



Saksbehandler: Liv Janne Dehlin

Saksdokumenter:

- Rapport nr. 9/2008 **Stephanie Dietrich**
Rapport fra møtet i Wien/GEKE-presidiet og deltakelse ved
bispevigsling til Michael Bünker 27.-28.1.2008 (*tidl. utsendt*)
- Rapport nr. 16/2008 **Stephanie Dietrich**
Rapport fra møte mellom de anglikanske kirkene i Storbritannia og
Irland og Leuenberg kirkefellesskapet (GEKE), Chateau
Klingenthal, Frankrike, 21.-23.04.2008 (*vedlagt*)

Saker fra de økumeniske organisasjonene

Gemeinschaft Evangelischer Kirchen i Europa (GEKE)

Sammendrag

Stephanie Dietrich har skrevet rapport fra møte i GEKE-presidiet og deltakelse ved bispevigsling til Michael Bünker 27.-28.1.2008 i Wien (*tidl. utsendt*) og rapport fra møte mellom de anglikanske kirkene i Storbritannia og Irland og Leuenberg kirkefellesskapet 21.-23.04.2008 i Klingenthal, Frankrike (*vedlagt*).

Forslag til vedtak

Rapportene tas til orientering.

Rapport fra møte mellom de anglikanske kirkene i Storbritannia og Irland og Leuenberg kirkefelleskapet (GEKE)

Chateau Klingenthal, Frankrike, 21.-23.4. 2008

v/Stephanie Dietrich

Tema: "On the way to full visible unity"

Bakgrunn

De anglikanske kirkene i Storbritannia og Irland og GEKE har hatt en rekke samtaler. Hovedtema har vært forholdet mellom de forskjellige kirkeavtaler (Leuenberg, Porvoo, Meissen, Reuilly) og ekklesiologien i de forskjellige kirkene og kirkefelleskapene. Etter møtet på Liebfrauenberg i 2004 - som ble et vanskelig møte som nesten førte til brudd på samtalerne - fortsatte man i en mer uformell og mindre setting på invitasjon fra Det Økumeniske Instituttet i Strasbourg. Møtet fant sted på slott Klingenthal, en stiftelse som tilbyr Strasbourginstituttet å arrangere konsultasjoner kostnadsfritt en gang i året. Den oversiktlige og fine rammen for møtet bidro til at de to møtene som har blitt arrangert etter 2004, har vært veldig positive og skapt et godt grunnlag for videre samtaler. Jeg ble invitert som representant fra GEKE-presidiet, og på bakgrunn av mine erfaringer og kontakter med anglikanske kirker gjennom Porvoo-avtalen. Jeg holdt innledningsforedraget om "Ecclesiological and Ecumenical developments within the CPCE", som ble godt mottatt (vedlagt).

Diskusjon

I samtalen drøftet vi blant annet forskjellige enhetsmodeller (unity in reconciled diversity, communion, community, visible unity, full visible unity, etc) og deres forståelser i de forskjellige sammenhengene.

Videre drøftet vi embetsforståelsen i forhold til diakonatet og bispetjenesten, samt episkopé i våre kirkelige sammenhenger. Det vakte spesiell stor debatt hvorvidt det tredimensjonale embetet er en struktur som kan diskuteres, eller om den er udiskutabel. Interessant i denne sammenhengen var også at det ikke var enighet blant de anglikanske representantene. Anglikanerne var til dels svært opptatt av hvordan den indreanglikanske uenigheten omkring homofilispørsmålet ville påvirke den forestående Lambeth-konferansen og generelt fremtiden til The Anglican Communion. Det dannet et interessant utgangspunkt for samtalen omkring "communion". Videre diskuterte vi innholdet i anglikansk-reformerte studietekster ("God's reign and our unity") og avtalen mellom Church of England og Metodistkirken i England og dens oppfølging. I sistnevnte avtale foreslås det at Metodistkirken innfører det historiske episkopatet gjennom at for eksempel deres presidenter bispevigles av biskoper som er anerkjent som del av Church of England. Dette førte til en interessant debatt omkring historiens og kontekstens betydning for utviklingen av kirkelige strukturer, men også til mange spørsmål om hva dette innebar for anerkjennelsen av Metodistkirken og dens tilsynsstrukturer uten et historisk episkopat i dag.

Resultat - personlige refleksjoner

Hovedformålet med dette møtet var å føre samtaler om sentrale ekklesiologiske problemstillinger. Klimaet var veldig bra, og debatten gikk på kryss og tvers av de konfesjonelle grensene. Jeg tror at dette møtet bidro vesentlig til å gjenopprette et godt samarbeidsklima mellom dialogpartnerne og danne et grunnlag for å komme nærmere hverandre.

Det er et ønske om å fortsette samtalen i den samme oversiktlige og uformelle rammen, antakeligvis om to år. Konsultasjonen ønsker å arbeide med forståelsen av "communion" i en kontekst av "visibility in ministry and church life".

Det ble også ytret et ønske om en mer utførlig dokumentasjon fra møtet, for å sikre at kirkene kan dra nytte av samtalerne i sitt økumeniske arbeid, og for å danne et grunnlagsmateriale for den neste samtalerunden. I denne omgang ble det bare skrevet en kort Communiqué, som nevner hovedtemaene som ble drøftet.

Fra et GEKE-synspunkt svarer disse møtene til vedtaket om videreføring av kontakten med de anglikanske kirkene, samtidig som deres uformelle form og begrensede ramme, samt hyppigheten (annethvert år) synliggjør at de er ikke av høyeste prioritet, hvilket også svarer til vedtakene i rådet.

Uansett er samtalerne etter min mening et viktig bidrag for å fremme forståelsen av sentrale ekklesiologiske spørsmålsstillinger i denne konteksten, og vi fikk også en del viktige input i forhold til GEKEs arbeid med læresamtalen om "Embede, ordinasjon, episkopé".

Gjennom dette møtet fikk jeg også anledning til å peke på Porvooavtalens forståelse av apostolisitet og apostolsk suksesjon som en påminnelse om den videre forståelsen av apostolisitet som må legges til grunn for våre samtaler i denne konteksten.

