

AN
ORTHODOX
RESPONSE
TO THE
PRELIMINARY DRAFT
FOR THE
FOURTH ASSEMBLY
OF THE
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
TO BE HELD AT
UPPSALA,
BY THE
ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL
SOCIETY OF AMERICA.

FELLOWSHIP OF SAINT ALBAN AND SAINT SERGIUS
LONDON
1968

INTRODUCTION

'AN ORTHODOX RESPONSE: to the Uppsala Assembly Preparatory Drafts' is a project undertaken by the Orthodox Theological Society in America in connection with the Uppsala Assembly of the World Council of Churches.

The Orthodox Theological Society in America was founded two years ago under the auspices of the Standing Conference of the Orthodox Bishops in America. Membership includes nearly the entire faculties of the Holy Cross Theological School in Brookline and of Saint Vladimir's Seminary in Crestwood who, with others, make a total of about forty. At the annual meeting held last January at Brookline it was decided that the Society might contribute to the Orthodox participation in the Uppsala Assembly if its members, a group of Orthodox theologians living and working in the West, would corporately respond to the various drafts prepared for the Uppsala Assembly, and share their ideas with those whose responsibility it will be to express the Orthodox point of view at that Assembly.

Teams of three or four theologians were assigned to work on each of the six section drafts. In May, at a special meeting in Brookline, the society met and discussed the reports of these teams. The members modified the drafts so that the present document expresses the consensus of the Society. As such the Society puts them out as its common response to the preparatory drafts. It should be stated, though, that this response has no official status, and is simply the expression of a consensus reached by a group of Orthodox theologians in America. It is their hope that it may be of some help not only to the Orthodox delegates at Uppsala but also to other participants in the Assembly.

Throughout the response it will be noted that two

themes dominate the concerns of those responsible for it. The first is the question of the nature of the Church and the meaning of the Church's unity. The second issue emphasized by the preliminary drafts is the mission of the Church as related to the condition and process of secularization. Throughout the response issues are raised and positions indicated where, it is felt, the preliminary drafts do not adequately express the fullness of the truth of the Church. It is felt that it is on these issues that the Orthodox representatives at Uppsala can best make their witness.

The Society gratefully acknowledges the publication of this Response by the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, acting through its Greater Boston Branch, and made possible by the generosity of the Misses Mary and Anna Dowd of Worcester, Massachusetts.

The Orthodox Theological Society
in America.

SECTION I

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH.

Preliminary Remarks.

The Draft for Section I was prepared by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches meeting in Bristol in 1967. It should be emphasized, however, that the Commission approved only the draft itself (pp 5112), not the Commentary. The latter, therefore, as E.C. Blake clearly states in his Foreword, 'will not be regarded as Assembly business' (p.6). The Commentary has been prepared by individual Faith and Order members and edited by the Staff: it represents, therefore, their reactions to the Draft, which they present as a help to Assembly participants.

It may be argued that the presence of this Commentary adds to the unavoidable ambiguity of the document, by giving it a onesided interpretation. Without entering into argument with the Commentary we will attempt to reflect, as Orthodox theologians, only on the draft.

I. Gift and Quest.

The draft consciously attempts to embrace the divergent standpoints of member churches and, therefore, is consciously ambivalent and ambiguous. For example, catholicity is said to be an attribute of the Church, presumably abiding, yet also a call to be realised. The Church is said to be, insofar as it exists by virtue of the Holy Spirit, always Catholic, yet 'becomes' Catholic constantly anew. The Holy Spirit is seen as the basis of catholicity, presumably enduring, yet also as the force which 'leads' to catholicity. The underlying presupposition behind these statements, which presupposition the Draft holds in full awareness, is the conviction principle that the separated churches have somehow

(Section I, 2nd page)

a given unity ('gift'), yet seek to realise it visibly ('quest') which is the aim and task of the World Council of Churches. This presupposition is reflected most clearly in statements such as: 'The Spirit maintains the Church in continuity through all ages, including past, present, and future, however hidden this continuity may be' (9), and in the leading question: 'When will God's gift of unity in the Spirit lead us to a visible union..?' (11).

