

## BAPTISTS AND THE WORLD FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCH

One of the most significant developments of the last century is an increasing awareness that to be a Christian is to belong to a world-wide fellowship. First the missionary movement of the nineteenth century and then the ecumenical movement of the twentieth century have fostered this awareness. But what sort of world fellowship is it to which we belong, and how wide is its embrace? These questions have proved more difficult to answer.

Two main ways of giving expression to the world-wide fellowship of the Church have emerged. The first was the development of world-wide families of churches of the same denomination, the oldest of which is the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (W.A.R.C.), which was formed in 1875. The second was the development of inter-denominational councils of churches, as exemplified by the International Missionary Council, the Faith and Order movement and the Life and Work movement after the First World War. From these came the World Council of Churches, provisionally established in 1938 and formally constituted a decade later at Amsterdam in 1948, with which the International Missionary Council merged in 1961. Neither of these ways does full justice to the catholicity of the Church. The World Confessional Families, or Christian World Communions as they are now called, are partial manifestations of catholicity because of their denominational basis. The World Council of Churches is a partial manifestation of catholicity because a number of churches do not belong to it. The largest of these, of course, is the Roman Catholic Church; but there are also a number of evangelical and pentecostalist churches that have remained outside. Baptist attitudes to this question are particularly interesting: for, as R.L. Child observed in 1941, whilst the Baptist denomination as such has never taken kindly to official movements towards church union, individual Baptists have often been to the fore in fostering these developments.(1) Child was speaking about Great Britain, but the same is true at the world level also.

A comparison of the attitudes to the wider ecumenical movement of the B.W.A. and the W.A.R.C. is interesting. W.A.R.C. (whose membership at that stage was Presbyterian and Reformed, but not Congregationalist) held a European conference in 1920, and more than half the delegates attended the two preliminary meetings held that August in Geneva, one which led to the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work in 1926, and the other to the World Conference on Faith and Order. In 1926 the Alliance recommended its members to take part in the Faith and Order Conference at Lausanne in the following year, and this recommendation was particularly influential in persuading many of the Reformed Churches on the continent to attend.(2) By contrast the only Baptist churches represented at Lausanne were those in Germany, Holland, Ontario and Quebec and the Northern Convention in the U.S.A.(3) In 1914 the Baptist Union Council in Great Britain had agreed, like the Southern Baptist Convention in the U.S.A., to take part in the preparations for a World Conference on Faith and Order; but in the event both bodies declined to be represented at Lausanne. The determining factor in the British decision was said to be the attitude of T.R. Glover, but it

was surely also related to the negative response the Baptists had made in 1926 to the Lambeth Appeal. The decision was supported by J.H. Rushbrooke, President of the Union in that year, and also European Commissioner for the B.W.A.(4) By 1937, however, the position had changed, when Rushbrooke was one of the British representatives at the Edinburgh Faith and Order Conference, which was also attended by observers from the Southern Convention.

In July 1939 the Baptist World Alliance received the reports of two commissions on Christian Unity at its Congress in Atlanta. The first report on organic union concluded that no proposal had yet been made which Baptists could accept without sacrificing vital principles. The second report surveyed the work of the World Conferences of 1937 and 1938 on Life and Work, Faith and Order and World Mission. Professor W.O. Carver in presenting that report said that 'the Baptist Ecumenical spirit seems likely to find more freedom of expression along the lines of Madras than of Oxford, and especially more than of Edinburgh'. Whilst Baptists needed to review their relationship with other Christian people, he believed that they

'must be willing to continue a separate section of the Christian movement so long as other sections obey not the truth of the New Testament; but we shall have grief of heart that we may not walk and work with them in full and unrestrained fellowship. We will not choose separation, nor in our own spirit consent to be a sect in God's family.'(5)

Commenting on these reports, Rushbrooke wrote that 'the tacit identification of unity with organic union, of co-operation with fusion, of denominationalism with sectarianism (to select only a few examples) has darkened counsel'.(6) Enthusiasm for a world fellowship therefore was muted by concern at the possible institutional implications.