Stephanie Dietrich, 23.4.2008

Vedlegg

1. Foredrag
2. Communiqué

The British and Irish Anglican Churches and the Community of Protestant Churches in Europe: Klingenthal Consultation 21-23 April 2008

“Informal reports on ecumenical and ecclesiological developments in our two ‘communities’: CPCE“

**CPCE: Rev. Dr. Stephanie Dietrich, Church of Norway
Assoc. Professor, Diakonhjemmet University College, Oslo**

“TOWARDS *VISIBLE* UNITY IN RECONCILED DIVERSITY”

1 Introduction

When I saw the title for the report I was asked to give, I felt challenged by the term “two communities”. It would be interesting to elaborate more on the understanding of ‘community’ in our context today. In which way is it theologically right to talk about the CPCE as a community? The brackets in itself signalize that the term ‘community’ needs to be discussed, definitely as a description of the understanding of the CPCE, probably also for the Anglican Community at the moment. The CPCE itself calls itself community or fellowship of churches, which is different from the Anglican understanding of community. The CPCE is a *fellowship* of churches, recognizing each other fully as churches, bound together through alter- and pulpit fellowship according to the ground principles of CA VII. This explicitly includes “the mutual recognition of ordination and the freedom to provide for intercelebration” (LA 33). If “community” is described through alter- and pulpit fellowship, the CPCE may well be understood as a community, but not as one denomination or one church. Maybe the most adequate way to describe the CPCE in the terms of “community”, “community” and “fellowship” would be that the CPCE is a community of churches which are in community through alter- and pulpitfellowship.

The statement of a ‘common understanding of the gospel’, the statement that the former doctrinal condemnations no longer apply to the present-day teaching of these churches, leads to pulpit and altar fellowship, which includes the mutual recognition of presbyteral ordination and common celebration of the Eucharist. Personally, I would emphasize the strong und indispensable link between the *declaration* of church fellowship, based on our common faith, and the visible *realization* of it in the churches’ concrete lives. The LA itself underlines this by saying (LA 35): “It is in the life of the churches and congregations that church fellowship becomes a reality.” There is a strong commitment within the CPCE today to work for such a realization of our fellowship.

It is not my task to discuss the understanding of the term ‘community’ today. Nevertheless, I think it is necessary to reflect on these basic questions of ecclesial self-understanding before we continue to elaborate on ecumenical and ecclesiological developments within the CPCE, because the reflections on the development must be hold together with the reflections on the foundation of the CPCE.

The LA made clear that the signatory churches remain churches within their own tradition: “The Agreement leaves intact the binding force of the confessions within the participating churches. It is not to be regarded as a new confession of faith. It sets forth a consensus reached about central matters, one which makes church fellowship possible between churches of different confessional positions. In accordance with this consensus the participating

churches will seek to establish a common witness and service and they pledge themselves to continue their common doctrinal discussions.” (37 b)

My report will be divided into two parts. Firstly, I am going to comment on the ecclesiological developments within the CPCE, based on the final report from the 6th General Assembly in 2006 in Budapest and the meetings in the CPCE council since then. Secondly, I would like to comment some aspects of the ecumenical development within the CPCE from my own viewpoint.

2 Personal perspectives

My comments on the development must be seen in the framework of my own personal context. I am an ordained priest in Church of Norway, which is both a Porvoo and a Leuenberg signatory church. Through many years, I have been responsible as the CoN staff person on the Porvoo Contact group, trying to explore and implement the Porvoo Common Statement in the life of our churches. At the same time, I have been more and more involved in the CPCE work on different levels, after Budapest 2006 as a member of the CPCE Council and presidency. I am deeply convinced about the ecclesiological compatibility of these two agreements for my own church, though I can see that this would not necessarily be the case for all churches, neither in the CPCE nor for the Anglican churches in Great Britain and Ireland. Therefore, in my ecumenical engagement I am concerned about the bringing together of slightly different ecclesiological positions without neglecting the obvious nuances and contextual differences, for example concerning the way episcopé historically and in the present is performed in our churches. Secondly, I am concerned about the need to avoid ecumenical block-building in Europe, neither the establishment of a northern-European “Porvoo-block” nor an all European protestant block or protestant synod.

3 Ecclesiological developments: Strengthening Community

The General Assembly in Budapest clearly showed that the idea of a protestant synod in Europe does not gain sufficient support within the CPCE. At the same time, the churches support the idea of closer cooperation on many levels and underline the need of visibility of our community. The model of unity in reconciled diversity needs to be developed further, but it is still an important key to the self-understanding of the CPCE. The awareness that reconciled diversity does not imply a static model of community, but a description of the fact that there is diversity within our community, but this diversity is a *legitimate* diversity which does not threaten our unity as such, but enriches it since it is a reconciled diversity, becomes important.

There is also a need to underline that the CPCE not only describes itself through reconciled diversity, but through *unity* in reconciled diversity. The challenge lies in the ability to balance, on the one hand, the unity and agreement on fundamental issues, and on the other hand, give space for a diversity which enriches and not threatens the living together of churches and people. As far as I understand the situation within the Anglican Communion, the whole debate about sexual ethics might be described and summed up by the discussion about the criteria and levels of diversity which are tolerable for a communion.

It is important for me to underline that the model of unity in reconciled diversity is not a static model, but gives space for continuing development. The unity once achieved through the common acknowledgement of certain principles and values has to develop through the continuous cooperation and need of reconciliation between partners of different cultures and contexts. Our unity is not merely a minimalist theoretical agreement on certain doctrinal

statements, but it is a fundamental and all-embracing unity which becomes visible through an attitude of mutual accountability, openness and our will to respect the other on their premises, and not our own premises. Therefore, this model is open for development and changes and can never be a static model.

One of the ecclesiological developments which can be noted in the CPCE context is an ongoing and fresh reflection on our self-understanding, a deepening of our model of “unity in reconciled diversity”, and a clearer consciousness about the ecclesial aspects of our community. The Community of Protestant Churches is not a mere theoretical construction based on dogmatic agreements, but it is a community of churches who in their various contexts seek to find ways to live out their community.

The CPCE consists of more than 100 signatory churches with a Lutheran, Reformed, United or Methodist denomination, plus some smaller churches like the Waldensian church. There is a huge variety of church life, context, theological and ecclesiological identity. Nevertheless, all these churches found a common basis for their consensus in their profound understanding of the Gospel, and therefore can accord each other fellowship in word and sacrament. No doubt, there are as many different views on sexual ethics within and between the churches of the CPCE as there are within the Anglican Communion. But these questions have not become a threat to our community in the same way as it has become for the Anglican Communion. The same questions are widely dealt with both within the different signatory churches and in the confessional world bodies. But they are not seen as divisive matters within the CPCE.

The CPCE agenda is focusing on the realization of church fellowship, the continuing theological tasks and the ecumenical commitment which is implicit in the LA. One of the most important tasks for the CPCE is to improve the **awareness of the situation of protestant minority churches in Europe**. In relation to these churches, the CPCE has an outstanding role to work for solidarity and cooperation between the churches in Europe.

The Assembly in Budapest was held under the theme “**Strengthening Community- The Profile of Protestantism in Europe**”. The strengthening of community has to be grounded in worshipping fellowship, deepened in further theological work and ought to lead to more binding structures on different levels. It is important to focus on the elaboration on these “binding structures”, because these binding structures visualize the way in which the CPCE wants to develop its identity, and the way it does not want to develop its identity.