On the surface of the draft, the fundamental problem concerns the relationship between catholicity as an attribute and as a calling; an abiding mark of the Church and a becoming; which is to say, between the Holy Spirit as a permanent gift to the Church and as a power that leads (- but where and on what basis?). From the Orthodox point of view, the second set of terms grows integrally out of the first; no separation is possible. However, it must be noted that on the theoretical and abstract level the ambiguity could be resolved in a manner acceptable to many participating members. Indeed the draft itself is not unaware of the fact that attribute and calling, being and becoming, 'gift' and 'quest' are intrinsically related.

II. The Una Sancta.

The deeper issue, therefore, is the de facto separation of the churches. This is sharpest as seen from the Orthodox standpoint, since for the Orthodox the Church, integrally One, Catholic and Apostolic, is historically identifiable as the Holy Orthodox Church. The absolutist claim of the Orthodox Church as the Una Sancta is the primary source of tension at all levels of confrontation and dialogue within the World Council. From a formalistic point of view, the question can be reduced fundamentally to this: What are the distinguishing characteristics which constitute the Church and make it truly Catholic? If the Draft really means what it says on page one

(Section I, 3rd page)

about using the term 'catholicity' as it is used in the creeds of the ancient Church, then it makes a serious commitment to the full doctrinal, sacramental and administrative structure of the ancient Church; Ignatius, who first used the term 'Catholic Church', is certainly a strong witness to such a structure. That commitment, however, is weakened by the Draft's ambiguity concerning the Church being and becoming Catholic; an ambiguity which can be resolved only when the Churches begin to talk about specifics.

In fact the Orthodox Church's belief that it is the Una Sancta raises the question of the nature of its participation, and the wisdom of its involvement, in the World Council. It is fruitless to discuss subsidiary aspects and issues of theology, especially if only on an abstract plane, unless they are directly related to the basic problems of daily encounter. We can agree that the Holy Spirit 'makes Christ's sovereignty and power a present reality' for the Church (paragraph 7). We can agree that the Holy Spirit is 'both the bond of unity and the source of diverse gifts' (paragraph 14). We may also make pleas for different stresses and emphases. For example, a stronger emphasis on the Resurrection dimension in paragraph 6 would be more congenial to Orthodox theology, while the strong awareness of social and international problems in the Draft is not shared by the Orthodox (c.f. paragraphs 4 & 12).

III Points for Debate.

From an Orthodox standpoint, truly engaging discussion can continue on the basis of the following perspectives:

1. The member churches must take history very seriously, that is the history of the Church as an ongoing people. Catholicity and historical continuity are inextricably bound together; doctrinally, sacramentally, and administratively. Those Churches of the World Council which truly wish to engage in meaningful dialogue with the

Section I, 4th page)

Orthodox Church must seek to clarify for themselves and for the Orthodox Church now much of the structure of the ancient Catholic Church they are willing to accept as normative for 'catholicity'.

2. At the same time the Orthodox, too, have a responsibility to work towards establishing the normative structure of catholicity. Is the total of accumulated traditions the essential expression of the Una Sancta? This would be absurd for, in fact, within the Orthodox Church there has always been variety and diversity, which legitimately illustrate the Church's catholicity without harming its unity. However, the Orthodox Church must determine those elements which are the necessary signs of the Una Sancta and remain faithful to these in its own life and practice. This is the condition of a valid ecumenical witness.
3. The two preceding issues raise again the problem of the distinction between 'Tradition' and 'traditions' - the subject of a long-standing debate in Faith and Order. This should help to clarify matters when delegates debate such statements as 'The Spirit maintains the Church in continuity through all ages, including past, present, and future, however hidden this continuity may be (paragraph 7), and '(The Spirit) creates a rich variety of forms and ways which sometimes appear to conflict (paragraph 14). Such statements cannot be understood by the Orthodox as meaning that Christianity is necessarily divided 'in appearance' and united in its 'depth'. Holy Tradition is One, precisely in its visible continuity, through the guidance of the Spirit bestowed upon the Church, while human traditions can be legitimately diverse.

