

THE ST. JAMES DECLARATION

PREAMBLE

This Declaration concerns itself with three interconnected issues. The first is that of Holy Orders and the general position of the independent sacramental movement on these matters. The second is addressed to definitions of Old Catholicism, and the third to Liberal Catholicism.

As an overriding consideration, we must express our concern at recent developments that have led to the proliferation of independent sacramental churches, principally with an existence confined to the Internet, many of recent and uncanonical foundation and which are composed of clergy who have been refused promotion within other denominations or who are otherwise ill-suited for advancement. This has led to a position where both Holy Orders and the “denominations” within which they are supposedly conferred risk becoming seen as mere vehicles for personal ambition, and where the lack of formation and ministerial suitability of those concerned risks the reputation of established churches, particularly where the names adopted by the new bodies are similar to those already in use. Furthermore, even when describing themselves as “Old Catholic”, not all of these bodies are composed entirely of clergy in Apostolic Holy Orders, nor do they subscribe to a recognizable Old Catholic theological position.

We do not believe that individuals, whether ordained or not, can validly “found a church” today and call that church Catholic without reference to legitimate and historical communions whose endorsement is necessary to give validity to such a body as Catholic in nature, nor that there is any need for the majority of such new bodies to be created in the first place. In saying this, we do not deny the need for new and specialist ministries within the Catholic Church, nor that some of these may be fulfilled within the historic structures of Old Catholicism.

As is the case with all Old Catholic bodies, our own authority is inherited from the unbroken Apostolic Succession that originates within the Catholic Church as well as the canonical authority inherent either in the representation of the See of Utrecht or, in our case, that was bestowed upon Prince-Abbot Joseph III (Vilatte) by the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch in his authorization of his consecration for the office of the first Old Catholic Archbishop of the United States. We preserve the Catholic faith unimpaired as it was known to the Fathers; we preserve the canonical continuity of our founding denominations; we do not originate in schism. Neither do we accept the Modernism that has so visibly weakened our Roman brethren in the years since 1870. We hold that the salvation of souls is the supreme law of the Church; this cannot compel us to accept the false teaching of wayward shepherds.

Our position is that Holy Orders are conferred by our denominations on behalf of the Catholic Church for the greater glory of God and in order to enable the clergy concerned to undertake the duties proper to the ordained ministry within them. They are not any form of personal property or honorific title.

While we can only hope to affect these developments within our own communion and the ambit of our influence, we must for the benefit of our clergy and in the interests of the faithful declare our complete dissociation from those who would spread ecclesiastical disorder, and the abhorrence of their actions to a faithful and disciplined Old Catholic witness. This Declaration is dedicated to that ultimate end.

The second and third parts of this Declaration are addressed to issues of definition within Old and Liberal Catholicism so as to attempt to dispel any confusion as to where we stand on those issues and to define our position in a historical context. These matters have a clear relationship with the issues discussed in the first part, in that they are dedicated to establishing without ambiguity what is and what is not the position of our communion, and therefore in ensuring that this position is understood clearly by the enquirer rather than merely assumed or defined according to the more or less-informed writings of third parties.

PART ONE

HOLY ORDERS AND RELATED MATTERS WITHIN THE INDEPENDENT SACRAMENTAL MOVEMENT

1. The development of independent sacramental churches has led to considerable overlap, incursion and confusion as to jurisdictional matters. While some of this confusion has come about as a result of historical events, in recent years, it has been the result of an indifference to jurisdiction and other undesirable factors. Where it is possible to act to improve this situation, we should do so, and those churches that are longest established and in the strongest possession of a secure ecclesiastical identity should set an example of this. We therefore call for those churches with a historic tradition and canonical continuity to seek to co-operate in jurisdictional matters, so as to ensure that ecumenical relations are strengthened and the smaller churches enabled to work together on matters of common interest, such as the development of agreed codes of practice. Where there is commonality of faith and practice, this should be reflected in an agreement of intercommunion and an avoidance of the unnecessary duplication of functions and jurisdictional office.

2. Jurisdiction is an essential factor in the conferral of Holy Orders. We will not recognize Holy Orders that are conferred within a communion that is not in clear jurisdictional succession from the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox Churches or another of the historic communions that is accepted as holding the Apostolic Succession. Where a communion originates in division from the mother church, it must show that this division was as a result of a serious and compelling matter of conscience, justified in Canon Law, and was not merely the result of interpersonal disputes. We reject wholeheartedly any entity that holds jurisdiction or historical continuity to be of no importance and hold that such an entity is not a church in any historic Catholic or Orthodox sense.

