Zeitschrift: Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift : neue Folge der Revue internationale de théologie

Band: 52 (1962)

Heft: 1

Artikel: Lanka und Nord-Indien/Pakistan

Autor: Rinkel, Andreas / Küry, Urs

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-404401

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 14.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

Lanka und Nord-Indien/Pakistan

Im Jahrgang 1959, S. 1 ff. dieser Zeitschrift, veröffentlichten wir eine Korrespondenz, geführt zwischen den Erzbischöfen von Utrecht und Canterbury über die «Vereinigte Kirche von Süd-Indien». Damals waren in der Kirche von England Bestrebungen im Gang, um die Frist von 30 Jahren, nach deren Ablauf man gemäss einem früheren Beschluss erst über ein Abkommen zur Herstellung voller kirchlicher Gemeinschaft («full communion») sich beraten sollte, auf 5 Jahre abzukürzen, und diese 5 Jahre waren inzwischen vergangen. Es war die Meinung, in der Zwischenzeit habe sich vollauf erwiesen, dass die «Kirche von Süd-Indien», welche aus der Vereinigung von Anglikanern mit verschiedenen Reformationskirchen hervorgegangen war, ihre Katholizität hinreichend unter Beweis gestellt habe, um mit ihr eine Übereinkunft zu treffen entsprechend derjenigen zwischen der Anglikanischen Kirchengemeinschaft und den Altkatholischen Kirchen. Zu einer derartigen Vereinbarung ist es dann allerdings noch nicht gekommen, da die Mehrheit der «Convocations» der Kirche von England der Auffassung war, die Zeit dafür sei noch nicht reif. Anlass dazu war zweifelsohne die Überlegung, dass in der neuentstandenen Kirche noch immer zu viele Amtsträger («ministers») tätig waren, welche nicht durch katholische Bischöfe geweiht waren.

Neben den Bemühungen um eine Vereinigung der Kirchen in Süd-Indien bestand seit Jahren ein gleiches Streben für die christlichen Kirchen auf Ceylon und in den Gebieten von Nord-Indien, Burma und Pakistan. Dieses Bestreben hat seinen berechtigten Grund. Die Christen in diesen Gebieten stellen eine sehr kleine Minderheit in einer überwiegend hinduistischen Welt dar. Ihre Position ist daher schwach, und die Tatsache, dass sie überdies unter sich noch aufgespalten sind in Kirchen römisch-katholischen, anglikanischen und verschiedenartigen reformatorischen Ursprungs, machte diese Schwachheit noch hervorstechender und umso fühlbarer. Selbsterhaltung drängt dort zur Vereinigung.

Seit bald einem halben Jahrhundert ist man dort darum auch mit Plänen zur Errichtung einer «Vereinigten Kirche» beschäftigt, in der die Christen anglikanischer Herkunft mit solchen methodistischer, baptistischer, presbyterianischer oder noch anderer reformatorischer Prägung ihre gemeinschaftliche kirchliche Einheit finden sollen. Im Laufe dieser Jahre sind viele und verschiedenartige Pläne

entworfen, abgeändert und aufs neue redigiert worden. Es war selbstverständlich, dass die Anglikaner in diesen Gebieten, welche bisher als mehr oder weniger selbständige Diözesen einen Teil der weltumfassenden Anglikanischen Kirchengemeinschaft bildeten, bei allen diesen Verhandlungen in dauernder Fühlungnahme mit der Mutterkirche in England waren. Demzufolge sind dann auch die Vorschläge und Pläne immer wieder Gegenstand von Erörterungen auf den Lambeth-Konferenzen der Anglikanischen Kirchen gewesen, welche wiederholt den Anglikanischen Diözesen der genannten Gebiete ihre wertvollen Ratschläge gaben.

