

First of all, may I bring you greetings by reminding you that Grace is yours and peace, from God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Now St. Paul used those words to greet all the churches. I do not believe he did this in prefatory fashion. By grace he meant all the initiating power of God for good in our lives and through us in society such as has prompted us in these days and throughout all our day. And by peace he means not only peace in the world or peace of heart, but rather, he means fulfillment, completion, total health such as characterizes us at this moment. These two gifts, his grace and his peace, belong to all men and women. We are of that community which has self-consciously received these gifts with grateful hearts. Now it is not lost on me, nor on you, the significance of being here in Malcolm X College. I can remember deeply to this moment how much I was moved when I read the Autobiography of Malcolm X, and how I realized for the first time that here was a man who was one of the great men of the history of this country; and then I felt perhaps more deeply than ever before, although I already felt it deeply, what it means for some of God's gifts to us, a people, that they be suppressed and locked into some of the systems of cruelty which have characterized our society. Now that in itself is enough cause for us to be here. But we are here also prompted in other directions, and we sing with the psalmist: "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless his holy name; Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not any of his benefits. He forgives our inequities; he heals our diseases; he redeems our lives from the pit he crowns us with loving kindness and tender mercies; and he restores us in such a way that our youth is renewed like the eagles." Now that ought to be expressive of our state of being at this very moment. And so, we do bless the Lord, and I want to thank YOU, thank you for what you have been doing in behalf of the Church and in behalf of all mankind. Perhaps it is not amiss for me to intrude that word of thanks to you at this moment, because believe me, you will get little enough thanks along the way.

Now here I am, when I don't have on my wedding garments. I'm out of uniform; but since you will see that Joe is in uniform, he will have to serve for both of us in that respect today. Not long ago I was with your colleagues in Britain. We paid a visit to the city of York in this the thousandth anniversary of its foundation. Now, as we came out of Yorkminster, where an ordination service was about to take place, whom should we encounter, but His Grace, the Archbishop of York himself. Now he was in all the purples of the Church such as I'm told I should be garbed in at this moment. Well, I greeted him and then I apologized a little bit for my condition, and he said, "You are looking very lay." But even that I took as a kind of compliment, because that placed me squarely in the midst of the People of God where I trust I belong. And yet, I'm here as a representative of the whole Church. That's true of all of you in a very real sense; I'm not the only one here who could greet you as such a representative, but as a Bishop of the whole Church, perhaps I have that responsibility, and also to regard myself, if I may, in your presence as a stand-in for any other ecclesiastical figure you might offhand name, and I want that to be very inclusive. Now I represent the Institutional Church, but so do you. Every one of us here has a foot in both of those worlds. The Church is a part--a very real and prompting part--of the New Social Vehicle. And when we are tempted to despise the Church, we ought to think of at least a couple of things. One I think would be this. If you are aware, as I'm sure all of us are, that there is not now an institution among men which has not been called into question. That includes the legal establishment, the medical profession, the educational order, the political order--not one has escaped. But in our time, at any rate, we ought to be particularly

mindful, and even a little modestly proud of the fact that the first institution to be called into question in our time is the Church, the religious establishment. Now that ought to say something to us. It ought to suggest, among other things, that the religious establishment was about its job. However ineffectively and ineffectually, it was about its job standing as a sentinel to civilization. Now if that be true, and it is true, then it follows that precisely that religious establishment has yet another responsibility, not to be last, but to be first to involve itself self-consciously in the reconstruction of society. I take it that that is what we've been about. Now some months ago when I was about my pastoral calling in New Bedford, Massachusetts, a layman addressed a question to me. The question was this: "What, after all, is the purpose of the Church?" He not only asked the question, but he proceeded to answer it from his light, and he answered it in this fashion: "Isn't it to encourage people to become more spiritual and to lay off the social dimension?" Well, I was glad he asked that question for at least two reasons. First of all, it bugs many people in our day, and secondly because I had a ready answer. Now, of course, I borrowed the answer, and I won't even have to cite in your presence the source, because the answer was this: "The purpose of the Church is to increase among men the love of both God and neighbor." Now, of course, the person from whom I borrowed it borrowed it from Jesus, and Jesus borrowed it from Scripture, and so it's dead center. Well, the point is that these two, that is, the love of God and the love of neighbor, are never found in isolation from each other. To use a chemical metaphor, they are never found in pure form. Now we've all seen people who specialize on the love of God to the neglect of their neighbors. But upon careful examination, it is found that they do not love God either. Or we find those who think they've turned their backs on the things of God, and they are caught in the act of loving their neighbor, and it is discovered to their astonishment at any rate that they love God too. And it is the purpose of the Church to keep these two in a kind of fruitful tension. And it is exactly that which is true spirituality.