3. We deplore the practice of clergy receiving Holy Orders without connexion to a canonical and historically continuous communion, or within an environment that is so loosely constituted as a jurisdiction that it is effectively unrecognizable as such. We include in this description those bodies that exercise no meaningful disciplinary control over the conduct of their clergy and are thus unaccountable to the public for the actions taken in their name. We hold that there is generally no good reason for wholly new communions to be formed in the modern era, and regard the formation of such *ex nihilo* without a clear and proven need for their mission as a deplorable practice. All too frequently, this practice is indicative of clergy who are either deficient in formation and/or who seek promotion for reasons of personal ambition rather

than the needs of the Church. Nor do we accept any form of “independent priesthood” or similar innovations.

4. We call for those newly founded bodies that are without a clear and distinct mission, and that are not well grounded in purposeful common ministry, to submit to one of the historic and canonical communions and thereby to return to that disciplined form of community that is integral to the church, putting aside thoughts of personal status and acting solely with the good of the church in mind.

5. We deplore unreservedly the practice of conferring Holy Orders upon individuals who have not completed an adequate formation and who are not personally well-known to their ordaining bishop or to a senior member of clergy deputed by him for the purpose of the assessment of ordinands. We hold that pre-requisites for ordinands must include criminal record checks, sufficient attestations as to integrity of character and personal suitability for ministry, theological formation at least to a level comparable to that of the larger denominations (including general education where required) and (given the considerable exigencies of ministry in the smaller churches) the confirmation over a period of time of the suitability and attunement of the individual concerned to the nature of ministry and Christian witness in their chosen denomination.

6. We hold that clergy who, within a short time of receiving Holy Orders in a denomination, without sound cause, seek to leave in order to exercise ministry in another denomination, are to be deplored, and any clergy who leave in violation of the canons and without being excommunicated are similarly to be deplored. We hold further that any clergy who leave a church in order to avoid disciplinary proceedings should be regarded as *vitandus*. Standards for incardinating clergy should be the same as those maintained for ordinands with the additional requirement that incardinands should be able to give a creditable account of their ministerial history and their reasons for seeking excommunication from their previous church. We regard the use of a period of observation for incardinands as highly desirable.

7. We hold that any entity that receives into its ranks clergy who have not been properly excommunicated or who are not in good canonical standing with their previous denomination is guilty of sin against the unity of the Body of Christ as well as of a profound ecclesiastical discourtesy, and that no relations should be maintained with such an entity or with its clergy.

8. We hold that Holy Orders are a sacrament that is received once only. The reception of additional episcopal commissioning as an act towards the unification of Christendom was initiated during the 1930s by the Apostolic Episcopal Church in pursuance of resolution 9 of the 1920 Lambeth Conference: “Reunion of Christendom”. This stated that the “visible unity of

the Church will be found to involve the wholehearted acceptance of...a ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.” The Resolution continues,

“May we not reasonably claim that the episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion which do not possess the episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a eucharist in which as one family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one Lord our worship and service.”

The Resolution then goes on to propose directly the creation of an Oecumenical Apostolic Succession:

“We believe that for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by way of mutual deference to one another’s consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communion should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united church. It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry. God forbid that any man should repudiate a past experience rich in spiritual blessings for himself and others. Nor would any of us be dishonouring the Holy Spirit of God, whose call led us all to our several ministries, and whose power enabled us to perform them. We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God’s grace and strength to fulfil the same.”

In the absence of a full implementation by the Anglican Communion (although partial implementation was achieved by means of the Bonn Agreement of 1931, after which Old Catholic bishops assisted at some Anglican consecrations using a formulary that was designed to make explicit their intention to transmit the Apostolic Succession), the Apostolic Episcopal Church undertook

this work on a comprehensive basis as an integral part of its mission as an ecumenical body, beginning with its incorporation in 1932 and continuing in the succeeding decades both through its own efforts and notably those of its intercommunion partner the former Catholic Apostolic Church (Catholicate of the West), as well as further intercommunion partners in more recent decades.