Den Abschluss all dieser Verhandlungen bildete ein Plan, wonach eine «Kirche» auf Ceylon und eine für Nord-Indien und Pakistan gegründet werden solle, bestehend aus den dort befindlichen Anglikanern und einer Anzahl reformatorischer Bekenntnisgruppen («Denominationen»). Die bestimmte Folge einer derartigen Vereinigung von Anglikanern mit Kirchen reformatorischen Ursprungs muss sein, dass diese Anglikaner der grossen Anglikanischen Kirchengemeinschaft nicht mehr weiter angehören können. Es ist klar, dass dies beidseitig als ein Verlust betrachtet werden muss und dass vor allem der austretende Teil den Wunsch hat, alles in Bewegung zu setzen, um mit der alten Mutterkirche schliesslich doch ein neues Band zu knüpfen, das der alten Bindung möglichst nahe kommt. Den Schlüssel dazu soll eine Übereinkunft über «full communion» (volle kirchliche Gemeinschaft) nach denselben Grundsätzen wie diejenige zwischen Anglikanern und Altkatholiken bilden, somit ganz entsprechend der Übereinkunft von Bonn 1931.

Als nach vielen Jahren von Arbeit und Besinnung schliesslich die Pläne definitiv feststanden, alle Reglemente entworfen waren, alle liturgischen Formulare und die zu vollziehenden Massnahmen ihre endgültige Form erhalten hatten, wandte sich der Bischof der Anglikanischen Diözesen Ceylon, Nord-Indien, Burma und Pakistan an die Erzbischöfe von Canterbury und York mit der grundsätzlichen Frage, ob ihre Kirchenprovinzen mit der «neu zu formenden Kirchen» («proposed churches») eine Verbindung im Sinne der «full communion», der vollen kirchlichen Gemeinschaft einzugehen bereit wären, sobald diese Kirchen als gegründet gelten könnten. Die Lambeth-Konferenz des Jahres 1958 gab auf diese Fragen eine Antwort, welche eine Empfehlung an die verschiedenen Anglikanischen Kirchen bedeutete, aber die Entscheidung liegt ausschliesslich bei diesen Kirchen und sie beschliessen darüber in ihren offiziellen kirch-

lichen Synoden oder – wie diese in England heissen – in ihren «Convocations».

Zu verschiedenen Malen nun standen diese Anfragen in den Konvokationen von Canterbury und York auf der Tagesordnung, wo man zumindest allseits darauf einzugehen schien. Mit Nachdruck wurde hauptsächlich darauf hingewiesen, dass eine derartige Beziehung der «full communion» auf die Verbundenheit mit den altkatholischen Kirchen einen Einfluss haben könnte, welche seit 1931 diese volle kirchliche Gemeinschaft mit den Anglikanern kennen und praktizieren. Dies führte dazu, dass sowohl in der Konvokation von Canterbury als auch in derjenigen von York Stimmen laut und in der Folge auch Beschlüsse gefasst wurden, gemäss denen die Vorsitzenden, also die Erzbischöfe von Canterbury und York, aufgefordert wurden, dem Erzbischof von Utrecht die Frage vorzulegen, ob eine solche Verbindung zwischen den anglikanischen Kirchen und den «proposed churches» von Ceylon und Nord-Indien die bestehenden Beziehungen zwischen Anglikanern und Altkatholiken überhaupt oder nicht in ungünstiger Weise beeinflussen würde.

Diese Anfrage kam im März 1961, mit der Absicht, dass die beiden Erzbischöfe die altkatholische Stellungnahme rechtzeitig erhalten sollten im Blick auf die Konvokationen von Canterbury und York, welche anfangs Mai 1961 neuerdings über «Schema und Plan» zu beraten hätten. Die zur Verfügung stehende kurze Zeit bot dem Erzbischof von Utrecht keine hinreichende Gelegenheit, die Internationale Altkatholische Bischofskonferenz zur Beratung beizuziehen, so dass er lediglich eine ziemlich persönliche Antwort formulieren und dieselbe bloss seinen holländischen Mitbischöfen und dem Bischof der Schweiz, als dem Sekretär der genannten Bischofskonferenz, zur Informierung und Begutachtung unterbreiten konnte. Diese Antwort wurde beiden Anglikanischen Konvokationen durch ihre vorsitzenden Erzbischöfe bekanntgegeben. In beiden Konvokationen reichte es im Mai nur zur Behandlung des Gesuches um Anerkennung der «proposed church» von Ceylon, während dasjenige der «proposed church» von Nord-Indien/Pakistan erst im Oktober 1961 behandelt wurde.