The same contrast of attitudes was found when the World Council of Churches was formed. At the Baptist World Congress in Copenhagen 1947, Henry Cook from Great Britain gave an address on 'Baptists and the World Council of Churches' which articulated the suspicions of many Baptists about the proposed World Council and some of the Churches that were expected to compose it. This suspicion was due partly to the conviction that the baptism of believers was the only scriptural baptism, and partly to the belief that the New Testament church was independent of state support and state control. It is significant that the suspicion of establishment should be as important as the question of baptism. Nevertheless Cook hoped that association with the World Council would lead to greater co-operation in evangelisation and inter-church aid, and for those reasons he supported it, provided that Baptist world fellowship was not weakened because of it. A speech from the floor by Dr M.E. Dodd of Louisiana opposed links with the World Council, but when Ernest Payne pointed out that the World Alliance could not take decisions which bound member churches, and that in any case membership of the World Council was open to national churches or denominations and not international bodies, the matter was dropped.(7) The division of views among Baptists about the attitude to be adopted towards the World Council has remained an important feature of Baptist life. Ernest Payne later noted that seven Baptist conventions and unions sent representatives to Amsterdam in 1948 and two others signified their intention of joining. 'Others, among them the strongest, refrained'. Two further

unions joined the World Council between 1948 and 1955, but, as he pointed out, Baptists, like the Orthodox Churches, were 'half in and half out'. He concluded that

'So long as, on an issue of this importance, Baptists are not in agreement, their fellowship in the World Alliance is the more necessary and significant, and they may be grateful that they are a world-wide community and so varied a community.'(8)

In 1962 he was Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee when the Russian Baptists joined the World Council, following the membership of the Russian Orthodox Churches at New Delhi in 1961.(9) By the time of the Vancouver Assembly in 1983 eighteen Baptist Unions and Conventions were in membership or associate membership.

The W.A.R.C. met in Geneva in 1948, and sent a message of warm greetings to the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches (W.C.C.) in Amsterdam, welcomed its formation and recommended all its constituent members to give serious consideration to applying for membership of the World Council. Marcel Pradervand attributes this in part to the fact that many of the delegates were 'new men' who did not see any conflict between confessional loyalty and commitment to ecumenism. The same meeting also decided to establish an office in Geneva (instead of Edinburgh), and more significantly to locate this office at 17 route de Malagnou, on the same site as the W.C.C.(10) Thus from the beginning, the W.A.R.C., like the Lutheran World Federation, was literally alongside the World Council; and in due course it moved to the new Ecumenical Centre on the other side of Geneva. By contrast the Copenhagen Assembly of the B.W.A. accepted a recommendation from the Executive that the Alliance's main office be moved to Washington, D.C., and that a European office be maintained in London. A new headquarters building was acquired in Sixteenth Street, Washington, and the meeting to commemorate its opening in 1948 was attended by President Harry Truman of the U.S.A.(11) This move away from Europe where the Alliance was founded and to North America where its great numerical strength lay was as symbolic in its own way as the fact that it did not move to Geneva. Geographical separation made relations between the B.W.A. and the W.C.C. distant just as geographical proximity made relations close for those World Communions which established their headquarters in Geneva.

In the first twenty years of the history of the W.C.C. there was a tendency on the part of some ecumenical advocates to regard the Christian World Communions as obstacles to ecumenism rather than promoters of it. The question of a confessional or a national basis for membership of the W.C.C. had been keenly contested in the formative stages, because it concerned the very nature of the Council. The decision was that membership should be open to churches organised at the national level. Trans-confessional united churches were also seen by many as one goal of the ecumenical movement. Such churches were inevitably based in a nation, or part of it like, for example, the United Churches of Canada (1925) or the Church of South India (1947). It was not obvious how such united churches could belong with integrity to either one or more of the Christian World Communions. Indeed the relationship of united churches to Christian World Communions has remained one of the recurrent issues in discussions within the ecumenical movement, though certain united churches remain in membership with the confessional families of their constituent groups.

Concern that the World Confessional Families (as they were called in these years) might become an alternative ecumenical movement surfaced in the 1950s, and was one of the reasons for the establishment of a regular informal meeting of their Secretaries in 1957. The man chiefly responsible for this initiative was Dr John A. Mackay, President of Princeton Theological Seminary, Chairman of the International Missionary Council and President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches from 1954 to 1959. Concerned about what he regarded as the 'resurgence of denominationalism', he was largely instrumental in persuading the W.A.R.C. to adopt the Basle Statement, which renounced the pursuit of world denominational pre-eminence as a betrayal of Jesus Christ. In a paper read at the meeting of the W.A.R.C. Executive Committee in Prague in 1956, Mackay wrote that

'The Confessional Movement could develop in such a way as to wreck the Ecumenical Movement or at least to reduce the W.C.C. to a venerated ecclesiastical facade...On the other hand the Confessional Movement, if wisely directed, can and should enrich the Ecumenical Movement.'(12)

Dr Visser't Hooft, General Secretary of the W.C.C., was also involved in the informal discussions which led to the first gathering of such secretaries; and the annual meeting has remained an opportunity for informal conversation among the Christian World Communions and with the W.C.C. ever since. From 1968 the Roman Catholic Church has been regularly represented through the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity; and this is a reminder of the significance of the changes which took place in the Roman Catholic Church in the 1960s.

