



Armenian Apostolic Church of America
138 East 39th Street, New York, New York 10016

Volume XVIII, Number 7 — January 1996

Catholicos Karekin I at St. Illuminator's Cathedral



Catholicos Karekin I presents a gift to Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian in remembrance of his visit to St. Illuminator's Cathedral.



The Catholicos puts on the ring which Archbishop Ashjian presented to him. The ring, a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Hagop and Ica Kouyoumdjian, was crafted from an authentic coin cast for the coronation of King Levon I.



Mr. and Mrs. Harold and Josephine Gulamerian receive the Prince and Princess of Cilicia titles from His Holiness who had issued it last year while still Karekin II of Cilicia.

Responding to an invitation by His Eminence Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian, Prelate of the Eastern Prelacy, His Holiness Karekin I, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians, visited St. Illuminator's Cathedral Saturday afternoon, January 13. His Holiness was accompanied by the Primate of the Eastern, Western, and Canadian Dioceses, Their Eminences Archbishop Khajag Barsamian, Archbishop Vatche Hovsepian, Archbishop Hovnag Derderian, as well as several clergymen who are part of the Pontifical entourage. His Holiness is on an extended visit to the United States and Canada.

The official procession, which began at the junction of Second Avenue and 27th Street, escorted His Holiness, under the Pontifical Canopy, to the Cathedral. The canopy was carried by Onnic Marashian (chairman of the Prelacy Executive Council), Hagop Kouyoumdjian, Haig Titizian, and Dro Piligian. On hand to greet His Holiness was Congressman Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey, who then accompanied His Holiness to the Church.

In spite of the snowstorm which paralyzed New York and left the streets in precarious condition, the Church was filled to beyond capacity with the faithful eager to catch a glimpse of His Holiness, who during the 1970s served as Prelate of the Eastern Prelacy.

Attending the service were His Excellency Samir Moubarak, the Lebanese ambassador to the United Nations; His Excellency Mohammed Hallak, the Syrian ambassador to the United Nations; Mr. Andre Tabourian, former member of the Lebanese Parliament and currently a member of the Central Executive Council of the Cilician See; all members of the Prelacy's Executive Council; clergymen serving the Prelacy and faithful individuals from Philadelphia, Boston, Providence, and even distant communities like Chicago and Indiana.

Following the opening prayers, Archbishop Ashjian offered words of welcome extending his love to the Catholics who was his mentor and teacher. His Eminence's poignant words heightened the emotions of the day, as he described the forty years of dedicated service by His Holiness to the Armenian Church at the Cilician Seminary, the dioceses of Iran, India, and the Eastern U.S. and Canada, the Great House of Cilicia, and finally the Holy See of Etchmiadzin. Archbishop Ashjian spoke of His Holiness' newest challenge of service as Catholicos of All Armenians. The Prelate noted that we have entered a new and historic era for the Armenian Church and nation in Armenia and the Diaspora. Archbishop Ashjian then invited His Holiness to present his message to the people.

Visibly affected by the emotions of

(Continued on page 2)

The next issue of OUTREACH will give more details about His Holiness Karekin I's visit to the U.S. and Canada, as well the complete text of his remarks at St. Illuminator's.

Catholicos Karekin I at St. Illuminator's

(Continued from page 1)

the day, Catholicos Karekin I blessed the gathered faithful, specifically remembering the many times he has prayed and spoken from this altar, first as Prelate, and later as Catholicos of Cilicia. His Holiness said as he entered St. Illuminator's for the first time as Catholicos of Etchmiadzin, he felt the same comfort and love as before. He emphasized the unity of the Armenian Church and the importance of mutual love.

Concluding his words, the Catholicos presented a memento in remembrance of his first visit to St. Illuminator's, depicting Holy Etchmiadzin and Ararat with the inscriptions, "Blessings from Holy Etchmiadzin," and "Ararat, the Arch of Salvation." Archbishop Ashjian accepted the beautiful gift with deep gratitude and in turn presented a gift to His Holiness, a ring fashioned from an authentic coin cast for the coronation of the Cilician King, Levon I (1199-1218). The unusual and beautiful ring was a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Hagop and Ica Kouyoumdjian of New Jersey.

