



THE OXFORD HISTORY OF ANGLICANISM

VOLUME IV

Global Western Anglicanism, c.1910–present

EDITED BY
JEREMY MORRIS

THE OXFORD HISTORY OF ANGLICANISM

General Editor: Rowan Strong

The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I

Reformation and Identity, c.1520–1662

Edited by Anthony Milton

The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume II

Establishment and Empire, 1662–1829

Edited by Jeremy Gregory

The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume III

Partisan Anglicanism and its Global Expansion, 1829–c.1914

Edited by Rowan Strong

The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV

Global Western Anglicanism, c.1910–present

Edited by Jeremy Morris

The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume V

Global Anglicanism, c.1910–2000

Edited by William L. Sachs

The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV

Global Western Anglicanism, c.1910–present

Edited by
JEREMY MORRIS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2017

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016943995

ISBN 978-0-19-964140-6

Printed in Great Britain by

Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Acknowledgements

The editor would like to thank the overall series editor, Professor Rowan Strong, for his support and assistance during the preparation of this volume, Mrs Gill Strong for her work and advice on preparation, and Ms Jo North and the editorial team at Oxford University Press; the staff of Lambeth Palace Library, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the University Library, Cambridge; the staff of other libraries and individuals referenced in the contributory essays; and the Provost and Fellows of King's College, Cambridge for hospitality during the annual editorial meetings.

Contents

<i>List of Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Series Introduction</i>	xi
1. Historiographical Introduction <i>Jeremy Morris</i>	1
 PART I. THEMES AND WIDER ENGAGEMENTS	
2. The Evolution of Anglican Theology, 1910–2000 <i>Mark Chapman</i>	25
3. Liturgical Renewal and Modern Anglican Liturgy <i>Louis Weil</i>	50
4. Gender Perspectives: Women and Anglicanism <i>Cordelia Moyse</i>	68
5. Sexuality and Anglicanism <i>William L. Sachs</i>	93
6. The State, Nationalism, and Anglican Identities <i>Matthew Grimley</i>	117
7. Sociology and Anglicanism in the Twentieth Century: Class, Ethnicity, and Education <i>Martyn Percy</i>	137
8. Anglicanism in the Era of Decolonization <i>Sarah Stockwell</i>	160
9. Anglicanism and Christian Unity in the Twentieth Century <i>Paul Avis</i>	186
10. War and Peace <i>Michael Snape</i>	214
11. Global Poverty and Justice <i>Malcolm Brown</i>	243

PART II. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

12. The Development of the Instruments of Communion 271
Colin Podmore
13. The Anglican Communion and Anglicanism 303
Ephraim Radner

PART III. REGIONAL SURVEY

14. Anglicanism in Australia and New Zealand 331
Ian Breward
15. North American Anglicanism: Competing Factions, Creative
Tensions, and the Liberal-Conservative Impasse 362
Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook
16. Anglicanism in Britain and Ireland 397
Jeremy Morris
- Index* 437

List of Contributors

Paul Avis is Honorary Visiting Professor in the Department of Theology and Religion, Exeter University, editor-in-chief of *Ecclesiology* and editor of Brill's 'Anglican-Episcopal Theology and History' series. He is the author of many books on Anglican theology and ecclesiology, including *Anglicanism and the Christian Church* (new edn., 2002).

Ian Breward is Emeritus Professor of Church History, Theological Hall, Ormond College, University of Melbourne. His books include *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (2001).

Malcolm Brown is Director of Mission and Public Affairs for the Archbishops' Council of the Church of England and a Senior Associate of the Cambridge Theological Federation. He was formerly Director of the William Temple Foundation in Manchester.

Mark Chapman is Vice-Principal of Ripon College, Cuddesdon and Professor of the History of the Church at the University of Oxford. His teaching and research interests include Anglican history and modern theology, and his books include *Anglican Theology* (2012).

Matthew Grimley is Fellow and Tutor in History at Merton College, Oxford. He is especially interested in changes in British religious and national identity since the First World War, and is the author of *Citizenship, Community and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (2004).

Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook is Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Dean of the Faculty, and Professor at Claremont School of Theology, and Professor of Anglican Studies at Bloy House, the Episcopal School of Theology at Claremont. Her recent publications include *The Heart of a Pastor: A Biography of Edmond Lee Browning* (2010).

Jeremy Morris is Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and an Affiliated Lecturer in the Faculty of Divinity, Cambridge. His research interests include modern British and European religious history, and Anglican ecclesiology, and his books include *F. D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority* (2005), *The Church in the Modern Age* (2007), and *The High Church Revival in the Church of England: Arguments and Identities* (2016).

Cordelia Moyse is a social historian specializing in church and women's history; currently an independent scholar, she is Director of Development

and Communications for Lancaster Cleft Palate Clinic, Lancaster, Philadelphia. Her *History of the Mothers' Union: Women, Anglicanism and Globalisation, 1876–2008* was published in 2009.

Martyn Percy is Dean of Christ Church Oxford, and teaches in the Faculty of Theology and Religions, and in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Oxford. His books include *Shaping the Church: The Promise of Implicit Theology* (2010) and *Engaging with Contemporary Culture: Christianity, Theology and the Concrete Church* (2006).

Colin Podmore is the Director of Forward in Faith; he was formerly Clerk to the General Synod, and Director of Ecumenical Relations for the Church of England. He is the author of *Aspects of Anglican Identity* (2005).

Ephraim Radner is an Anglican priest, who has worked in Africa and the United States, and is currently Professor of Historical Theology, Wycliffe College at the University of Toronto. He has written, amongst other things, *The Fate of Communion: The Agony of Anglicanism and the Future of a Global Church* (2006).

William L. Sachs is a historian and Episcopal priest; he directs the Center for Interfaith Reconciliation in Richmond, Virginia. His books include *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion* (1993) and *Homosexuality and the Crisis of Anglicanism* (2009).

Michael Snape is the Michael Ramsey Professor of Anglican Studies at Durham University. He specializes in the history of war and religion in the twentieth century, and his books include *God and the British Soldier: Religion and the British Army in the First and Second World Wars* (2005).

Sarah Stockwell is a historian of decolonization and Professor of Imperial and Commonwealth History at King's College London. She has published extensively on mission, empire, and decolonization in the twentieth century, including *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives* (2007).

Louis Weil is the James F. Hodges and Harold and Rita Haynes Professor of Liturgics Emeritus at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific in Berkeley, California. A much-published liturgical scholar, he is a founding member of *Societas Liturgica* (1969), of the North American Academy of Liturgy (1973), of which he was president in 1983, and of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (1985).

Series Introduction

Rowan Strong

Even Henry VIII at his autocratic best could hardly have imagined that his Church of England would, nearly five centuries after he had replaced papal authority with his own, become a global Christian communion encompassing people and languages far beyond the English. Formally, Henry asserted his royal power over the national Church on a more global scale—on the imperial theory that ‘this realm of England is an empire’ asserted by the Act in Restraint of Appeals (to Rome) in 1533. Yet this was sixteenth-century imperial theory serving a national end. England was an empire and therefore King Henry was an emperor, that is, a ruler who was the paramount earthly authority and consequently superior to the papacy. So Henry’s Church of England was always a national project, meant first and foremost to be the Church of the English—all the English—who would, if necessary, be compelled to come in. That national politico-religious agenda—a Church of all the English with the monarchy as its supreme head—formed the thrust of the policy of all but one of the succeeding Tudor monarchs. However, that royal agenda of the inclusion of all the English lay at the heart of the problem of this national ecclesiastical project.

At no time since Henry VIII ushered in his religious revolution did all the English wish to be part of this Church of England, though for over two centuries the monarchy and the English ruling classes attempted to encourage, cajole, or compel everyone in England to at least attend their parish church on Sunday. In Henry’s reign, religious dissent from this monarchical Church was disparate and small, partly because Henry ensured it was dangerous. So some advanced Evangelicals (as early Protestants were called), such as Robert Barnes and William Tyndale, were executed by the regime in the early years of the religious revolution. Later, some prominent conservatives influenced by Catholic reform, such as Bishop John Fisher, Sir Thomas More, and some members of particular observant religious orders, followed their Evangelical enemies to the scaffold or the block. As the Protestant Reformation unfolded, and Catholic reform began to gather definition, from the reign of Edward VI onwards, those among the English who dissented from, or who were dissatisfied with, this national Church began to increase in numbers. Even those within it argued among themselves as to what the Church of England stood for.

Consequently, the Church of England, and its later global Anglican expansion, was always a contested identity throughout its history. It was contested

both by its own adherents and by its leadership. This series looks at the history of that contestation and how it contributed to an evolving religious identity eventually known as Anglican. The major question it seeks to address is: what were the characteristics, carriers, shapers, and expressions of an Anglican identity in the various historical periods and geographic locations investigated by the volumes in the series? The series proposes that Anglicanism was not a version of Christianity that emerged entire and distinct by the end of the so-called Elizabethan Settlement. Rather, the disputed and developing identity of the Church developed from Henry VIII's religious revolution began to be worked out in the various countries of the British Isles from the early sixteenth century, went into a transatlantic environment in the seventeenth century, and then evolved in an increasing global context from the eighteenth century onwards. The series proposes that the answer to 'what is an Anglican?' was always debated. Moreover, Anglican identity over time experienced change and contradiction as well as continuities. Carriers of this developing identity included formal ecclesiastical dimensions such as clergy, prayer books, theology, universities, and theological colleges. Also among such formal carriers of Anglican identity was the English (then the British) state, so this series also investigates ways in which that state connection influenced Anglicanism. But the evolution of Anglicanism was also maintained, changed, and expressed in various cultural dimensions, such as architecture, art, and music. In addition, the series pays attention to how Anglicanism interacted with national identities, helping to form some, and being shaped itself by others. Each volume in the series devotes some explicit attention to these formal dimensions, by setting out the various Anglican identities expressed in their historical periods by theology, liturgy, architecture, religious experience and the practice of piety, and its interactions with wider society and politics.

A word needs to be said about the use of the term 'Anglicanism' to cover a religious identity whose origins lie in the sixteenth century when the name was not known. While recognizing the anachronism of the term Anglicanism, it is the 'least-worst' appellation to describe this religious phenomenon throughout the centuries of its existence. It is a fallacy that there was no use of the term Anglicanism to describe the Church of England and its global offshoots before John Henry Newman and the Oxford movement in the 1830s. Newman and his Tractarian *confreres* certainly gave wider publicity to the name by using it to describe the separate Catholic culture of their Church. However, its usage predates the Tractarians because French Catholic writers were using it in the eighteenth century. It has become acceptable scholarly usage to describe this version of Christianity for the centuries prior to the nineteenth, notwithstanding its admittedly anachronistic nature.¹ Into the nineteenth century contemporaries

¹ John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England* (New Haven, 1991), pp. xiii–xiv; John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor (eds.), *The Church of England c.1689–c.1833*

used the terms ‘Church of England’ or ‘Churchmen’ to encompass their Church, even in countries and colonies beyond England. However, these names are not acceptable or understood today with their formerly inclusive meaning. The latter is objectionable on gender terms; and the former, while used by Anglicans in a variety of different lands and cultures, only leads to confusion when addressing the Church of England beyond England itself. Consequently, it has long been recognized in the scholarly literature that there is a need for some term that enshrines both the Church of England in England, its presence beyond that nation, and for that denomination over its entire historical existence. The most commonly adopted term is Anglicanism, and has been used by a number of recent scholars for periods prior to the nineteenth century.² A less Anglo-centric term—‘Episcopal’ or ‘Episcopalianism’—is widely used in some parts of world for the same ecclesiastical phenomenon—Scotland, North America, and Brazil. However, that term does not figure as widely as Anglican or Anglicanism in the historical literature, so it is the predominant usage in this series.

Consequently, Anglicanism is understood in this series as originating as a mixed and ambiguous ecclesiastical identity, largely as a result of its foundation by the Tudor monarchs of the sixteenth century who were determined to embrace the whole of the English nation within their national Church. It is, consequently, a religious community that brings together aspects of ecclesiastical identity that other Western Churches have separated. From an English Church that was predominantly Reformed Protestant in the sixteenth century, emerging Anglicanism developed a liturgical and episcopal identity alongside its Protestant emphasis on the Bible as the sole criterion for religious truth. The series therefore views Anglicanism as a Church in tension. Developing within Anglicanism over centuries was a creative but also divisive tension between Protestantism and Catholicism, between the Bible and tradition, between the Christian past and contemporary thought and society, that has meant Anglicanism has not only been a contested, but also at times an inconsistent Christian identity.

Within England itself, the Tudor project of a Church for the English nation became increasingly unrealistic as that Church encompassed people who were not English, or people who thought of themselves less as English than as different nationalities. But it has proved to have a surprisingly long life for the English themselves. The series demonstrates various ways in which the Church over the centuries attempted to enforce, encourage, or cling to its

(Cambridge, 1993), ch. 1; J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1660–1832* (Cambridge, 2000 edn.), p. 256; Nigel Voak, *Richard Hooker, and Reformed Theology: A Study of Reason, Will, and Grace* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 1–5; Patricia U. Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (Oxford, 2003 edn.), pp. 40–61.

² John Frederick Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism in North America* (Detroit, 1984); Thomas Bartlett, ‘Ireland and the British Empire’, in P. J. Marshall (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1998), p. 270.

national identity in England, with some degree of success, not least in retaining an enduring cultural appeal for some English who were only loosely connected to its institutional life, or barely to its theological or religious claims. Even today English cathedrals often attract audiences to daily Evensong that otherwise would not be there.

But for those in England and beyond for whom their Church was more central, contestation, and the evolution of identity it prompted, was probably inevitable in a Church that, after its first two supreme heads, was deliberately re-founded by Elizabeth I to be ambiguous enough in certain key areas to give a Church for all the English a pragmatic chance of being accomplished. But this was a loaded gun. A basically Protestant Church, aligned with the Swiss Reformation, but with sufficient traditional aspects to irritate convinced Protestants at home (though less so major European Reformers); but insufficiently Catholic to pull in reformed Catholics for whom papal authority was non-negotiable, simply pleased no one for quite a while. It was neither Catholic fish nor properly Protestant fowl, at least according to those English that wanted the Church of England to conform completely to the worship and polity of Geneva, by the later sixteenth century the pre-eminent centre of international Protestantism. Even Elizabeth's bishops were not entirely comfortable with the Church they led, and some of them tried to push the boundaries towards a properly Reformed Church modelled on that of the New Testament. Until, that is, they realized Elizabeth was having none of it, and made it clear she would not deviate beyond the Church and worship enacted by Parliament in 1558–9. In her mind, though probably in no one else's, those years constituted 'the settlement' of religion. When her archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal, refused to suppress the so-called 'prophesyings' of local clergy meeting for what would now be termed professional development, the queen simply suspended him for the rest of his life and put his functions into the hands of an appointed committee. Royal Supremacy was an undoubted component of the Church of England's identity, and Elizabeth and her successors for many years were not about to let anyone forget it, be they bishops or religiously-interfering Members of Parliament.

The fact that Elizabeth emulated the long reigns of her father and grandfather, and not the short ones of her half brother and half sister, meant that her Church of England had time to put down local roots, notwithstanding the 'Anglican' puritans who sought to remake it in Geneva's image; or the zealous Catholic mission priests who hoped to dismantle it by taking Catholics out of it completely.

Where the English went their Church was bound to follow, though this intensified the unhappy situation of Ireland where the English had for centuries sought political domination undergirded by settlement. The consequence of legally establishing a Protestant Church of Ireland was to add religious difference to the centuries-old colonial condition of that island,

whose Gaelic-speaking population remained stubbornly Catholic, in part because the Catholic Church was not English. Generally, the Irish wanted no part of this Church, aside from a small percentage of Irish who stood to gain from alliance with the prevailing Protestant power.

The following century saw the contest for the Church of England become more militant and polarized, until the English went to war to settle the issue among themselves. Perhaps the most surprising development was the emergence of a group of Anglicans who began to publicly advocate for the conservative aspects of the Church of England, a group that coalesced and became another sort of Anglican to the usual sort of Calvinist. This new variety of Anglican was particularly encouraged by specific royal patronage under the first two Stuart kings, James I and Charles I. These new contestants for the identity of the Church have been called by various names—Arminians, Laudians, avant-garde conformists—partly because they were not tightly defined but represented various agendas. Some sought, with the support of Charles I (the first Supreme Governor to be born into the Church of England), to bolster the independence and wealth of the Church; others, to oppose the Church's Calvinist theology and particularly the doctrine of predestination; others, to redress the lack of attention given to the sacraments and sacramental grace compared with the fervour for preaching among the more devout. But all were more or less agreed that the worship of the Church and the performance of the liturgy were woeful and needed to be better ordered, and churches should be more beautiful as aids to devotion and the fundamental significance of the sacraments.

But whether their agenda was liturgical, theological, or sacramental, to their puritan opponents this new Anglicanism looked like Catholicism, and that was the Antichrist from whose idolatrous and superstitious clutches the Protestant Reformation had released the English into true Christianity. They were not prepared to hand over the Church of England to a Catholic fifth-column. But while James I was cautious in his support for these avant-garde Anglicans, liking their support for divine-right monarchy but not their anti-Calvinism, his aesthetic, devout, and imperious son was markedly less so. The religious ball was in the royal court, particularly when Charles pulled off, in the 1630s, a decade of ruling without calling a Parliament, thereby silencing that body's uncomfortable and intolerable demands for royal accountability and religious reform.

The export in 1637 of Charles's particular version of the Church of England to his other kingdom of Scotland, in the form of a Scottish Prayer Book, not only stoked the fires of Scottish Presbyterian nationalism, but also released the pent-up energies of those within the Church of England who wanted an end to what they saw as royal absolutism and religious renovation by would-be papists. The rapid result of this intensification of political and religious contestation was the outbreak in 1642 of years of civil war in the royal

Supreme governor's three kingdoms. The internal Anglican quarrel, part of wider political differences, ended with the demise of the revolution begun by Henry VIII—the legal abolition of the Church of England, sealed in 1645 in the blood of the beheaded archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud; and followed by that of his Church's head, Charles I, in 1649. For the first time in its legal existence the Church of England (and the Church of Ireland) no longer officially existed.