Es darf als bekannt vorausgesetzt werden, dass die Beschlüsse der beiden Konvokationen vom Mai 1961 in bezug auf die «Kirche von Lanka» («proposed church of Ceylon») nicht endgültig waren und eine neue Behandlung im Oktober vergangenen Jahres notwendig machten. Diese Verzögerung gab dem Erzbischof von Utrecht die Gelegenheit, diese Frage doch noch der Internationalen

Altkatholischen Bischofskonferenz vorzulegen, welche Ende September in Haarlem zusammentrat. Das Ergebnis dieser Beratungen war eine «Erklärung» der Bischofskonferenz, welche nunmehr als offizielle altkatholische Antwort an die Erzbischöfe von Canterbury und York zuhanden der anfangs Oktober 1961 zusammengetretenen Konvokationen gesandt werden konnte. Die Entschliessungen dieser Konvokationen dürfen ebenfalls als bekannt vorausgesetzt werden.

Obgleich sowohl die Antwort des Erzbischofs von Utrecht vom 25. April 1961 als auch die Antwort der Bischofskonferenz von Ende September 1961, beide gerichtet an die Erzbischöfe von Canterbury und York, ein mehr oder weniger persönliches Gepräge haben, erhielten doch beide durch ihre Bekanntgabe in den Konvokationen beider Kirchenprovinzen eine offenkundige Publizität. Somit stand einer Veröffentlichung der beiden Antworten nichts mehr im Wege. Beide Erzbischöfe, von Canterbury und von York, gaben denn auch ihre Zustimmung zur geplanten Publikation der altkatholischen Antworten, welche hiernach nun erfolgt.

Es dürfte daraus hervorgehen, dass der altkatholische Standpunkt grosse Zurückhaltung zeigt und nicht uneingeschränkt den für Ceylon und Nord-Indien/Pakistan entworfenen Plänen zustimmen kann, dass aber trotzdem – oder gerade deshalb – keine endgültige Antwort gegeben werden kann auf die gestellten Fragen, ob eine allfällige Beziehung von «full communion» zwischen den anglikanischen Kirchen und den «proposed churches» das Verhältnis zwischen Anglikanern und Altkatholiken überhaupt oder nicht ungünstig beeinflussen werde.

Es dürfte auch deutlich sein, dass die altkatholische Bischofskonferenz längst nicht so umfassend mit allen Umständen, Faktoren, Motiven und Argumenten von Ceylon und Nord-Indien/Pakistan vertraut sein kann wie die anglikanischen Kirchen, und dass sie aus diesem Grunde vorläufig eine abwartende Haltung einzunehmen wünscht, vorläufig, d.h. so lange als die «proposed churches» noch nicht zu existieren begonnen haben. Im weiteren möge der Text der Antworten, der hier folgt, für sich selber sprechen. *A. R.*

Answers tho the Questions put by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Archbishop of Utrecht

The question of the Archbishop of Canterbury runs as follows:

If the Church of England expressed its willingness to enter into full communion with a Church of Lanka in accordance with the Scheme in its

present form, would the Old Catholic Churches consider that their relationships with the Church of England as set out in the Bonn Agreement still hold good or not?

The questions of the Archbishop of York run as follows:

1. If this Province (i.e. York) were to go into full communion with the proposed United Church of Lanka, would this affect our relations with the Old Catholic Churches?
2. If this Province (i.e. York) were to go into full communion with the proposed United Church of North India and Pakistan, would this affect our relations with the Old Catholic Churches?

