3	7	1	5	2
Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.	15	2	5	1	4	2
The Reformed Church in America	11	1	4	1	3	2
The Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America	9	1	3	1	3	2
The Orthodox Church in America	9	1	3	1	3	2
Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese for the U.S. of America and Canada	9	1	3	1	3	2
Seventh Day Baptist General Conference	8	1	3	1	3	1
Syrian (Orthodox) Church of Antioch	8	1	3	1	3	1
Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America	9	1	3	1	3	2
United Church of Christ	37	5	10	1	6	3
The United Methodist Church	166	21	43	5	21	10
The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America	55	7	15	2	8	4
Totals:	825	103	243	41	160 × 4	83
	928		284		=640	

1) Representatives of state and local Councils of Churches are shown as "State." These representatives are chosen from a nomination list provided by State Councils of Churches.

2) Each Program Board is allowed an "additional thirty-five" in addition to basic representatives nominated by denominations. Each of the "additional thirty-five" must be certified by his denomination, but this does not count against their basic representatives.

3) Central Division of Communication is allowed an "additional seventeen" representatives.

Following is a projection, using the present formula, of Roman Catholic representation in the NCC compared with a large member denomination, such as the United Methodist Church, and the combined membership of denominations participating in the Consultation on Church Union. The projection reveals that the present formula could not be used because of the size of the General Assembly and the General Board would not be viable.

Communi- cants	Communion	General Assembly	General Board	Each Division
		8 + 1 per 70,000 = basic + 1/8 of that total represent- ing state and area councils of churches	¼ of GA basic + 1 + ¼ of state and area council repre- sentatives	2 + 1/10 of GA + 35 ad- ditional
40,000,000	Roman Catholic	578 + 72 = 650	146 + 18 = 164	67 + 35 = 102
25,000,000	Churches in C.O.C.U.	357 + 46 = 403	90 + 13 = 103	42 + 35 = 77
10,000,000	United Metho- dist	166 + 21 = 187	43 + 5 = 48	21 + 35 = 56

2. The present distribution of the representation of member churches is illustrated in the following table from four examples:

	American Baptist		Episcopal		United Church		United Meth.	
	GA	GB	GA	GB	GA	GB	GA	GB
Youth	4	1	2	1	2	0	5	3
Laywomen	6	1	9	4	5	1	13	4
Laymen	5	2	10	4	9	2	38	10
Minority Groups	5	1	9	3	7	2	13	6
Clergy—Ordained	19	6	21	7				
—Rectors			9	3	6	2	28	12
—Judicatory heads			9	2	3	1	27	7
National officials & Staff	8	4	9	5	11	4	42	9
Total Number of Representatives (Including Basic & State)	34	10	45	12	42	11	187	48

Note: There is some overlapping in categories in the count.

These four churches select representatives to the NCC in the following ways.

American Baptist Convention—Representatives for the General Assembly and General Board are nominated by the General Council and approved by the American Baptist Convention in annual session. The Division Program Boards are nominated by the American Baptist National Program Boards and General Council and approved by the American Baptist Convention.

The Episcopal Church—Representatives to the General Assembly and General Board of the National Council of Churches are selected by the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, a continuing Commission of the General

Convention, and elected by the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church. The chief responsibility for preparing the recommendation to these positions is undertaken by a committee of the Joint Commission called by the Committee on Councils of Churches. The positions on the Division Program Boards are filled by the Ecumenical Officer in consultation with appropriate Executive Council staff members and the individuals concerned.

United Church of Christ—

- a) General Assembly—The national agencies are asked to suggest names for appointment by the Executive Council.
- b) General Board—Chosen from the General Assembly delegation according to the formula of the National Council of Churches.
- c) Division Program Boards—The cognate national agencies suggest names to the Program Boards, and they in turn are approved by the office of the President.

*United Methodist Church—*Assembly members and General Board members are chosen by the General Conference on nomination of the Council of Bishops. If the Assembly comes at such a time that our quadrennial General Conference is not in session the Council of Bishops is authorized to act.

In choosing the Assembly members the Council of Bishops asks for nominations from the related boards and agencies in the church and these are usually staff members or board members. These nominations represent one-half the Assembly total. The other half is nominated by the bishops from the church at large.

The Council of Bishops selects the program board members but this is largely perfunctory as we ask for nominations from the cognate agencies of the church and at least in the last fifteen years none of these nominations have been changed.

3. Members of the Study Committee's task force on representation were generally agreed on the opinion that present representatives of NCC member churches are tied in with denominational decision-making and financial authority.

Para-ecclesiastical and minority groups are present or represented in a variety of other ways. There are six Organizations in Fraternal Relationship who are related to the total Council. In addition, there are 38 Organizations in Fraternal Relationship which are related to major units. The NCC Bylaws offer guidelines for careful consideration to be given to minority groups, women and youth as members of the General Assembly, General Board, Executive Committee and Program Boards.

All persons who serve on committees of the NCC are required to be "persons in good standing" in member and non-member communions. A list is maintained of non-member communions recognized by the General Board to be in agreement with the Preamble to the Constitution of the NCC.

Members of the task force on representation recognized the problem faced by the NCC and the denominations in appointing representatives who will bring greater diversity but who may not be decision-makers or possess financial authority. It was agreed that the gifts and the perspectives which youth, minority representatives, and others can bring are essential to the work of

the Council, but it was recognized that denominational "responsibles" must also participate in the deliberations of the NCC if support is to be secured from the denominations. It was also recognized that many denominations are limited in the appointments of representatives by financial considerations. A church official who has a travel budget is more likely to be appointed than a lay person or a pastor who would have to be supported in his travel out of the church's central budget.

APPENDIX E—FINANCE

The NCC budget has been reduced in recent years. The member churches must decide how much of a structure will be needed in the future. Accordingly, any projection of a fair share asking from the RCC if it were to become a member is hazardous. Some guidance can be gained, however, from the 1972 projected budget. Of the total budget of \$17,572,770, \$11,485,340 is expected from contributed sources. Of this latter amount \$6,787,890 will come from member communions. Of this total from the member communions, \$531,000 is for general operations and \$6,256,890 for programs in which the communions elect to participate.

This \$6,256,890 for programs and projects will be spent in the following way:

Division of Christian Life and Mission	\$ 930,590
Division of Christian Education	337,630
Division of Overseas Ministries	4,658,670
Commission on Faith and Order and Commission on Regional and Local Ecum.	92,540
Central Division of Communications	173,710
Planning and Program	41,000
Washington office	22,750

The NCC is at present undergoing restructure, but the current estimate for the general operations budget in 1973 is \$834,000* as compared to \$811,520 in 1972. It is this budget to which the RCC, as a member, would be expected to pay its fair share. In the event of membership it is evident that further consultation will be required regarding both the amount of the fair share and the sources from which it would come. It should not be assumed that all Roman Catholic contributions to the NCC would come from the general fund of the bishops; on the contrary, other Roman Catholic organizations might be expected to share responsibility. In addition, the RCC through its many agencies will determine the extent of its participation in and support of the various programs of the NCC indicated above.

* The figure \$834,000 assumes the present membership of 33 churches in NCC.