My thesis for this report is therefore that the model of “unity in reconciled diversity” also includes the perspective of “*visible* unity in reconciled diversity”, because the strengthening of community and the development of binding structures contribute to the *visibility* of our unity within the CPCE. I am certainly aware that the term “visible unity” causes different associations in our contexts. Nevertheless, I think that “visible unity” is a useful description for the goal of our fellowship. Through this perspective, it also becomes obvious that “visible unity in reconciled diversity” is a flexible and developing model, not a static model. Diversity is not a goal in itself, but diversity is a fact of our different contexts, and as *reconciled* diversity it might also enrich the unity and strengthen the community, because unity is different from uniformity.

The ecclesiological development within the CPCE points towards a *strengthening of community* and therefore one might say that it represents an attempt to make the unity more *visible*.

In what ways then did the Assembly focus on the strengthening of community?
The starting point here is the decisions made at the CPCE General Assembly in Budapest in 2006.

4 Budapest – main decisions

The final report from Budapest includes the guidelines for the work within the CPCE for the years until 2012. I will not go through the whole report as a whole, but I would like to point out some of the decisions made which are important for Anglican-protestant relations.

a. Towards VISIBLE unity through emphasis on worship and common life

At the Assembly in Budapest, the presidents underlined the identity of the church as worshipping community. “It is the nature of the church to be a worshipping community which finds its expression in the regular celebration of worship. As a fellowship reconciled in Christ, the CPCE lives by the proclamation of the gospel and the celebration of the sacraments. This common participation in word and sacrament has consequences for all the spheres of the life of the community. This relationship between the foundation in worship and the practice of celebrating together requires the consensus also to be celebrated and experienced in a common life of worship. “

This awareness that the common life of worship belongs to the core of our communal life was already implicit in the LA. The General Assembly in Belfast first expressed the will that the allied churches should also deliberately grow together more strongly in the life of worship. This was clearly followed up and underlined in Budapest.

b. Towards VISIBLE unity through merging churches?

The Leuenberg Agreement made very cautious statements on the question of an organizational merger of individual churches. The LA is not to be understood as doctrinal basis for a new confession, pressing for church fusions. The Agreement has not directly promoted this process of merging churches. However, it has facilitated this course where the churches were in any case moving along it, such as in the Netherlands and in Alsace-Lorraine. This fundamental understanding of the need of merger of individual churches was derived from the LA and underlined in Budapest. The churches belonging to different protestant traditions living in the same context can co-exist, but there is no fundamental doctrinal reason for them to do so, and not to merge. As the LA (44) says: “The question of organic union between particular participation churches can only be decided in the situation in which these churches live.” This was underlined once again in Budapest.

c. Towards VISIBLE unity through doctrinal conversations and studies

Before Budapest, doctrinal conversations and studies on Evangelizing and “The Shape and Shaping of Protestant Churches in a Changing Europe” were concluded. In Budapest, decisions were made to perform doctrinal conversations on “Ministry, ordination and episcopé”, “Scripture, confession and church” and “New challenges in social justice for the Protestant churches”. These doctrinal conversations play a very important role for the life and self-understanding in the CPCE. They are important inner-protestant clarifications on important matters of our community life. The LA agreement made clear the fundamental fellowship achieved through the unity in Word and Sacrament, but at the same also underlines that there is still a need to continue the doctrinal conversations on *items which do not have divisive force*, but still persist within and between the participation churches.

Personally I would also like to add that profound doctrinal conversations always have been one of the signs of quality of the Leuenberg church fellowship. Studies like "The Church and Israel" and "Law and Gospel" are outstanding theological contributions from a broad evangelical prospect which already have proved their usefulness in different contexts.

d. Towards VISIBLE unity through strengthening commitment and structures

The General Assembly underlined that the church fellowship should be strengthened internally by deepening the common understanding of the gospel, and at the same time becomes manifest externally in respect of common witness and common service in the world and to the world. This is taking place by doctrinal conversations, consultations and comparable forms of work, by public relations, meetings of Church Leaders and by exchange programs. At Budapest, we discussed also the development of the structural and legal development of the CPCE. It was underlined that such a strengthening should serve the purpose to heighten the transparency and efficiency of the decision-making processes, and at the same time help the CPCE to make its special profile more visible. I can only list up some of the structural recommendations from Budapest which clearly will contribute to strengthen the visibility of our unity: Mutual consultation between the churches on decisions related to doctrinal and confessional questions, the reception of the results of doctrinal conversations as a task of binding freedom for the member churches, forums and consultations, networking, work in regional groups, a statute for the work, etc. Through the strengthening of structures, one wishes to give the community which is achieved through our common doctrinal basis, a more visible character.

4. Ecumenical development: Towards visible unity through ecumenical collaboration

a. Towards visible unity through wider ecumenical perspective

The LA (46) was clear on the ecumenical motivation of the project: "In establishing and realizing church fellowship among themselves, the participating churches do so as part of their responsibility to promote the ecumenical fellowship of all Christian churches." The Budapest Assembly affirmed this commitment from 1973 and expressed its gratitude for the fact that the Leuenberg model has served as an inspiration for agreements between churches belonging to the Reformation tradition all over the world. The Assembly also asked the Council to continue to hold talks with those European churches of the Lutheran and Reformed tradition who have not signed yet the LA.

It is also an important task for the CPCE to uphold our good relations and the dialogue with churches like the Church of Sweden and the Church of Finland, who are Porvoo signatory churches, but not members of the CPCE due to different reasons.

b. Towards visible unity through dialogue- (without achieving visible unity yet...)

• EBF

In the years 2002-2004 a dialogue between the CPCE and the European Baptist Federation was conducted which resulted in the document "*The Beginning of the Christian Life and the Nature of the Church*". This dialogue on the one hand showed a convergence in the understanding and practice of baptism. On the other hand it became obvious that the Baptist understanding of Baptism would make it impossible for them to come to an agreement with the CPCE churches on the level- of alter- and pulpitfellowship. In addition, the Congregationalist structure of the EBF would make it difficult to come to *binding* agreements concerning re-baptism. This also visualized the ecclesiological problems concerning churches with Congregationalist structures. The council recommended the member churches to carry

on or intensify the dialogue with the Baptists. A full member status of the CPCE through a specific agreement (like the agreement between the Methodist church and the CPCE) is therefore not possible. This does not exclude the possibility for further cooperation on many common areas of work.

- **Conversations with the Anglican Churches**

The final report from Budapest mentions the consultations which have taken place and reminds the wish for an agreement on a pan-European level between the Anglican and the CPCE churches. The doctrinal work on the theme “Ministry, ordination and episcopate” shall, according to the decisions of the Assembly, do so “in particular regard to the dialogue with the Anglican churches.” The Council also underlined the wish to invite guests from the Anglican churches to participate in the work of the doctrinal conversation groups. The possibility to work theologically on crucial doctrinal themes together is an important contribution to our mutual relations. Whether or not there might be the possibility to work towards an agreement on the level of the Meissen- or Reuilly agreement on a CPCE-level seems to be open. There are of course theological, ecclesiological and contextual aspects concerning the possibility of such an agreement which need to be discussed very thoroughly. Especially for many of the minority churches throughout Europe, from both the Anglican and the protestant tradition, such an agreement might become very helpful in practice, also because it turns out to be impossible for all the small churches to come through with individual agreements.