Before the conclusion of the service, His Holiness was given one more task. Last March, at the request of Archbishop Ashjian, His Holiness, then Karekin II of Cilicia, issued an encyclical awarding the titles of Prince and Princess of Cilicia to Harold and Josephine Gulamerian for their many years of service to the Prelacy, the Cilician Catholicate, and the orphans in Armenia. Because of ensuing events, the insignia was not officially presented. Taking advantage of this opportunity, and with the approval of His Holiness Aram I, Catholicos of Cilicia, Archbishop Ashjian asked Catholicos Karekin to present this coveted and well-deserved recognition to Mr. and Mrs. Gulamerian. "That which I issued as Karekin II," the Pontiff said, "I now present to you as Karekin I."

The combined choirs of the Cathedral, St. Sarkis Church, and Sts. Vartanantz Church under the direction of Deacon Sarkis Apelian, added beauty to the service. Further enhancing the inspiring and emotional service, were the voices of the combined choirs of Hamazkain and the Iranian Armenian Society, directed by Raffi Sevadjan, singing *Amen Hye-ee Srditz Pughatz, Giligia, and Mer Hairenik.*

*"Get down on your knees and thank God you are on your feet."
—Irish Saying—*

OUTREACH

A publication of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America
138 E. 39th Street
New York, New York 10016
Tel: (212) 689-7810 Fax: (212) 689-7168
Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian
Prelate
Iris Papazian
Editor
Mardiros Minas-Haftvani
Business Manager

OUTREACH (USPS 426-490) is published monthly, with the exception of a combined June-July-August issue by the Prelacy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America, 138 East 39th Street, New York, NY 10016, (212) 689-7810. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcome; please include a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. Signed articles do not necessarily reflect the policy of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America. Send all correspondence to the above address to the attention of the Editor. Printed in the United States of America. Second class postage paid at New York, NY 10016. **Postmaster:** Send address changes to OUTREACH, 138 E. 39th Street New York, New York, 10016. ISSN: 10643087

Christmas Party Benefits Prelacy Building Fund



Archbishop Ashjian with members of the Prelacy Ladies Guild.

The beautiful home of Mr. and Mrs. Aram and Silva Zadourian in Alpine, New Jersey was transformed into a Christmas wonderland for a holiday dinner party benefiting the Prelacy's Building Fund, on December 9, 1995.

Ignoring the snow and ice that had fallen earlier in the day, friends and supporters of the Prelacy found their way to Alpine and enjoyed the warm hospitality of the Zadourians.

The Prelacy building in Manhattan underwent extensive renovation in 1987. Since then, there has been in place a plan to enlarge the Vahakn and Hasmig Hovnanian reception hall by enclosing the adjacent terrace. These plans, however, were put on hold following the earth-shattering and historic events in Armenian since 1988.

In order to complete the renovation as originally envisioned, last year the Prelacy Ladies Guild decided to concentrate its efforts to raise the \$105,000 needed to complete the project. Several fundraising events have taken place already and this most



Paree Akhorjak! Archbishop Ashjian with hosts Aram and Silva Zadourian in front of the gorgeous holiday table.

recent Christmas dinner party at the Zadourian residence added considerably to the growing fund.

"We are so very grateful to Aram and Silva for their generous and loving hospitality," said Archbishop

Mesrob Ashjian. His Eminence, who often refers to the Prelacy Ladies Guild as "the heart and soul of the Prelacy" thanked all of the members for their dedication and devotion. ✚



Scenes from the joyous evening of friendship which benefitted the Prelacy Building Fund.



THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT is at a decisive point in its history. Various terms have been used to describe this situation: some refer to the present period as one of "transition"; others speak of "uncertainty" and "stagnation"; still others would go so far as to say that the movement is in the process of "losing its integrity." But what lies behind all of these and similar characterizations is the reality that the ecumenical movement is at a crossroads of new realities in a world that itself is marked by radical transformation. Under these circumstances, the movement is searching for a new identity, a new self-expression, a new orientation.

Looking at the present ecumenical scene, one may identify a number of emerging trends and growing challenges that the ecumenical movement must wrestle with realistically and seriously.

From Individual-Centered to Church-Centered Ecumenism

The ecumenical movement was given shape and visibility by a few visionary people who came from different confessions and regions. For many years ecumenism was largely sustained by the commitment of such individuals. Their churches, including in many cases most of the hierarchy, were hardly aware of it. Today, the ecumenical movement is a movement of *churches*. In theory this development is surely to be welcomed. It has become clear that ecumenism is not a movement *extra ecclesiam*; and by penetrating into the whole life and mission of the churches, it has acquired a certain "ecclesial character." But neither is ecumenism only an *intra ecclesiam* reality. As the movement of the Holy Spirit, the ecumenical movement transcends the boundaries of institutional churches and embraces the whole people of God.