In receiving additional episcopal commissioning, the bishop is not required to deny the efficacy of his previous consecration, nor to recognise the additional commissioning as a repetition of that sacrament (which would be blasphemous). The comparison to an *ekonomia* is more appropriate, whereby the effect of additional commissioning is merely to make effective the act of consecration within the context of the church concerned.

The work of the Oecumenical Apostolic Succession has today been completed through the unification of the major Successions from the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, and exists unimpaired within the Apostolic Episcopal Church. The successful completion of this work renders the practice of continued subconditional consecration redundant and undesirable except as a means of rectifying any prudent doubt or error that may have attended a previous consecration. For the purposes of clarification, our view is that clergy who desire to work ecumenically and thereby to receive the Oecumenical Apostolic Succession should join either the Apostolic Episcopal Church or one of the other communions to which its succession has been legitimately transmitted, and should receive Holy Orders within and for that communion.

9. The doctrine of ordination *per saltem* is a historical fact within the Church, but in modern times this doctrine has effectively fallen into desuetude and forms no part of current Old Catholic or Roman Catholic Canon Law with respect to Holy Orders. We hold that there is no good reason why independent sacramental clergy should receive orders *per saltem* today, and will consider any cases where they do so as being *prima facie* doubtful as to their validity.

10. We hold that clergy who receive Holy Orders from individuals who claim episcopal status but have not been Apostolically consecrated are not merely in invalid orders in any Catholic sense but have demonstrated through their intent an indifference to Catholic sacramental practice that would render any subsequent Apostolic bestowal of Holy Orders upon them doubtful.

11. We hold that Holy Orders bestowed under conditions of material deception, simonistically or in exchange for sexual or other favours are doubtful. We hold that any bishop who is prepared to concede Holy Orders under such circumstances shall be declared *vitandus*.

12. Our past practice has included the conferral of Holy Orders in strictly limited circumstances upon clergy for other denominations and missions. While we do not repudiate these actions, it is intended that they will not be repeated in the future and any conferral of Holy Orders will be for and within our communions solely.

13. We note that certain clergy have claimed and published tables of Apostolic Succession that assert succession from us, even though they are not in communion with us. We therefore state as follows:

- (i) that we recognize no member of clergy who claims Apostolic descent from us but who is not in communion with us, and that we specifically disclaim any connexion with them or any responsibility for their actions;
- (ii) that we do not consider valid succession to be a sufficient basis alone for any form of ecclesiastical recognition other than the purely mechanistic;
- (iii) that we do not recognize the actions of bishops who have formerly served within this communion after such time as they have left this communion and thereby severed relations with us;
- (iv) that we shall not be held responsible for the actions of any bishop purely by virtue of the fact that we stand in his succession, nor should any bishop who stands in succession from us likewise be held responsible for our actions purely by virtue of that fact.

PART TWO

OLD CATHOLICISM

1. We define Old Catholicism as an orthodox tradition within the Catholic Church that accepts the Declaration of Utrecht of 1889 and that is in conformity with the general practice of the Catholic Church prior to the First Vatican Council.

2. The Episcopate of the Old Catholics is derived:

(i) from the See of Utrecht of the Catholic Church, being the mother See of Old Catholicism, and/or:

(ii) from the consecration of Prince-Abbot Joseph III (Vilatte) as first Old Catholic Archbishop of the United States of America by the Syrian Orthodox Church.

3. The Union of Utrecht of the Old Catholic Churches is an association of Old Catholic national and related churches, principally organized on the European continent, that was formed following the Declaration of Utrecht in 1889. Concerning this body, we declare as follows:

(i) that the Union of Utrecht is but one of several Old Catholic entities existing today, and that it exercises no form of worldwide or binding jurisdiction over those Old Catholics who are not among its membership, and that any statements it may make concerning those Old Catholics who are not among its members are without legitimate authority;

(ii) that the Union of Utrecht is a body whose modernism, in particular in its union since 1931 with the Anglican Communion and in its decision to ordain women, has brought about clear division between its practice and that of traditionally-minded Old Catholics;

(iii) that in as much as the Union of Utrecht endorses false statements concerning those Old Catholic bodies and clergy which are not within its communion, whether of its own accord or as part of the Anglican Communion, it creates a serious impairment to any ecumenical understanding and co-operation.

(iv) that we endorse those resolutions of the 1943 Council of London concerning such false statements.