Preliminaries

1. The time given to us is too short to formulate an answer voicing the opinion of the International Conference of the Old Catholic Bishops (IBC). Therefore, the following answer is only approved of by the undersigned and his suffragan Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer and by the Bishop of Switzerland, Dr. U. Küry, Secretary of the IBC. Though it may be expected that in future the IBC will agree with our answer, a certain reservation should nevertheless be made.

2. When being studied for the first time, to outsiders, as we are, the casus positio cannot be so clear as to the immediate involved parties. We do not know the geographical or ecclesiastical situations in the Provinces in question, nor do we know the social and political aspects, factors and motives, playing a part in the Scheme and Plan. For instance, we can see but little difference between the Scheme of Ceylon and the Plan of North India/Pakistan and we are therefore of the opinion that the following answer may hold good for both, without alterations.

3. To outsiders Bishop St. F. Bayne Jr.'s extremely useful and complete booklet "Ceylon, North India, Pakistan – a Study in Ecumenical Decision" lacks an immediate surveyability, at once and clearly indicating the crux of the matter. Therefore both "the Report of the Joint Committee on relations with the proposed Church of Lanka" and the detailed elucidation of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury were extremely clarifying to show us the way in the abundance of sources of the "Bayne-booklet".

4. It will be clear that the questions put to us cannot be answered simply by saying "yes" or "no". They demand motivation, which at the same time means the giving of a verdict about the Scheme and Plan, though strictly speaking that is not being asked of us. Nevertheless we feel obliged to express our opinion, so that the grounds our answer is based upon will be known.

May it be said beforehand that this judgment only means to represent our trend of thought, but not in the least thereby presumes to influence or direct your Convocations.

On the strength of what has been said sub 2 our judgment wants to be purely theoretical and principal, not considering local circumstances, factors and motivs that have led to the drafting of this very Scheme and Plan.

Our answer

It is impossible that this answer could be a blunt "no" or "yes".

To avoid confusions: "yes" means: "the relationship still holds good (Canterbury), "it will not affect the relations" (York); a "no" means the opposite: "will not hold good", "will indeed affect".

If we merely say "yes" this would be unjustified, as in fact the proposed Union does not yet exist and no one can say how, with every exactness of the well defined proposals, things will develop in practice. So long as the Union still is a "proposed" one it may be possible for us to answer "yes". The fact is that we may disapprove of the proposals, but at the same time are of the opinion that this need not trouble the relations between the Anglican Communion and the Old Catholic Churches so long as the terms of the Bonn Agreement are not affected between these two.

The same holds good for a mere "no", i.e. "the relationship will be affected". For this would require a simultaneous statement as to how far this relationship would be affected, troubled or violated. This is however only possible if practice would prove to what extent a full communion-relationship between the proposed United Church(es) and the Churches of the Anglican Communion would affect the latter in an essential deteriorating sense in regard to their character as real Catholic Churches originating from the Church of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. This "practice" does not exist so long as the United Churches have not come into existence.

Our answer must start from the first term of the Bonn Agreement, stating that nothing can and may violate the present relation between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches, so long as can be said: "Each Communion recognizes the *catholicity* and independence of the other and maintains its own."

In the matter concerned there lies in the word "*catholicity*" the final principle that must underlie our answer and must remain at the root of it. This catholicity reveals itself in the agreement and unity in doctrine, in the conception of the sacraments (which includes the conception about the essence of liturgy) and in order. These conceptions need not be further amplified here. – We might also say to be convinced that the Anglican Communion itself, even if entering into a relationship with a united Church showing less clearly the catholicity conceptions already mentioned, by doing this would not automatically distract anything from its own, ever professed conception of catholicity, so long as the Anglican Communion maintains and conditions the terms of the Lambeth Quadrilateral as minimum-marks of catholicity.