In practice, this shift towards church-centered ecumenism has produced a number of problems:

1. There is a fear in some quarters that becoming church-centered leads inevitably to confining the movement to church institutions and totally paralyzing it. The result is that distinctions are made between "ecclesiastical" ecumenism, "social" ecumenism, "secular" ecumenism and other types of ecumenism. While it is useful for analytical purposes to distinguish different facets of the ecumenical vocation and to recognize that different individuals and bodies may concentrate on one or the other of these, such distinctions should not lead to compartmentalization of the ecumenical movement, which creates ambiguity, disintegration and polarization. The all-embracing and the *ecumenical* character of the ecumenical movement must be nourished constantly and articulated clearly, though again without undermining its ecclesial (not "ecclesiastical") basis and identity.

2. The shift away from individual-centered ecumenism has brought with it an overall lowering of commitment to the ecumenical movement and a reduction in the quality of its work. Not all of the "ecumenists" who are appointed by their churches as "conference-goers" are qualified in terms of their acquaintance with the life and history of the ecumenical movement; and in some cases they may not even have a particular commitment to the search for visible unity. Instead of being present to contribute fully from the life of their own church to the fellowship of churches, they may be there only to "represent" their church and to "defend" its theological teachings or political positions. The ecumenical zeal and deep engagement of former generations have too frequently given way to nominal and uncommitted representation.

3. Church-centered ecumenism has also created difficult problems pertaining to the nature and size of representation in ecumenical bodies. While the clergy tries to maintain its predominance, the laity, and particularly women and youth, struggle for more power and visibility. The establishment by many ecumenical bodies—usually after a long and strenuous debate—of "quotas" for certain categories

The Ecumenical Movement at a Crossroads

by Aram I

Catholicos of the Great House of Cilicia

of participants, has not proved to be a satisfactory solution to the problem. While at one level these formulas may secure a certain diversity, the division of people into "categories" also heightens tensions and has not in most cases proved to secure more participation and wholeness. The fundamental problem is related to the compartmentalization of ecumenism noted above: the failure to maintain the oneness of the movement as perceived by church leadership and ecumenism as perceived by movements and action groups, of ecumenism which is the projection of the inner divisions of the churches and new types of ecumenism which are emerging from the grassroots.

"It is probably inevitable that as the ecumenical movement took shape in various institutions the passion and high expectations which motivated and sustained it in the early years would be replaced by more realistic and pragmatic attitudes."

4. The ecumenical movement is inconceivable without the participation of the churches, and the churches cannot exist responsibly and authentically without the ecumenical movement. Yet after a short period of great ecumenical enthusiasm, during which the self-understanding of the church was significantly enhanced, it has been clear in the last decade that a general indifference, if not weariness, toward ecumenism has set in. Many churches are losing their sense of ownership of the ecumenical movement. Instead of being a reality touching their lives, ecumenism is often dealt with purely as a matter of "external relations." In this sense (to take an example), the World Council of Churches is seen less as a fellowship of the churches than as a reality *outside* the churches.

At the same time, the representatives of the churches in ecumenical bodies may not in fact "bring back home" what they have learned and experienced. The appearance of being "ecumenical" which a church gives through what its representatives say in ecumenical gatherings may be contradicted by the behaviour of that same church within its own context. There may be a variety of immediate problems in their own everyday life—economic and political difficulties, internal conflicts of different sorts, including in many cases the growth of conservative and anti-ecumenical groups. Some churches may regard trends and developments within the ecumenical bodies as a division from or even a contradiction of what they judge to be the real nature and goals of the ecumenical movement. In some churches the ecumenical momentum may have been taken up by groups and movements whose activities completely bypass the formal institutional boundaries and structures.

In the face of this situation ecumenical education is often disorganized and in a number of churches even non-existent. If members hear about the ecumenical movement it is only by chance, and what they hear is likely to be partial, unclear or even mistaken.

It is thus vitally important that the churches re-appropriate the ecumenical articulation by giving a new and holistic articulation to it. Otherwise the ecumenical movement will develop along lines which will move further and further away from the reach of the churches. Moreover,

the ecumenical movement must help the churches to rediscover the true meaning of church as being essentially the people of God. In fact, what is crucial for the future of the ecumenical movement is the fuller participation of all the people of God in the life and witness of the church, not just in the ecumenical movement.