4. We define Old Roman Catholicism as a tradition within the Catholic Church that is synonymous with Old Catholicism, noting that Prince-Abbot Joseph III employed both terms as alternatives to describe his jurisdiction, but that has also come to be particularly identified with those churches that derive from the later mission of Archbishop Arnold Harris Mathew, consecrated as Old Catholic bishop for Great Britain, following his Declaration of Autonomy and Independence from the Union of Utrecht on 29 December 1910. Jurisdiction in

this body was firstly derived from the See of Utrecht, in that Archbishop Mathew's status was not dependent upon his membership of the Union of Utrecht but was inherent in his consecration as Old Catholic bishop of Great Britain, and secondly from its union with the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria and the consecration of Archbishop Mathew as Primate of the Order of Corporate Reunion in 1909.

Since there are differences in faith and practice between these bodies we shall define them as follows:

(i) those churches that derive from the Old Roman Catholic Church of Great Britain, also called the Catholic Church of England, Ancient Catholic Church of England, or English Catholic Church, which designations were adopted for the church headed by Archbishop Mathew after 29 December 1910, the successor bodies being;

(a) the Uniate Western Catholic Church, established by Archbishop Mathew as a continuation of his work within the Order of Corporate Reunion on 5 March 1916, which continues to be a part of the Order of Corporate Reunion today. The character of this church was that of an Old Catholic Uniate body.

(b) the Old Roman Catholic Church of Great Britain and Ireland, also using the subtitle Pro-Uniate Rite, as revived under Archbishop Mathew in 1917. The character of this church was that of an Old Catholic Uniate body. In 1925, its character changed significantly (see below).

(c) those churches that derive from the North American Old Roman Catholic Church, founded in 1916 as the union of three Old Catholic bodies, and with its Episcopate derived from Archbishop Mathew. The character of this church was that of Old Catholicism as defined in section 1 above.

(ii) those churches that derive from the continuation of the former clergy of church 4(i) who were members of the Theosophical Society after their resignation from the jurisdiction of Archbishop Mathew in the latter months of 1915; these having gone on to form the following bodies:

(a) the Old Catholic (Old Roman Catholic) Church in Great Britain, renamed the Liberal Christian Church (Old Catholic) on 1 December 1917 and the Liberal Catholic Church (Old Catholic) from 6 September 1918 onwards. The character of this church is discussed in part 3 of this Declaration.

(b) the Church Catholic established in 1916 by Bishop Frederick James and extinct at his death.

(c) the Independent Catholic Church established in 1922 by Patriarch James Bartholomew Banks and renamed The Old Catholic Orthodox Church (Apostolic Service Church) in 1925 and extinct at his death.

In 1925, Archbishop Bernard Mary Williams of the Old Roman Catholic Church of Great Britain and Ireland, referenced at 4(i)(b) above, promulgated a new Constitution in which he repudiated the Declaration of Utrecht and accepted the First Vatican Council. This led to the development of a form of Old Roman Catholicism that was sharply distinct from its origins, and that differed from Rome in two material matters only: the use of a vernacular liturgy (now moot in the light of the Second Vatican Council) and the permitting of a married clergy (although until 1965 celibacy was required for bishops).

A small number of members of the Old Roman Catholic Church of Great Britain and Ireland did not accept the 1925 Constitution, and constituted themselves as the Old Catholic Orthodox Church. This was one of the founding bodies of the Catholic Apostolic Church (Catholicate of the West) in 1943.

5. It may thus be seen that groups calling themselves Old Roman Catholic or that derive from churches of that name may profess one of two distinct positions; either maintaining Old Catholicism or repudiating it. It must also be separately noted that not all of those groups that descend from Old Catholic or Old Roman Catholic bodies continue to maintain the Old Catholic faith, and that some call themselves Old Catholics without having any jurisdictional or Apostolic succession from the canonical entities that are properly entitled to that designation.

6. There is no central body that governs or has authority over Old Catholics and Old Roman Catholics; a key definition of both is that they form a part of the Catholic Church and thus acknowledge the Pope as head of that church. However, under a pre-1870 understanding, the bishop holds the supreme authority for that portion of Christ's flock entrusted to his care, rather than conceding that authority to the Pope as has been the practice of the Roman Catholic Church since the First Vatican Council. "The bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop, and if someone is not with the bishop, he is not in the Church" (St. Cyprian, Letter 66 (69), 8 to Florentius Pupianus, c. AD 254). Thus Old Catholic and Old Roman Catholic communities are autonomous episcopally-governed jurisdictions within the Catholic Church that acknowledge Papal jurisdiction but yet are separated from the Holy See due to historical and doctrinal factors.