- **Conversations with the Orthodox Churches**

Concerning the dialogue with the orthodox churches, there are no clear recommendations from the Assembly, but the council was asked to continue the dialogue. The consultations which have taken place focused on core ecclesiological issues and the baptism. There will be a meeting on the theme of baptism in October 2008. Presumably due to the very different ecclesiological self-understanding and possibilities to recognize each other, there has not been a very far-reaching outcome from these conversations yet. Nevertheless, it is important for the CPCE to uphold its conversations with the Orthodox Churches. It is for example important to clarify practices concerning re-baptism. In addition, there are many areas of common interest for our churches concerning witness and service to the world.

- **Roman-Catholic Contacts**

The Assembly also asked the Council to find appropriate forms for a dialogue with the Roman-Catholic Church. The Council decided in 2007 that this is not a matter of high priority for the moment being, but that the contact with the R-C Church to a large degree happens on a national and local level.

- c. **Towards visible unity through collaboration with the CEC and other ecumenical bodies**

The Assembly emphasized very strongly the need to coordinate its work with other bodies through cooperation, such as the WCC and the confessional world bodies. It especially underlined its closeness to the CEC, saying: “The CPCE and the CEC know that they are committed to common aims.” The Assembly asked for the furthering of the relationship with the directing bodies of the CEC, especially on issues of social ethics and European political questions.

I think the cooperation with CEC in Bruxelles is a good example for how these bodies can cooperate on common issues, and the CPCE representative can serve as a resource in order to bring the voice of the protestant churches in Europe in the context of the CEC office in Bruxelles. CPCE does not want to represent a separate voice towards the EU institutions, but as a part of CEC it can contribute with important perspectives to the European Christian voice brought forward through the CEC.

The project "Healing of Memories" in Romania has also been a good example of cooperation between the CPCE and the CEC.

Altogether, one might say that the inter-confessional relations of the CPCE are an important aspect of the CPCE work, but they are not the area of work with the highest priority. This has many reasons. One reason is that the resources available are small. Nevertheless, the main reason for not putting ecumenical dialogues on the top of the agenda is reflections on what the CPCE should do, and is best at. There are many dialogues between member churches of the CPCE and churches belonging to other denominations. There are dialogues on a local, regional, national, European and world level. There are also important dialogues between the confessional world bodies. The task for the CPCE is therefore to evaluate these various dialogues for its own context and to cooperate with those bodies who give priority to this kind of dialogue work.

The core of the CPCE work needs to be what the CPCE is best at and what forms the specific identity of this community of protestant churches. This brings us back to the beginning: More than 100 churches of the Reformation brought together in alter- and pulpit fellowship through their doctrinal agreement on the core of the Gospel; celebrating in worship, working towards closer unity through theological conversations, strengthening their commitment and finding appropriate structures to do this work in the best way, for the sake of the Church of Jesus Christ in the world.

One might also characterize the ongoing work within the CPCE council through saying that the Council tries to find appropriate ways to focus on the core elements of the CPCE, what it is best at, while looking for *visible unity in reconciled diversity*.

5. Jesus Christ alone

I want to conclude this presentation by quoting the "Leuenberg fathers" from 1973 in art. 2 of the LA:

"The Church is founded upon Jesus Christ alone. It is he who gathers the Church and sends it forth, by the bestowal of his salvation in preaching and the sacraments. In the view of the Reformation it follows that agreement in the right teaching of the Gospel and in the right administration of the sacraments is necessary and sufficient prerequisite for the true unity of the Church. It is from these Reformation criteria that the participating churches derive their view of church fellowship as set out below."

Stephanie Dietrich 19.4.2008

Communiqué - Klingenthal Consultation, 21–23 April 2008

The dialogue between the British and Irish Anglican Churches and the Community of Protestant Churches in Europe (CPCE) continued in a Consultation held at Chateau Klingenthal, France, 21-23 April 2008, organised by the Institute for Ecumenical Research of the WLF, Strasbourg.

The central theme of the discussions concerned models of unity, including understandings of “unity in reconciled diversity”, “full visible unity” and “communion”. It became clear that further work was desirable to clarify these concepts and their interrelation.

Other topics of study included the theology of ministry, and the practical consequences and out-workings of current ecumenical agreements as they begin to bear fruit in the lives of their constituent churches. The consultation heard a presentation of the CPCE Study Project on ministry, ordination and oversight (episcopé). Texts considered included recent reports arising from the Anglican-Methodist covenants in England and in Ireland, the Church of England Report on *The Mission and Ministry of the Whole Church* (2007), and the Anglican-Reformed document *God's Reign and our Unity* (1984).

The participants agreed that the dialogue should continue in a similar form, with a particular focus on clarifying what communion is and how it is made visible in the ministry and life of the Church. Specific examples of lived communion should be considered, particularly drawn from the Anglican Communion and the CPCE, but also of the implementation – or failure to implement – other moves towards unity.

Participants were:

from the British and Irish Anglican Churches

The Revd Prebendary Dr Paul Avis (The Church of England)
Dr Martin Davie (The Church of England)
The Right Revd Michael Jackson, Bishop of Clogher (Church of Ireland)
The Revd Canon Dr Charlotte Methuen (The Church of England)
The Revd Dr Alison Peden (Scottish Episcopal Church)
The Right Revd Stephen Platten, Bishop of Wakefield (The Church of England)
The Revd Thomas Seville CR (The Church of England)

from the CPCE

The Revd Prof. André Birmelé (Institute for Ecumenical Research of the LWF)
The Revd Prof. Theo Dieter (Institute for Ecumenical Research of the LWF)
The Revd Dr Stephanie Dietrich (Church of Norway)
The Revd Prof. Martin Friedrich (CPCE Office)
The Revd Fleur Houston (URC)
The Right Revd Jürgen Johannesdotter (EKD)
The Revd Dr John McPake (The Church of Scotland)
The Revd Prof. Elizabeth Parmentier (Institute for Ecumenical Research of the LWF)
The Revd Gareth Powell (The Methodist Church of Great Britain)

Rapport fra møtet i Wien/GEKE-presidiet og deltakelse ved bispevigsling til Michael Bünker 27.-28.1.2008

v/ Stephanie Dietrich

Bakgrunn

Som medlem i presidiet for GEKE deltok jeg under bispevigslingen til Michael Bünker 27.1.2008. Bünker er generalsekretær i GEKE og nå biskop for den lutherske kirken i Østerrike. Ved denne anledning ble det også avholdt et møte i GEKE-presidiet og et møte mellom presidiet og sekretariatet.