Defensive and critical ecumenism

It is probably inevitable that as the ecumenical movement took shape in various institutions the passion and high expectations which motivated and sustained it in the early years would be replaced by more realistic and pragmatic attitudes. At the same time what might be called "defen-

menical movement. The ecumenical movement must never lose sight of the fact that ecumenism is essentially a local reality. Unless it becomes responsive in its priorities, agendas and structures to the realities of any local situation, it will remain a foreign intrusion in and imposition on that situation.

4. In many regions, ecumenism is still perceived and practised mainly in terms of relationship and collaboration among the churches. While relationships and collaboration are indeed indispensable means for realizing the goals of the ecumenical movement, they do not exhaustively define it. The ecumenical movement is a quality of common life and witness for the renewal, mission and unity of the church. It is a movement of the Holy Spirit that challenges the churches in their isolation and self-centeredness, giving them the sense of belonging to each other both locally and globally. In ecumenism the churches do not co-exist; they inter-act. They do not act independently; they act inter-dependently. The goal of the ecumenical movement is to strengthen and give visible manifestation to the churches' inner inter-relatedness and God-given *koinonia* in the one body of Christ. All ecumenical efforts should be sustained by and oriented to this end.

Return to contextualism and confessionalism

The churches' ecumenical witness is often made more difficult because of contextual and confessional considerations. If these two elements of the churches' identity are not perceived in the proper perspective and oriented in the right direction, they threaten to destroy the holistic nature of the ecumenical vision.

1. The whole church and the whole *oikoumene* and their inseparable wholeness and unity form the *raison d'être* of the ecumenical movement. It is within the framework of this holistic vision of the ecumenical movement that the interdependence and complementarity between the contextual and the global must be articulated. The ecumenical vision should neither be completely contextualized nor completely globalized. One must distinguish at this point between an holistic vision and what is sometimes called "globalism"—a way of thinking, acting and being that totally ignores the local. Authentic holism emerges from the encounter of different contextual realities in critical openness to each other. The ecumenical movement can protect its integrity and indivisibility only if it is guided by the kind of vision which maintains the specificities of both the contextual and the global and thus enhances their inner coherence within one whole. We should not underestimate the difficulties of achieving such a vision, but without it ecumenism will fall into the trap either of blind parochialism and exclusive regionalism or of absolute globalism.

2. Paralleling the steady growth of ecumenical contextualism in the last few decades is the increasingly organized structural expression of confessionalism. Feeling themselves more at home or more secure in the context of their own church family or communion, many churches spend much of their ecumenical energy and resources within their own confession. The extent to which they are ecumenically engaged outside their own confession is basically conditioned by factors pertaining to its own interests.

There is no doubt that a church's awareness of its own confession and traditions strengthens its identity and self-awareness. But it may also prevent it from experiencing more fully its ecclesial inter-relatedness with other churches and from moving towards the reality of one church. In other words, renewed emphasis on confessional awareness brings the danger that the churches will isolate themselves, rather than contributing towards the fuller and richer expression of the unity of the church.

3. Closely related to the growth of what we might call "confessional ecumenism" is the role played by the bilateral dia-

(Continued on page 4)

The Ecumenical Movement at a Crossroad (Continued from page 3)

logues in advancing towards visible unity. There is no doubt that these dialogues have been instrumental in moving churches from isolation to openness, from misunderstanding to better understanding and from mistrust to collaboration. While some of these dialogues have formulated theological agreements or resulted in joint declarations on specific doctrinal issues, others have become repetitious or come to a standstill.

Different churches display different attitudes and approaches to consensus-oriented bilateral dialogues. Some give them a high priority, claiming that positive tangible results are likely to be attained from what is referred to as "ecumenism of negotiation." Others clearly treat these dialogues as a kind of ecumenical fashion, engaging in them with no clear agenda, focus or direction. Thus, although the bilateral dialogues are increasing in many parts of the world, they often have no connection with each other.

There are several reasons why I doubt that this major shift of focus from multilateral to bilateral dialogues can bring any remarkable contribution to church unity. For one thing, most of the major sources of theological and doctrinal controversy have already been exhaustively treated in the main bilateral dialogues. There is little if anything substantial to be added. Moreover, the agreements reached in these dialogues, while clarifying a number of divisive issues, have so far failed to offer any basis for communion and thus to advance significantly the common search for unity. In the third place, the churches are very slow to receive and implement the consensus reached through bilateral dialogues.