(Section I, 5th page)

4. The document does not pay sufficient attention to the radical difference between notions of positive diversity and contradiction. Positive diversity only enriches the life of the Church and is indeed an expression of its catholicity, but contradictions - whether they are based on misunderstanding or on real differences - are obviously evil, and do create heresies and schisms.
5. Close attention should be given by Orthodox delegates to the attitude ascribed to 'some Christians' in paragraph 12. These Christians, who play a vocal and leading role in the ecumenical movement today, often confuse the secular notions of 'peace', 'reconciliation', 'unity', 'solidarity', with the unity given by and in Christ. The resulting substitution is theologically wrong and challenges the very content of the Gospel. The issue raised in this paragraph may be the major one for the Uppsala Assembly.
6. The claim of the Orthodox Church to be the Una Sancta implies the question: What, in our view, is the ecclesiological status of the other member churches of the World Council? As expressed in the Lund Statement, eucharistic communion presupposes membership in the One Church of Christ. Such a mutually acknowledged membership is also the precondition for any ecumenical assembly to assume the role of an 'Universal Council' (see Commentary, pg 18). Also, until such membership in the Una Sancta becomes mutually and fully recognizable it is, at least, ambiguous to make a distinction between 'obedience to the Gospel' and 'confessional.... loyalties' (paragraph 10), the two being spiritually, sacramentally, and doctrinally identical.

Those who prepared the Draft of Section I were not unaware of the great problems and the size of

(Section I, 7th page)(Section II)
the task imposed by these issues. The Draft begins by, more or less, assuming unity as a 'gift' but ends, significantly, with the 'quest' by pointing sharply to the fact of separation and disagreements (paragraphs 13-16). The only possible recourse is to concentrate on those disagreements as specifically as possible, basing one's judgement upon Scripture, Tradition and the activity of the Spirit in the present.

Therefore, while Orthodox must certainly seek the road of renewal and repentance in order to be highly sensitive to the stirrings of the Holy Spirit, it is also their solemn duty to emphasize the historical origins of the Church, which constitute the only acceptable foundation of its historical continuity and its witness in the twentieth century.

SECTION II

RENEWAL IN MISSION

The task of the Uppsala Assembly, in its six sections, is to issue covering statements to the member churches with specific recommendations as to the manner in which they may effectively translate into their own thought and action the theses and implications of the documents which the Assembly will adopt. The main concern is to speak as ecumenically as possible about the most relevant and specific issues of our contemporary situation, without prejudice to or compromise of the ecclesiological self-awareness and identity of the member churches. It is in this light that the following criticisms and observations are made on the documents of Section II.

The concepts of 'new humanity' and 'mature manhood' as used in Section II (Paragraphs 1,2,4,5) are deficient without specific reference to and

(Section II, 2nd page)
explicit connection with the historical Una Sancta. 'New humanity' must be seen in the context of the Church as the inauguration of the new age and as the sacramental institution in and through which a moving, dynamic, powerful, process of regeneration of individual Christians and all creation takes place in Jesus Christ and by the Holy Spirit. In spite of the increasing awareness and appreciation of the inseparable connection between Church and Mission recently, very little current thought and study is reflected in this document.

It is within the Mystery of the Church that the new humanity and God's mission takes form and meaning. It is through the Church as redeeming and renewing humanity that God converts us to Himself. The mission of the Church is to proclaim God's renewing love and His grace, as saving truth and communion with Him; to those outside the Church and to those within whose faith has become nominal or dormant.