Bispevigslingen - noen inntrykk og refleksjoner

Den lutherske kirken i Østerrike er en liten minoritetskirke med én biskop. I Wien er det ikke noen kirkelige (lutherske) kirker/lokaler som er store nok til å ta imot så mange mennesker. Derfor fant bispevigslingen sted på et kongress-senter. Ca. 3000 mennesker kom tilreisende. Først og fremst kom det busser fra menigheter i hele Østerrike med kirkemedlemmer. I tillegg kom det en rekke nasjonale økumeniske gjester, representanter for regjeringen/det offentlige samt en del internasjonale gjester. I invitasjonen ble det lagt vekt på at dette ikke var en "Bischofsweihe" (bispevigsling/ordinasjon), men en "Amtseinführung" (innføring i tjenesten). For den protestantiske minoriteten i Østerrike var det i denne sammenheng viktig at man hadde en annerledes ekklesiologi og embetsforståelse/bispeforståelse enn den romersk-katolske majoritetskirken. Det var allikevel interessant å analysere selve gudstjenesten, som inneholdt alle liturgiske ledd som man tradisjonelt ville se på som en del av en vigslingshandling (forpliktelse, epiklese, forbønn, håndspåleggelse, etc.). Sammen med de to andre medlemmene i GEKE-presidiet deltok jeg bl.a. ved håndspåleggelsen og forbønnshandlingen. Den ortodokse og den romersk-katolske representanten deltok med forbønn, men ikke håndspåleggelse. I tillegg til biskoper fra lutherske kirker i hele Europa (deriblant den finske erkebiskopen) deltok også barn fra den lutherske kirken i Østerrike ved håndspåleggelsen og forbønn. For Michael Bünker var det viktig at barna deltok i håndspåleggelsen.

Hele gudstjenesten ble overført på østerriksk riks-TV, og det var stor medieoppmerksomhet rundt bispeinnvielsen.

Rett etter gudstjenesten ble det avholdt et TV-intervju der jeg deltok (som eneste kvinne). Jeg ble blant annet stilt spørsmål om GEKE, og hva det betyr for en luthersk majoritetskirke som Dnk å ha kontakt med minoritetskirker som den østerrikske. Jeg sa bl.a. at fellesskapet og samarbeidet med minoritetskirker påminner oss at Jesu Kristi kirke ikke er avhengig av størrelsen, og at ingen kirke har rett til å si at den er den eneste Kirken. - Det vakte jubel i salen. Folk reiste seg og klappet og trampet og var helt fra seg av begeistring over at dette ble sagt, og da tolket av den lutherske kirken i Østerrike som et utsagn i forhold til Den romersk-katolske kirken. Den romersk-katolske kardinalen som stod ved siden av meg på scenen var nok ikke like begeistret for oppstyret. Allikevel: Interessant å se hva konteksten gjør med tolkning av slike utsagn.

Bispevigslingen ble etterfulgt av en stor mottakelse og kulturell fest for alle tilreisende. For min egen del synes jeg at det var veldig interessant å se hvilken betydning og symbolvirkning den lutherske biskopen i Østerrike og hans "Amtseinführung" har for denne minoritetskirken, som har en lang og vanskelig forfølgelseshistorie bak seg. Bünker ga uttrykk for stor takknemlighet over støtten og det fantastiske oppmøtet fra både fjern og nær.

Møter 28.1.2008

På mandag avholdt vi diverse møter, både i presidiet og sammen med sekretariatet.

Rapporten fra sekretariatet følger vedlagt til orientering.

Jeg ønsker i denne anledning kun å fremheve noen punkter som kan være viktige for Dnk og MKRs arbeid:

1. Organisatoriske og finansielle problemer i GEKE

Sekretariatet flyttet fra Berlin til Wien januar 2007. I utgangspunkt var det et klart ønske at GEKE-sekretariatet også kan ligge hos en protestantisk minoritetskirke. I GEKE-sammenheng har det alltid vært viktig å støtte opp om og å synliggjøre minoritetskirkene. Signalvirkningen av flyttingen er derfor ønskelig for de fleste ikke-tyske kirkene. Flyttingen førte med seg en reduksjon av den økonomiske støtten samt en reduksjon av staben. GEKE er fortsatt helt avhengig av de tyske kirkene/EKD, som fortsatt står for hovedutgiftene for arbeidet, om enn noe redusert i forhold til tidligere støtte. Blant annet dekkes to hele stillinger (Dieter Heidtmann i Brüssel/KEK-kontoret og Martin Friedrich/studiesekretær Wien) av tyske kirker. På den ene siden ønsker man at GEKE-arbeidet skal fortsette, på den annen side er det en nesten uoverkommelig oppgave så lenge støtten fra de ikke-tyske kirkene er så marginal. Det arbeides nå også for at det kan ansettes en ny person i Wien som vil kunne ha en overordnet stilling i forhold til sekretariatets daglige drift. Også denne stillingen søkes finansiert gjennom støtte fra enkelte "Landeskirchen" i Tyskland. Rådet har jobbet en del med oppgaveprioritering (og nedprioritering) på møtene etter generalforsamlingen. Samtidig er det en komité som jobber med den vanskelige finansielle og organisatoriske strukturen. Blant annet finnes det ingen klar bestemmelse om størrelsen på medlemsavgift til GEKE per i dag. Hvis kirkene ønsker at GEKE skal ha en viss funksjon i Europa, bør man også vurdere hvorvidt dette må synliggjøres gjennom økonomisk støtte til fellesskapet. Også Dnk bør ha en gjennomgang av sin støtte til GEKE utover den viktige støtten som ytes gjennom det at Dnk betaler for reise og opphold til dem som deltar i GEKE-arbeidet.

2. Faglig arbeid- og læresamtaler

Hovedfokus i Leuenbergfellesskapets/GEKEs arbeid har hittil vært læresamtalene. Det er fortsatt et behov for grundig teologisk arbeid også i det indreprotestantiske samarbeidet. Generalforsamlingen vedtok en satsing på embetsteologi, Skrift og bekjennelse og på kirkens sosialetiske ansvar. Det siste er blitt ivarettatt av en gruppe yngre teologer/vitenskapsfolk (deriblant Gard Lindseth/MKR).

Videre arbeides det med problemstillingen "teologisk utdanning/ordinasjon" og spørsmålsstillinger om "fri-flyt" innenfor GEKE - hvilket krever samarbeid og koordinering mellom kirkene. Dnk har mottatt invitasjoner til deltakelse ved både konsultasjoner og studieprosessene. Det vil være et stort og viktig bidrag fra Dnk om vi kan sende fagfolk til de respektive prosjektene. Jeg håper at det vil være mulig å prioritere norsk deltakelse ved disse anledningene. Det vil samtidig også gi flere anledning til å bli kjent med arbeidet innenfor GEKE-nettverket, for eksempel nye TN-medlemmer. Dnk har en særstilling i det europeiske kirkelandskapet gjennom sin tilhørighet i både Porvoo- og Leuenbergsammenheng og har dermed mange viktige perspektiver i det teologiske arbeidet.