Even so, both multilateral and bilateral dialogues are crucial for the future course of the ecumenical movement in general and of the debate about unity in particular. While bilateral dialogues deal mainly with doctrinal issues, multilateral dialogues touch questions with missiological and pastoral implications of daily concern to the lives of the churches. While bilateral dialogues approach the question of unity from a confessional perspective, multilateral dialogues tackle it from a multi-confessional and multi-contextual perspective. Confessional awareness is strengthened in bilateral dialogues, while it serves to enrich ecumenical fellowship in multilateral dialogues. The renewed impetus which bilateral dialogues give to the process of convergence on church-dividing doctrinal and theological issues is tested through a common reception process only in the multilateral dialogues. And the unions between communions or confessions which are facilitated by bilateral dialogues will remain isolated achievements if they fail to advance the broader unity of the church through multilateral dialogues. Thus emphasizing the one at the expense of the other makes for a poor ecumenical strategy.

To conclude, if bilateral dialogues are carried out independently and do not provide a common framework and orientation for multilateral dialogues, their effect may be both to jeopardize the sense of the holistic nature of church unity and to reduce the urgency of the common search for visible unity. After almost thirty years of intense bilateral dialogues, it seems to me that the time has come for a comprehensive evaluation and implementation of their results, a steady shift in subject matter from doctrinal issues to practical missiological and pastoral issues arising out of the life of the churches and a close organic inter-relation between bilateral and multilateral dialogues, probably within the framework of Faith and Order.

Unity at an impasse?

Many observers have described the past few decades, since the late 1960s, as a time of unprecedented "activism" in the ecumenical movement. Apart from ambiguities created by the different ways in which this word is used, it is evident that

the churches have reacted in different ways to the phenomenon being described. Some have welcomed it as a clear sign that the ecumenical movement is investing more time and energy in concrete actions than in dreams and visions. Others have seen it as an attempt to bridge the gap between unity on the one hand and the church's missionary and diaconal responsibilities on the other. Still others have discerned in this process a regrettable shift of priority away from unity to issues of church and society.

There is no doubt that the ecumenical movement must address concerns arising in the daily life of people and requiring a Christian response. But the growing engagement in this area may create tensions and polarizations within the ecumenical movement if it is not understood in the right perspective and manifested in a proper way. Let me elaborate my concern:

1. We must be unequivocal about the organic association between the search for unity and the struggle for justice. What are sometimes called the "horizontal" and "vertical" dimensions cannot be in contradiction or competition; they must complement each other and act together. The ecumenical movement has reached this conviction after a long debate and bitter experience. The merger of the Faith and Order and Life and Work movements to form the World Council of Churches was not an arbitrary decision in the interest of administrative efficiency. It was a concrete expression of the wholeness of faith and life and of the inter-connectedness of ecclesiological and political issues.

But if the theological and spiritual dimensions of ecumenical action are overshadowed by secularistic perspectives and considerations, or if unity is conceived exclusively in terms of the church's struggle for justice and peace, or if we do not identify the specificity of our ecumenical involvement and establish a creative and sound theological interaction between the search for unity and engagement in social and ethical issues, then the ecumenical movement becomes totally "horizontalized," and an uncritical commitment to human issues may engender a serious dichotomy.

2. The ecumenical movement has created a sense of coherence, integrity and wholeness among the churches. For example, the churches have been brought closer to each other in a convergence process by the study on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM) and by some of the agreed statements of bilateral dialogues. However, they are still far from eucharistic sharing and conciliar fellowship. On this crucial question, the ecumenical movement is almost at an impasse.

In my view, three basic issues must be addressed if the search for unity is to be brought out of uncertainty and stagnation:

First, the concept of unity itself is in confusion. The ecumenical movement has proposed a number of models of unity, but it has not yet achieved a common understanding of the nature of unity. The existing models of unity are mainly motivated by confessional and contextual considerations and are hence largely unrelated to each other. If a consensus on a common understanding of the nature of the "unity we seek" is not established among the churches, the present uncertainty may lead the churches to further confusion.

Second, the churches' failure to reach a common concept of the nature of unity is due mainly to the lack of a common understanding of the nature of the church, and to the Christocentric emphasis that has dominated our discussion of unity. Ecclesiology and pneumatology must be given a focal place in the quest. The concept of *koinonia*, which has once again moved to the centre of the ecumenical agenda, will certainly give a new clarity and impetus to the search for visible unity.