Then an unexpected thing happened—some people continued to worship and practise their devotional lives according to the use of the defunct Church of England, demonstrating that its identity, though contested, was by this time a genuine reality in the lives of at least some of the English. They did this despite it being illegal, though the republican regime under Oliver Cromwell was not particularly zealous in its proscription of such activities. However, the diarist John Evelyn was present one Christmas Day when a covert congregation in London was dispersed by soldiers while keeping the holy day (proscribed by the regime) by gathering for Holy Communion according to the Book of Common Prayer.³ Evelyn and others worshipped this way, and numbers of clergy used as much of the Prayer Book as they could in the parishes, notwithstanding that their leaders, the bishops, did little to set an example or to ensure the continuation of their illegal order. Anglican identity through worship and the ordering of the week and the year according to the Prayer Book and the Calendar of the Church of England was now being maintained, not by the state, but at the clerical and lay grassroots.

When Charles II landed in Dover in 1660 as the recognized king of England, after the rapid demise of the republican regime with its non-episcopal quasi-congregationalist Church following the death in 1658 of Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell, one outcome was the restoration of the legal monopoly of the Church of England. What that legal restoration did not do was to restore the spirituality, devotion, practice, and belief of the Church of England, because these had been ongoing in the period of the Church's official demise. Nevertheless, the legislation that brought back the establishment of the Church of England did newly define some ingredients of Anglican identity.

Before the Commonwealth the Church of England had not made ordination by bishops a non-negotiable aspect of Anglicanism. While it was certainly normal, there were exceptions made for some ministers who had been ordained in non-episcopal Churches elsewhere to minister in the Church of England without re-ordination. Now all clergy in the Church had to be episcopally ordained, with the sole exception of those clergy who came from Churches with a long historic tradition of episcopacy—the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and the Church of Sweden. So from 1660 episcopacy became a

³ William Bray (ed.), *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn FRS* (London, 1878, 4 vols.), I, p. 341 (25 Dec. 1657).

basic characteristic of Anglicanism. The result was the expulsion of hundreds of clergy who would not conform to the requirement and to that of using only the Book of Common Prayer in worship. These dissenting clergy and laity, most of whom came from the previous Calvinist and puritan groups, now became permanent nonconformists outside the Church of England. In 1662 a slightly revised Book of Common Prayer was passed by Parliament as the only authorized liturgy for the Church therefore reinforcing liturgical worship as a fundamental criterion of Anglican identity. Parliament again passed an Act of Uniformity and various other acts against nonconformist worship. Uniformity was restored as an aspect of Anglicanism. So also was the royal supremacy.

However, while episcopacy has remained virtually unquestioned, and uniform liturgical worship remained uncontested within Anglicanism until the late twentieth century, the same could not be said for the other dimensions of the 1662 resettlement of Anglicanism—legal establishment, the royal supremacy, and uniformity. These identifiers were to be victims of the global success of Anglicanism from the eighteenth century, as the Church of England expanded; first across the Atlantic into North American colonies, and then globally within and beyond the British Empire. The first to go was legal establishment when the Americans successfully ushered in their republic after their War of Independence with Britain and some Anglicans remained in the new state. No longer could these Anglicans be subject to the British crown, or be legally privileged in a country in which they were a decided minority, when the Americans had gone to so much trouble to jettison these things. So an Anglicanism—known after the Scottish precedent as Episcopalianism—came into existence for the first time in history without monarchical headship, but rather as a voluntary association. Even within the British Empire these legal and political aspects of Anglicanism, so much a part of its foundation in the sixteenth century, were in trouble by the 1840s. It was then that the bishop of a very new colony, almost as far away from England as you could get, started acting as though the monarchy and establishment were Anglican optional extras. Inspired by the United States precedent, Bishop Augustus Selwyn began unilaterally calling synods of his clergy just four years after New Zealand had been annexed in 1840 as a crown colony, and a few years later he was leading his Church into a constitution which made authoritative synods of laymen, clergy, and bishops. Voluntaryism was catching on in international Anglicanism.

Contestation and evolution continued to be a part of Anglicanism. One of its most enduring characteristics, the sole use of an authorized liturgical form for public worship, began to be challenged by two mutually hostile internal parties—Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics. In some dioceses the latter succumbed to the temptation to use the Roman missal with the permission of sympathetic diocesan bishops. In contrast, encouraged by the global ambitions of the

wealthy diocese of Sydney, some of the former had *de facto* abandoned the use of an authorized prayer book entirely. Into this recent Anglican contest has been thrown issues of human sexuality which have conflicted wider society, particularly in the West, but which have been accentuated for Anglicans by questions of how varieties of human sexuality conform or do not conform to the authority of Scripture. So these historical forces have not ceased to play their part within the dynamic of Anglican identity. The post-colonial era following the retraction of the British Empire has brought further criticism, from Anglicans themselves, about the extent to which their denomination was complicit in British imperialism, and that therefore their identity suffers from being an imperial construct. For such Anglican critics, necessary deconstruction has to occur which allows English markers of identity, even as basic as liturgical worship or episcopacy, to be questioned or even relinquished.

Since the nineteenth century and the effective end of the royal supremacy—whether that was exercised by the monarch or the British Parliament—emerging global Anglicanism was increasingly beset into the twenty-first century by the issue of authority. There has been no effective replacement for the royal supremacy, in part because of Anglicanism's historical origins in anti-papal national royalism. Beyond the purely diocesan level, the Anglican Communion struggled to find an operative replacement for the authority of the royal supremacy. Various attempts at authority by moral consensus, all bedevilled by anxiety that something akin to a centralized (i.e. papal) authority was being constructed, were tried. But all such central organizations of an emerging international Communion were saddled with the original limitations imposed by Archbishop Longley when he agreed to call the first Lambeth Conference of diocesan bishops in 1867. By repudiating any real global authority, and opting for the consultative label of 'conference' rather than 'synod', Longley found a way to bring opposing parties of Anglicans together. But the emerging Anglican Communion, with its so-called 'Instruments of Unity'—be they the Anglican Consultative Council, or Primates' Meeting—tried to emulate Longley and both avoid the devil—papal centralism—and the deep blue sea—myriad manifestations that belied the claim to unity. True to its origins, Anglicanism perhaps remained more comfortable with its various national existences, than with its international one.

However, the history of Anglicanism is not merely the tracing of the evolution of a now global form of Western Christianity, important though that may be to tens of millions of contemporary Anglican adherents. As part of the historical turn to religion in recent academic interest, in the past two decades there has been a great increase of interest in the history and development of both the Church of England and its global offshoots. Scholars have investigated a plethora of facets of these religious phenomena, from the institutional to the popular, from formal theological belief and worship to informal, more diffusive faith. Other historians have looked at seminal

Anglican figures and movements. As well as specifically religious history, other historians have been recapturing the pivotal importance of Anglicanism in wider social and political contexts.

There has been a general historiographical revision which might broadly be described as moving the Church of England (and religion generally) from the margins to the centre of major economic social, political, and cultural development in English, British, imperial, and global history from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries. The Church of England, Anglicanism, and religion more generally are now seen to be seminal dimensions of these various historical periods. So, for example, the significance of religion in the British Empire has now been recognized by a number of important scholars.⁴ However, the major religious denomination in that empire, the Church of England, has been only sparsely studied compared to Nonconformity and is just now beginning to be critically examined.⁵ Belatedly religion is moving up the scale of historical importance in British, imperial, and global history, but it still lags behind the significance and attention that it has received from historians of England. There have been various studies of the Church of England in its national context, but these have not always been integrated into wider British and global studies.⁶

A number of studies of historical Anglicanism have focused on the narrative of the institutional and theological history of Anglicanism, either as the Church of England or as an Anglican Communion. These include Stephen Neill's now very dated *Anglicanism*, originally published in 1958. More recently, there have been William L. Sachs's *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion* (1993), and Kevin Ward's *A History of Global Anglicanism* (2006). However, these scholarly histories are single-volume histories that inevitably provide insufficient depth to do justice to the breadth of scholarship on their subject. Anglicanism is now a subject of such complexity as both an institutional church and a religious culture that sufficient justice cannot be done to it in a single-volume historical treatment.

But there is now sufficient international historical interest and extant scholarship to make an extensive, analytical investigation into the history of Anglicanism a feasible intellectual project. In undertaking such a challenge the

⁴ Andrew Porter, *Religion versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1700–1914* (Manchester, 2004); Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination 1830–1867* (Chicago, 2002); Jeffrey Cox, *The British Missionary Enterprise since 1700* (Abingdon, 2008).

⁵ Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire 1700–c.1850* (Oxford, 2007); Steven S. Maughan, *Mighty England Do Good: Culture, Faith, Empire, and World in the Foreign Missions of the Church of England, 1850–1915* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2014).

⁶ Nancy L. Rhoden, *Revolutionary Anglicanism: The Colonial Church of England Clergy during the American Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2007); Rowan Strong, *Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland: Religious Responses to a Modernizing Society* (Oxford, 2000); Bruce Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia* (Melbourne, 2002).

scholars who embarked on the project back in 2012 understand that not only was Anglicanism a religious identity shaped by theological and ecclesiastical understandings, but Anglicans were also formed by non-religious forces such as social class, politics, gender, and economics. Anglicanism has, therefore, been an expression of the Christianity of diverse social groups situated in the differing contexts of the past five centuries—monarchs, political elites, and lower orders; landowners and landless; slave-owners and slaves; missionaries, settlers, and indigenous peoples; colonizers and colonized—and by their enemies and opponents, both within and without their Church.

Historiographical Introduction

Jeremy Morris

When the editors of this *Oxford History of Anglicanism* were considering the overall plan of volumes for the series, it was originally proposed to have one volume covering world-wide Anglicanism in the twentieth century, under one editor. But all of the independent referees argued that the projected scope was simply too vast for a single volume, and that two were needed in its place. The difficult question, however, was how to divide the subject? Any chronological division, for example at 1945, would risk both unbalancing coverage into two volumes of unequal length, and cutting key themes that really merited sustained discussion into two segments. A thematic division, perhaps putting regional and local perspectives in one volume, and overarching themes covering the whole of the Anglican Communion in another, would require much more overlap between the two volumes than was desirable, unless, that is, one volume was to deprive itself of necessary illustrative and contextual material, and the other was to avoid conceptual explanation and survey. In the end, the decision was taken to divide twentieth-century Anglicanism into two cultural entities, Western Anglicanism (the subject of this volume), and non-Western Anglicanism. It is not, it needs to be said at once, a very satisfactory or neat division, but a practical necessity. Both books, it is hoped, will be read as effectively dove-tailing into each other, with the editors trying to produce complementary volumes that have distinct, different approaches.

The difficulties of the distinction between 'Western' and 'non-Western' Anglicanism are worth spelling out from the outset. By 'Western Anglicanism', we mean principally the three regional areas of North America, the British Isles, and Australasia (or rather, Australia and New Zealand). The category is defensible in various ways: these were all industrial and 'advanced' economies by the twentieth century; they were mostly English-speaking; their demographic profile was mostly dependent on historic migration from Europe and particularly Britain and Ireland, or of course indigenously British and Irish; their religious histories shared certain common identities, in that those of

North America and Australasia had been profoundly influenced by settlement from Britain and Ireland, and by Britain's religious changes and conflicts; and their Anglican life in particular was consequently shaped decisively by the liturgical tradition of the Book of Common Prayer. Moreover, as this volume will demonstrate, in the twentieth century even as the Anglican Churches in all three regional contexts pursued essentially autonomous, distinct destinies, their experience of growth and decline was broadly similar. But at the same time, the commonalities, or the religious and cultural 'border' between Western and non-Western Anglicanism, should not be exaggerated. After all, until the 1960s, much of the leadership of the Anglican Churches in Africa and Asia was British or American. A great deal of qualification is needed, and by implication a great deal of complication, to make sense of Anglican experience across all three regions covered in this volume. Both North America and Australasia had colonial histories of their own, with the domination and subjugation of indigenous peoples. The Church-state link in England was not shared with North America and Australasia. The governance structure of the Episcopal Church in the United States was substantially different from that of the Church of England, and of the Anglican Churches in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Sharply different constitutional histories in the United States and Britain and Ireland naturally conditioned different national religious histories. So one could go on.

The difficulties are compounded by terminology. We have already seen some of the definitional complexities associated with the term 'Western Anglicanism'. Several other terms in common use also have their limitations and their unacceptable undertones, including 'First world' or 'Old' and 'New' worlds, and 'global North'. There is no longer any adequate common term to capture the simple geographical region covered, to all intents and purposes in this volume, by the outdated term 'British Isles'. Some historians—notably Diarmaid MacCulloch—have attempted to introduce the term 'Atlantic Isles' to cover both Britain and Ireland.¹ But this has not passed into common usage yet. For much of the twentieth century, 'British Isles' has referred to both Britain and Ireland, and for that reason is reluctantly retained here. But the creation of the Republic of Ireland in the 1920s sundered the link between realm and government, and made the common term politically problematic. Commonly, before 1920, 'Church of England' referred to both England and Wales. Australia retained the title 'Church of England in Australia' in formal use until 1981; its abandonment naturally reflected post-colonial national consciousness. Even the term 'Anglican' is of limited use in Scotland and the United States; in both countries 'Episcopal Church' is the proper designation, though most would accept 'Anglican' as a common substitute; yet both

¹ D. MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490–1700* (London, 2003), p. xxvi.

Churches share roots that are at once not entirely dependent on the Church of England, and yet also somewhat distinct from each other.

If terminology, like scope, is complicated enough, what about chronology? Historians have long fretted about the apparent tidiness of chronologies too dependent on the passing of centuries. Both 'long' eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have been posited as a way round the problem. The twentieth century presents similar obstacles. Here, I have chosen to begin essentially just before 1914, taking the scope of the volume loosely just beyond the end of the twentieth century into the beginning of the twenty-first. If this seems untidy, at least it has given contributors the freedom to trace particular trends and narratives as far as humanly possible. It would seem strange, for example, to discuss the evolution of the Anglican Communion, and of its institutional forms, in the twentieth century, only to stop short of the profound conflicts and far-reaching changes that opened up in the 2000s. The year 1914 would seem a natural starting-point, if only because at the beginning of the twentieth century much of the world was carved up into European empires, and the long and violent death of those empires really began in 1914.

THE WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE AND ANGLICANISM

But in practice it is convenient to begin just a few years before, with the World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910. This was a conference on such a scale, and so momentous in its consequences for Western Protestantism, that it has commonly been taken to mark a watershed between the age of empire and mission, and the 'ecumenical century'. The Catholic theologian George Tavad, for example, claimed it 'inaugurated twentieth century ecumenism', and the Anglican bishop and missionary Stephen Neill argued it was 'in many respects the end of an epoch'.² Certainly in two key respects the conference was significant. First, its watchword 'the evangelization of the world in this generation' captured both the ambition of the modern missionary movement and its conviction that, by the early twentieth century, Western empire and economic progress had brought the Christianization of the world within grasp—an ambition bitterly crushed by the First World War. Second, however, the conference did give renewed impetus to what was by then a growing conviction, born of the great obstacle interdenominational competition created in the mission field, that Churches needed not only to work

² G. H. Tavad, *Two Centuries of Ecumenism* (London, 1960), p. 95; S. Neill, *A History of Christian Missions* (Harmondsworth, 1964), p. 393.

together for the benefit of mission, but to grow together. Mission and Church unity were thus inextricably entwined. Even though the war intervened, still the work of the Continuation Committee formed out of the conference itself became instrumental in the inter-war process of evolving the ecumenical instruments that eventually came together in the World Council of Churches.

What is interesting about the conference, from the point of view of the study of modern Anglicanism, is that many of the themes that concerned Anglicans throughout the twentieth century were already present in 1910. Fear of the decline of Churches in Europe and America—as one delegate put it, ‘men are not coming forward as ministers, nor . . . as missionaries, because they are not coming forward into the membership of the Christian Church at all’—fear of the advance of Islam in Africa and Asia, criticism of colonialism, concerns to understand better other world religions, concern to expand the numbers of indigenous clergy, anxiety about the growth of nationalism—these were some of the leading themes of the conference.³ Anglicans were present in significant numbers, and that included some Anglo-Catholic delegates, who felt able to participate because of a prior agreement that ecclesiological issues would not feature substantially in discussion. But the very presence of Anglo-Catholics in an ecumenical conference drawn principally from British and Irish, European, and American Protestantism reflected the decisive ecumenical shift Anglicans would make in the course of the century, away from a bipolar approach (Anglo-Catholics drawn to Roman Catholics, Orthodox, and Old Catholics, Evangelicals to the Free Churches, and continental Lutheranism and the Reformed) towards a more integrated, even-handed one.

For these reasons, then, as well as others, the Edinburgh conference can stand as a suitable start to a ‘short’ twentieth century, lasting from 1910 to 1999. Certainly its light falls over many of the contributions to this volume. And Anglicans, in 1910, had good reason to be confident that their voice would be as strong and significant as any Christian voice in the century to come. Not only were Anglicans closely involved in much of the organization of the conference, and prominent as delegates, as well as prominent in the mission field from which many of the delegates were drawn, but the archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, had opened the conference with a passionate plea for the coming of the kingdom of God: ‘Secure for that thought its true place, in our plans, our policy, our prayers; and then, why then, the issue is His, not ours’.⁴ So strong has been the myth about Edinburgh 1910 and its influence over the twentieth century, that few have commented on the irony of Davidson’s words, given the conflict about to be unleashed on the

³ World Missionary Conference, *Report of Commission VI* (Edinburgh, 1910), p. 308.