But there is a possibility of difference of opinion in the third term of the Bonn Agreement in which it is said that if each (Communion) believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith this does *not* require "the acceptance of all *doctrinal opinion*, sacramental devotion or liturgical practice characteristic of the other".–Here remains always the imminent danger that what is called "doctrinal opinion" by one is part of "the essentials of the Christian Faith" in the other's eyes.

We do not disguise that this danger is present in the proposed Scheme and Plan. And if the Anglican Communion, without any restrictions, would agree with all expressed, or less clearly expressed or even unspoken conceptions of Scheme and Plan, the possibility of a difference of opinion between Anglicans and Old Catholics in regard to the interpretation of the Agreement would become real. And this would possibly "affect our relationship" and might require a restriction to our otherwise inconditional "yes".

This leads automatically to

Our arguments

which give our verdict on certain points, forms and principles of Scheme and Plan.

There cannot exist any doubt about our complete agreement with the arguments that have been developed in the "Minority Report on the Church of Lanka". It may go without saying that some arguments (as e.g. "disappearance of the Anglican Communion") appeal less convincingly to us than to the "Anglican". But especially everything said under the titles "the Unification Rites", "Relations with Parent Churches" and "Lack of integrity" has our full agreement, while on the other hand we cannot sympathize with the reassuring argumentation on these points in the Majority Report. Though rightly this Report starts from the principle "to be vigilant that nothing should be done by the Church of England to compromise the catholicity of its own faith and order", after studying the different proposed rites in the Bayne-booklet and as reviewed, explained and criticized in the Report, we cannot declare that there need not be any fear of "compromizing".–What we miss is *certitude, unambiguousness.*

We do not in the less doubt the sincerety and earnestness of the intentions, but if in the "proposed" acts and rites already these intentions not reveal themselves clearly and unambiguously to the extent that every doubt and difference of interpretation may be called excluded, there is no reasonable ground that the practice of the future should present absolute certitude indeed.

Be it permitted for us to formulate our opinion in some points.

a) By an act, rite or declaration of unification a United Church is being created, which at the same time presents itself as a part of the One Catholic

Church, but all this is based upon the organizational resolutions and acts rather than on an unquestionable unity of conception with regard to the significance of the ministries, in other words the organization prevails upon the question of truth.

b) Each other's ministries are recognized as real ministries, "ministries of Christ in his Word and Sacraments", but this is done without further investigation or decisive argumentation.

c) It is recognized that as a result of the at present divided state of Christendom all ministries are "limited in scope and authority" and do not possess the seal of the whole Church.

– In our view both *b* and *c* are already two points exclusively detrimental to Anglicanism: the "catholic" abandons something of which he ought to be convinced he does possess it. –

d) A theory of "supplemental or conditional consecration or ordination" is applied, in other words acts are performed, which are supposed to supply deficiences where this would be necessary, and not to do this where not necessary. But in doing so, it is not stated when, where and to whom deficiences are really supplied, and when, where and to whom not and therefore nothing happens.

e) Everybody must be subject to this act even though–as must be expected from a duly consecrated Anglican bishop or duly ordained Anglican priest–in his own conviction he has been perfectly catholic consecrated or ordained "in the Church of God". This implies that to anybody being of this conviction, to be subject to the rites of unification is a mere pretence and may be felt to be profanation.

f) The Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum is proposed as the central and common Creed for the United Church, but otherwise every joining "denomination" is allowed to keep its own–which means here: reformed–confession as absolutely valid. In our opinion the only result can be that every part of the United Church preserves its own former character. In future too, one continues to be Anglican, Methodist, Baptist etc. The only so-called acquired gain would be that an Anglican minister may also celebrate in the Methodist, Baptist etc. part, and the other way round, even if the "doctrinal opinions" (e.g. think of the deep-lying differences in conception of Baptism, Eucharist and Order) oppose each other, often exclude each other.–Here we only see an administering unity, not a unity of faith.