Well, you've heard a good bit these days about the marriage of the Institutional Church and the Movemental Church. I believe that that is true. I believe that it must be true. And, at least in the initial sense, it is beginning to be true. And one could cite that on many hands. And if others were here standing in for the whole Church as I happen to be at the moment, they could also cite evidence I believe. But let me go with you as I went also with Joe and Phil Townley some months ago to Addis Abbaba. And there, I think, we saw plenty of evidence of the marriage, and what a place it is for the Church. If I may simply remind you, we went up to a place called Lollabella. Now Lollabella is on a high plateau, and then a mountain above the plateau in northern Etheopia. It was built in about the eleventh century by a king named Lollabella. As some of you by chance saw last December the National Geographic magazine, I notice that some of my best friends look at the pictures in it at any rate, you would have seen there the rock-hewn churches of Lollabella. Now this king was, of course, a Christian, and I think he wanted to do at least two things in causing those churches to be carved out of solid rock. He knew very well that not many people of Etheopia could make the pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and so he brought a little of the Holy Land there. And on the top of the mountain, or to cite Scripture, the mountains which are above the mountains, he built Zion, city of our God. And you can't have a Holy Land without the Jordan River--well, there was no river up there on the top of the mountain. And when you don't have a Jordan River and you need one, what you do is dig it. And that is what he did. And so if you can't take the people to the Holy Land, you bring the Holy Land to them. Now that is something to reflect upon in a global situation. And not only that, but he built it with material which was at hand, which, as I say, he carved those temples out of

solid rock to give witness to this fact through this enduring medium: that Jesus Christ had come to stay. Well, that only for a background for saying this: the marriage of the Institutional and the Movemental Church. And in at least that situation it took place in something very like the following manner. In the course of about ten days we had conversation together with representatives of the Church throughout the whole world. This was bishops, archbishops, moderators, theologians, members of the bureaucracy of the various churches and so on; and we usually set a stage for having this encounter, or this ceremony if you will, at a table; and we would break bread together. And I would tell the story. Now all of you in one way or another could tell that same story: the story of the Ecumenical Institute, one of the manifestations of the Movemental Church in our time. I did point out along the way that the road in recent years has been strewn with the wreckage of experimental endeavors in the Movement of the Spirit. And so, the Ecumenical Institute, I think we can claim for it a kind of longevity in this situation which holds something of the trek from Austin to Evanston and from Evanston to West Chicago and from there to the outermost parts of the globe. Now I would tell that story in essence. I learned to tell it in a dozen ways to suit the particular situation appropriate to the precise ceremony which was going on at that time. And I finally told Joe and Phil that if I told that story one more time I would believe it myself. I should say that without exception the validity of this marriage was acknowledged. And that, mind you, from representatives I think from every inhabited continent. Well, they already knew something was going on in their own backyards at this time, and so they could fill in some of the gaps themselves; and I leave you to fill in the gaps as well. But the end is not yet in that regard. For within the next thirty days I hope I shall have in the presence of Joe, and I don't know whether Phil will be present at that time or not, to tell this story in the presence of Cardinal John Philabrand who will be in this country and who is the head of the Secretariat for Christian Unity of the Vatican. And I don't mind telling you, if you don't tell anyone else, that one of the reasons we'll do that is in the hope that he will make it possible for us to tell this story in yet another presence.