⁴ W. H. Temple Gairdner, *Edinburgh 1910: An Account and Interpretation of the World Missionary Conference* (Edinburgh and London, 1910), p. 43.

world, though George Bell, in his masterly biography of Randall Davidson, chose to omit them from his account of the archbishop's address.⁵

THE TRANSFORMATION OF ANGLICANISM

If Davidson's almost apocalyptic words jar strangely, to a modern eye, given the anxieties delegates shared about Christian mission at home and abroad, they merely serve to highlight the extraordinary transformations Western Anglicanism underwent in the course of the succeeding century. These transformations have many complex dimensions, but four are absolutely central to the variety of narratives and analyses presented here, and have changed the historiography of Anglicanism in the twentieth century.

The first, inescapably, is that of secularization. This was both a theoretical preoccupation of theologians, historians, and sociologists alike in the twentieth century, and an actual set of experiences undergone by Church people in North America, the British Isles, and Australasia. The two were not always closely or directly related, ironically. The actual experience of church attendance varied considerably through the century and across different geographical contexts. In broad measure, in the British Isles Anglican church attendance remained relatively stable until the 1960s, though there were already signs of contraction well before then; thereafter it entered a steep decline, which appeared to be slowing down early in the twenty-first century. In Canada, it followed a similar trajectory, though with modest growth earlier in the twentieth century. In Australasia, likewise, Anglican membership remained relatively stable for the first half of the century, but declined towards the end. In the United States, the Episcopal Church expanded almost three-fold in the first half of the century, but began a sharp decline in the 1970s, which 'bottomed out' in the 1990s. That was against a much higher level of regular church-going overall, however, and the difference between the experience of church-going in the United States and that elsewhere in the Western world has itself led to much scholarly discussion.⁶ At the same time, Anglicanism in the United States had proved much more fissiparous than it had in Britain and Ireland.⁷

But secularization theory has sometimes seemed at best loosely related to available statistics of church attendance, not least because it has mostly been constructed at a relatively general level—or perhaps it is better to say that it is

⁵ G. Bell, *Randall Davidson: Archbishop of Canterbury* (3rd edn., Oxford, 1952), p. 574.

⁶ Cf. P. Berger, G. Davie, and E. Fokas, *Religious America, Secular Europe? A Theme and Variations* (Aldershot, 2008).

⁷ Cf. R. Lindsay, *Out of Africa: The Breakaway Anglican Churches* (Camarillo, CA, 2011).

at its most persuasive at a general level—and has required significant, and sometimes damaging, qualification and adjustment in order to take account of particular local trends. This is a point made forcefully by the Anglican sociologist of religion David Martin, for whom ‘those versions [of theory] that treat secularization as a universal and unilateral trend’ have been a constant target of criticism.⁸ Secularization theory in its classic form was influenced particularly by the sociological enquiries of Ferdinand Tönnies, Max Weber, and Émile Durkheim, and assumed that the rise of modern industrial and commercial society, allied to critical philosophies emanating from the Enlightenment which privileged reason and marginalized faith, was intrinsically threatening to religious belief. An inevitable decline was the fate of traditional, organized religion—above all, Christianity—in the condition of modernity.⁹ The theory was informed by what we might call the ‘pathology’ of many nineteenth- and early twentieth-century clergy, who were convinced that their failure to fill their churches was a sign that the age was against them, and that society was sinking inexorably into a pit of materialism and indifference. The theory for much of the twentieth century was central to social commentary on religion, and the history of Anglicanism was influenced by this. Yet towards the end of the century much more critical voices, such as that of David Martin, came to the fore. The difficulty of using a universal theory to account for particular and complex situations was highlighted by a growing number of historians, and there were even scholars who began to doubt the historical truth—as opposed to the sociological theory—of the connection of Church decline with social and economic advance.¹⁰

The ways in which secularization theory has had to adjust to take account of different historical realities can be traced through many of the contributions to this volume. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, a growing number of scholars were ready to accept both, on the one hand, the general observation of declining church attendance in the West, and on the other the disruption offered to the conventional picture of decline by the growth of Christianity in other parts of the world, and by migration from there to the West. A common observation was that the ‘centre of gravity’ of world Christianity was shifting southwards, from Europe and North America to Africa and Asia.¹¹ This helped to effect a reassessment of the place of religion in modern society in

⁸ D. Martin, *The Future of Christianity: Reflections on Violence and Democracy, Religion and Secularization* (Farnham, 2011), p. 5.

⁹ Cf. S. Bruce (ed.), *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis* (Oxford, 1992).

¹⁰ Cf. C. G. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800–2000* (London, 2001); R. Stark and R. Finke, *The Churching of America 1776–1992: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1992).

¹¹ T. M. Johnson and S. Y. Chung, ‘Tracking Global Christianity’s Statistical Centre of Gravity, AD33–AD2100’, *International Review of Mission*, 93 (2004): 166–81.

the West, encouraging some scholars to assert forcefully the abiding importance of faith.¹² It also obliged scholars to recognize the multi-ethnic character of large city congregations, and the resultant changes in ecclesial culture—in music, in styles of worship, and in approaches to mission and to healing ministry. For Anglicans in the West, this reflected two important changes. The first was to the culture of Anglicanism itself, as it adjusted from being a white, male, Anglo-Saxon-led religious tradition, to being one of much greater diversity. The second was the increasing shift in power and influence in Anglicanism away from its traditional centre in the Church of England, with a concomitant increase in intra-Anglican conflict over a wide range of issues, though focused particularly on issues of human sexuality and women's ordination, a shift that itself in part reflected changing reactions to the experience of empire.

The second major transformation is related to this, then, and that is decolonization, or loss of empire. The growth of Anglicanism world-wide followed successive cycles of trade and imperial expansion. The language of empire was at the heart of Anglicanism from its origins in the English Reformation. As the Henrician Act in Restraint of Appeals of 1532 had asserted, 'this realm of England is an Empire...governed by one Supreme Head and King'. Here 'empire' denoted a single polity, 'compact of all sorts and degrees of people', rather than a description of sovereignty over other realms and nations. Thus 'empire' was, in the Henrician legislation, a political entity in which Church and state worked harmoniously together. But this was patient of adaptation into overseas empire. Even though very different colonial contexts had, in the nineteenth century, made the close application of the 'English model' of establishment under the royal supremacy virtually impossible outside Britain and Ireland, still by the early twentieth century in most parts of the British Empire there was an assumed 'fit', a correspondence, between the apparatus of colonial government and the ethos of Anglicanism. As several contributors to this volume observe, until the 1950s and 1960s the Anglican Churches outside North America were mostly led by English-born and educated bishops. Anglican clergy were present, often as officiants, at major state and ceremonial occasions in the colonies, and served as chaplains in the armed forces. Standard histories of Anglicanism written in the first half of the century almost inevitably subordinated (often severely) its development in Africa and Asia to what was assumed to be the essential narrative, namely the story of the Church of England. J. W. C. Wand, who had served as archbishop of Brisbane from 1934 to 1943, and was subsequently bishop of Bath and Wells, and then London, published an apparently comprehensive study of *Anglicanism in History and Today* in 1961; the whole of Anglican

¹² Cf. G. Davie, *Religion in Modern Europe: A Memory Mutates* (Oxford, 2000).

Africa outside South Africa attracted just one paragraph in a book of 280 pages.¹³ What was perhaps even more extraordinary was the bias unconsciously reflected in the chapter titles: after an opening chapter, 'Historical Turning Points', outlining the key points in Anglican history, but really focusing on the Church of England, the second simply carried the title 'Its Sister Churches'.

Such a thing rapidly came to seem inconceivable with decolonization. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, the change began with the Indian subcontinent. The creation of the Church of South India in September 1947 followed independence by a few months, though it had been over twenty years in the making. The new united Church, controversial as it was with many Anglo-Catholics, may have been led at first mostly by Anglo-Saxon bishops and senior clergy, but it proudly asserted the independent ancient history of Christianity in India, and made a determined effort to reinterpret Christian life and worship in a way that was distinctive to India. This was a process echoed later in Africa and elsewhere in Asia, as colonial government made way for independence, and empire mutated into commonwealth. It had two effects that changed the historiography of Anglicanism. First, it encouraged greater attention to the contextual variety of local Anglicanism, and thus shifted the attention of historians away from a 'top-down', Lambeth-centred view of Anglicanism in the non-Western world, towards one in which the distinct identities and developments of Anglicanism in its many local contexts came to the fore. Almost as a result of this shift, there was a reluctance to force the denominational categories of Western Christianity sharply into an analysis of non-Western contexts—something very evident in the rich literature on African Christianity that began with books such as those by Bengt Sundkler and Louise Pirouet, and arguably found its most eloquent theoretician in Kwame Bediako.¹⁴ Naturally, the main focus of such a change lies largely outside the scope of this volume. But the change went hand in hand with a second shift, namely one in which historians became much more aware that Western Anglicanism was itself a contextual product as much as a norm, and that the history of imperial expansion was not only responsible for transmitting a European version of Christianity to the non-Western world, but shaped it even in its country of origin. The work of historians such as Bill Sachs and Bill Jacob, amongst others, reflected this changing awareness.¹⁵ There was a parallel awareness present in the work of political and social historians who

¹³ J. W. C. Wand, *Anglicanism in History and Today* (London, 1961), p. 44.

¹⁴ B. Sundkler, *Bara Bukoba: Church and Community in Tanzania* (London, 1974); L. Pirouet, *Black Evangelists: The Spread of Christianity in Uganda, 1891–1914* (London, 1978); K. Bediako, *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion* (Edinburgh and Maryknoll, NY, 1995).

¹⁵ W. L. Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion* (Cambridge, 1993); W. Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997).

delineated the close connections between the ‘imperial project’ and domestic politics and policy in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Rowan Strong’s study of the intimate relationship—the ‘public discourse’—between imperialism and Anglicanism in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries has yet to be matched by historians of the twentieth century, but the work of many historians of Anglicanism nonetheless is consonant with it—one example would be Matthew Grimley’s study of Anglican theories of the state.¹⁶ Post-colonial studies, and post-colonial theory, had not had much direct impact on the historiography of Western Anglicanism, at least in its more conventional, ‘ecclesiastical history’ form, by the end of the century. It was to theologians and historians writing out of a non-Western context, for the most part, that one had to turn for examples of this, and that of course lies outside the scope of this volume, though there were echoes—as we shall see later—in work that was done to attend to Christian minorities or neglected communities in the West.

A third transformation was related to decolonization, and that was in the history of mission. In the age of empire, or at least until the Second World War, missionary activity undertaken by the Anglican missionary societies was largely in continuity with what had been done in the nineteenth century. It generated a ‘heroic’ history of its own, emphasizing the work of the missionary societies and individual missionaries. In this historiography, Christian mission was seen predominantly as a one-way process of donation, with the faith being given or ‘transmitted’ to those willing to receive it. Charles Groves’s monumental *Planting of Christianity in Africa* (1948–58) argued that Western missionary work had been undermined by its tendency to be too intellectual and insufficiently emotional, and in doing so paid relatively little attention to the ways in which African people themselves appropriated and shaped the Christianity they received.¹⁷ In Stephen Neill’s influential *History of Christian Missions* (1964), this perspective was still present, though qualified and nuanced by awareness of more recent developments, including the growing strength of indigenous Churches in Africa and Asia, and the rapid increase of Pentecostalism. Neill drew attention to the way, between the wars, the great missionary societies began to lose confidence, affected as they were by political turbulence in Europe; but he still tended to describe mid-century missionary work in terms that would have been familiar to earlier generations, citing ‘the strengthening and extension of the hold of the missions on almost every country in the world’.¹⁸ More recent work has

¹⁶ R. Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c.1700–1850* (Oxford, 2007); M. Grimley, *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (Oxford, 2004).

¹⁷ C. P. Groves, *The Planting of Christianity in Africa*, 4 vols. (London, 1948–58).

¹⁸ Neill, *History of Christian Missions*, p. 462.

complicated this picture, demonstrating how much was learned by missionaries from the context in which they worked, and the people amongst whom they worked, as much as was taught by them.¹⁹ Mission is always a two-way process, susceptible to a two-way analysis: for every 'sending' culture there is a 'receiving' one, and each is influenced by the other, if not necessarily to an equal degree. By implication, the history of mission must always keep two contexts in mind, not simply one.

The mutual interactions of sending and receiving cultures began to have more prominence in the generation of mission historians influenced—whether consciously or not—by decolonization, from the 1960s onwards. Perhaps the most startling example was the reception of a late nineteenth-century controversy, rather than a twentieth-century one—namely that over Bishop J. W. Colenso's efforts to translate the Bible into Zulu, and the resulting split in the South African Church.²⁰ It was another South African theologian—though Reformed, not Anglican—David J. Bosch who provided a typological 'map' for historians rethinking the history of mission, effectively marginalizing the 'heroic' model of mission, and demonstrating the powerful operation of many different paradigms in mission history.²¹ Along with the work of Lesslie Newbigin, bishop of the Church of South India, who also deployed the concept of 'paradigm' change popularized by Thomas Kuhn to help explain how culture and mission were intertwined, and other scholars, this changed perceptions of Western Anglicanism itself in the 'age of mission'. Not only did it foreground the role of imperial expansion and colonial government in the activity of mission itself, but it also highlighted how central the imperial 'project' had been to Anglicanism's self-understanding. The effects were most noticeable, not so much in ecclesiastical history, but in political history, and in the new social history that experienced such an upsurge in the 1960s and 1970s. Here, time and again religion was often marginalized, or pigeon-holed as an epiphenomenal distraction from the main business of historical explanation. The missionary societies, and indeed the whole enterprise of Christian mission, were often reduced to mere adjuncts to ideologies of social and political control. Christianity almost disappeared altogether from the much-lauded *Age of Extremes* (1994) by Eric Hobsbawm, for example, whose assessment of its significance can be deduced from his passing comment that in the last decades of the century there was 'a bizarre return to

¹⁹ Cf. K. Cracknell, *Justice, Courtesy and Love: Theologians and Missionaries Encountering World Religions, 1846–1914* (London, 1995); B. Stanley, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2009).

²⁰ Cf. the essays gathered in J. A. Draper (ed.), *The Eye of the Storm: Bishop John William Colenso and the Crisis of Biblical Inspiration* (London, 2003).

²¹ D. J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY, 1991).

fashion among some intellectuals of what their educated grandfathers would have described as superstition and barbarism'.²²

Just as criticism of 'classic' secularization theory helped to reinstate the significance of religion as an object worthy of scholarly attention, so the reaction against excessively reductive post-colonial interpretation has permitted a more nuanced reading of the missionary enterprise to emerge. Recognizing the reciprocal process of cultural exchange that underlies Christian mission, historians into the twenty-first century increasingly acknowledged that the growth of Christianity in the non-Western world belied the assumptions of many post-colonial scholars that it was simply an alien implant and would disappear. As David Maxwell observed, clearly 'the grass-roots adherents ignored the criticisms of the intellectual elites'.²³ Historians such as Andrew Walls, Lamin Sanneh, and Jeffrey Cox pioneered a new appreciation of the complexities of mission history.²⁴ Here, the missionary movement was not seen merely as an adjunct to the European project of empire, though the wider political context of mission was not ignored. The essence of this new approach—though I am admittedly risking a certain over-synthesizing here—was to take the evangelistic goals of the missionary societies seriously as their stated aim, and to explore their relationship to their cultural and political contexts through their primary role as religious institutions, rather than as agencies subserving concealed political or ideological agendas.²⁵ This way, for example, the work and aspirations of Indian Anglicans could be understood on their own terms, and not as a mere afterthought or residue of the raj.²⁶ The work of the missionary societies was integral to the development of indigenous Anglican Churches throughout the world, but that development itself could not be explained exclusively through analysis of the societies. European perspectives were important, in other words, and could not or should not be excluded from consideration—thus much of the fruits of post-colonial criticism and historiography could be retained—but to say this did not occlude the need to consider dynamic local factors in accounting for the history of Anglicanism in the 'mission field' and afterwards. Just as this repositioned the study of African and Asian

²² E. J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century 1914–1991* (London, 1994), p. 202.

²³ D. Maxwell, 'Decolonization', in N. Etherington (ed.), *Missions and Empire* (Oxford, 2005), p. 286.

²⁴ Cf. A. Walls, *The Cross-Cultural Process in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission and Appropriation of Faith* (Maryknoll, NY, 2002); L. Sanneh, *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll, NY, 1989); J. Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines: Christianity and Colonial Power in India, 1818–1940* (Stanford, CA, 2002).

²⁵ Cf. K. Ward and B. Stanley (eds.), *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799–1999* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2000).

²⁶ Cf. S. B. Harper, *In the Shadow of the Mahatma: Bishop V. S. Azariah and the Travails of Christianity in British India* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2000).

Anglicanism, recognizing its contextual distinctiveness, it also rebalanced the historiography of Anglicanism in the West, reaffirming its complexity and its own distinct identity.

Mention of identity leads to the fourth area of transformation in the historiography, namely the broad question of Anglican identity itself. Here the major fault-line was represented by a single book, *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (1978), by Stephen Sykes. For much of the twentieth century, scholarly understanding of what Anglicanism is was dominated by a broad historical perspective, represented particularly by scholars such as William Wand and Stephen Neill, which assumed that the essence of the Anglican tradition could be constructed first and foremost by narrating the history of the Church of England. In this view, Anglicanism tended not to be systematized as a theological tradition with its own characteristic doctrinal positions, but rather described more loosely as a distinct tradition of spirituality and order, with varying emphasis placed upon its pastoral ministry (the ministry 'to all in every place' view which was an obvious derivation from the historic parish system), its spirit of moderation and compromise, its claimed 'triad' of authority of Scripture, reason, and tradition, and its adherence to the historic threefold order of ordained ministry. Its character was often described as its 'genius'.²⁷ Ecumenically it was commonly called a 'bridge' Church between Protestantism and Catholicism. Spiritually it was deemed to have a historic core of gentle and moderate, if disciplined, character, which bore a remarkable similarity to the religious ethos of the High Churchmanship of those who, for the most part, were the ones who wrote about Anglican spirituality. An excellent example was *Anglican Devotion* (1961) by C. J. Stranks. His approach was predictably historical, surveying a number of texts from the Reformation to the Oxford movement. When he sought to summarize 'Some characteristics of Anglican devotion' in his final chapter, moderation and balance were constantly to the fore. Anglican spirituality attempted to 'hold the balance between the claims of reason and emotion', the Book of Common Prayer was characterized by restraint, dignity, and a 'fusion of fact and feeling', the pre-eminence of the Bible in Anglican devotional life was matched by the centrality of the Prayer Book. Protestants welcomed the Catholicism of the Prayer Book and Catholics its Protestantism, and all this was stated nonetheless within a moderate Tractarian or High Church appreciation of the Church and the sacraments as essential to Christian life.²⁸ Martin Thornton's influential *English Spirituality* (1963) was perhaps another example of the genre, if however one with a much sharper and more original attention to a particular

²⁷ Cf. A. W. F. Blunt, *The Genius of Anglicanism* (London, 1942).