Third, it is time for the ecumenical

movement to move from the convergence process to the reception process. While I recognize that many churches require further theological discussion and ecumenical maturation regarding eucharistic sharing, I see no basic reasons to postpone the mutual recognition of baptism. Such a concrete step would significantly enhance the search for full and visible unity.

Many churches feel insecure in an ecumenical movement that is moving towards new horizons. They feel that the emerging models and priorities of the ecumenical movement are compromising its goals, and so they call for a *retour aux sources*. In my opinion, the question is not one of returning, but rather of moving forward in faithful obedience to the call of God. The ecumenical movement has never been an established reality. Tensions and ambiguities are inherent to a movement that is constantly shaped and reshaped by responding to the changing situations and challenges of the world. What is required today is a *broader* vision

which, without marginalizing the basic goals of the ecumenical movement, takes the churches beyond the classical ecumenical priorities; a *critical* vision which offers the ecumenical movement a clear and comprehensive self-understanding within the context of the total life of the church and the whole creation of God; and a *clearer* vision which makes the ecumenical movement identifiable in the midst of new movements and realities. †

This article by Catholicos Aram I appeared in a recent issue of The Ecumenical Review. His Holiness is Moderator of the World Council of Churches central committee. This article evolved out of observations, comments, and presentations he made during a visit last year to churches in six cities in the United States.

Armenian Ecological Society Receives \$12,000 Donation

The Armenian Ecological Society (AES) is pleased to announce that one of its founding members and the current president of the Society, Mr. John T. O'Connor, has contributed \$12,000 to the Society. Part of the donation will be utilized to purchase computers for the Ministry of Ecology in Armenia.

The Armenian Ecological Society is a new organization, formed under the laws of New York State as a non-profit organization. The purpose of AES is to help Armenia in ecological concerns and to preserve its natural resources, especially the vast and rich Khosrov Preserve and the other Preserves in Dilijan in northern Armenia and Shigahogh in Zangezour.

Serving on the Society's Board are concerned individuals from the United States, Europe, and South America including Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian, Philip Ketchian, Van Krikorian, Esq., John T. O'Connor, Zohrab Tazian, Judge Sarkis Teshoian, Kegham Kevonian, Armen Haghazarian, Ara Kasparian, Lenna Kandarjian, and Jorge Vartbaronian.

In a meeting of the Board in New York on October 8, Archbishop Ashjian, who had just recently returned from Armenia, reported about activities in Armenia concerning AES. He reported on a productive working session he had with the Minister of Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs, S. Avedissian and his First Vice Minister, Samuel Baloyan. The newly reorganized ministry now has jurisdiction over the natural preserves and is preparing a master list of priorities to maintain and improve the preserves. Archbishop Ashjian also reported that through the efforts of board member, Armen Haghazarian, the Armenian branch of the Society has been registered with the Ministry of Justice in Armenia.

Current projects of the AES include:

1. Publication of books on environmental issues.
2. Publication of a book about

Khosrov Preserve with color photographs.

3. Preparation of videos.
4. "Lights for Armenia," —voltaic energy.
5. Conservation works in preserves.
6. Suggestion of new legislation.
7. Studies in cooperation with Ministry.
8. International Conferences.
9. Application for World Heritage Site.
10. Development of land trust project.

"During these days in the U.S.," said Archbishop Ashjian, "the news is filled with discussions about balanced budgets, about what should be cut and what should not be cut and about the importance of leaving a legacy for our children and grandchildren. But what about Armenia, and its natural resources? We must also feel part of the Armenian nation, that we have responsibilities as well as rights. Khosrov Preserve is a unique gift from God. We must cherish this ecological gem and help save endangered species."

Meetings were also held with representatives of the AES of Armenia including Armen Kevorkian, Vice Director of the Armenian Speleological Society; Edward Saroyan, President of the Armenian-German Association; Ashot Panoushyan, Researcher and President of UNESCO Club of Armenia; Hagop Hovanissian, a TV Director; Sumpad Davtian, a cartographer; Andrei Chesnakov, a mountaineer; Samuel Garabedian and Arkam Ayvazian, authors of books about Armenia and Dr. Armen Haghazarian, President of Research in Armenian Architecture.

Tax-deductible donations may be sent to the Armenian Ecological Society, Grand Central Station, P.O. Box 3141, New York, New York 10163. All donors will receive a set of all-purpose notecards with color scenes from Khosrov Preserve. †

PEANUTS

by Charles M. Schulz