We should like to add the following remarks.

The opinion that at present in a divided church *all ministries are defective, not only in jurisdiction, but also in grace, character* and *authority*, strikes us as an essentially *unacceptable* starting point. We must deny this flatly.

Confusion of "church" and "denomination" but also of jurisdiction and authority and of order and commission prevails here.

If the Archbishop of Canterbury is called "Primate of All-England", this means that, as the successor to the ancient See of God's Church in England, he possesses authority over all who in "All England" are baptized in the Church of God. Those who withdraw from his authority are disobedient. There may be thousands or even millions of disobedient people, so that their lawful Archbishop cannot exercise his jurisdiction over them, this does not deprive him of his authority granted to him by God. The Church of England is not a mere denomination, it is the Church of God in England and its Archbishops, its Bishops and its Priests are not lacking in any way in "grace, character and authority".

Therefore, if the Church of England wants to enter into full communion with another Church, she must be convinced that the ministry of that other church is holding the same grace, character and authority. In so far it does not possess these, the Church of England or another duly acknowledged part of the Church of God should confer its orders, originating from the time of Christ and his Apostles, to that church which is lacking in grace, character and authority. This administering, conveying, handing-on of orders is an invariable sacramental act of the Church of God and it cannot be replaced by a new act–conditional or supplemental–, which would also include bishops and priests already duly consecrated or ordained to the Church of God. Such an act would be either a new kind of sacrament, or an act with a double character, as the Church has never known. Rightly it is said in the Bayne-booklet that the Unification Rite is a "new act" and "has no historical precedent". For that very reason such an act *cannot be the foundation* for a unity in orders in the Church of God.

Expressing hope and confidence that God will regard such an act as a restauration of unity means overlooking the way the Church of God has followed through the ages. With all earnestness, sincerity and faith in the power of prayer which we are willing to recognize in such an act, it nevertheless remains an act of precarious sentimentalism and for the practice of the future it will remain a source of ambiguity and incertitude.

If the submission of our Lord to the Baptism of St. John is quoted here as an argument that would give liberty to already in the Church of God ordained priests and consecrated bishops to be subject to such a "new act" of unification rites, "*to fulfill all righteousness*", we must rejoin that the position of Christ as being the Founder of the Church and being without sin, was absolutely otherwise than the position of his ministers in his Church, who have not been sent to fulfill all righteousness in the absolute sense as Christ did, but to fulfill "*His*" righteousness, i.e. to obey Him in the ways and the means He has given them.

We must also lay stress on our objection that we do not believe the most fundamental principle, the unity of faith, to be sufficiently warranted. Apart from the question whether the faith of the Church of the first five or six

centuries has found its full expression in the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum – faith is more than doctrine –, to us the question arises if not the unity of faith searched for and anchored in this symbolum is again being unsettled by allowing confessions of much later time and of reformatorical origin to be maintained. The fact is being lost sight of that some of those confessions in fact have been drawn up to combat or deny certain points of the faith professed by the Catholic Church until then. We already pointed this out under *f*. We deem the possibility very real indeed that in Baptism, Eucharist and Orders a minister of the "United Church" will be administering something that is not acknowledged or is even denied by his flock, or that his flock will be awaiting to receive something through the hands of its minister which he is not intended to give them.

Here lies the imminent danger we already pointed out in the paragraph "Our Answer". There must not be an endeavour to minimalize the "essentials of the Christian Faith" to the profit of the "doctrinal opinions". We are convinced that the Church in all its appearances of nations and languages cannot have the same and identical system of "dogmatics", but we are equally convinced that its "dogma" is one and immutable. The Church of today in its praiseworthy and necessary pursuit "in oecumenicis" of restauration of lost unity will have to see to it that in this pursuit it does not overlook and neglect its equally great duty to exercise and maintain a "sound theology".