²⁸ C. J. Stranks, *Anglican Devotion Studies in the Spiritual Life of the Church of England between the Reformation and the Oxford Movement* (London, 1961), pp. 271, 274, 276, and 280.

strand of spirituality, namely the ascetic one.²⁹ To describe this genre the way I have is not to deny that this was indeed the Anglican tradition, or rather 'Anglicanism', as it was commonly followed by large numbers of church-goers. But it did appear to present Anglicanism as a much more unified and compact religious tradition than it really was, one in which theology took second place to pastoral practice, in which the accent was on restraint and moderation rather than on confessional confidence, and in which a high literary culture was particularly constitutive of a notional 'spirituality' that in fact was almost invariably associated with a privileged elite.

Demolition of this overly synthesized view of Anglican identity cannot be attributed to Sykes alone, but his was by far the most caustic and penetrating voice. *The Integrity of Anglicanism* was an attack on the theory of Anglican 'comprehensiveness', which he traced back to F. D. Maurice, but which had been articulated eloquently by Michael Ramsey. According to this theory, Anglicanism's great merit was that it reconciled apparently contradictory opposites, encompassing widely different doctrinal and ecclesiological systems in an overarching schema that in and of itself possessed coherence, and which, as we have seen, was generally supported by a somewhat selective reading of history. Anglicans could thus claim to have 'no special doctrines' of their own, but at the same time to be distinguished by their moderation, breadth, openness to other traditions, and so on. As Sykes archly commented, 'Lots of contradictory things may be said to be complementary by those with a vested interest in refusing to think straight.'³⁰ To the contrary, for Sykes, Anglicanism must have a distinctive theological position of its own, as otherwise it could not reasonably defend its difference from other religious traditions which did themselves claim to have distinctive doctrinal emphases. The refusal to see this was simply an example of a 'poisonous arrogance' which assumed an entity known as 'the English mind' and which went back no further than the Industrial Revolution; it needed to be called out for what it was by 'Anglicans of other racial origins' than the English.³¹ Sykes himself never provided a definitive answer to the obvious following question, 'What then is Anglican theology?', though he did, in a later collection of essays, make significant strides towards the answer.³² There were strongly critical reactions to Sykes's arguments, especially from those who were convinced he had misunderstood Maurice and Ramsey.³³ But his work was a fatal blow to the earlier genre. It became impossible to maintain with the same blithe

²⁹ M. Thornton, *English Spirituality: An Outline of Ascetical Theology According to the English Pastoral Tradition* (London, 1963).

³⁰ S. W. Sykes, *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (Oxford, 1978), p. 19.

³¹ Sykes, *Integrity of Anglicanism*, p. 61.

³² S. W. Sykes, *Unashamed Anglicanism* (London, 1995).

³³ Cf. W. J. Wolf, J. E. Booty, and O. C. Thomas, *The Spirit of Anglicanism: Hooker, Maurice and Temple* (Edinburgh, 1982).

confidence the notion that there was a 'single' religious tradition called Anglicanism—other, that is, than as an identifiable, actual communion of Churches—and that no work needed to be done to demonstrate Anglicanism's theological characteristics.

As a result, Sykes's work helped to provoke a growing anxiety about the question of Anglican identity, an anxiety naturally intensified by the developing crisis in world-wide Anglicanism in the 1980s and 1990s over the ministry of women and, later, human sexuality. One of the central concerns of Sykes's work had been the nature of ecclesial authority—a particularly problematic issue in Anglicanism. Increasingly from the 1980s on scholars began to explore this question with a much more critical eye on Anglican history, and with a concern to try to elucidate what exactly was distinctive about Anglicanism ecclesiology. One of the most persuasive voices was that of Paul Avis, who, in a series of books over nearly thirty years, provided an answer as close as that of any to the questions posed by Sykes.³⁴ But there were others. The Australian scholar Bruce Kaye, a theologian with an acute understanding of history, for example, attempted to perceive a way through conflicting understandings of Anglicanism.³⁵ Paul Zahl, an American Anglican from a more identifiably Reformed background than is usual in the field of Anglican studies, argued for a 'Reformed' reading of Anglicanism; in Britain the theologian John Webster implicitly attempted something similar, though from a systematic, 'continental' theological perspective that shied away from the apparent parochialism of preoccupation with Anglican identity.³⁶ What these and other contributions made clear was that there was no easy route through to clarifying exactly what was the 'identity' of Anglicanism. The Anglican Churches unquestionably occupied a distinct place in the spectrum of world Christianity; but what *defined* their position was hard to pin down.³⁷ Anglican identity was no longer a given; the phrase suggested, quite simply, a question.

This pluralization of the concept of Anglican identity found its echo in the growing popularity of 'Anglican studies', a suitably all-inclusive category useful as a way of clustering disparate fields of enquiry in theological colleges and courses, but at the same time a significant nod to Sykes's plea for Anglicans to make explicit the theological, historical, and other presuppositions that steered

³⁴ P. D. Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Edinburgh, 1989); Avis, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction* (London, 2000); Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology* (London, 2007).

³⁵ B. Kaye, *Reinventing Anglicanism: A Vision of Confidence, Community, and Engagement in Anglican Christianity* (Adelaide, 2003).

³⁶ P. M. Zahl, *The Protestant Face of Anglicanism* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1998); J. B. Webster, *Word and Church: Essays in Christian Dogmatics* (Edinburgh, 2001).

³⁷ Cf. C. Podmore, *Aspects of Anglican Identity* (London, 2005); also R. D. Williams, *Anglican Identities* (London, 2014).

their Church opinions and actions. Sykes himself edited a popular contribution to what, by the end of the century, was fast becoming a genre of its own.³⁸ It was a genre that revelled in breadth, with thematic sections devoted perhaps to history, theology, literature, gender, sexuality, ethics, and so on, or to regional perspectives, and invariably drawing on multiple authors. Two voluminous companions to Anglicanism that appeared within two years of each other reflected this bewildering diversity of content and style—the *Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion* (2013) and the *Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* (2015).³⁹ The implication for the historiography of Western Anglicanism was clear: Anglicanism was best studied as a collection of diverse and often disparate voices.

ANGLICANISM AND THE DISCIPLINES OF HISTORY

It is evident, surveying the themes of secularization, decolonization, changes in the understanding of mission, and the increasing complexity of notions of Anglican identity, that they have a common structure that helps to give an overarching shape or narrative to the history of Western Anglicanism: it could be summarized as a movement from a dominant central perspective to multiple local contexts, from cultural and social cohesiveness to multi-layered ecclesial conflict, and from agreed and consensual views to complicated, contested claims. If these were four major transformations through which the history of Western Anglicanism in the twentieth century can be interpreted, it can be no surprise that the actual historiography of Western Anglicanism—that is, the history as actually written by historians and theologians—can be categorized in a similar way. This volume is written effectively bearing this set of historiographical trajectories in mind; the themes weave in and out of the various contributions here. It is a different question, however, as to how these various transformations have affected the practice of historical writing. From the perspective of historical writing on twentieth-century Anglicanism at the beginning of the twenty-first century, one can see an opening out of the traditional discipline of ‘ecclesiastical history’ into several related strands, registering both continuity and change in Anglican historical scholarship.

National and international narratives have remained important, if perhaps less fashionable than they once were. Most accounts published towards the

³⁸ S. W. Sykes and J. E. Booty (eds.), *The Study of Anglicanism* (London, 1988).

³⁹ I. S. Markham, J. B. Hawkins IV, J. Terry, and L. N. Steffensen (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion* (Chichester, 2013); M. D. Chapman, S. Clarke, and M. Percy (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* (Oxford, 2015).

end of the twentieth century and into the early twenty-first century were alert to the impact of the global development of Anglicanism on older modes of understanding. A few examples only can suffice here. Kevin Ward's *History of Global Anglicanism* (2006) and Bruce Kaye's *Introduction to World Anglicanism* (2008) were marked by the transformations discussed above, yet also displayed a concern to render a coherent account for the general reader.⁴⁰ Kaye himself edited a history of Anglicanism in Australia, to some extent matching the broader account of the Churches in Australasia by Ian Breward.⁴¹ More local approaches were not ignored, either, as evidenced by, for example, Allan Davidson's studies of New Zealand dioceses.⁴² For the Anglican Churches in Britain and Ireland, national narratives remained important too, though there were surprisingly few attempts to rewrite Anglican history as such: the best accounts were in fact those that included much material on Anglicanism in studies of broader scope, such as those by Adrian Hastings, Densil Morgan, and Keith Robbins.⁴³ North American Anglican scholarship also followed national lines, to some extent.⁴⁴ National Churches naturally demand national Church histories, however well-adjusted to take account of contemporary challenges. It is unlikely that there will ever cease to be a requirement for historians to consider Anglican history in its distinct national contexts. Likewise, the practice of biography has remained central to modern Anglican scholarship. Many of the chapters in this book lean heavily at times on the work of scholars who have concentrated on one particular life, in the best cases putting it firmly in its broader social, political, and ecclesiastical contexts. Good examples are probably too many to cite here. This is also true of theological history, or rather historical theology, though here most works tend either to focus on a single individual and are written by theologians, or relate twentieth-century Anglican theological history as part of a broader chronological framework.

The more traditional practice of ecclesiastical history has also remained firmly in place. In contrast to wide-ranging national and global narratives, the particular characteristic of ecclesiastical history as I mean it here would involve a focus on institutions, or on a specified theme, or on a group of individuals or 'movement'. The study of the twentieth century, in contrast to

⁴⁰ K. Ward, *A History of Global Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2006); B. Kaye, *An Introduction to World Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2008).

⁴¹ B. Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia: A History* (Carlton South, Victoria, 2002); I. Breward, *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (Oxford, 2001).

⁴² A. Davidson, *Tongan Anglicans 1902–2002* (Auckland, 2002); Davidson (ed.), *Living Legacy: A History of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland* (Auckland, 2011).

⁴³ A. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920–1985* (London, 1986); D. D. Morgan, *The Span of the Cross: Christian Religion and Society in Wales 1914–2000* (Cardiff, 1999); K. Robbins, *England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales: The Christian Church 1900–2000* (Oxford, 2008).

⁴⁴ Cf. A. L. Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada: Controversies and Identity in Historical Perspective* (Urbana, IL, 2004); D. L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church* (Harrisburg, PA, 1993).

that of earlier ages, can suffer from a paradoxical situation vis-à-vis sources—from too many to make a sufficiently comprehensive account viable (though the increasing availability of Internet sources, with search engines, to some extent is easing this difficulty), and from too few to make it possible at all, if key archives remain closed to the contemporary researcher. A thirty-year rule is in place commonly in the United Kingdom, but in some cases this can be much longer, even up to a century. Thus, the commissioned ‘official’ history, such as Andrew Chandler’s monumental history of the Church Commissioners, can build successfully on approved access to achieve the kind of comprehensive coverage that might not otherwise be available.⁴⁵ Alternatively, by judicious use of published as well as some archival material, a similar goal can be attained. Good examples once again abound. To note just a few, Bob Reiss’s study of the Church of England’s clergy recruitment, John Mantle’s detailed account of the short-lived worker-priest movement, and Cordelia Moyse’s history of the Mothers’ Union are all models of the genre.⁴⁶ Whilst the overall approach of books such as this is relatively conventional, one might include under the same broad umbrella of ‘ecclesiastical history’ some studies which have been influenced rather more obviously by contemporary currents of social and political criticism, because the central preoccupation remains nonetheless the Church as institution. Here, one might cite, for example, Miranda Hassett’s analysis of structures of power and finance in the Anglican Communion, and Gardiner Shattuck’s study of the Episcopal Church’s attitude to and policy on civil rights.⁴⁷

Yet that last point indicates how the scope and methods of ecclesiastical history began to broaden out considerably in the second half of the twentieth century, in the process changing the way Anglican historians tended to read the Church’s past. Probably the greatest single impact came from the enormous growth and diversification in what is usually called ‘social history’ from the 1960s on. There were several dimensions to this. New methods of analysis were applied to familiar data, using more intensively categories such as social class, centre and periphery, elite and popular religion, forms of power and hegemony, amongst others. New sources were mined, or old sources mined more intensively: they included oral material, census and occupational data, and transcripts and other records from court proceedings. New subjects of analysis were also sought out, particularly looking at marginalized and

⁴⁵ A. Chandler, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century: The Church Commissioners and the Politics of Reform, 1948–1998* (Woodbridge, 2006).

⁴⁶ R. Reiss, *The Testing of Vocation: 100 Years of Ministry Selection in the Church of England* (London, 2013); J. Mantle, *Britain’s First Worker-Priests* (London, 2000); C. Moyse, *A History of the Mothers’ Union: Women, Anglicanism and Globalisation, 1876–2008* (Woodbridge, 2009).

⁴⁷ M. K. Hassett, *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ, 2007); G. H. Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington, KY, 2000).

oppressed groups, with a view to reconstructing history 'from below' in response to the more conventional political history 'from above'. As noted earlier in this chapter, this could often go hand in hand with an assumption that religion was a sort of ideological dead end, a mistake that would fade from history, and so many of the pioneers of this new social history proved not to be all that interested in religion itself; quite often, if discussed at all, it appeared as a kind of cipher for other forms of social protest and ideological mobilization. As a result, one cannot say that there was a new 'Anglican social history'; such a thing had yet to be attempted. But there were social historians who turned their attention particularly to the study of religion, and in so doing included Western Anglicanism within their field of interest. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries proved particularly fertile ground. But there were incursions into twentieth-century studies too. In Britain and America in particular, a robust subdiscipline of the social history of religion emerged in the hands of scholars such as Hugh McLeod, Jeffrey Cox, and Simon Green, all of whose works had interesting things to say about Anglicanism as a social phenomenon.⁴⁸ Later British examples included Ian Jones's study of post-war Birmingham, and Sarah Williams's groundbreaking study, using oral material, of working-class religion in South London in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁴⁹

Emerging out of the new social history were particular strands of study dealing with particular communities of people, whether defined racially, socially, by gender, or otherwise. Here, again, scholars of religion in a broader sense have had interesting things to say about Anglicanism, but there have also been historians who have turned to examine rich themes within Anglicanism itself. Probably the largest group of works in what has sometimes—somewhat tendentiously—been called 'advocacy history' is constituted by that studying the impact of religion on women. These have ranged from conventional biographies, such as Sheila Fletcher's study of the pioneer Anglican woman preacher Maude Royden, to broader thematic studies, such as Sean Gill's history of women in the Church of England, and Catherine Prelinger's study of the changing role and status of women in the American Episcopal Church.⁵⁰ A second field—though much larger in American Anglican studies

⁴⁸ Cf. D. H. McLeod, *Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City* (London, 1974); J. Cox, *The English Churches in a Secular Society: Lambeth, 1870–1930* (Oxford, 1982); S. J. D. Green, *Religion in the Age of Decline: Organization and Experience in Industrial Yorkshire 1870–1920* (Cambridge, 1996).

⁴⁹ I. Jones, *The Local Church and Generational Change in Birmingham 1945–2000* (Woodbridge, 2012); S. C. Williams, *Religious Belief and Popular Culture in Southwark, c.1880–1939* (Oxford, 1999).

⁵⁰ S. Fletcher, *Maude Royden: A Life* (Oxford, 1989); S. Gill, *Women and the Church of England: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (London, 1994); C. Prelinger (ed.), *Episcopal Women: Gender, Spirituality and Commitment in a Mainline Denomination* (New York, 1992).

than in British and Australasian—is concerned with the category of race, and especially with the relationship of the Episcopal Church to African Americans.⁵¹ A third field concerns minorities constituted by sexual preference, though this is as yet small.⁵²

That last comment points to an undoubted further development in prospect in the historiography of twentieth-century Anglicanism. As intellectual fashions change, and as the world of twentieth-century Anglicanism recedes, it is likely that the discipline of historical enquiry will continue to develop in ways largely unforeseeable at present. There is a rich field of historical material lying in wait for historians in the future. The prospect of detailed, thoroughgoing work on different communities of Anglicans is an exciting one, as is the possibility of authoritative explorations of particular institutions and themes. The history of the global Anglican Communion itself is likely to look very different by the middle of the twenty-first century from what appeared in prospect in the first quarter.

CONCLUSION

This brief introductory survey of the historiography of Western Anglicanism in the twentieth century has done no more than draw attention to a number of broad themes, and to the variety of historical approaches through which the subject has been pursued. The essays in this volume illustrate both themes and approaches in different ways. One conclusion that might be drawn is that the study of Anglican history is not well served by concentration on just one approach, but that, as a major Christian tradition in its own right, Anglicanism as a community of belief works at many different levels and in many ways, and opens up therefore for historical enquiry many complementary angles, some of which had barely begun to be explored by the beginning of the twenty-first century. Church history cannot be done satisfactorily, as was once assumed, by concentrating on Church leaders, key institutions, and theological ideas; it requires coordination with the careful study of social and political contexts and movements, from which as much is to be learned about what shaped Anglicanism in the West as is to be learned from official Church sources. What is at issue here is not only a history of ‘the Anglican Church’, for as we have seen, such a unified, compact entity exists really only in the imaginations of certain theologians. Rather, it is a history of

⁵¹ Cf. C. E. Lincoln and L. H. Mamiya, *The Black Church in the African American Experience* (Durham, NC, 1990); also Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race*.