7. We therefore reject any form of blanket statement that fails to recognize the diversity of faith and practice that today exists among both Old Catholics and Old Roman Catholics and we deplore the re-publication of such historical statements whose patent inaccuracy does little to assist ecumenical relations. We hold that a group asserting that it is Old Catholic or Old Roman Catholic

must be examined on an individual basis to establish its *bona fides*, and that any judgement that is not made with a full and objective awareness of the facts at hand cannot be relied upon.

PART THREE

LIBERAL CATHOLICISM

1. We define Liberal Catholicism as a tradition within the Catholic Church that accepts the Declaration of Utrecht of 1889 and that is in conformity with the general practice of the Catholic Church prior to the First Vatican Council, and that descends from the former clergy of the Old Roman Catholic Church of Great Britain who were members of the Theosophical Society and who resigned from that church in the latter months of 1915. These then formed the Old Catholic (Old Roman Catholic) Church in Great Britain, renamed the Liberal Christian Church (Old Catholic) on 1 December 1917 and the Liberal Catholic Church (Old Catholic) from 6 September 1918 onwards. Since that time, divisions within the Liberal Catholic Church have given rise to multiple churches in the Liberal Catholic tradition, as well as several competing bodies that claim to be the Liberal Catholic Church itself.
2. The Episcopate of all Liberal Catholic bishops is derived from the Rt. Revd. James Ingall Wedgwood, who was consecrated on 13 February 1916 in succession from Archbishop Mathew.
3. The Liturgy of the Liberal Catholic Church is in conformity with the essential form of the Mass before 1870 and thus remains authorized for use within our communion.
4. The word “Liberal” in the phrase “Liberal Catholic Church” referred to the permitting of extensive freedom of thought in the interpretation of the Catholic Faith. This allowed those with esoteric views to participate fully in a Catholic church and did not exclude those who were Freemasons or members of esoteric societies. However, the following points must be clarified:
 - (i) the boundaries of such freedom have always been a subject for debate within the Liberal Catholic Church. Where such freedom embraces beliefs that, for example, would not be compatible with conscientious attendance at the liturgy of the Liberal Catholic Church, or with the Acts of Faith or other Christian confessions of that church, a person may be said to have placed himself outside those boundaries. In the light of this, some Liberal Catholic jurisdictions have published basic Teachings that set out their principles of belief.
 - (ii) there has never been any official link between the Liberal Catholic Church and the Theosophical Society, nor with any branch of Freemasonry, and members have been free to belong or not to belong to such bodies or other esoteric societies entirely at their choice and without any requirement to accept their teachings.

(iii) the teachings, writings and observations of Bishop C.W. Leadbeater are not official teachings of the Liberal Catholic Church and represent his personal perspectives and spiritual insights solely.

(iv) the faith, discipline and practice of the Liberal Catholic Church as a body has at all times been carefully disciplined to ensure that it conforms to an orthodox and Old Catholic standard of belief; a careful distinction has been drawn between the official position of the church and the insights of its members, and the church has governed itself canonically and with good order. Any allegation that the Liberal Catholic Church as a body has endorsed heretical or heterodox beliefs is wholly unfounded. Furthermore, during the late 1920s, Archbishop Evlogius of the Russian Orthodox Church in Europe endorsed the Holy Orders of the L.C.C. as valid.

4. Since its foundation, the nature of liberalism among Liberal Catholics has been constantly redefined. This is shown, among other issues, by the imposition of some Liberal Catholic churches of dietary restrictions upon their clergy, requiring them to follow a vegetarian diet and to abstain from alcohol and tobacco. A further matter, and one of greater material concern to Catholics since it raises a controversy as to the matter of the sacrament, has been the replacement of wine at the Eucharist with unfermented grape juice. In more recent years, some Liberal Catholic denominations have decided to ordain women to the major orders.