The consumation of all things in God, the ultimate eschatological fulfillment, the absolute Glory of God filling the entire cosmos, is the final goal of mission. In this present 'time of the Lord' (kairos Kyriou), in this present 'age of the Church', in this process of passover from the old to the new already begun in Jesus Christ and directed by the Holy Spirit, God's mission and the Church's mission are one. All men are called to be converted and become living members of the visible, eucharistic and charismatic communion - the Body of Christ - through faith and baptism. The task of every Christian within the Church is to seek the personal conversion of all men to God. This is done, in the first instance, through the explicit proclamation of the saving truth of God's Love in Christ, but also through authentic Christian diakonia and through the maintenance of a reconciling presence in the world. Within that concrete reality, within the sacramental institution of the Church, there is a transmission of the divine life and the 'new

(Section II, 3rd page)
humanity' is born and nurtured.

Renewal and mission must be understood in the context of the Church as the inauguration of the Kingdom of God which is organically connected to the whole creation and human history. But this Kingdom is not of this world. Rather, it is the transfiguration of all creation into divine life and blessedness. There is still 'this world' which stands under judgement and condemnation already by its denial and rejection of the new world. 'This world' must either be defeated or recreated through the dynamic Lordship of Christ in the Church, through the positive witness to God's promise and the communication of His divine life in the sacraments and in service.

In this sense, 'we dare to make our business the problem of the world's agenda' (paragraph 3). But can we say that the understanding or misunderstanding of what God is doing in His Son is unnecessary to renewal? Is it possible to avoid the problem of truth and saving knowledge at the expense of a vague call to action? Renewal, mission, unity - for that matter the whole ecumenical endeavour - depend entirely and precisely upon our understanding of what God is doing in His Son as confirmed by the Holy Spirit (cf. St. John 16;13). Renewal takes place in the truth and the sure knowledge of what God has done mightily in history; the power for renewal and for transformation of this world is given within the body of the fullness of truth. Unity is guaranteed within the profession of the true faith; the apostolic kerygma is a pure and true proclamation of God's salvation. We must answer to the needs of our day, but always out of the knowledge of the saving truth and in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Simply to join other men who strive to work with God in service to the world (how can this be done without criteria established in the Gospel anyway?), without, at the same time, strictly preserving and witnessing to the

(Section II, 4th page)(Section III)
crucial and definitive character of unique salvation in Jesus Christ, is the very betrayal of the Christian mission!

It is with this unfailing vision of the truth which has been granted to us by God's revelation that we dare to undertake the mission in the broad sense at the 'points of tension'. But we must clearly affirm that everything in the world and every person is a point of tension and that God's mission must be directed to the total human situation. In fact we find a dangerous and misleading confusion in the uses of the term 'mission' in Parts II and III of this document. We have already indicated that the mission of the Church is the proclamation of the apostolic kerygma and the establishment of the sacramental fellowship of life in every place. To undertake a vast program of social, political, and economic involvement, to analyze our secularistic and pluralistic environment, to meet the material needs of the world, belongs to the sphere of missionary cooperation and ecumenical activity only in a broad sense. This can and must be done by each member church of the World Council on an ecumenical basis wherever possible, but without compromise or reduction of the essential truth, unity, mission, and integrity of the Church. We are not to confuse the mission of the Orthodox Church with ecumenical cooperation and service, since mission is a task of the Church and is at the essential level of its life, whereas cooperation and service can and must take place in ecumenical fellowship and community.

SECTION III.

WORLD ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

The preliminary Draft for Section III of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches deals with the vast and highly complicated issue of 'World Economic and Social Development'. To expect that a

(Section III, 2nd page)

Christian position can be expressed and delineated on this question in seven pages is of course unrealistic. The Draft points to many real and serious problems and raises great and difficult questions concerning the twentieth century's struggle for economic and social development. Much of what is contained in the Draft is self-evident. As Orthodox Christians, then, there are only a few areas in which we would or could disagree with the affirmations of the Draft; and further, we too sense the profound difficulties in finding correct answers to the specific questions raised.