⁵² Cf. C. J. A. Hall, *A Thorn in the Flesh: How Gay Sexuality is Changing the Episcopal Church* (Lanham, MD, 2013).

Anglicanism—that is, of a community of belief which shares much of its history with a vast range of other human forms of association. Thus, the historiography is necessarily complicated and contested.

But a second conclusion might be seen to sit at odds a little with this, and to suggest that, nonetheless, a broad generalization can be attempted. Taking the century as a whole, it is hardly surprising that one can discern a long, slow but inexorable shift away from the Anglo-centric perspective that dominated Anglican historiography in the ‘Indian summer’ of the British Empire, between the wars, to one in which the diversity and dynamism of Anglicanism across the globe had decentred preoccupation with what was going on in Lambeth or Canterbury, and opened up a correspondingly diverse and dynamic set of perspectives even on the apparently fading Anglicanism of the West. It was no longer possible to construct an adequate history of modern Anglicanism that had little to say about Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Pacific Rim. Nor was it possible to pretend that the beliefs and practices of Anglican congregations even in the West could be described largely in terms of the theological and ceremonial concerns of a male clergy. Conflicts between different elements of world-wide Anglicanism, whether over theological ‘orthodoxy’ or over ethics, could not be relegated to a secondary level of analysis, but irrupted into the management and evolution of churches as far afield as San Francisco, London, and Sydney. What Anglican leaders wanted, and what their congregations were prepared to condone or recognize, were very different things. By the end of the twentieth century, Western Anglicanism had travelled a long way from its profile at Edinburgh 1910.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avis, P. D., *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Edinburgh, 1989; new edn., 2002).
- Brown, C. G., *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800–2000* (London, 2001).
- Bruce, S. (ed.), *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis* (Oxford, 1992).
- Chapman, M. D., S. Clarke, and M. Percy (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* (Oxford, 2015).
- Cox, J., *Imperial Fault Lines: Christianity and Colonial Power in India, 1818–1940* (Stanford, CA, 2002).
- Davie, G., *Religion in Modern Europe: A Memory Mutates* (Oxford, 2000).
- Etherington, N. (ed.), *Missions and Empire* (Oxford, 2005).
- Grimley, M., *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (Oxford, 2004).

- Hassett, M. K., *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and Their African Allies Are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ, 2007).
- Jacob, W., *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997).
- Kaye, B., *An Introduction to World Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2008).
- Markham, I. S., J. B. Hawkins IV, J. Terry, and L. N. Steffensen (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion* (Chichester, 2013).
- Sachs, W. L., *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Stark, R. and R. Finke, *The Churching of America 1776–1992: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1992).
- Sykes, S. W., *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (Oxford, 1978).
- Ward, K., *A History of Global Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2006).

Part I

Themes and Wider Engagements

The Evolution of Anglican Theology, 1910–2000

Mark Chapman

In her essay ‘Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown’, Virginia Woolf wrote: ‘On or about December 1910 human character changed. . . . All human relations have shifted—those between masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children. And when human relations change there is at the same time a change in religion, conduct, politics and literature.’¹ In the years before the First World War, society was becoming increasingly diverse and riven with conflict. To politicians such as Winston Churchill, as well as some clergy such as J. N. Figgis, a monk of the new Anglican Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, and a well-known preacher and political theorist, civilization was at a crossroads, and its forces were ‘visibly dissolving’. It looked to Figgis that the world was tottering. The theological controversies in the years before the First World War were characterized by divisions over the extent to which theology could accommodate itself to the scientific developments of the modern world, or whether it was forced to make a stand against what was frequently perceived to be the decadence of a society which had lost its earlier sense of unity.

Many who sought the task of accommodation were in search of the kind of synthesis which had prevailed in the different varieties of mainstream Anglican theology in the past: they were the natural heirs of Hooker, the Caroline Divines, and the Cambridge Platonists. Although some groups of Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics had tended towards the sectarian and had resisted any compromises with the wider culture, on the whole Anglican theology was happy to embrace an understanding of truth which did not regard it as the sole preserve of the Church. At the beginning of the twentieth century this kind of synthesis was expressed in the English modifications of Hegelianism which

¹ Virginia Woolf, ‘Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown’, in *The Hogarth Essays* (London, 1924), pp. 4–5.

had been so marked in the collected volume edited by Charles Gore in 1889, *Lux Mundi*, which continued to exert an influence well into the Edwardian period: liberal Catholics were synthesizers rather than sectarians.

Some others, who represented a less distinctive churchmanship, most notably William Temple, continued along the Hegelian path well into the twentieth century in search of the ideal of an organic society in which the individual would find his or her true realization in the social whole. Others, who were labelled 'modernists' or liberal churchmen, began to reject the idealist solution although they retained a vision of the unity of all truth. In general theirs was based not on a Hegelian synthesis, but on what they regarded as a scientific and rational apprehension of the world which applied to all things, including the Bible and the teachings of the Church. Some aspects of the Christian tradition, especially the miracles of the New Testament and supernatural explanations of the sacraments and ministry, proved very difficult to explain (and provoked rapid responses from conservative critics). Still others, such as Figgis himself, as well as some New Testament scholars influenced by the recovery of apocalyptic in the years immediately before and after the First World War, including E. C. Hoskyns, grew increasingly aware of the irreconcilability of modern thought with the world-view of the Bible. This could prove disruptive to any thought of Anglican synthesis. While never a dominant strand of Anglican theology, such radicals have frequently been a thorn in the flesh of the synthesizers (and in recent years one might include in their number Donald MacKinnon).

With its long history of accommodation to the English state, its very loose requirements for belonging, and weak systems of discipline of both clergy and laity, Anglicanism, especially in its English established form, has always tended towards synthesis even when this looked less and less plausible to those outside. It has never achieved the confessional or dogmatic unity of some other mainline Churches: comprehensiveness, which may have started as a political necessity after the calamities of the civil war, became a theological virtue, but one that required presuppositions about unity, truth, and provisionality which arguably no longer held sway in the changed conditions of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Yet Anglican theology for the most part continued the line of synthesis, both philosophical and modernist, until remarkably late—indeed it is possible to date the final effort at an Anglican Church and state synthesis to the archbishop of Canterbury's *Faith and the City* report of 1985. By that stage, however, British society was far too pluralist to allow for the sort of overarching conception of truth which had underpinned earlier expressions of Anglican theology. Its grandiose claims at universality and to speak for all members of society looked increasingly hollow. By the end of the twentieth century, the Church of England and the wider Anglican Communion were too diverse and divided

to allow for any single version of Christian truth to dominate—and this included the version of comprehensiveness that had carried the day for so long. ‘Anglican theology’ had by that stage become little more than a somewhat vacuous term which expressed the competing identities of Church parties, or had become synonymous with the weak ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion.

THE MODERNIST SYNTHESIS AND ITS DETRACTORS

It is not unreasonable to identify a great deal of nineteenth-century Anglican theology as a kind of Platonizing quest after a truth which was imperfectly perceived in both Church and society but which was realized in the process of education and maturity. In different ways this sort of thinking was displayed by (among others) Samuel Taylor Coleridge, F. D. Maurice, A. P. Stanley, and the headmaster-theologians such as Thomas Arnold and Frederick Temple. It was a strand of idealist thought that remained influential through the twentieth century, not least in the thinking of the great scholar-archbishops of Canterbury of the mid-twentieth century, William Temple and Michael Ramsey, even though they expressed it in very different ways. On this model, critical thought was simply part and parcel of the attempt to approach a truth that would never be revealed in its fullness except at the end of days. Although such a method was always challenged by the conservatism of the Oxford movement with its efforts to re-establish the Church on the basis of the Fathers, or by the conservative pietism of the Evangelicals which had grown increasingly biblicist in the late nineteenth century, it nevertheless continued to shape English academic theology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In 1910, despite the growth of the Anglican Communion and the beginnings of what can be called an ‘Anglican Communion theology’ that paid attention to inculturation and context, Anglican theology was still dominated by the two ancient English universities of Oxford and Cambridge: it was still synonymous with Church of England theology, even though this often had a global dimension (like the ‘Greater Britain’ of the British Empire).² Even though Anglicanism had spread throughout the British Empire and some Churches in the white dominions had become self-governing, the colonial episcopate continued to be educated in England, which, given the social

² See Hilary Carey, *God’s Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c.1801–1908* (Cambridge, 2011).

background of senior Anglican clergy, for the most part still meant Oxford and Cambridge. The Anglican globe still revolved around England, and it was English theological disputes that dominated the Anglican Churches across the world (although it should be noted that here, as in other aspects of its foreign relations, there was a degree of American exceptionalism, which took the non-established nature of Anglicanism for granted, and the American Church produced the first non-English Anglican theologian of international stature in William DuBose [1836–1918] of the University of the South). Both ancient English universities had recently begun to reshape their curriculum and to introduce undergraduate theology which was increasingly influenced by critical patterns of thought: the Cambridge scholar F. J. A. Hort commented in 1893, for instance, that ‘beliefs worth calling beliefs must be purchased with the sweat of the brow’. He refused to supply ‘ready nourishment to the credulity which is truly said to be a dangerous disease of the time’.³ By the 1900s Oxford was sharing this tradition as the influence of the Tractarians waned.

The years immediately before the outbreak of the First World War were crucially significant for Anglican theology, particularly in the social and political unrest that challenged the underlying national synthesis. Although there were periods of upheaval and unrest throughout the nineteenth century, it appeared to many (of whom Virginia Woolf is just one example) that society was breaking down. And theology, which had so often simply displayed the cultural assumptions of the broader society, began to change. It thereby reflected something of what Jose Harris called the ‘ramshackle and amorphous society’, which ‘was not (despite the fashionable jargon of the Edwardian era) a coherent “organism”, still less a “corporation”, a “system”, or a “machine”’.⁴ Indeed, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the period from the accession of King George V in 1910 to the outbreak of the First World War in many ways set the agenda for what followed in the 1920s and 1930s and even into the 1960s. At the same time, the character of the debates, which were not restricted simply to England, also laid the foundation for the wider perspective on Anglican theology that emerged from the mission field in earnest after the Second World War. The period can be viewed as what Raymond Williams called an ‘interregnum’ which contained the germs of the future.⁵ As the next section demonstrates, Ensor’s judgement that the First World War ‘altered direction less than is often supposed’ is certainly borne out in theology.⁶

³ F. J. A. Hort, *The Way, The Truth and the Life* (London, 1893), pp. xxxiv–xxxv.

⁴ Jose Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit: Britain 1870–1914* (London, 1994), p. 3.

⁵ Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780–1950* (Harmondsworth, 1963), pp. 165–95.

⁶ R. C. K. Ensor, *England, 1870–1914* (Oxford, 1936), p. 556.

MODERNISM AND THE PROBLEMS OF CHRISTOLOGY

In 1912 a group of predominantly Oxford theologians published a collected volume edited by B. H. Streeter (1874–1937) called *Foundations*. Like the earlier Oxford collections *Essays and Reviews* (1860) and *Lux Mundi* (1889) it created a huge stir in the wider theological and ecclesiastical world (even provoking one of the few twentieth-century works of theological humour).⁷ Perhaps the key point about the volume was its recognition that the old liberal synthesis was inadequate in accommodating all the changes in modern thought. Although for the most part the authors remained committed to the unity of knowledge and most moved in a more modernist direction, there were some hints that the quest for synthesis was a chimera. For instance, in his essay on ‘The Modern Situation’, Neville Talbot, chaplain of Balliol College, Oxford (and afterwards bishop of Pretoria) spoke of his own generation as the first that had not known the world before the doctrine of evolution: ‘While it has been growing up the assumptions of Mid-Victorian liberalism have been going bankrupt For the infection of a kind of cosmic nervousness has become widespread. Somehow the world is now felt to be less domestic than it was. The skies have darkened and men’s minds have become more sombre.’⁸ ‘Somehow or other,’ he went on, ‘the rose colour has faded out of Victorian spectacles’, and the old certainties were being ‘swept by violent tides out of old anchorages, both religious and moral’.⁹ The perception of an all-encircling gloom did not necessarily bode well for the future of those interested in the synthesis of theology and modern thought, even if few ventured into the stormy waters.

The main presenting challenge of *Foundations* was not in Talbot’s unearthing of impending doom but in Streeter’s own essay, ‘The Historic Christ’, which appeared to deny the historicity of the resurrection using the findings of modern science and psychology.¹⁰ This controversy added to the uproar which had followed the publication of J. M. Thompson’s *Miracles in the New Testament* the previous year, which had come to the conclusion that

⁷ R. A. Knox, *Some Loose Stones* (London, 1913).

⁸ Neville S. Talbot, ‘The Modern Situation’, in B. H. Streeter (ed.), *Foundations: A Statement of Belief in Terms of Modern Thought—by Seven Oxford Men* (London, 1912), p. 7. See also K. W. Clements, *Lovers of Discord: Twentieth-Century Theological Controversies in England* (London, 1988), pp. 49–106; Thomas A. Langford, *In Search of Foundations: English Theology, 1900–1920* (Nashville, TN and New York, 1969), ch. 5; Alan Stephenson, *The Rise and Decline of English Modernism* (London, 1984), ch. 5; A. Michael Ramsey, *From Gore to Temple* (London, 1960), ch. 6; Mark Chapman, *Bishops, Saints, and Politics* (London, 2007), ch. 8; more generally, Ernest Nicholson (ed.), *A Century of Theological and Religious Studies in Britain* (Oxford, 2003).

⁹ Talbot, ‘The Modern Situation’, pp. 9 and 11.

¹⁰ B. H. Streeter, ‘The Historic Christ’, in *Foundations*, pp. 73–146. On Streeter, see Peter Hinchliff, *God and History: Aspects of British Theology 1875–1914* (Oxford, 1992), ch. 10.

the miracles were very hard to defend using the principles of modern history: Thompson's licence to work as a priest in his Oxford college was revoked by his bishop.¹¹ Although Streeter maintained the reliability of the synoptic gospels, in their 'general impression', he nevertheless claimed that the resurrection appearances to the disciples were to be understood as 'visions... directly caused by the Lord himself veritably alive and personally in communion with them'.¹² The reason for this was simple: 'the theory that the actual physical body laid in the tomb was raised up seems to involve... that it was subsequently taken up, "flesh and bones", into heaven—a very difficult conception if we no longer regard the earth as flat and the centre of the solar system, and heaven as a definite region locally fixed above the solid bowl of the skies'.¹³ Such a statement proved provocative to those of a more literalist and conservative disposition.

However, a number of prominent theologians came to Streeter's defence, most importantly William Sanday, Lady Margaret Professor at Oxford. Although he had earlier gained a reputation as a moderate churchman and was a cautious mediator of German theology into England, he had been converted to what he called the 'Modernist cause' in 1912. Sanday's defence of Streeter provoked a telling response from the archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, who wrote privately to ask him to keep his views to himself: 'We are in the midst of a time of great flux and perplexity and people are nervous and (pardon the word) "jumpy" to a degree that often depresses me.'¹⁴ In a time of rapid change it seemed important for theologians to batten down the hatches rather than to question long-cherished truths.

In the ensuing pamphlet war the key protagonists against Sanday were Charles Gore, bishop of Oxford, and the outspoken Anglo-Catholic bishop of Zanzibar, Frank Weston, one of Sanday's own pupils. Although Gore had edited *Lux Mundi* his actions as a bishop were less liberal: he had imposed doctrinal conformity in his former diocese of Worcester where he had reprimanded a liberal churchman, C. H. Beeby. Within a few months of the publication of *Foundations*, Gore had set out his views at length in an open letter to the people of his diocese in which he called for the expulsion of 'insincere' clergy who refused to assent to the creeds.¹⁵ Against Gore's charge of 'insincerity', Sanday asserted that there was 'nothing wanton about our critical English scholars of the left wing... They obey their conscience, and go

¹¹ J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the New Testament* (London, 1911).

¹² Streeter, 'The Historic Christ', pp. 83 and 136.

¹³ Streeter, 'The Historic Christ', p. 131.

¹⁴ Davidson to Sanday, 27 Jan. 1913 (Sanday papers, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Eng. misc. d. 123 [I] fol. 6).

¹⁵ Charles Gore, *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship in Faith and Organisation* (London, 1914), p. 14.

where their conscience leads them.’¹⁶ He went on to outline what he called a ‘sound and right Modernism’, which he defined in terms of the Saviour of mankind extending ‘His arms towards the cultivated modern man just as much as He does towards the simple believer’.¹⁷ Christianity, he felt, was for everybody, cultivated and simple alike (even if the religion of the cultivated might require a change of expression). After impressive diplomacy from Randall Davidson, and mutual apologies from Gore and Sanday, the debate temporarily subsided: in a compromise they both affirmed the authority of the creeds, but also their desire ‘not to lay unnecessary burdens upon conscience’.¹⁸ Through the course of the First World War, however, Sanday was regularly in debate and discussion with detractors, including some from his own university. For instance, in 1916 he had a heated exchange with a future leader of Anglo-Catholicism, N. P. Williams of Exeter College, who later became Lady Margaret Professor.¹⁹ ‘The real difference between us,’ Sanday wrote, ‘is a difference in the definition of truth, especially in relation to authority’.²⁰ Both were seeking a synthesis, but where Williams relied on the authority of the Church, Sanday was relying on the scientific truths presented to the modern mind.