And among others, we told the story to the Patriarch of the Etheopian Church in that capital city. It's a wonderful church. It has, by the way, a relationship, of course, with the Coptic Church; but whereas the Coptic Church has three liturgies, the Etheopian Church has fourteen. It has never thrown anything away, and yet it is wide open without pressure to update itself--it possibly can within this decade--and it is for that reason that we asked and received the immediate response of the Patriarch to have the ITI which is going on there in Addis Abbaba at this very moment. And not only that, but we got the approval of the Ecumenical Bishop of the Coptic Church to have another ITI in Egypt. And we shall get around to the Patriarchy of Antioch and then the Ecumenical Patriarch, I hope on the same trip, in Constantinople. Well perhaps this is enough to suggest that marriage is an acknowledgement upon two partners, and whether it is the presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church of this country or some of these other ecclesiastical leaders, there you have it. Now you may think I'm taking up too much time. I've been assigned a certain amount of time, and I expect to use it.

Now we've had some wonderful terminology, as we always have--Establishment, Disestablishment, Proestablishment, and Transestablishment. I suppose it would be fair to say that we're all involved in all of those, whether we like it or not. There is this great term in British Church history in the last century: Antidisestablishmentarianism. Now that was, I think, supposed at one time to be the longest word in the English language; that is, until someone dug up some place name in Wales which

was much longer even than that. But I'm sure that a good bit of Antidisestablishmentarianism has been going on here. I don't know all the details in British Church history, I'm willing to have instruction at that point. But I do know that for that period at any rate, the Antidisestablishmentarianistic Movement, to coin an even longer word, prevailed. So here we are, every one of us, a part of the Establishment. I mean the Establishment is the social apparatus in all of its ramifications which actually is, and one would say unless someone has been able to stop the globe and actually get off, he is a part of the Establishment. One is tempted to inquire as to whether those two brethren in their beach buggy on the moon have succeeded in that, but they are particularly clear illustrations of the fact of the mutual interdependencies which bind all our lives together like some great fabric, and they know all too well that they have not opted out, on the grounds that I assume they do not want to stay there. But we are all, in one sense of the word I suppose, a part of the Disestablishment. It is hardly possible not to be in these days, because after all there are many faces to the Establishment. It is true that whatever Establishment is under assault, it would like to get rid of those who assault it. And it is equally true of the Disestablishment. It would like to get rid of the Establishment. But particularly in the case of the Church. It is precisely the Church which has given birth to the Movement, to the Disestablishment, if you will. This has always been true in Church history, and it is the Disestablishment that has remembered this as structural revolutionaries which always wants to become the Establishment. And if the Disestablishment succeeds, it by definition becomes the Establishment. And that is something which is easy to forget, but we ought not quite to do this. The Establishment would on its part like to be relevant; and on the other hand, I think that it is true that the Movemental Church, the Disestablishment, would like to be accepted. But we are moving toward Transestablishment which will establish the ends and goals, neither of the Establishment nor of the Disestablishment, but rather some synthesis of the two, for the dialogue is going on between them, and the outcome will be in the hands of the Holy Spirit. For after all, when we speak of the communion of the Holy Spirit, we are speaking of communication; we are speaking of conversation of dialogue, which implies that the partners of this dialogue must be present to each other; they must really be there.

And now just a few words in conclusion. It seems to me that one of the most fruitful and compelling demands upon us is that we do everything within our power to establish dialogue about the New Social Vehicle. I've quoted so many times this week that phrase which Servan-Schreiber quotes saying something like this: that the aim of politics is to see to it that people do not busy themselves about what really concerns them. Well, that's not an exact quotation, but it's near enough to have the gist of it, and I submit to you that that's exactly the case. And in and of itself, it should be a stimulus for us to start the conversation. And people will have plenty to say; even those who have not become articulate, once they are invited to speak, will have plenty to say. And so I want to suggest another thing to you, and that is you are churchmen. And it may be that you think that the focus of your Disestablishment thrust is to be at the Church. I'd like to suggest in no defensive mode whatever that nothing could be further, in my judgment, from the truth. But if I'm not gravely mistaken, the opposition will come from a most surprising quarter. If we had the triangles up here I'd be able to point to it. But I mean in that upper triangle; and I mean particularly the educational establishment, the academic establishment--that's where it is. I mean to say that's where you will have articulated the kind of sentiments which would try to undercut and with a phrase wipe out everything you have labored so hard and long for in these days. Now no one will know better than you how imperfect the product is up to this point; but it is received by the grace of God