Yet, in spite of this general agreement and common perplexity in facing the specifics as presented in the Draft it seems to us that a dimension of the whole **issue** has been overlooked. Running through the whole draft are two tacit assumptions. The first is that injustice is almost exclusively a question of economic disparity between poor and rich nations. The second, and obverse aspect of the first, is that social development is related exclusively to economic factors and to the political dimensions which tend to increase or decrease disparity. There seems to be an uncritical assumption that wealth solves problems of justice and injustice as well as providing the key to social well-being.

Of course, the Christian requirement of the 'feeding of the poor and hungry' demands concern with and even anxiety for the economic aspects of international relations. We do not mean to discount it in the least. Yet, as Christians addressing ourselves to questions of justice and social development, the quality of life and the non-economic aspects of justice ought also to be emphasised. The Christian judgement on the primacy of spiritual values over other factors ought surely to inform such a statement. The Orthodox Christian understanding that our goal as children of God is to become truly human in our

(Section III, 3rd page)

individual and social existence impels us to emphasize the need for Christians to consider dimensions of human development other than the purely economic and political.

Thus, under the guidance of the Gospel, the rich as individuals and nations ought to be challenged with the call to self-sacrifice for the welfare of their neighbours. The statement could well point out that those nations within which are stratifications of socio-economic classes are denying the elementary concepts of human brotherhood. The rich nations and people should be challenged to a re-evaluation of their own values, to the submission of material superfluity to the greater demands of **spiritual, moral,** and intellectual development, on the basis of the Christian view of man.

The needs of poor nations and individuals and their right to adequate living standards must be championed, but the Church must point here also to dimensions of life which transcend materialistic concern. We do not fulfil our task as Churches if we simply urge that the poor become rich, for in this case we inflict upon the former the malaise from which the wealthy suffer and for which we are also concerned.

There are values in national, tribal, and other particularist cultures which ought to be preserved and deepened; there are the personal dimensions of human development per se which ought to be held up before all who are involved in this effort; there is the affirmation which the Church must keep before all men if she is to be true to herself - that the **tragedy** of the human situation has its beginnings in the sinfulness of men and human institutions, and that, even tentative, changing solutions require the saving redeeming, and reconciling power of Jesus Christ in the life of men and nations. The restoration of **human potentiality** is accomplished in Jesus Christ and there is not restoration of true humanity whether we be rich

(Section III, 4th page)(Section IV)
or poor, powerful or weak, black or white, without Him.

In short, if Christians and Christian Churches do no more than point to the problems of economic disparity they have abdicated their most unique role. As a spiritual and moral force in the lives of men, as a force for the transcendence and sanctification of the material, they must point to the need to seek first the Kingdom of God in human existence.

SECTION IV.

TOWARDS JUSTICE AND PEACE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.

This Section, like the last, consists, in both Draft and Commentary, of vague and general affirmations to which no man of decency, Christian or non-Christian, could take exception. Perhaps little more could be expected from an organisation like the W.C.C. which embraces so wide a range of political opinions; on the other hand it is beyond doubt that the Orthodox Churches of the several nations and jurisdictions represent the extreme wings of these differences. It seems advisable that the Orthodox delegation should express itself on this section with the greatest caution.

Nevertheless, the Orthodox Christian will miss here several elements essential to a realistic Christian critique of an international society which has an integrity of its own and operates by its own laws. The document occasionally adopts the tone of those who know best, although in fact ecclesiastical staffs are often incompetent to judge in international affairs. It would be far more appropriate to call the leaders of the Church to a humble recognition that Christian influence in this area is usually, and ought to be, very limited.

Moreover, the document makes no attempt to describe the transformations of international society

(Section IV, 2nd page)(Section V)
necessary even to the attainment of the modest goals described, much less to the attainment of a society somehow reflecting the love of the Eternal God for His creation. Neither its intimations of the glory stored up for us nor its recognition of the powers of evil in the world which obstruct His will are sufficiently radical.