The controversy with Weston reveals something about the increasingly global dimension of Anglicanism. After the publication of *Foundations* he produced a lengthy pamphlet which took the form of an open letter to Bishop Edgar Jacob of St Albans who had appointed Streeter an examining chaplain. A few years later Weston went as far as excommunicating the bishop of Hereford when Streeter was appointed canon of Hereford Cathedral in 1915. The principle of criticism, Weston held, so compromised truth and created ‘mental chaos’ that it made missionary activity virtually impossible.²¹ Modernism, he held, was ‘a new religion, and every soul attracted thereto means a new betrayal of the witness with which we are entrusted’.²² From his missionary context in Zanzibar he recognized that the power of Islam would never be broken by a ‘debating society’ but only by ‘the living, speaking church of the infallible Word incarnate’.²³ For Weston, although it was no doubt ‘easy enough to cast away the dogmas that hinder the modern mind from professing

¹⁶ William Sanday, *Bishop Gore’s Challenge to Criticism: A Reply to the Bishop of Oxford’s Open Letter on the Basis of Anglican Fellowship* (London, 1914). See also G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson* (London, 1935), pp. 677–89; and G. L. Prestige, *Life of Charles Gore: A Great Englishman* (London, 1935), pp. 346–51.

¹⁷ Sanday, *Bishop Gore’s Challenge to Criticism*, pp. 30–1.

¹⁸ Cited in G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson* (3rd edn., Oxford, 1952), p. 683.

¹⁹ *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition: A Friendly Discussion between W. Sanday, D.D. and N. P. Williams, M.A.* (London, 1916).

²⁰ *Form and Content*, p. iv.

²¹ Frank Weston, *Ecclesia Anglicana: For What Does She Stand? An Open Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Edgar, Lord Bishop of St Albans* (London, 1913), p. 8.

²² Weston, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, p. 27.

²³ Weston, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, p. 15.

Christ', that would also be to betray the witness of revelation.²⁴ Two years earlier he had preached: 'Save our converts in Africa from reading in books by Christians at home all those things that make them doubt whether there be a God at all.'²⁵ The tone of the debate indicates something of the very different set of presuppositions operating at home and overseas. Thus, writing to *The Times* on 29 December 1913, Sanday spoke of Weston's criticisms as the product of 'isolation and the trying conditions of work in the tropics'.²⁶ But this was to patronize his former pupil: in 1914 Weston wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury that a 'view possible in an Oxford study is not necessarily possible in the mission field. . . . Questions that are left open in academic circles require definite solutions in the world's market-places.'²⁷

Weston was as equally critical of the missionary gathering at Kikuyu in British East Africa where Nonconformists had been invited to share communion by Anglican bishops as he was of *Foundations*. Attacking liberal defenders of reunion, Weston asked (with a high view of bishops typical of conservative Anglo-Catholics): 'Is the Episcopate the expression of the mind of Christ or is it merely of human invention?'²⁸ Just as the English college of bishops is the 'catholic' link with the ascended Christ,²⁹ so the African bishop was 'bound to present the Catholic religion', using his knowledge of European controversy to guard against any 'exaggeration, or understatement, of any one point of doctrine. He is Catholic rather than English, and aims at becoming an African Catholic.'³⁰ The gospel was not something just for the 'cultivated modern man'; perhaps it was simply the case that Africans had to reinterpret the gospel, the Church, and the sacraments 'in the light of modern European thought! Poor Africans; not yet among the wise of European thought.'³¹ The debate might have focused on Oxford, but it had implications for the future of contextualization across the Anglican Communion.

Weston was also critical of Herbert Hensley Henson, at the time canon of Westminster and afterwards bishop successively of Hereford and Durham. Henson's 1912 volume *The Creed in the Pulpit* had questioned the literal truth of the virgin birth. After the announcement of Henson's appointment to Hereford, Weston wrote another pastoral letter, which Henson dubbed the

²⁴ Weston, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, p. 27.

²⁵ Cited in H. Maynard Smith, *Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar: Life of Frank Weston 1871-1924* (London, 1926), p. 171.

²⁶ *The Times*, 29 Dec. 1913.

²⁷ Prefatory letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in Frank Weston, *The Case Against Kikuyu: A Study in Vital Principles* (London, 1914), p. 4.

²⁸ Weston, *The Case Against Kikuyu*, p. 7.

²⁹ Weston, *The Case Against Kikuyu*, p. 37.

³⁰ Weston, *The Case Against Kikuyu*, p. 40.

³¹ Frank Weston, *The Christ and His Critics: An Open Pastoral Letter to the European Missionaries of his Diocese* (London, 1919), pp. 68-9.

‘Zanzibabarian fulmination’.³² There was a flood of protest letters to newspapers, the most notorious being from the Anglo-Catholic Darwell Stone (1859–1941), principal of Pusey House, the Anglo-Catholic institution in Oxford set up to perpetuate the memory of Dr Pusey. Stone, who remained a vociferous opponent of liberal views right up to his death, claimed that Henson’s beliefs about the virgin birth and the resurrection were a ‘definite disqualification’ from being a bishop.³³

Weston was equally critical. Indeed, he held, it would be impossible lawfully to worship the Jesus whom Henson preaches: we might worship the spirit or word within him, ‘but we cannot worship Jesus as we worship God. For the exact reason that the liberal’s Jesus is not God.’³⁴ In a later attack he was rather more graphic about what he saw as the watering-down of Christ: ‘From the recesses of rich studies in palaces and deaneries, from the cosy arm-chairs of college studies, God cries aloud to the sons of men, “Fools! Fools that ye were to see me naked and dying on Calvary’s tree”.’³⁵ In one of his last writings Sanday published a response to Weston, which emphasized what he called ‘the unification of thought’. It was ‘the same mind that has to think of things secular and sacred, and the processes of thinking for both are the same. . . . Unification of thought means unification of life. It means that the universe is all of a piece; it means that life from the beginning has been in essence just what we see it around us today.’³⁶ The points of disagreement between the modernists and Anglo-Catholics such as Weston were simple: was theology and the God it sought to explain simply part of the general human quest for knowledge? Or was there a special form of knowledge disclosed through God’s own divine institution, the Church, governed and upheld by its bishops? The answers were neither obvious nor settled.

CHRISTOLOGY AND MODERNISM FROM THE 1920s

These pre-war and wartime debates set the tone for the inter-war years, but there was one crucial difference. Modernism, represented by such men as Sanday, had frequently been close to German thought. Indeed, in the years before the war English theology had developed more of an international

³² Weston, *The Christ and His Critics*.

³³ Letter of Stone to *The Times*, 1 Jan. 1918.

³⁴ Weston, *The Christ and His Critics*, p. 119.

³⁵ Weston, *The Christ and His Critics*, p. 132.

³⁶ William Sanday, *The Position of Liberal Theology: A Friendly Examination of the Bishop of Zanzibar’s Open Letter Entitled ‘The Christ and His Critics’* (London, 1920), p. 31.

flavour than at any time since the Reformation.³⁷ But the war was to put an end, at least temporarily, to the sympathetic reception of German scholarship. On the whole, Anglican theology after the First World War was relatively isolated from German influences. In particular, both Anglo-Catholicism and Evangelicalism were usually hostile to what they regarded as the rationalist German thought which lay behind the despised modernist synthesis of theology with scientific truth.

Nevertheless a number of theologians continued to be closely acquainted with continental thought. These included Alec Vidler (1899–1991), who mediated much modernist Roman Catholic thought into England, and A. G. Hebert, a monastic scholar who was responsible for organizing translations of a number of important Swedish writings, including Gustav Aulén's *Christus Victor*. In a completely different vein, the Anglo-Catholic Eric Mascall (1905–93), an idiosyncratic philosophical theologian, helped explain transcendental Thomism to an English audience, although his broader influence was marginal, since there were few who showed much interest.

The most important of these figures was George Bell (1883–1958), bishop of Chichester, who continued to communicate with German scholars from the 1920s through a number of conferences and through his engagement in the early years of the ecumenical movement. He befriended Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906–45) and also got to know Nathan Söderblom (1866–1931) of Sweden. He became a major influence behind the foundation of the World Council of Churches after the Second World War. Anglicans were often in the forefront of ecumenical dialogue, which included entering into successful union schemes, the most important being the Church of South India which was established at Indian independence (even if these tended to be resisted by many Anglo-Catholics with a higher view of ministry).

The Christological controversies continued through the 1920s. The most controversial was the conference held at Girton College in Cambridge in 1921 by the Churchmen's Union, which had been established as the voice of modernism within the Church of England. The Union was led for many years by Henry Major (1871–1961), long-time principal of Ripon Hall, the one Church of England training establishment which associated itself with liberal theology. The conference topic was the person of Christ, where many of the now familiar debates were repeated. J. F. Bethune-Baker (1861–1951), Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge, and a well-known patristics scholar, and the veteran controversialist Hastings Rashdall (1858–1924), a polymath Oxford theologian, historian, and idealist philosopher, who had become dean of Carlisle, were the most controversial speakers, and both seemed to deny the

³⁷ See Mark D. Chapman, 'Anglo-German Theological Relations during the First World War', *Zeitschrift für neuere Theologiegeschichte/Journal for the History of Modern Theology*, 7 (2000): 109–26.

resurrection of Christ. Bethune-Baker's language was provocative: 'The God I recognize is a supreme "person" like Jesus in all that makes "personality" . . . So Jesus is the creator of my God.'³⁸

With such controversial statements coming from a number of prominent people, it was hardly surprising that it provoked bitter controversy. In the end it led to calls for a doctrine commission, which was set up principally not to describe the faith of the Church of England, but to set the boundaries of acceptable belief: it took comprehensiveness for granted. Initially under the leadership of Bishop Burge, Gore's successor at Oxford, after his premature death it was chaired from 1925 by William Temple (1881–1944), bishop of Manchester. The commission, which included large numbers of participants from across the theological spectrum of the Church of England, eventually reported in 1938. The lengthy volume was based implicitly upon an understanding of the Church as only partially in possession of the truth: in his 'Introduction' Temple, by that stage archbishop of York, wrote that 'our aim is not to compose a new *Summa Theologiae*, but to promote unity and mutual appreciation in the Church of England, partly by the interpretation of one school of thought, and partly by pointing to the fulness of a truth diversely apprehended in different quarters'. There was, he suggested, no such thing as a system of Anglican theology. Instead the goal of Anglicanism was a form of comprehensiveness which held different truths in balance. Consequently, the Anglican Churches, while holding to the faith of Catholic Christendom, Temple argued, 'have exhibited a rich variety in methods both of approach and of interpretation'.

They are the heirs of the Reformation as well as the heirs of the Catholic tradition; and they hold together in a single fellowship of worship and witness those whose chief attachment is to each of these, and also those whose attitude to the distinctively Christian tradition is most deeply affected by the tradition of a free and liberal culture which is historically the bequest of the Greek Spirit and was recovered for Western Europe at the Renaissance.³⁹

This view that there were three ways of looking at the truth, none of which was adequate to contain the fullness of God, has had its critics, but still has a hold on some self-perceptions of Anglican theology across the world.

The Gorton Conference in many ways marked the last major outing of serious modernism, which, although continuing to exert an important influence in the Church of England, was rapidly superseded as a dominant theological voice by the triumph of various forms of Catholicism, both conservative and liberal, which rose to prominence in the theological faculties

³⁸ Cited in Stephenson, *The Rise and Decline of English Modernism*, p. 118.

³⁹ Doctrine Commission of the Church of England, *Doctrine in the Church of England* (London, 1938), p. 25.

of Oxford and Cambridge after the demise of the old guard like Sanday and Rashdall. That said, there were some who continued to fly a liberal banner later in the century, most notably the maverick Bishop E. W. Barnes of Birmingham (1874–1953). An anti-ritualist rationalist, he published *The Rise of Christianity* (1947) which was modest in its intellectual achievement and confused in its historical learning and did little to help the modernist cause.

Nevertheless, various forms of liberal theology, some more scholarly than others, have played an important role in Anglican theology throughout the twentieth century. Liberal-minded theologians, including the Oxford patristic scholars Geoffrey Lampe (1912–80) and Maurice Wiles (1923–2005), continued to produce controversial volumes. As Oxford Regius Professor, Wiles published an important book on *The Making of Christian Doctrine* in 1967 in which he sought to read the Fathers in their own terms rather than in the light of later tradition: 'We ought not...to begin with any preconceived theory concerning the pattern of doctrinal development.'⁴⁰ Similarly, in his Cambridge Hulsean lectures, *The Remaking of Christian Doctrine*, he spoke of the 'continually changing'⁴¹ character of doctrine and its restatement in terms acceptable to the modern world. In 1977 he was embroiled in the controversy over *The Myth of God Incarnate* to which he had contributed an essay calling for the metaphorical reinterpretation of ancient sources. Evangelicals called on the authors, many of whom were Anglican academics, to resign their orders. By the late 1970s, however, the mainstream media were no longer interested in theological controversies.⁴²

Throughout this period the Church of England continued with a standing Doctrine Commission, which produced various reports and responses to some of the controversies of the 1970s and later, although it was eventually abolished for reasons that are unclear. Maurice Wiles was appointed as chair of the commission which produced the controversial report *Christian Believing* in 1976, which, he noted, 'was not an easy report to write', since its contributors could not reach complete consensus.⁴³ It was published simply as a collection of essays. Afterwards Donald Coggan, the Evangelical archbishop of Canterbury, reorganized the commission, removing Wiles as chairman. The later reports *We Believe in God* (1986) produced under the chairmanship of John V. Taylor, *We Believe in the Holy Spirit* (1991) under John Austin Baker and Alec Graham, and *The Mystery of Salvation* (1995) under Alec Graham were collective efforts and far more consensual. Lacking the disagreements that one might expect among Anglicans they made very little contribution to the

⁴⁰ Maurice Wiles, *The Making of Christian Doctrine* (London, 1967), p. 15.

⁴¹ Maurice Wiles, *The Remaking of Christian Doctrine* (London, 1974), p. 2.

⁴² Clements, *Lovers of Discord*, pp. 210–27.

⁴³ Doctrine Commission of the Church of England, *Christian Believing* (London, 1976), p. xi.

theology, although *The Mystery of Salvation* hit the press because it seemed to be cooling hell down a little.

THE IDEALIST SYNTHESIS

Another synthesizing strand in Anglican theology which continued to shape theology into the twentieth century was the sort of philosophical idealism which had earlier been demonstrated by the writers of the *Lux Mundi* circle. One of its most idiosyncratic representatives of a Platonist variety was William Ralph Inge (1860–1954), dean of St Paul's Cathedral in London (from 1911), who was also a regular columnist for the popular London daily, the *Evening Standard*, which made him one of the most well-known Church figures between the wars. He soon earned the title 'The gloomy Dean' for his pessimism about democracy and for his insistence on not tying Christianity to the spirit of the present age (even if he came to champion voguish causes such as eugenics and racial supremacy). Inge is hard to categorize: on the one hand, he was a modernist and from 1924–34 president of the Churchmen's Union, while, on the other hand, he developed a strongly Platonist faith with an emphasis on the presence of the 'indestructible and eternal' values of Goodness, Beauty, and Truth in the immanent world of 'space and time'.⁴⁴ Stressing the importance of mystical experience as the proof and 'bedrock of religious faith', he felt it gave him utter confidence in the reality of 'absolute and eternal values', and at the same time an 'open mind towards the discoveries of science' and 'receptive attitude to the beauty . . . of creation'.⁴⁵ This, he felt, would help move the Churches beyond the confessional conflict which characterized the modern situation.⁴⁶

Although a completely different personality, William Temple similarly developed a theological system which was often dense, impenetrable, and complex. Never at home with the party disputes of the Church of England, he was one of the last great Hegelian synthesizers in the nineteenth-century mould. Despite the difficulty of his thought he was the dominant voice in Church of England theology between the wars. Temple had come under the influence of the Hegelian Edward Caird at Balliol College, Oxford. Initially beset by grave doubts about the possibility of miracles, he was eventually ordained in 1909, and contributed one of the less controversial essays to

⁴⁴ W. R. Inge, *Outspoken Essays* (London, 1919, 1922), Second Series, pp. 31–2; see also W. R. Inge, *Diary of a Dean, St. Paul's, 1911–1934* (London, 1949); Adam Fox, *Dean Inge* (London, 1960); Robert Meredith Helm, *The Gloomy Dean* (Winston-Salem, NC, 1962).

⁴⁵ Inge, *Outspoken Essays*, Second Series, p. 14.

⁴⁶ W. R. Inge, *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought* (London, 1926), p. 33.

Foundations. His chapter on 'The Church', however, betrays something of his idealist assumptions. The Church was simply one aspect of the wider quest for truth and could not be said to be in full possession: it 'cannot be more than a limited distance ahead of the society in which its members live'.⁴⁷

Temple's philosophical system is laid out most clearly in *Mens Creatrix* (London, 1917), *Christus Veritas* (London, 1924), and his Gifford Lectures, *Nature, Man and God* (London, 1934). These works show the profound influence of his early philosophical training and his abiding sense of the underlying unity of all truth, as well as the significance of mind and the supremacy of value. Like many in earlier periods of Anglican theology, he was deeply influenced by Plato, asserting a rational principle behind the universe in *Mens Creatrix* which could be grasped not only through the intellect, but also through the imagination and conscience: he argued both from faith to understanding and also from understanding to faith. In *Christus Veritas* Temple moved on to discuss the principle of convergence into truth in relation to the Incarnation of Christ. He held a high doctrine of 'personality' and fellowship, seeing the human will as the union between mind and feelings: a person was 'a self-conscious and self-determining system of experience' in the process of achieving the 'unification of the experience that constitutes them'.⁴⁸ Deeper unity was to be found as the human being became integrated with a power beyond itself. In *Nature, Man and God* Temple addressed the question of the relationship between spirit and matter, understanding the universe in sacramental terms. Later in his career, partly through his ecumenical encounters—he chaired the provisional committee of the World Council of Churches in 1938—Temple moved away from this relatively optimistic idealism, gradually adopting a position closer to the Christian realism of the American Reinhold Niebuhr.

Temple was engaged in many different areas of Church life: during the First World War he became leader of the Life and Liberty Movement which sought to offer a far greater measure of self-government to the Church of England, and he was also involved with the Workers' Educational Association and Student Christian Movement. His abiding interest in social and economic theology led to his championing of the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship in 1924 and the Malvern Conference in 1941 which began to plan for post-war reconstruction. He was translated to Canterbury in 1942, the same year that saw the publication of his Penguin Special *Christianity and Social Order* (Harmondsworth, 1942) which was deeply influential in the formation of the welfare state. Anglican social theologians, including Ronald Preston, who taught in Manchester, continued

⁴⁷ William Temple, 'The Church', in *Foundations*, p. 356.