3. Samtaler med andre kirkesamfunn, prioriteringer og KEK-samarbeidet

Rådet vedtok i fjor at samtaler med andre kirkesamfunn ikke bør ha høy prioritet, men at allerede avtalte møter skal finne sted - for å opprettholde kontakten og pleie samarbeidsforholdene med blant annet anglikanerne og de ortodokse i KEK. Jeg gikk inn for at man skulle holde en slik lav profil av flere grunner:

1. GEKE er ikke en kirke/konfesjon som kan føre dialoger på vegne av medlemskirkene.
2. Det foregår en rekke dialoger allerede. Det er viktig at vi ikke "dobbeltkjører" i vårt dialogarbeid.
3. GEKE bør konsentrere seg om det som er spesielt for GEKE. Det betyr at man bør videreføre arbeidet med å virkeliggjøre fellesskapet i det konkrete gudstjenestelige og praktiske samarbeidet mellom kirkene, samt at vi bør videreføre læresamtalene på viktige teologiske områder der vi fortsatt trenger et solidt arbeid i protestantisk sammenheng. Videre er samarbeidet med KEK viktig. I Brussel representerer Dieter Heidtmann GEKE som en del av KEK-staben. KEK har gitt uttrykk for at man er svært fornøyd med dette samarbeidet og GEKES bidrag inn i KEKs profilering i Brussel, først og fremst i forhold til sosialetiske spørsmål. GEKE har også en liten sosialetisk arbeidsgruppe, der Ulla Schmidt fra Dnk er medlem.

Det er klar bevissthet hos alle involverte om at det er KEKs, og ikke GEKES stemme som fremmes i Brussel; samtidig er det også tydelig at GEKE blir en stadig viktigere samarbeidspartner for KEK-kontoret når de ortodokse kirkene i voksende grad "kjører sin egen agenda" i Brussel, uavhengig av sine forpliktelser og sin tilhørighet i KEK. Fra vår side burde samarbeidet mellom GEKE og KEK slik det foregår i Brussel, få uforbeholden støtte. En hovedgrunn til at det fungerer såpass bra, er nok at Dieter Heidtmann, prest i kirken i Würtemberg, er en veldig kompetent og dyktig medarbeider, og gjør et svært godt arbeid. Spørsmålet om hvordan arbeidet kan videreføres når kirken i Würtemberg ikke lenger har Heidtmann som GEKES utsending i Brussel, vil måtte drøftes etter hvert. Samarbeidsmodellen GEKE-KEK er uansett et godt utgangspunkt for det videre arbeid i Brussel.

4. Regionalgruppearbeidet

GEKE har også en del regionalgrupper i Sør/Øst-Europa, Nord/Vest og i Rhinområdet. For mange år siden fantes det også en nordisk gruppe, den såkalte "København-gruppen". Kirken i Danmark har nå tatt initiativ til gjenopprettelsen av en slik gruppe, der man jobber med sentrale teologiske spørsmål i en region. Det foreløpige forslaget er å invitere kirker til samarbeid om temaet "gudstjenestens teologi", som også drøftes i Sør/Øst-gruppen. Det er for tiden en interessant dialog omkring en protestantisk gudstjenesteteologi; bl.a. om gudstjenesten er "fullverdig" når det er en prekengudstjeneste, sakramentenes betydning for gudstjenesteteologien, forholdet teologi/liturgi, etc. En ny "Nord-Europagruppe" vil kunne omfatte både kirkene i Norden, Baltikum, Nord-England (Church of Scotland har meldt sin interesse), og evt. kirkene i Nord-Tyskland og Polen. Den vil føre sammen teologer fra disse kirkene som kan samarbeide om et konkret teologisk prosjekt som er relevant for kirkene, også ut over dem som er spesielt interessert i økumenikk og spørsmål som forholdet mellom Porvoavtalen og Leuenbergkonkordien.

5. Arbeidet i presidiet

Når jeg ble valgt som medlem i presidiet på generalforsamlingen i Wien i 2006, var det noe uklart hva det egentlig ville innebære å være en del av presidiet. Tidligere har sekretariatet stort sett tatt seg av alt det løpende, og presidiets oppgave har hovedsaklig bestått i å lede møtene i eksekutivkomiteen, mens presidenten tok seg av noen representasjonsoppdrag på

vegne av fellesskapet. Den nye situasjonen i Wien samt sekretariatets svekkelse har nok bidratt til at presidiet må ta seg av flere løpende oppgaver enn hva som var vanlig tidligere. Det har også ført med seg at presidiet har 2-3 ekstra møter i året for å drøfte en del prinsippavgjørelser for arbeidet. Videre er jeg bedt om å representere presidiet i møtene med anglikanerne (Klingenthal april 2008) og ortodokse/KEK (Wien oktober 2008). Som representant for Den norske kirke har jeg forsøkt å holde fast ved og fremme de prinsippvedtak som KM gjorde ved undertegnelsen av konkordien i 1999 (signaturforklaringen), samt Dnks/MKRs prinsipielle linje i forhold til KEKs og LVFs arbeid.

Jeg ønsker også i denne rapporten å understreke behovet for løpende dialog med MKR ang. arbeidet i GEKE, og takker for tilliten til at jeg ivaretar dette vervet i samsvar med MKRs økumeniske engasjement.

Oslo 9.4.2008

Vedlegg: Protokoll fra møtet

Protokoll zur GEKE Dienstbesprechung am 28.1.2008

Im Evangelischen Zentrum Wien, GEKE – Büro

Anwesend: Präs. Thomas Wipf, Prof. Dr. Stephanie Dietrich, Prof. Dr. Michael Beintker, Dr. Michael Bünker, Dr. Martin Friedrich, Dr. Dieter Heidtmann, Dipl.Theol. Thomas Flügge, Dipl.Theol. Kristina Herbold, Evelyn Martin

TOP 1 Information, Ergänzungen zu Terminen

1.1. Informationen aus Begegnungen bei Amtseinführung Bischof Bünker am 27.1.08
Wipf begrüßt, dankt und äußert seinen Stolz über das eindrucksvolle Erlebnis, das die Amtseinführung und das anschließende Fest geboten haben.

1.2. Ergänzungen zu Terminplanung 08/09

Termine für nächste Dienstbesprechungen (Präsidium mit Stab):

Da Stephanie Dietrich in Paris nicht anwesend sein kann und Prof. Beintker am 29.5. erst spät abends anreisen kann, wird die vorbereitende Sitzung der Präsidenten mit dem Stab am **30.5.08 um 8.00 Uhr** angesetzt.