When the Second Vatican Council was summoned in 1961, Pope John XXIII invited representatives from the Christian World Communions to attend as observers. Following the Council a series of bilateral theological dialogues was initiated with many of these Communions, of which the best known in England is probably the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. These in turn gave a new impetus to theological dialogues among the other Christian World Communions. Most important of all, the Roman Catholic initiative gave a new significance to the Christian World Communions in themselves for, with the possible exception of the Salvation Army, the world bodies were consultative rather than authoritative in character.

The B.W.A. was also more reserved in its relations with the Roman Catholic Church than other World Communions. When invitations to the Second Vatican Council were being considered, Monsignor Willebrands from the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity indicated that they did not wish to send an invitation to the Alliance which might embarrass them if they had to refuse it. So an informal approach was made to the Alliance Executive to see whether they wished to receive an invitation. Ernest Payne was very much in favour of acceptance, as was the Italian Baptist leader, Manfredi Ronchi. But there was considerable opposition from the Southern Baptists in the U.S.A. and from Baptists in Latin America; and even some threat of serious division within the Alliance if an invitation were to be accepted. So it was decided not to go, and the Alliance was the only major world body not represented. Morris West suggests that it may not have been a bad thing that one world body remained unconvinced about the change in Roman Catholic mood.(13) Nevertheless when the Roman Catholic Church held an Extraordinary Synod of Bishops to mark the twentieth anniversary of the Council in November 1985 the B.W.A. was represented

by another ecumenically active British Baptist, Dr David Russell.

The theological dialogues initiated in the years following the Second Vatican Council involved a new theological agenda. Bilateral dialogues had certain advantages in concentrating on particular issues dividing two groups. But at first they seemed to rival the Faith and Order discussions of the W.C.C.; and it almost seemed that an alternative ecumenical network was being set up, centred on Rome. Some of these fears were assuaged when the Roman Catholic Church itself became a member of the Faith and Order Commission. These developments also sharpened the problem of the United Churches, who did not seem to fit in easily to the new framework; and they created new questions about the internal consistency of the dialogue process. In 1969 the Secretaries of the World Confessional Families decided to undertake a survey of bilateral conversations, and the results of this were eventually published in the book, **Confessions in Dialogue**. Subsequently the Faith and Order Commission, in conjunction with the World Confessional Families, organised a series of meetings to bring representatives of the various dialogues together. These meetings, held in 1978, 1979, 1980 and 1985 were able to register significant consensus, and in particular to affirm that there was but one ecumenical movement in which all were partners.(14)

Until recently the B.W.A. has only been involved in one such international dialogue - that with the W.A.R.C. This was first mooted at the 1969 meeting of the W.A.R.C's Executive Committee, and then deferred until 1971 after the union with the International Congregational Council. The dialogue took the form of a pilot study in the European context 'without prejudice to other areas of the world', and was approved by the executives of both world bodies in 1972.(15) The report, published in 1977, discusses baptism and church membership, ministry in the church, and the local and universal nature of the church. The last section on the church is particularly interesting in view of the traditions involved. The report affirms that the church is first and foremost an event rather than an institution. 'The local congregation is not a sub-department of the one church of Christ, but manifests and represents it.' But the local congregation is necessarily related to other local congregations. It is not the universal church of Christ in itself: local congregations are united by the call to mission in the world, which makes them interdependent. Hence the wider church relationships at area, national, regional or world level have ecclesiological significance. These relationships are more than the sum of the churches involved. Hence the report ends with some searching questions to both Baptists and Reformed about how their mutual encounter can make them more aware of dimensions in each other's understanding that they may have neglected.(16) It remains to be seen what the response to this report will be from the member churches concerned. The B.W.A. is now involved in dialogues with the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran Churches; a second round of theological conversations with the W.A.R.C. is about to begin, and a dialogue with the Mennonite World Conference and the Anglican Commission are being considered.