⁴⁸ William Temple, *Christus Veritas* (London, 1924), p. 68.

Temple's programme of serious theological engagement with economic and social thought.

In theology Temple founded no school, although there were some, particularly in Oxford, who continued in his theological style which went beyond parties. Particularly influential was Oliver Chase Quick (1885–1944), whose powers of synthesis made him an obvious choice for membership of the doctrine commission, where he formed a close friendship with Temple. Like Temple, Quick was primarily a philosophical theologian with a theological temper both 'catholic and evangelical, and at the same time inherently Anglican'.⁴⁹ In 1934 as professor at the University of Durham, which was beginning to emerge as an influential department of theology, he wrote the standard textbook for the next generation, *Doctrines of the Creeds* (1938). After a brief spell as Regius Professor at Oxford before his early death, Quick was succeeded in 1944 by Leonard Hodgson (1889–1969), who similarly stood above parties and adopted a philosophical style of theologizing. He had worked in New York at the General Theological Seminary as Professor of Christian Apologetics which gave him a feel for a less established style of Anglicanism. He moved away from both Hegelianism and positivism, adopting a philosophical position which emphasized both the rational character of revelation and the importance of experience. Hodgson followed Temple in other ways: from 1954 until 1966 he was warden of William Temple College, Rugby, which brought together representatives of industry, psychiatrists, sociologists, and theologians to try to develop a more practical synthesis of learning for the problems of the present day. His 1967 book, *Sex and Christian Freedom*, was the fruit of such conversations, in which he called on clergy to 'talk twentieth-century common sense without being disloyal to our ordination vows'.⁵⁰

Some later Anglican theologians working in Oxford continued to draw on philosophy, including the Oxford professor and later bishop of Durham Ian Ramsey (1915–72), who worked within the then dominant tradition of analytic linguistic philosophy. More original was the Oxford scholar Austin Farrer (1904–68), whose work was highly distinctive in its treatment of the great themes of theology. Perhaps because of his distinctive approach and his aloofness from the dominant philosophical and theological mood of his time, as well as his lack of use of footnotes, his work has undergone something of a revival in the early twenty-first century. He is honoured more as a spiritual writer than a theologian.⁵¹ Similarly, although from a very different and non-professional theological background, Farrer's friend C. S. Lewis (1898–1963) became one of the most important Christian apologists of his time through

⁴⁹ J. K. Mozley, *Some Tendencies in British Theology* (London, 1951), p. 87.

⁵⁰ Leonard Hodgson, *Sex and Christian Freedom* (London, 1967), p. 8.

⁵¹ See Robert Boak Slocum, *Light in a Burning-Glass: A Systematic Presentation of Austin Farrer's Theology* (Columbia, SC, 2007).

such works as *Mere Christianity* (London, 1952) and has remained highly influential on apologetics, especially among Evangelicals until the present.

Others drew on process philosophy, including Norman Pittenger (1905–97), who taught in New York and Cambridge, and who was also one of the first openly homosexual theologians in the Anglican Communion. Another figure who developed an original expression of philosophical theology was John Macquarrie (1919–2007), a convert to Anglo-Catholicism from the Church of Scotland, who had been professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York before his appointment as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Oxford. In his widely read textbook, *Principles of Christian Theology* (London, 1966), he adopted an ‘existential-ontological’ approach. This book remains one of the few comprehensive systematic statements of the Christian faith by an Anglican theologian, although it displays few traces of the Anglican tradition. At Oxford, Macquarrie displayed a conservative but always eirenic line in the debates over the Incarnation following the publication of *The Myth of God Incarnate*.

THE TRIUMPH OF ANGLO-CATHOLICISM

Despite his location in Zanzibar Frank Weston’s notoriety and eloquence made him the natural leader of the Anglo-Catholics after the First World War, when Anglo-Catholicism began to move into a dominant position in the Church of England. He was prominent in the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican bishops from across the world in 1920 where he displayed an ability to work together with colleagues of different persuasions (including Hensley Henson). He was formative in writing the famous Lambeth Appeal which sought reunion with other Churches prepared to accept episcopacy into their systems. Where once Anglo-Catholicism had prided itself on being a small and beleaguered minority (a status it shared with conservative Evangelicalism) this had changed by 1923 when the London Anglo-Catholic Congress under Weston’s chairmanship in July 1923 attracted 15,000 people. In the 1920s there was something of a flowering of Anglo-Catholic theology from such figures as N. P. Williams and Kenneth Kirk, a major moral theologian, who became bishop of Oxford. In 1933 Williams published the collection *Northern Catholicism*, which functioned as a manifesto for non-Roman national catholic Churches. Anglo-Catholicism also grew as a social force through the Schools of Sociology (conferences organized by bodies such as the English Church Union) and the Christendom Group (a group of church leaders and theologians committed to social theology, and including Maurice Reckitt, W. G. Peck, and others). Interest in ministry and sacraments proved a particular Anglo-Catholic emphasis, producing major works of liturgical

scholarship. These were to include A. G. Hebert's *Parish Communion* (London, 1936), Gregory Dix's immensely influential *Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945), and the volume of essays *The Apostolic Ministry* (London, 1946), edited by Kenneth Kirk.

A more liberal variety of Anglo-Catholicism found expression in characteristic Anglican fashion through another collection of essays that drew mainly on Cambridge scholars, *Essays Catholic and Critical* (London, 1926), edited by E. G. Selwyn (1885–1959). Selwyn, who became dean of Winchester, edited the journal *Theology*, which represented liberal Catholicism throughout much of the century under successive editors, most prominently Alec Vidler. *Essays Catholic and Critical* was an influential volume which took a more rounded approach to the Christian faith than the sort of scientific reductionism promoted by the modernists: it had more space for mystery and metaphor. Its title also revealed its apologetic intentions: it sought to avoid the extremes by means of what can be labelled a liberal Catholic consensus which was neither too hot nor too cold, and which appealed to many in the Church in the 1920s. One of its contributors, A. E. J. Rawlinson (1884–1960), who went on to become bishop of Derby, wrote that the spiritual depth of Anglo-Catholicism was not to be gauged by the success of the congresses but by the consciousness of belonging to 'something which is more than an insular sect'.⁵² The essays display both a seriousness of scholarship and an openness to modern thought, as well as an attempt to grasp the breadth and depth of the tradition. What was also key was a greater valuing of the supernatural element in religion which had been underplayed in the earlier debates. One contributor can be singled out: Sir Edwyn Hoskyns (1884–1937), of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (the only college, according to Streeter, in Oxford or Cambridge that took the teaching of theology seriously), who knew the German scene intimately, and translated Karl Barth's *Römerbrief* in 1933. He inspired many Cambridge undergraduates in the critical yet devotional reading of the Bible, including the future archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey (1904–88).

In 1945 as Van Mildert Professor in Durham, Ramsey described the task of the theologian as to 'look beyond "isms" to the Gospel of God and to the Catholic Church which he tries to serve with a method, use and direction needed as greatly today as in the past'.⁵³ Much of Ramsey's most influential book, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, which outlines his method, is an exploration of the critique of the Church by encounter with the 'fact of Christ crucified and risen'.⁵⁴ The Church should bear witness, not to the perfection of those who share in it, 'but to the Gospel of God'. It was 'not something Roman or Greek or Anglican; rather does it declare to men their utter dependence

⁵² A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Authority and Freedom* (London, 1924), p. 169.

⁵³ A. M. Ramsey, 'What is Anglican Theology?' *Theology*, 48 (1945), p. 6.

⁵⁴ A. M. Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London, 1936), p. 132.

upon Christ by setting forth the universal Church in which all that is Anglican or Roman or Greek or partial or local in any way must share in an agonizing death to its pride'.⁵⁵ This meant that the Church was 'a scene of continual dying; yet it is the place where the sovereignty of God is known and uttered, and where God is reconciling the world to Himself'.⁵⁶ The Catholic Church, for Ramsey, was constantly under judgement: 'these are Catholicism's own themes, and out of them it was born. But they are themes learnt and relearnt in humiliation, and Catholicism always stands before the Church door at Wittenberg to read the truth by which she is created and by which she is to be judged'.⁵⁷ Ramsey represented a form of Anglo-Catholicism that was both open to the Reformation and to the challenge of the Bible. His overall theological system, however, is difficult to pin down: he was influenced by the Platonizing tendencies of F. D. Maurice, the Protestant Congregationalism of his upbringing, as well as some strands from the Orthodox tradition. Although an Anglo-Catholic in appearance and holding a high view of the ministry, he was neither socially nor theologically conservative and was ecumenically open, promoting the unsuccessful reunion talks with the Methodists through his time as archbishop and, after his historic encounter with Pope Paul VI in 1966, inaugurating the first serious ecumenical talks with Roman Catholics through the Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission process from the 1960s. Like Temple he stood above party in an archiepiscopate that covered the 1960s, perhaps the most volatile years of the century.

After the Second World War, the Lambeth Conferences of 1948 and 1958 began to shape a distinctive Anglican Communion theology which became increasingly aware of the contextual problems which arose from political and ecclesiastical independence of former British colonies: there was a recognition that mission did not simply move in one direction. Figures such as Max Warren,⁵⁸ and John V. Taylor,⁵⁹ secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, became aware of the need for the development of indigenous expressions of theology and liturgy. By the 1960s the Anglican Communion had established a secretariat under the American bishop Stephen Bayne, which promoted cross-cultural relationships and tried to outline how the Communion might respond to different circumstances which were quite distinct from the sorts of establishment models of traditional English Anglicanism.⁶⁰ The impact of the American Episcopal Church was strong, especially the 'National Church' model of William Reed Huntington, which advocated the reconciliation of

⁵⁵ Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, p. 66.

⁵⁶ Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, p. 41.

⁵⁷ Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, p. 180.

⁵⁸ Max Warren, *The Missionary Movement from Britain in Modern History* (London, 1965).

⁵⁹ John V. Taylor, *Go-Between God* (London, 1972).

⁶⁰ Stephen Fielding Bayne Jr, *An Anglican Turning Point* (Austin, TX, 1964).

separated Protestant communions under a notion of a united church for a single national community, and which led to the development of theologies of relationality modelled on ‘instruments of unity’ or ‘communion’ and bonds of affection rather than any stronger form of authority.⁶¹ The theological problems that emerged in the Anglican Communion in the late twentieth century were far less concerned with the sorts of doctrinal disputes which had characterized earlier Church of England debates, and instead involved matters of Church order, especially the ordination of women and homosexuals. Anglican Communion theology has been one of dispute resolution, and only turned to matters of biblical and theological interpretation relatively late.⁶²

In parts of the Anglican Communion from the 1960s in the wake of decolonization there was an increasing recognition of the need to develop contextual approaches to theology that would pay proper attention to specific local circumstances: these can be regarded as in some ways heirs to the traditional Anglican quest for synthesis between society and theology. As theological education institutions increasingly came to be staffed by local theologians and as Churches developed an indigenous leadership so there was an increasing awareness of context in many parts of the world. In Africa, for instance, the Kenyan-born John Mbiti (b. 1931), produced a series of books including *African Religions and Philosophy* (1969) and *Concepts of God in Africa* (1970) which sought to draw on traditional African philosophy as a way of reinterpreting Christian understandings of God. More popular forms of African theology were expounded by Archbishop Desmond Tutu (b. 1931) of Cape Town⁶³ and have been influential in North America.⁶⁴ Elsewhere contextual theologies have developed in different ways. An example is that of the Province of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, where particular attention has been given to developing a theology related to the tricultural constitution which gives due regard to the experience of the indigenous peoples.⁶⁵ In other parts of the world the multi-cultural context has led to significant reflection on relationships with other religions and to the formation of the Anglican Network for Inter Faith Concerns.⁶⁶ Elsewhere has seen the development of forms of liberation theology, including the important work of Naim Ateek

⁶¹ Mark Chapman, *Anglican Theology* (London, 2012), ch. 8; James M. Rosenthal and Nicola Currie (eds.), *Being Anglican in the Third Millennium* (Harrisburg, PA, 1997).

⁶² See ‘Introduction’, in Mark Chapman, Sathi Clarke, and Martyn Percy (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* (Oxford, 2015).

⁶³ See, for instance Desmond Tutu, *The Rainbow People of God* (New York, 1994).

⁶⁴ Michael Battle, *Practicing Reconciliation in a Violent World* (Harrisburg, PA, 2005).

⁶⁵ See, for instance, Jenny Plane Te Paa, ‘How Diverse is Contemporary Theological Education? Identity Politics and Theological Education’, *Anglican Theological Review*, 90 (2008): 223–38.

⁶⁶ See Anglican Communion Network for Inter Faith Concerns, *Generous Love: The Truth of the Gospel and the Call to Dialogue—An Anglican Theology of Inter Faith Relations* (London, 2008).

(b. 1937) in Palestine.⁶⁷ A conference on contextual theologies in 1998 produced an important textbook,⁶⁸ and also led to the setting up of the Anglican Contextual Theologians network which first met in 2003. This has encouraged significant reflection on the impact of economic and social conditions and the effects of colonialism and neo-colonialism on the development of Anglicanism. There has been an increasing awareness of the long history of silencing local voices, especially those of minorities⁶⁹ and women.⁷⁰

THE 1960s

By the 1960s a number of theologians, particularly associated with Cambridge, were calling for a modernization of theology. This found expression in the collected volumes *Soundings: Essays Concerning Christian Understanding*, edited by the liberal Catholic Alec Vidler (Cambridge, 1962), and *Objections to Christian Belief*.⁷¹ There was also some questioning of the traditional approach to Christian morality: it was clear that for many the real issues were not to do with belief, but with practice. Under the influence of Mervyn Stockwood, bishop of Southwark (a London diocese south of the River Thames), there was a great deal of public discussion of theological and moral reform in what came to be called 'South Bank Theology'. Douglas Rhymes, for instance, a canon of the cathedral, had given a course of lectures which proposed a liberalization of morals.⁷² The most controversial publication, however, was by one of the assistant bishops of the diocese, John Robinson (1919–83), bishop of Woolwich. His *Honest to God* (London, 1963) sold over a million copies and brought theological discussion to the popular press. The headline that 'God is not a big daddy in the sky', as the *Daily Herald* put it,⁷³ created a stir in the media and throughout the Churches. There were in turn large numbers of responses from across the theological spectrum.⁷⁴

⁶⁷ Naim Stifan Ateek, *Justice and Only Justice: A Palestinian Theology of Liberation* (New York, 1989).

⁶⁸ Ian Douglas and Kwok Pui-Lan (eds.), *Beyond Colonial Anglicanism: The Anglican Communion in the Twenty-First Century* (New York, 2001).

⁶⁹ Willie James Jennings, *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race* (New Haven, CT, 2010).

⁷⁰ Kwok Pui-Lan (ed.), *Anglican Women on Mission and the Church* (Norwich, 2011).

⁷¹ D. M. MacKinnon, A. R. Vidler, H. A. Williams, and J. S. Bezzant, *Objections to Christian Belief* (London, 1963).

⁷² Douglas Rhymes, *No New Morality* (London, 1964).

⁷³ 19 Mar. 1963.

⁷⁴ See Clements, *Lovers of Discord*, ch. 7; Paul A. Welsby, *A History of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1984), chs. 5–8; Robert J. Page, *New Directions in Anglican Theology: A Survey from*

Robinson's book was hardly original. It drew extensively on German sources, particularly Bultmann, Tillich, and Bonhoeffer, serving to popularize their thought, and calling for the recognition of the presence of God outside the Churches by demythologizing traditional forms of language about God. Robinson's thesis was simple: all 'religion' had to go; it was no longer 'a precondition of faith and something more authentic was needed to replace it'.⁷⁵ God-language had to be restated in human terms, which meant that some, not unreasonably, came to see Robinson as an atheist.⁷⁶ What was required instead was a new form of Christianity predicated on seeing Christ in the secular, especially the 'Secular City', which had resonances with the 'death of God' theology that was becoming popular in the United States at the same time.⁷⁷ Quoting Bonhoeffer directly, Robinson asked: 'In what way are we "religionless-secular" Christians...not regarding ourselves from a religious point of view as specially favoured, but rather as belonging wholly to the world?'⁷⁸ The Church, he held, had a duty to rid itself of its set of cultic practices, immersing itself instead in the search for God or 'the "beyond" in the midst of our life'.⁷⁹ To do this it had to adopt a new life modelled on the self-giving love of Jesus, the 'man for others'.⁸⁰ Much of *Honest to God* amounted to a proposal for a worldly spirituality rather than a constructive theology. Chapter 5, for instance, on 'Worldly Holiness', was concerned with attempts to take liturgy, prayer, and the other trappings of Christianity out of the Church and into what it called the 'common': the worst that could possibly happen was that 'churchiness would keep on reasserting itself'.⁸¹

South Bank Theology and its religion-less Christianity could be understood as a kind of clergy-led anti-clericalism, which had a profound effect not simply on theology but also on other areas such as the deployment of clergy to unchurched areas.⁸² At a deeper level there is a sense in which it represented a lingering clamour after an all-embracing synthesis that had been the hallmark of earlier expressions of Anglican theology. It was essentially a somewhat idiosyncratic attempt at a theology of a national Church. At another level it

Temple to Robinson (New York, 1965); David L. Edwards (ed.), *The Honest to God Debate* (London, 1963); Rowan Williams, 'Honest to God and the 1960s', in *Anglican Identities* (London, 2004).

⁷⁵ John Robinson, *Honest to God* (London, 1963), pp. 36–7, 129.

⁷⁶ Alasdair MacIntyre in *The Honest to God Debate*, p. 215.

⁷⁷ See, for example, Douglas Rhymes, *Prayer in the Secular City* (London, 1967); see also Paul van Buren, *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel, based on an Analysis of its Language* (London, 1963).

⁷⁸ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison* (London, 1953), pp. 280–1; cited in Robinson, *Honest to God*, p. 122. See also pp. 61, 7.