Weiterer Termin: **15.8.2008** in Wien

Die 5. Ratssitzung soll am 1.-3.10.09 in Genf stattfinden.

TOP 2 Planung der Ratssitzung Mai 08 Paris

Der Generalsekretär klärt Einzelheiten zur 3. Ratssitzung mit Herrn Clavairoly: Begegnung mit Kirchenvertretern Freitag Abend (?) und Gottesdienst Sonntag. Die Sitzung soll am Samstag 18.00 (mit dem Abendessen) enden.

Die Tagesordnung und der Tagungsverlauf werden in der Geschäftsstelle zusammengestellt und mit den Präsidenten abgestimmt, bevor sie an die Teilnehmenden weiter gegeben werden.

TOP 3 Finanzen

3.1. Erläuterungen zu Budget 08: Martin berichtet dass die Mehrheit der Ratsmitglieder dem Haushaltsplan 08, der im Dezember ausgesandt wurde, zugestimmt hat. Damit ist der Haushaltsplan 2008 durch den Rat angenommen worden. Das Ergebnis soll den Ratsmitgliedern zugesandt werden.

3.2. Informationen zu Jahresabschluss 06: Letztlich wurde uns von der EKD mitgeteilt, dass auf die von ihr zunächst verlangte anteilige Rückzahlung des Zuschusses für die Vollversammlung in der Höhe von € 16.192,98 verzichtet und der GEKE als „Anlaufunterstützung“ für die Wiener Geschäftsstelle umgewidmet wurde.

3.3. Anlagevermögen: Fällig gewordenes Festgeld und Wertpapiere wurden wegen der derzeitigen unsicheren Börsensituation in Festgeld angelegt (Höhe ca. € 90.000,-)

TOP 4 Öffentlichkeitsarbeit

4.1 Focus: Erscheint vierteljährlich elektronisch und als Printausgabe. Die bestehenden Printverteiler müssen noch effektiver bedient werden. Zudem soll 2008 der Mehrwert der Printausgabe kritisch überprüft werden.

Newsletter: Erscheint 14-tägig, bedient etwa 250 europäische Einrichtungen und Pressedienste und etwa 50 Einzelpersonen (ausschließlich elektronischer Versand). Daneben gibt es noch das gemeinsam mit KEK hergestellte „Europa-Info“.

4.2. Logo/ Corporate Design

Die Agentur „Büro und Webdesign Tobler“, Bern, hat drei Entwürfe für ein neues Logo der GEKE vorgelegt. Ein Entwurf entspricht dem Auftrag „Abwandlung des bisherigen Logos“.

Es zeigt sich, dass es offenbar sehr schwierig ist, die Wiedererkennbarkeit zu wahren und gleichzeitig eine Veränderung durchzuführen.

Beschluss: Büro und Webdesign Tobler erhält den Auftrag zur Entwicklung einer neuen Vorschlagsreihe.

Das Präsidium dankt Flügge für sein Engagement und die guten Ergebnisse!

TOP 5 Berichte

TOP 5.1. diverse Projekte

a) Aktuelle Aktivitäten

- Heidtmann berichtet über seine aktuellen Arbeitsschwerpunkte in der Kommission Kirche und Gesellschaft: Dialogseminar mit der EU Kommission zum Thema Werte der Arbeitsmarktstrategie (27.-29.2.08) mit EU-Kommissaren Figel und Spidla; Vorbereitung der kirchlichen Stellungnahmen zu „Europas sozialer Wirklichkeit“ und zu „Active Inclusion“.
- In der Zusammenarbeit mit Eurodiakonia gibt es unterschiedliche Vorstellungen über die Kooperation zwischen Kirche und Diakonie. Dies bedeutet zusätzliche Arbeitsbelastung, weil parallel statt zusammen gearbeitet wird.
- Die Ökum. Jugendgruppe aus Sibiu war in Brüssel, ca. 30 Personen, u.a. Begegnung mit EU-Kommissar Orban und Abgeordneten des EP. Jugendgruppe hinterließ bei den Begegnungen in Brüssel einen sehr positiven Eindruck.

b) Centro Melantone

Bünker berichtet, dass die Vereinsgründung nun vollzogen ist. Vorgesehen ist, dass die GEKE auch ein Vorstandsmitglied stellt. Martin Hirzel soll angefragt werden.

c) Brüssel

- a. Heidtmann sieht als eine Hauptaufgabe für die Kirchen die Ausgestaltung des Dialogs mit den europ. Institutionen, wie er nun im Lissabon-Vertrag verankert ist.
- b. Zusammenarbeit mit Orthodoxen Kirchen
Heidtmann informiert über das Gespräch der orthodoxen Kirchenvertreter in Brüssel mit Kommissionspräsident Barroso, in das die KKG der KEK nicht einbezogen war. Im KEK-Präsidium ist ein Gespräch zur Zusammenarbeit mit den orthodoxen Büros geplant, an dem Wipf teilnehmen wird.
- c. Vertragsverlängerung Heidtmann
Das Präsidium beschließt, die württembergische Landeskirche um eine Verlängerung der Beauftragung von Heidtmann um 3 Jahre (bis zur nächsten GEKE-VV 2012) zu bitten.

d) Bildung

Bünker berichtet über Gespräch mit Peter Schreiner, gemeinsam mit Beintker (Nov.07). Geplant ist zum Thema Bildung eine Konsultation und ein Publikationsprojekt. Schwerpunkt liegt dabei auf der „Laienbildung“. Zunächst wäre es interessant, von den Mitgliedskirchen zu erheben, was theologisch dahinter steht. H.J. Luibl soll zur Mitarbeit gebeten werden.

Friedrich berichtet über die Gründungsveranstaltung des Bildungsinstitutes für Europa in Erlangen. Es könnte Partner der GEKE im Bildungsbereich sein.

Geplant wird eine Konsultation zu Bildung in Europa im Zeitraum bis 2010. Ort der Tagung: Wien? Beintker weist auf unterschiedliche Interessen hin. Projektbeschreibung mit Konzept der Mittelaufbringung dafür ist zu erstellen (März 08) und der Ratsversammlung in Paris (Ende Mai 08) zur Entscheidung vorzulegen.

Der Konzeptentwurf wird nach Fertigstellung an das Präsidium geschickt.

e) Ausbildung

Konsultation zum ordinationsgebundenen Amt: 20.-23.11. Berlin, Bonhoeffer-Haus. Beintker inhaltlich verantwortlich, Friedrich koordiniert die Beteiligung der GEKE, durchgeführt und mitfinanziert von der EKD. Das Programm wird von Beintker noch im Februar verschickt.