Finally, the document leaves no place in international society for the claims of the Christian Church - that it is, and ought to be, the model of peace and concord for the world. In particular, Orthodox Christians may reasonably ask that the World Council should explicitly draw attention to all states and societies which legally restrict the practice of religion, in the hope that a fair, courageous, and consistent stand on the question will lend greater weight to pronouncements otherwise liable to the suspicion of political bias.

SECTION V

THE WORSHIP OF GOD IN A SECULAR AGE.

An Orthodox Christian will undoubtedly respond to Section V with mixed feelings. He will, of course, welcome the prominent place given to worship on the agenda of the Assembly. He will not deny that our confused and complex age has caused a crisis in the understanding and the experience of worship which confronts us with many questions as to its relation to our individual lives and to the common life in the world. He will appreciate the many pertinent and constructive suggestions in the Draft.

We feel it necessary, however, to concentrate our response on what we consider to be the basic deficiency, not of particular statements, but of the document's fundamental orientation. The root of this deficiency is the assumption (common, in fact, to all Sections) that the 'secular age' creates a situation for the

(Section V, 2nd page)

Church so radically new that an equally radical evaluation of Christianity is necessary which embraces worship, unity, spiritual renewal, theological conversation. It is this assumption that only a world-centered and world-orientated Christianity is possible and permissible for Christians to-day that makes Section V an unconvincing mixture of arbitrary questions and debatable definitions.

The Church has always understood her leitourgia, and lived it, as above all a gift of God in Christ by the Holy Spirit; the worship in Spirit and in Truth into which a Christian enters and into which he can enter only because in Baptism he has died to 'this world' and in the Sacrament of the Holy Spirit he has received the gift of Communion in the 'world to come'. In the Eucharist he is given access to Christ's table in His Kingdom. So the basic ordo (typos) or structure and forms of the Liturgy are the manifestation of, and communion with, the eternal unchanging and spiritual reality of the Kingdom of God, rather than symbols of this world's changing and contingent situations. Hence the Liturgy has always been understood primarily as an act of withdrawal from the world, the fulfillment of the Church as being in, but not of the world.

We detect today a powerful trend to change this initial understanding and experience of worship; to make it primarily the symbolical expression of the various needs and 'priorities' of human society, etc. We feel compelled to reject this drastic change not in the name of a mystical, quietistic and escapist understanding of worship, but in the name of the very truth of Christianity in which the only measure of 'this world', the only means of its proper understanding and evaluation, the only motivation of Christian action in it, is to be found not in the world itself, but in the revelation of the Divine Kingdom, as revealed to us in Christ and bestowed upon the Church by the Holy Spirit. Of this manifestation of its abiding

(Section V, 3rd page) (Section VI)

and transforming power, worship is the very gift and means. It is because Christians, in their leitourgia withdraw from the world that they can recover it not in their human, broken, and partial knowledge of it, but in all its depth as God's creation, as the realm of the prince of this world, as the object of redemption and as 'means of salvation'. In other words it is in worship, in the living communion between God and man, that secularism - the world closed to God and self-concern - can be overcome and all genuine secular values restored to their spiritual significance.

We do not deny the need for a deeper study of the historical forms of worship, for a better understanding of its unchanging and changing elements, for its purification from many distortions and we fully understand the need for renewed methods of liturgical education. We appreciate the very substantial progress made in recent years in one common study of Baptism, Eucharist, and other forms of worship. We want to uphold, however, a certain liturgical discipline for our age as well as our absolute conviction that the lex orandi is the lex credendi, that the totality of faith and love of God, expressed in the liturgy of the Church, are 'in our secular age' the place from which the Church can best witness to the power of the Holy Spirit.

SECTION VI

TOWARDS A NEW STYLE OF LIVING

In this Section we are concerned with the question of how contemporary Christians should live the way of life revealed by Christ. After raising this basic question, the Draft outlines five areas in contemporary society which are to be taken as specific problems in which a new Christian style of living must be discovered:

- a) Youth and Age;
- b) The Old and the New;

(Section VI, 2nd page.)