The other important evidence for current Baptist ecumenical attitudes comes from the response of Baptist Churches around the world to the Faith and Order Commission's Statement, **Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry** (1982). The responses so far published include some from Baptist Churches who are not members of the W.C.C., which indicates

the way this document has stimulated wide ecumenical discussion. Comments have been received from Great Britain and Ireland, Scotland, the Covenanted Baptist Churches in Wales, the American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A., Denmark, the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Sweden, and Burma. There is a common concern about the sacramental emphasis of the report both from the churches in Scotland, Sweden and East Germany, who are not members of the W.C.C., and from those who are members: the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, for example, expresses anxiety lest there be confusion between the signs and the deeper realities expressed in the sacraments. There is a general emphasis on the centrality of spiritual unity in Christ; and Baptists from both the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. emphasise the importance of a rich and faithful pluralism, and the need to create a place for legitimate diversity.(18)

One of the most positive statements comes from Burma, where European missionaries have found it impossible to work in recent years. The Burmese Baptists speak movingly of the spirit of thanksgiving with which they respond. More striking still is what follows:

'We do not feel that we are responding to a 'foreign' document. Even though delegates from Burma were not present at Accra or Lima, we do not feel that the text is alien. Because in the first place even though we are Burmese, we are at the same time members together in the one family of God on earth. And in the second place we can regard the document as our own, because we share the belief mentioned on page viii of the preface that "the witness of local churches itself is an important factor for the coming into being of this ecumenical achievement".'

They continue, 'we do not respond simply because it is expected of us. We respond because of our commitment to unity and the ongoing mission of the whole church in the whole world.'(19) The Burmese comment, not uncritical, provokes reflection on the nature of the experiences which provide the strongest urge towards a sense of world fellowship.

Theological dialogue is not, however, the only ecumenical agenda. One of the continuing concerns of the Annual Meeting of Christian World Communions has been the question of religious liberty and human rights. For bodies like the B.W.A. and the W.A.R.C. this concern goes back a long way. In particular the aims of both bodies include an explicit commitment to work for religious liberty. The constitution of the W.A.R.C. adopted in 1875 committed the Council to 'seek the welfare of Churches, especially such as are weak or persecuted'; and in its early years the Alliance was particularly concerned with the problems of the Waldensian Church in Italy and the position of Reformed Christians in Austria, Spain and Turkey.(20) B.W.A. did not have an explicit reference to religious liberty in its initial constitution, but from an early stage it was involved in standing up for the rights of minority Baptist communities in Europe. This was reflected in the statements made at the Roll Call of the first World Congress in London in 1905, and it was of great practical importance in the years immediately following the First World War. J.H. Rushbrooke was heavily involved in securing rights for Baptists in Romania.(21) When the constitution of the Alliance was amended at the Copenhagen Congress in 1947, one of its primary purposes was defined as 'the safeguarding and maintenance of full religious liberty everywhere, not only for our own constituent churches, but also for

all other religious faiths'.(22) One reason for the importance of this in both families is the extent to which the member churches had their origins in minority religious movements, often protesting against a larger 'established' church. The diversity of experience in the W.A.R.C. was made clear when it was proposed to unite with the International Congregational Council in 1966. The Statement of Principles noted that

'The classic Reformed part of the sixteenth century Reformation in Europe goes back not only to Geneva, but also to Strasbourg, Zurich, Heidelberg, Debrecen, the Hague, Edinburgh, and many other towns, great and small. Many Reformed congregations were founded by refugees, and this has continued to be true throughout the intervening centuries. There were then, and have continued to be, admxtures of the Reformed line with that of the Reformation's "left wing" from sixteenth-century Strasbourg on. Some Congregational churchmen feel closer at many points to the Baptists or to the Disciples of Christ than to the Presbyterian or Reformed Churches in their area, and some within the latter Churches, including many "evangelicals" do too.'(23)

In a sermon at the service of preparation for Holy Communion at the Evanston Assembly of the W.C.C. Ernest Payne made some pertinent remarks on this theme. In a key passage, long remembered by many present, he spoke of the tensions created by the inability of most of the delegates to share communion together:

'We come perplexed, frustrated, in danger of being impatient with one another, of accusing those with whom we differ with obstinacy or blindness or carelessness. Some are tempted to press for majority decisions and to try to force issues. But who shall decide how heads are to be counted? And who, with the New Testament open before him, or the long and devious history of the Christian church in mind, would dare to assert that the mind of Christ is necessarily or fully expressed by either the majority or the minority in any particular Christian assembly, or even by the whole church at any one moment in its pilgrimage?...Each must obey his own conscience, standing himself answerable to his Lord. To try to force the conscience of another is as wrong as it is fruitless.'(24)

This statement combines the insights of a historian and someone from a tradition which upholds the liberty of the individual conscience.