Teilnehmen sollen etwa 30 Personen, nach Delegationsverfahren der Kirchen. Für 20 sollen Kirchen Kosten übernehmen, für 10 soll die GEKE die Kosten übernehmen, teils ganz, teils anteilig.. (Die Budget-Zuordnung ist noch zu klären). Es besteht Aussicht auf teilweise Refinanzierung durch die EKD

Zielgruppe: Delegierte der Kirchen, die in kirchlich- theologischer Verantwortung stehen und auch ein Mandat ihrer Kirche haben.

Ziel der Konsultation: Ist-Zustand wird diskutiert, Folge: Vereinbarung zur gegenseitigen Anerkennung wird vorbereitet.

TOP 5.2. Lehrgespräche/ Fachkreise

a) Amt

Friedrich berichtet: Von 7 Gruppenmitglieder haben nur vier am Treffen 24.-26.1. teilgenommen. Text liegt noch nicht vollständig vor, wird aber weiter erarbeitet. Beim nächsten Treffen 23.-25.10. soll eine Version erstellt werden, die präsentiert werden kann. Die Präsidenten legen Wert auf eine Beschleunigung des Verfahrens. Deshalb sollte im Jan. 09 eine Lehrgesprächsgruppe (20-25 Teilnehmer/innen) eingesetzt werden, die in zwei Konsultationen den Entwurf bis Anfang 2010 weiter bearbeitet. Er kann dann noch vor der VV in das Stellungnahmeverfahren der Kirchen gehen.

Bei Ratssitzung Mai 08 soll genauer Zeitplan vorliegen, damit Lehrgesprächsgruppe vom Rat in seiner Sitzung im Jänner 09 eingesetzt werden kann.

Die Präsidenten bitten darum, möglichst bald Einblick in die Texte zu bekommen

b) Schrift

Friedrich berichtet: Konsultation 12.-14.9.08 mit 30-40 Teilnehmer/innen in Berlin. Kleines Team wird vorbereiten. Projektverlaufsplan sowie überarbeiteter Text wird im Mai dem Rat präsentiert.

c) Fachkreis Ethik

Heidtmann berichtet: Im November konnte der Fachkreis nur in kleiner Gruppe tagen. Rostagno möchte gerne weiter mitarbeiten, allerdings die FK-Treffen nicht besuchen. Sein persönlicher Vorschlag: Pfarrer Sergio Manna zu berufen. Das Präsidium würde den Fachkreis lieber mit einer Vertreterin oder einem Vertreter aus dem akademischen Bereich ergänzen. Die anderen FK-Mitglieder werden eingeladen, Vorschläge zu machen, die Entscheidung trifft der GEKE-Rat Ende Mai in Paris.

Zum Thema „Sterbehilfe“ sind bei der KEK zwar Stellungnahmen eingelangt, aber Heidtmann bezeichnet sie als zu „flach“. Daher wird eine Konsultation am 15.10.08 in Wien vorbereitet. Ulla Schmidt schreibt einen Entwurf, Stellungnahmen der Kirchen werden eingehoben, Ziel ist der Versuch eine gemeinsame Position zu finden.

d) Jugendkonsultation/ Sozialethische Herausforderungen

Herbold berichtet: Das Drafting Committee arbeitet am 29.-30.1.08 in Wien. Am 13.-15.3. 08 wird in Bad Godesberg die Nachfolgekonferenz zu 07 stattfinden. Herbold kann zwar an der Tagung nicht teilnehmen (Ende des Sondervikariats), möchte aber inhaltlich gerne dabei bleiben.

Wipf bedankt sich bei Herbold bereits jetzt für die engagierte Mitarbeit in der GEKE!

TOP 5.3. Regionalgruppen

KKR: Bünker berichtet, dass zu den Statuten ein Kompromiss gefunden wurde, sodass sie sich nun als Regionalgruppe konstituieren kann. Jetzt geht es darum, wo dieser Vertrag unterzeichnet werden kann. Der erste Gedanke dies im Rahmen der Ratssitzung durchzuführen lässt sich termintechnisch nicht durchführen.

SO Europa: Im Rahmen der SO-Europa-Gruppe in Gallneukirchen (14.-17.4.08) Bünker wird für einen Abend in seiner Eigenschaft als Bischof anwesend sein. Sollte OKR Martin nicht kommen können, müsste er vorher extra unterschreiben.

TOP 5.4. Dialoge

a) Orthodoxie

Beintker berichtet: Thema der Konsultation wird Anerkennung der Taufe sein – aufgrund unterschiedlicher ekklesiologischer Theologie. Teilnehmer/innen stehen fest: Dietrich, Dupre, Großhans, Olga Lukacz, McEnhill, Frau Nüssel, Ratz, Saarinen, Wallraff. Beintker wird mit Ionita die Frage der Referent/inn/en klären: Es sollen 2 orthodoxe und 2 evangelische sein. Vorschläge: Wallraff, Nüssel von evang. Seite. Die Struktur soll Ende Februar vorliegen.

Bünker wird sich mit Metropolit Staikos über einen offiziellen Empfang verständigen. Das Buch mit der Dokumentation der Konsultationen von Wittenberg und Phanar (Leuenberger Texte 11) wird zu dem Zeitpunkt aufliegen.

b) Baptisten

Bünker berichtet: Seit der Ratssitzung in Brüssel ist das Klima getrübt, obwohl sich eigentlich am Standpunkt der GEKE (also vorläufig ist Assoziierung nicht möglich) seit Budapest 06 nichts geändert hat.

Zur Klärung wird es ein Gespräch mit Tony Peck in Prag geben. Delegation: Bünker, Friedrich, Houston. Termin: 7.2.08.

Zu den Überlegungen, wie Baptisten tatsächlich mehr eingebunden werden könnten, meint Beintker, dass zunächst der Status geklärt werden müsse. Vom Grundverständnis der Kirchengemeinschaft nach der LK sind keine Abstriche möglich. Bünker legt Wert darauf, dass das grundsätzliche Vertrauen wieder hergestellt wird.

Beintker: Nicht nur die Anerkennung der Taufe, sondern auch die Struktur (vereinsrechtlicher Aufbau) sind Hindernisse zu einer Partnerschaft.

c) Anglikaner (vertagt)

d) Röm. kath. Kirche (vertagt)

TOP 6 Evang. Europ. Versammlung – Entwurf D. Heidtmann

Heidtmann stellt das Konzept für ein Ev. Europ. Forum in Verbindung zur nächsten GEKE-Vollversammlung vor. Das Präsidium beauftragt die Geschäftsstelle, mit möglichen Partnern erste Sondierungsgespräche zu führen, damit dem Rat im Mai ein Stimmungsbild über die Erfolgsaussichten eines solchen Projektes gegeben werden kann. Der Vorschlag soll in den Regionalgruppen vorgestellt werden. Friedrich kontaktiert Generalsekretärin Überschar vom Deutschen Ev. Kirchentag, Heidtmann die EKD (Heider-Rottwilm).

Ende der Besprechung.