(i) Within our communion the use of fermented grape juice (wine) is obligatory at the Eucharist and the use of unfermented grape juice is not permitted;

(ii) Within our communion no dietary restrictions are applied either to the clergy or to the laity;

(iii) While our communion holds that the ordination of women is valid, it has decided (for reasons explained in an Encyclical) not to participate in the ordination of women until such time as the matter may be favourably decided by an Ecumenical Council.

5. A more pervasive current of thought in recent years has been prompted by the Second Vatican Council and by the ideas of political liberalism. These have caused a redefinition of the term “liberal” in the minds of some that wish to see the recent changes in the Roman Catholic Church go further, and who thus espouse a “liberal Catholicism” that is distinct from “Liberal Catholicism” in the L.C.C. sense. The confusion between these two definitions of “liberal” means that the word has lost the clear meaning that it once had, and can apply not only to those who endorse the L.C.C.’s freedom of thought but also to those who oppose its hierarchical structure and traditionalist worship. It is this latter meaning that is most prominent in the public mind today and that thereby creates a series of problems and misapprehensions for those Liberal Catholics whose concepts remain those of the original L.C.C.

6. A further point at issue has been the contrast between the essentially inner, esoteric nature of the Liberal Catholic central charism and the attempt to function as a universal church through the provision of public worship, even where that provision is primarily to a non-esoteric congregation. Whereas at one point during the 1920s it appeared that the L.C.C. would have realistic expectations of some degree of mass appeal, the position since 1929 has been one of decline in numbers, although not in quality of witness. The cost of maintaining buildings has become considerable, especially when these are under-used.

7. Although a limited dialogue between Liberal Catholic groups has been attempted over the years, this has not ultimately proved productive, and the differences between the groups have not been reconciled. The issue has become complicated by the recent proliferation of groups which have been affected by the same problems that we identified in the Preamble of ill-qualified clergy and a lack of understanding of the historical and theological basis of the Liberal Catholic tradition. These problems were largely absent from the Liberal Catholic movement until the last few years, when they have become more visible and prevalent.

8. In attempting a reform of the Liberal Catholic tradition and drawing that tradition closer to its Old Catholic and orthodox roots, the Ecclesia Apostolica Divinorum Mysteriorum has sought to establish an esoteric and inner church that is at once orthodox and fully Catholic but that also permits of a wide range of study and thought, drawing upon the traditions of Catholic and Orthodox mysticism and those of the Wisdom Schools that are compatible with a Catholic witness in keeping with the Declaration of Utrecht. As a disciplined communion under canon law, the Ecclesia has established a solid foundation and has come to fulfil a number of expectations. However, it has not been immune from the problems outlined in this Declaration. Accordingly, it has been decided that for the immediate future:

(i) the public missions of EADM will be transferred to the Order of Antioch and that EADM will no longer have any role in the provision of public worship, functioning as an inner communion for Catholic clergy interested in the exploration of the mystic and esoteric traditions solely.

(ii) in order to distance it from those misleading assumptions that have come to attend the phrase "Liberal Catholic" in the modern era, EADM asserts clearly that its understanding of that term is construed exclusively in the light of its original and traditional definition in the writings of Bishop James Ingall Wedgwood, first Presiding Bishop of the Liberal Catholic Church.

(iii) EADM clearly distances itself from any form of esoteric belief or membership that is not fully compatible with a witness to the Catholic and Orthodox faith as defined in the Declaration of Utrecht of 1889; nor

shall it be held responsible for any such belief that may have been held by members of the Liberal Catholic movement in the past outside its own communion.

(iv) the clergy listing of EADM will no longer be open to the public; clergy will continue to be issued with faculties in keeping with the Canons and can be verified by enquiry to the Secretariat.

(v) none of the foregoing shall be taken to imply any detriment to the Apostolic Succession of EADM from the Liberal Catholic Church and the former Liberal Catholic Church of Ontario.

Done at St James's, London, this 26th day of October in the year of Our Lord two thousand and twelve:

+EDMOND P
Superior-General, Order of Antioch
Metropolitan, Ecclesia Apostolica Divinorum Mysteriorum

+ANDREAS
Titular Archbishop of Mount-Carmel

+ANTONIUS
Titular Bishop of Gaza

JASON+
Vicar-General

FOR THE GENERAL CHAPTER OF THE ORDER OF ANTIOCH
FOR THE COUNCIL OF THREE OF THE ECCLESIA APOSTOLICA
DIVINORUM MYSTERIORUM