- c) The Rich and the Poor;
- d) Men and Women;
- e) Personal Decision in Community.

Although these particular areas of 'opposition' confront Christians to-day with an intensity and urgency perhaps greater than ever before, it still remains true that these 'oppositions' are inevitable human problems which have constituted life in this world and which will continue to exist until the summing-up of all things in Christ with His destruction of evil. They cannot be considered as in themselves exhaustive of the total reality of Christian living or to be the sole determining factors in the formation of its 'style', nor is the task of overcoming these and all 'oppositions' and tensions of human existence to be accomplished primarily, and certainly not exclusively, by a social and political recasting of the 'evil structures' of the world in which we live.

The style of living for a Christian is formed primarily by the vision and experience given to him in the inner life of the Church, as the channel of Grace, as sacramental reality, and as the Kingdom of God in which we confess our faith when we proclaim that we 'believe in' the Church. It is a reality through which the tensions of the life of this world are seen and experienced and lived as already overcome. This is the witness of the Early Church which testifies that in Christ's Body there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, young nor old, rich nor poor. If there is a judgement upon Christians today - and there certainly is - it is not that they have failed to reshape the political structures and social realities of this world to overcome the tensions described above. On the contrary it is that they have themselves lost the 'one thing needful' and have failed to experience these tensions as overcome already within their own lives; thus failing to be, in fact, the Body of Christ whose members live

(Section VI, 3rd page)

and act by the Spirit of God in the life of this world.

Confessing their failures and accepting God's judgement upon them, Christians must still not cease to present to themselves, and to all men, the Christians ideal for every style of human living, of which there are certainly as many unique expressions as there are men to be temples of God through Christ and the Spirit. Proper to every Christian 'style of living' in this world, however, notwithstanding the uniquely personal and situational character of every 'style', there is always the element of struggle and growth, struggle against evil and growth to mature manhood in Christ. There is also always present in every 'style';

- i) the created in the image and likeness of God;
- ii) the immutable revealed commandments of God which forever remain the tutor to fulness of life in Christ and the Spirit; and finally,
- iii) the immutable Christ, the same yesterday, today, and for ever, who has given us the New Law of the Spirit of God who is Himself the 'pledge' and the 'guarantee' of the life of the world to come.

The new style of Christian living, therefore, remains even today the life of ascetic effort to grow in holiness by the 'acquisition of the Holy Spirit'. This effort still remains primarily an effort of prayer and interior warfare against the 'powers of darkness'. It still retains the eternal image of God in Christ as its inspiration and its goal. In any given case and situation however, the how of Christian living in this world, which is the fundamental question of this section, still remains the mystery of the Spirit who remains hidden behind the human person and community of persons in whom Christ must be formed to give the perfect communion with God the Father in an unending growth of divine life and glory.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF ST. ALBAN AND ST. SERGIUS

is an unofficial body of people who, realising the need for the unity of the Church, aim at furthering mutual understanding and co-operation between the divided Christians of East and West. It is a fellowship of prayer, study and common work.

The aim is achieved by providing opportunities for personal contacts, study, and the sharing of Eucharistic Worship as fully as the rules and exceptions now in force permit.

Though historically the Fellowship began mainly as an Anglican-Orthodox rapprochement, it sees reunion between these two bodies as only one part of the general process of the re-affirmation of the unity of the Church. It therefore welcomes as full and equal members Christians of any discipline who are concerned with the unity of East and West.

Further particulars can be obtained from:

The Greater Boston Branch of the Fellowship:

Dr. George Ursul,
78 Mount Vernon Street,
Boston. Mass. 02108. U.S.A.

The Headquarters of the Fellowship:

St. Basil's House,
52 Ladbroke Grove,
London W 11. England.

This pamphlet is published by the Greater Boston Branch of the Fellowship, and has been duplicated at St. Basil's House.