The Baptist emphasis on individual conscience has also enabled individuals to do things ecumenically that Baptist Unions or Conventions have not. This may be seen in the different contributions of three leading British Baptists to the quest for world fellowship: J.H. Rushbrooke, Ernest Payne and David Russell. J.H. Rushbrooke, tellingly described as a 'Baptist Greatheart' by Ernest Payne, was a pioneer in the first half of the century in turning the B.W.A. from a dream into a practical reality. One of John Clifford's boys from Westbourne Park, he caught Clifford's wider vision of the Church. As a young man he was the first minister of the united Free Church in Hampstead Garden Suburb from 1910. But, as Ernest Payne remarks, it is almost as though Rushbrooke's experience there led him to believe 'that distinctively Baptist witness had no chance of permanent survival in fellowships like that at Hampstead'.(25) During his later career in the B.W.A. he was cautious about Baptist participation in the ecumenical movement. Ernest Payne wonders how far Rushbrooke's

distrust for some of the leaders of the ecumenical movement was due to the fact that he was never within the inner circle of that ecumenical leadership. Certainly those who held office in the Christian World Communions did not find it easy to become part of that inner circle. But he seemed to believe that 'ecclesiastical fusion' had an 'inevitable authoritarian element', and he even went so far as to assert that 'the drive for ecclesiastical union mars the harmony of co-operation and weakens the sense of Christian unity which actually exists'.(26) His deep knowledge of Germany and the rest of Europe was probably responsible for his belief that the world fellowship of the Church depended on religious liberty.

Ernest Payne was an important mediating influence in the next generation. He did not have Rushbrooke's hesitations about the W.C.C. and was elected to its Central Committee at Evanston in 1954 in succession to the Rev. M.E. Aubrey, his predecessor as General Secretary of the Baptist Union. As a national General Secretary in Britain it was easier for him to enter the W.C.C. than it would have been for any officer of one of the world bodies. His election as Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee was more unexpected, and thus was begun a long and important period of ecumenical service. After Franklin Fry's death he became Chairman of the Central Committee and presided at the Uppsala Assembly in 1968. He was at the centre of problems such as the choice of a new General Secretary to follow Visser't Hooft, the Programme to Combat Racism, South Africa, and the financial difficulties of the W.C.C. in the 1970s.(27) His greatest asset was his diplomacy, coupled with a gift like that of William Temple for producing reconciling forms of words.

His successor as General Secretary of the Baptist Union, Dr David Russell, was different again: he did not have the same degree of responsibility in the W.C.C., though he served as a member of the Central Committee from 1968 to 1983. His concern for religious liberty and his patient work in bridging gaps across the Iron Curtain, which he was often able to do more effectively than some of the American Baptist leaders, gave him an unquestioned stature. He was always ready to ask the awkward questions about ecumenical involvement that characterised a Rushbrooke or a Glover, but he believed that such questions were most effectively asked from within rather than from the sidelines. Thus he combined the concerns of both Rushbrooke and Payne. His particular concern about human rights culminated in the foundation in Britain of the group, Action by Christians against Torture.

The history of the B.W.A. suggests that Baptists have always been aware of the fragility of institutional manifestations of the fellowship of the Church, both at national and world level. At the same time they have recognised the significance of the way individuals can transcend this fragility. In the one ecumenical movement the W.C.C. and the Christian World Communions need one another. A telling testimony to this comes in the response of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians-Baptists in the U.S.S.R. to **Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry**. Unity of witness to Christ is possible, they say, in a great diversity of national and confessional traditions. This witness is united 'as long as we, as Christians, can contain each other'.

Then, drawing on the image of Christians as branches of the vine, they continue:

'Our differences and confrontations began and continued in those cases when we tried by ourselves to take away branches that bore no fruit (John 15.2). This taking away was carried on in the history of Christianity both physically and spiritually and nobody was asking the vine-grower about it. These initiatives (or, rather, arrogance) of churches were the cause of disrespect and lack of recognition among Christians.'(28)

Behind that comment lies a long experience of persecution from both church and state, and also a challenge to the contemporary Church.