which has initiated it and by the peace of God which has brought it to its present stage of completion. And then let us recall one or two other facts of life. Of course the economic community will be something less than pleased with everything you may have placed your fingers on, not to mention the political establishment. But here again, if I am not greatly mistaken, you will not find that their response will be by direct action, but rather they will hide behind the phrases which will soon be emitted from the academic community. And don't you forget it. If I'm wrong, I hope that you will tell me so. And I would like to suggest one or two responses. One thing it would seem to me ought to be an encouragement to us that there are so many indications in the economic community that they are trying to head in the same direction. Talk globality--that's a language which the international business community knows full well. They know they have to have globality. But leave it to them and it will be for their own ends. If there's tyranny which is evident in this lower left-hand triangle at the present time, let that be expanded, as some say it will by 1980 or by the year 2000, so that perhaps some 500 international business concerns will be in charge of every political order, for all intents and purposes. But at the same time an instinct there for the direction in which we could go. If you are interested in evangelism, I suggest that that would be some of the ways in which our energies might be projected so that what is inevitable will not be in the service of demons but of Almighty God. And then one other thing, a word of encouragement and reassurance. When you cut up against sociologists and anthropologists and the economists--the whole bevy of the academic community--I think you could give a modest answer. I would say that in this month you have put in not less than three months of labor, as such labor is ordinarily reckoned--is there anyone who disagrees with that? And when you get a thousand people putting in three months labor, that adds up to 250 years; just about ten lifetimes, or the productive lifetimes of ten academicians. Well, I don't regard that we've been complete idiots here who have to apologize very much. Well that might, if not convincing to the enemy, it might be reassuring to you. And then one or two cautionary words. I hope we don't peddle too quickly for having it or settle too quickly for coming to terms with the Establishment. I hope we won't become tired too quickly. We're in the hundredth anniversary of the Paris commune. If I understand correctly the reason it failed in trying to put the power of decision in the hands of the people was twofold: they got tired and they became disunited. That was a hundred years ago; and if you read Servan-Schreiber's book carefully, you would see that the city of Paris is the only city in the world today without a mayor. It is still suffering from the reprimand they received for trying to put the power in the hands of the people. And then I hope we will live with reality. I told some the other day about what happened in the Japanese village after World War II. Experts came from the Western world to rationalize their land-holding policy of fragmentation, a village in which farmers would go out in several directions to very small plots of land. Why anyone knows that that's no way to do things. So the experts said you must unify. A man goes out in three directions to one acre; give him three acres in one spot. But it didn't work. And the reason it didn't work was threefold. And each one of them rooted to the realities of the situation. These farmers were not idiots either, for they said that if they had all their land together, it might not be good land. When we have it separated, some of our land is good even if some of it is stony and unproductive. Or, if we have all of our land together and a flood comes along or a windstorm, and we lose anything, we lose everything. Whereas, if we were divided, this would not be the case. And then the third reason was that when they went out from the village not just in one direction but in every direction, they didn't always meet the same people. This was one of the ways in which they were able to address themselves and be addressed

by the whole community. So, we've got to be rooted in reality. And I'll just mention one other thing from India. It is said that two American engineers were asked to go there to lay out an access road from the main artery to a village. And these two American engineers, as they went along, were confronted with a doby--a doby is a washerman--with a donkey and a great load of dirty clothes. He was taking them to the river. They thought they would joke with him a little bit, and they said, "If you had to lay out a road from the village to the main artery, how would you do it?" "Well," he said, "I would simply drive my donkey from the village to the main road, and where he walked, that is where the road would be." And they said to him, "Well, supposing you didn't have any donkey?" He said, "Well, in that case, I would call on the services of two American engineers."

So there is a verse of Scripture that I want to use. In fact a couple of them. It's the one which says, "Don't be, as you put on your armor, like one who is taking it off." And I would anticipate along the way, to coin a phrase, there is going to be a good bit of sweat and blood and toil and tears. But we do have the reassuring words of one who said that "Behold I place before you an open door which no man can shut."