We ask forgiveness if perhaps we may have expressed some of the things as they have been written above in a somewhat too severe way. It is not our intention to say what the Convocations have to decide, – we have only wanted to reply to the questions put to us and we have tried to account for this answer. We pray that the Convocations may find the way that is the only right and correct one in the eyes of God, which may also convince and show the way to the seeking "churches", the way which entirely safeguards the catholicity of the Anglican heritage and serves only and exclusively the glory of God's Kingdom.

Utrecht, 25. April 1961.

† *Andreas Rinkel*, Archiepiscopus Ultraiectensis

Declaration of the International Bishops Conference

The International Conference of Old Catholic Bishops (IBC), together at Haarlem, on September 22. 1961, having taken cognizance of the answer given by the Archbishop of Utrecht and approved of by some members of the IBC, to the questions put to him by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York on behalf of their Convocations of May 1961, declares to be in agreement with the contents of this answer.

The IBC ascertains that the purport of the questions was whether or not an agreement of full communion of the Provinces of Canterbury and York with the proposed Churches of Lanka and of North India/Pakistan would affect the relations with the Old Catholic Churches.

The IBC ascertains that answering with a definite "yes" or "no" is out of the question, as the problem of intercommunion or full communion can only be raised between *existing* churches and that on the grounds of interpretation and function of bible, tradition, creeds, ministry and sacraments in these churches.

On these grounds the IBC takes the liberty to express its uneasiness about Scheme and Plan, which after having been studied, lead to the following remarks:

1. Full communion, in the opinion of the IBC, demands besides recognition of each other's independence as a positive factor the conviction and recognition of each other's catholicity. This catholicity must reveal itself in faith and order. Both unity in faith and unity in order are essential conditions.

2. On this issue Scheme and Plan are not so clear that they guarantee sufficient certainty. The IBC is entirely convinced of the integrity of the intentions, but not of the correctness and unambiguousness of the means and ways.

3. It remains uncertain whether the proposed formula really wants to be an ordination to the priesthood of the catholic church, or not, or only conditionally.

   There is uncertainty whether the recipient is really willing to receive a "catholic ordination" and is convinced that his "ministry" so far has been insufficient and defective. There remains uncertainty about the intrinsic significance of episcopacy, which endangers the catholicity of this office, and which does not make it conclusively acceptable for the church universal.

4. There remain uncertainties in the domain of the catholic faith. Confessions and catechisms of later date, which on certain points are contrary to the creed of the early church and to the elucidation the church of all ages has given of it, cannot be left in force and kept in use.–There is great uncertainty about baptism and its application.–There is an uncertainty about the catholic meaning of the Eucharist.

5. There remain anomalies regarding the possibility of inviting and accepting unbaptized persons into the membership of the "church" and unordained men to official acts of the "church". There remains the possibility that women will be accepted into the priesthood, which the IBC deems contrary to the catholicity of the ministry of the church.

6. These and similar uncertainties exclude the possibility of intercommunion or full communion between the Old Catholic churches and the "proposed churches". Moreover they create the danger that the now existing full communion with a church of the Anglican Communion would get lost if this church merged in one of the proposed churches.
7. In all this the IBC sees no motive to alter its relations with the churches of the Anglican Communion, based on the Bonn Agreement of 1931, but it does not disguise from itself that here are dangers extant, especially in acts of the church or sacramental functions into which the Anglican Churches would wish to draw both the Old Catholic churches and the "proposed churches".
8. The IBC is convinced that all these uncertainties will be given as much weight in the Orthodox world and it therefore ventures to express the wish that renewed studying of Scheme and Plan might remove these uncertainties before the churches of the Anglican Communion would come to a definite decision.

On behalf of the International Conference of Old Catholic Bishops,

The President:	The Secretary:
† *Andreas Rinkel,*	† *Urs Küry,*
Archbishop of Utrecht	Bishop of Switzerland