It is echoed in an equally penetrating comment at the end of the response from the Baptist Union of Denmark. 'A Danish writer talks in an aphorism about "stumbling in one's own horizon". This experience has often been made by the churches - also by us belonging to the Danish Baptist Union.'(29) How often do we stand in our own light? Jesus himself spoke of the need to see the plank in our own eye before pointing out the speck in our neighbour's. As they plead for recognition of diversity, Baptists need to be able to recognise and celebrate that diversity among themselves. One of the notable features of modern Baptist history in Britain has been the stream of individuals who have in their persons transcended collective attitudes which have often seemed narrower than their own. David Russell stands in that tradition.

#### FOOTNOTES

1 R.L. Child, 'Baptists and the Reunion Movement', *Baptist Quarterly*, n.s., x (1940-41), p392. 2 M. Pradervand, *A Century of Service: A History of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, 1875-1975*, Edinburgh 1975, pp114-15, 134-35. 3 H.N. Bate (ed.), *Faith and Order, Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927*, New York 1928, p527. 4 E.A. Payne, *The Baptist Union: A Short History, 1958*, pp177-78, 196-98; E.A. Payne, *James Henry Rushbrooke, 1870-1947: A Baptist Greatheart*, 1954, p254; ref. mag. H.G. Wood, *Terrot Reeveley Glover*, Cambridge 1953, p157, but there is no explicit reference to Lausanne. 5 F. Townley Lord, *Baptist World Fellowship: A Short History of the Baptist World Alliance, 1955*, pp103-4. 6 *Ibid*, p104. 7 W.O. Lewis (ed.), *Seventh Baptist World Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 29-August 3, 1947*, 1948, pp56-59. 8 Lord, *Op.Cit.*, p172. 9 W.M.S. West, *To be a Pilgrim: Memoir of Ernest A. Payne*, 1983, p128. 10 Pradervand, *Op.Cit.*, pp170-71, 174-76. 11 Lewis, *Op.Cit.* p115; Lord, *Op.Cit.*, pp126, 137-38. 12 Quoted in E. Perret, 'Twenty Years: The Conference of World Confessional Families' (1957-1977), unpublished paper presented at the 1977 meeting of Secretaries of World Confessional Families in Rome, p5. 13 West, *Op.Cit.*, pp129-30. 14 N. Ehrenstrom and G. Gassmann, *Confessions in Dialogue*, 3rd enlarged and revised edition, Geneva 1975; *The Three Reports of the Forum on Bilateral Conversations (Faith and Order Paper 107)*, Geneva 1981; *Fourth Forum on Bilateral Conversations Report (Faith and Order Paper 125)*, Geneva 1985. 15 Ehrenstrom and Gassmann, *Op.Cit.*, pp28-29. 16 H. Meyer and L. Vischer, *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a world Level*, Geneva 1984, pp149-51.

17 Unpublished paper by Gerhard Klass, presented at the 1987 Conference of Secretaries of Christian World Communions in Geneva. The proposed dialogue with the Anglican Commission was suggested by David Russell at the 1988 Lambeth Conference. 18 M. Thurian (ed.), **Churches respond to B.E.M.: Official responses to the 'Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry'** text, i, Geneva 1986, p77; iii, Geneva 1987, pp227, 234, 239, 254, 258, 260; iv, Geneva 1987, pp196, 206.

19 Thurian, **Op.Cit.**, iv, p185. 20 Article III.4, Pradervand, **Op.Cit.**, pp23, 25. 21 **The Baptist World Congress, London, July 11-19, 1905**, London 1905, pp4-8; J.H. Rushbrooke, 'The Baptist World Alliance', **B.Q.**, ix (1938-39), pp71-78. J.H. Rushbrooke, 'Atlanta and Rumania', **B.Q.** x (1940-41), pp132-33; Lewis, **Op.Cit.**, pp14, 20. 22 Article II, Lewis, **Op.Cit.**, p163. 23 Pradervand, **Op.Cit.**, p220. 24 West, **Op.Cit.**, pp96-97. 25 Payne, J.H. **Rushbrooke**, p80. 26 Underwood, **History of the English Baptists**, p8. 27 West, **Op.Cit.**, pp97-98, 125-28, 133-40, 161-72, 177-81, 184-87. 28 Thurian, **Op.Cit.**, iii, p227. 29 **Ibid**, p252.

DAVID M. THOMPSON