⁷⁹ Robinson, *Honest to God*, p. 121.

⁸⁰ Robinson, *Honest to God*, esp. pp. 75–6.

⁸¹ Robinson, *Honest to God*, pp. 85 and 89.

⁸² See Leslie Paul, *The Deployment and Payment of the Clergy* (London, 1964).

was absurd: a theology seeking to abolish the very religion required to sustain it was doomed to failure.⁸³ There was little sense of multi-culturalism or awareness of the pluralism of British society: all people were still assumed to be in some sense Anglicans, and all that was required was an awakening of a sense of worldly holiness. The influence of South Bank Theology continued well into the 1980s: the influential Church of England report *Faith in the City* was premised on the assumption that all that was needed to revive the Church was a refocusing of ministry to the inner city, where there was 'common belief in God' which had to be nurtured so that it developed into what it called 'authentic Christian faith'.⁸⁴ The British, it maintained (against growing statistical evidence) were a 'believing people'.⁸⁵

ANGLICAN THEOLOGY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Towards the end of the century there was a significant decline in the influence of Anglican theology in the universities and also in the country at large. Although this decline had been under way from the end of the nineteenth century with the growth of non-Anglican colleges in both Oxford and Cambridge, as well as the opening up of university theology positions to non-Anglicans, especially in the newer universities, the impact of secularization and de-Christianization was rapid from the mid-1960s. The decline in candidates for ordination in England led to the closure of a number of theological colleges from the 1970s, which was followed by the closure of a number of theology departments during the 1980s. The Church of England monopoly on Oxford and Cambridge was almost completely removed, which meant that the traditional institutional basis for Anglican theology collapsed. Shorn of their links with the Churches, most theological departments, including those of Oxford and Cambridge, were forced to question the relevance of their traditional curriculum, and most have expanded into the field of religious studies.

The relatively benign synthesis of either the liberal Catholic or modernist type that had dominated the Churches between the wars and into the early years of the welfare state did not survive the onslaughts of the 1960s. Anglican theology was increasingly polarized and partisan, especially after the revival of Evangelicalism following the Keele Conference of Anglican Evangelicals in 1967, where leaders including John Stott sought to engage with Church

⁸³ Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, c.1958–1974* (Oxford, 1998), p. 19.

⁸⁴ *Faith in the City: A Call to Action by Church and Nation* (London, 1985), §3.39.

⁸⁵ *Faith in the City*, §3.38.

structures and the contemporary world. The Evangelical influence on Anglican theology increased substantially in the 1990s, when George Carey was archbishop of Canterbury, and afterwards. Popular Evangelical theologians include Alister McGrath in Oxford, N. T. Wright, who was for a time bishop of Durham before returning to academia, and the lay Anglican theologian David Ford in Cambridge. Evangelicals moved into the theological mainstream and came to dominate most of the remaining Church of England theological colleges. In global Anglicanism the movement represented the dominant strand of theological opinion, including significant figures of the Episcopal Church such as Paul Zahl and Ephraim Radner, and the first black presiding bishop, Michael Curry (elected 2015).

By the beginning of the new century, while many Anglicans were active in theology, it was not clear that there was a distinctive Anglican theology. Some English theologians sought to develop a more coherent and distinctly ‘Anglican’ theology, notably Stephen Sykes, sometime professor at Cambridge and Durham and for a time bishop of Ely, while others led by John Milbank, a lay Anglican at Nottingham University, sought to revive a Catholic traditionalism. The lack of any clarity about what constituted Anglican theology, however, was obvious during Rowan Williams’s time as archbishop of Canterbury from 2002–12. Williams had been Lady Margaret Professor in Oxford and described himself as a ‘chastened Anglo-Catholic’.⁸⁶ A major theologian, he drew on a huge variety of writers from many different traditions, including his Cambridge teacher, the radical Scottish Episcopalian Donald MacKinnon (1913–94). Like MacKinnon, Williams consistently emphasized the tragic character of theology, offering a critique of the earlier liberal Anglican settlement: in some ways he was a radical outsider like his hero Figgis, challenging the complacency of Anglican comprehensiveness. But in another way he maintained a theology of comprehensiveness, but one which relied on conflict rather than synthesis. For Williams, conflict and tragedy were at the heart of Christian living and they simply could not be avoided. In the face of that conflict, he wrote, ‘we are assured of the possibility of “re-producing” the meaning that is Christ crucified and risen, through our commitment to an unavoidably divided church—not by the effort to reconcile at all costs, but by carrying the burdens of conflict in the face of that unifying judgement bodied forth in preaching and sacrament’.⁸⁷ Throughout his time as archbishop, Williams had more than his fair share of conflict both at home and in the Anglican Communion. At the same time, however, a number of figures from outside England and the United States were emerging as global figures in the

⁸⁶ Rowan Williams, ‘Reformed Characters: Rediscovering a Common Tradition’, *Epworth Review*, 28 (2001): 23–30 (p. 25).

⁸⁷ Rowan Williams, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford, 2000), p. 58.

Anglican Communion, which increasingly threatened the English hegemony over Anglican theology which has formed the substance of this chapter.

THE FUTURE OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

The future of Anglican theology is likely to be far more plural than ever before as it progresses further into the twenty-first century. As well as the continued development of contextual theologies of synthesis such as those described earlier, there is also likely to be an increased focus on mission in the former heartlands of the Communion, especially in the Church of England, which has seen a catastrophic loss of active members since the 1960s. It is likely that theological risk-taking will be one casualty of such an emphasis: crisis theologies have always had a tendency to be more exclusive and less synthetic. Similarly, the rise in numbers and influence of the Churches of the global South, many of which have retained a conservative approach to theology and biblical studies, much of which is resistant to recent theological developments, mean that there is likely to be an increasing polarization between Anglicans of different points of view. Theological fragmentation will be one side-effect of the possible dismemberment of the Anglican Communion, as competing Anglicans make a claim to be the authentic inheritors of the Anglican spirit. It is highly likely that the models that develop will be dominated by very different interpretations of the Anglican tradition. While for some Anglicans there will be further reflection on social and political context, synthesis and adaptation, others will continue to see the primary context for the future of Anglican theology as the Thirty-Nine Articles bolstered by early twentieth-century methods of biblical interpretation. Caution, reserve, and subtlety are consequently unlikely to dominate Anglican rhetoric in the mid-twenty-first century.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayne Jr, Stephen Fielding, *An Anglican Turning Point* (Austin, TX, 1964).
 Clements, Keith W., *Lovers of Discord: Twentieth-Century Theological Controversies in England* (London, 1988).
 Doctrine Commission of the Church of England, *Doctrine in the Church of England* (London, 1938).
 Doctrine Commission of the Church of England, *Christian Believing* (London, 1976).
 Douglas, Ian and Kwok Pui-Lan (eds.), *Beyond Colonial Anglicanism: The Anglican Communion in the Twenty-First Century* (New York, 2001).
 Hick, John (ed.), *The Myth of God Incarnate* (London, 1977).

- Langford, Thomas A., *In Search of Foundations: English Theology, 1900–1920* (Nashville, TN and New York, 1969).
- MacKinnon, D. M., A. R. Vidler, H. A. Williams, and J. S. Bezzant, *Objections to Christian Belief* (London, 1963).
- Mozley, J. K., *Some Tendencies in British Theology* (London, 1951).
- Nicholson, Ernest (ed.), *A Century of Theological and Religious Studies in Britain* (Oxford, 2003).
- Page, Robert J., *New Directions in Anglican Theology: A Survey from Temple to Robinson* (New York, 1965).
- Ramsey, A. Michael, *From Gore to Temple* (London, 1960).
- Robinson, John, *Honest to God* (London, 1963).
- Stephenson, Alan, *The Rise and Decline of English Modernism* (London, 1984).
- Streeter, B. H. (ed.), *Foundations: A Statement of Belief in Terms of Modern Thought—by Seven Oxford Men* (London, 1912).
- Taylor, John V., *Go-Between God* (London, 1972).
- Temple, William, *Christus Veritas* (London, 1924).
- Williams, Rowan, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford, 2000).

Liturgical Renewal and Modern Anglican Liturgy

Louis Weil

The scope of liturgical renewal which is usually associated with the term ‘the Liturgical Movement’ refers in general use to several developments which began in the nineteenth century, and which have continued to influence liturgical practices in the diverse Christian traditions until the present time. Although the focus in this chapter will be a consideration of those developments in regard to their evolution within the Anglican Communion, and particularly in Western Anglicanism, it is important from the outset to place the idea of liturgical renewal within a much broader historical framework.

Liturgical change in one Christian tradition, even in times of adversarial denominationalism, is inevitably affected by the liturgical practices of other traditions. This may take the form of the adoption of practices which are recognized as pastorally appropriate—such as a more abundant use of Scripture—or it may take the form of opposition to a liturgical practice of another tradition as an assertion of its own distinct identity. In the latter we see an adversarial stance: how is one tradition decidedly different from another? Out of this may emerge what we might call the distinct liturgical ethos of a particular tradition, shaped at least to some extent by its rejection of the ritual practices of another tradition. We see this, for example, during the Reformation of the sixteenth century when the Roman Catholic Church maintained the use of Latin as its liturgical language while the Reformers insisted on the use of the vernacular in worship.

Liturgical development and change have taken place throughout the history of Christianity, and, indeed, they are integral in the evolution of all ritual practices, as stable as these may often appear to be. With regard to the evolution of Christian ritual practices, within which our subject takes its appropriate place, it is important for us to consider reactions to these developments among ordinary laity and clergy. Liturgical renewal involves not only the work of scholars, but also the possible authorization and implementation

of that work or its rejection by the leaders of the Church. This entire process has unfolded in widely diverse historical and cultural contexts in which such developments have taken place.

Liturgical change has not generally been greeted enthusiastically by the laity or their pastors. The primary reason for this is that liturgical piety operates at a very deep level of religious experience. Liturgical reformers may offer both historical and theological reasons for proposed changes at a given time and place, and Church authorities such as the members of the episcopate may claim their right to authorize such changes on the basis of their *jus liturgicum*; but the people of God who are then required to participate in those rites may reject them, not on the basis of reasoned argument but because of the formative influence of their experience of liturgical worship in their daily lives. What they have seen and heard in their parish churches, often over generations, has shaped in them an expectation as to what form their liturgical prayer should embody.

It is not only among the laity in the pews that this liturgical expectation for what is familiar may be found. After his retirement as archbishop of Canterbury in 1961, Geoffrey Fisher was interviewed by the magazine *Church Illustrated* concerning his views about developments in the Church of England. As he discussed the problems which the Church was facing, Fisher began to speak of 'the real enemy of the Church', which, he said, 'is the liturgiologists'. They were, he said, pressing upon the Church liturgical changes which it did not want.¹ He was thus giving a response to liturgical change which was rarely given adequate pastoral attention. It was not simply a question of a new version of the Prayer Book replacing an older one. The experience of liturgical change operated at a much deeper level where such change could intrude upon a person's faith.

This observation is confirmed in the general experience of the liturgical developments of recent decades in the reactions of many laity and clergy. Although, of course, there were Church members who longed for some aspects of change, as, for example, many Roman Catholics who had hoped for the use of the vernacular at mass, for others such change was abrasive of the piety in which they had been grounded throughout their lives. The forms and rituals of corporate prayer take root at a sub-rational level upon which historical or theological arguments may have little impact.

Experience in prayer, both corporate and private, becomes closely integrated with faith itself. With regard to private prayer, each individual Christian has personal control: he or she can use whatever forms or methods in private prayer which they find meaningful. But when praying with others, and pre-eminently in the corporate liturgical prayer shared with other

¹ *Church Illustrated*, 7 Apr. 1966.

members of parish communities, the patterns experienced week after week, and often over many years, inevitably established themselves as 'normative'. These norms became an important part of religious experience. So it is never a question simply of exchanging one form for another which has been newly authorized by Church authorities.

This pastoral concern, however, was not on the agenda for the reform-minded authorities in the sixteenth-century court of the English monarchy. For them, a vernacular liturgical book would serve a political purpose for a national Church. Although Anglicans generally acknowledge the remarkable quality of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's gift for liturgical revisions, the first Book of Common Prayer in 1549 conflicted with the liturgical expectations of many of the clergy and people whose piety had been formed over centuries through their experience of the Roman Rite in Latin.

THE ICONIC SIGNIFICANCE OF 1662

By the later seventeenth century, this 'norm', as it had developed in the local uses of various cathedrals in England, had shaped the faith and piety of that society as a whole. The evolution of the Prayer Book of the English Church continued to reflect the political as well as religious debates which had taken place among English Christians, and also the influence of theological and political developments on the continent. Liturgical developments do not take place in a vacuum: they are inevitably related to the wider social and cultural context, often to issues far removed from specifically theological or liturgical concerns.

In the historical sequence of the Prayer Books of the Church of England, although until the mid-twentieth century they all reflected the dominating influence of the work of Archbishop Cranmer in the books of 1549 and 1552, it was the book of 1662 which exercised the greatest influence. This was at least in part due to Anglican missionary expansion. Although liturgical developments in the modern era gave to British Anglicans newer supplementary books, the book of 1662 remained canonically the official book of the Church of England and other Churches of the Anglican Communion. Any consideration of liturgical renewal in the Anglican Communion, therefore, must keep in mind the significant role taken by the book of 1662.

As recently as the 1960s, theology students of the Church of England, in connection with their liturgical preparation for ordination, were examined solely on the Prayer Book of 1662. The stability of that book as the foundation of Anglican liturgical prayer contributed to its widespread influence for three centuries. It was this book which was carried by explorers and traders as the British Empire expanded to every corner of the globe. In these distant places,

settlements of Anglican people expected their clergy to maintain the same liturgical practices which they had known at home, and missionaries instituted those same practices among the diverse cultures where they proclaimed the gospel of Christ.

THE MODERN LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

Central to the narrative presented in this chapter is what is generally known as *the* Liturgical Movement. Our initial aim was to place this subject within a wider context which recognizes that there has been liturgical change and development throughout the history of Christianity, and that various reform movements also included an aspect of liturgical renewal. The invention of printing led to an unprecedented change in the mode of liturgical development. In this sense, there has been constant liturgical 'movement'. Yet the pace of that development has not been the same throughout the long history of Anglicanism: there have been stages of development in which other currents within the life of the Church have influenced changes in corporate worship, in some contexts contributing to this change, but in others inhibiting change.

When we focus on the Liturgical Movement which began in the nineteenth century, we find a development of enormous complexity in the Church's life. The scope of renewal in the various Christian traditions evolved differently, and even within a given tradition there was significant diversity in both the emergence and the character of liturgical renewal of that tradition in different cultural contexts. We may also speak of the Liturgical Movement in its origins as operating within the framework of a particular tradition's liturgical identity as, for example, when raising questions of liturgical reform in Anglicanism with a specific focus upon the Book of Common Prayer as authorized in each national Church. In spite of similarities among the various authorized versions of the Prayer Book, already in the nineteenth century there were significant differences. The issues which churchmen might raise in England about the 1662 book did not coincide precisely with those which members of the Scottish Episcopal Church or the American Episcopal Church might raise, particularly with regard to the form of the eucharistic rite authorized in these two latter Churches.

We can thus discern an initial stage of liturgical renewal which was characteristic of various traditions prior to the emergence of an ecumenical dimension within the Liturgical Movement. That initial concern grew out of the scholarly work which had, in fact, been taking place since the sixteenth century. Such scholarly work, however, had no official status. The trauma of the conflicts over sacramental theology and liturgical rites in the sixteenth

century, particularly in the Roman Catholic and Anglican traditions, had set the authorized rites in stone. The rites in both traditions required conformity.

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN ROMAN CATHOLICISM

The early phase of the Liturgical Movement in the nineteenth century focused on the restoration of the authentic tradition, and for the Roman Church this meant essentially an idealization of the late medieval models. Yet from this typical approach of the Romantic Movement, there emerged writings which popularized the renewal of the liturgy in a non-technical form for laity and clergy. The influence of the Solesmes Benedictines was particularly significant in this regard, not only within the Roman Church but in other liturgical traditions as well. Dom Prosper Guéranger, O.S.B., wrote a fifteen-volume series titled *The Liturgical Year*, which gradually appeared in various languages and had an enormous influence as a resource for liturgical renewal. This work became known to clergy and laity in the Church of England and seems to have had impact upon liturgical developments in Britain, not least through High Church liturgical scholars who had an eye on continental Catholicism.

The idealization of an earlier classic model of liturgical prayer was part of a phenomenon in the nineteenth century known as the Romantic Movement. This movement has been interpreted, at least in part, as a reaction to the dehumanizing forces of the Industrial Revolution. A dominant theme in Romanticism was nostalgia for the life-style of pre-industrial society. Along with this there developed an idealization of all aspects of medieval society—its literature, its architecture, and, in due course, its understanding of the Church, its theology, and its forms of worship. Sometimes called ‘the Gothic Revival’, it was a multi-faceted phenomenon which is found reflected, for example, in the Waverley novels of Sir Walter Scott.

In England, of course, there were many buildings and monuments which dated from the medieval era. Although these structures had often been the victims of neglect for two centuries, the Gothic style had always remained in the awareness of British society in general. The impact of the Gothic style, especially in regard to the design of new church buildings, was enormous. Its dominance in Church architecture continued well into the twentieth century, and it continues even today to be the model for what many people conceive as the appropriate style for a building in which people gather for worship.² The

² Cf. Kenneth Clark, *The Gothic Revival* (3rd edn., New York, 1962); James F. White, *The Cambridge Movement* (Cambridge, 1962); also G. A. Bremner, *Imperial Gothic: Religious*

Gothic style became identified not only as the preferred Anglican architecture, but was also taken over by Protestant Churches whose patterns of public worship and the understanding of its meaning embodied a very different liturgical piety from that with which the Gothic style was identified.

Various mutations of this Gothic style thus became normative as the point of reference for the design of a church building. This stability of architectural design went hand in hand with the stability of the texts of the Book of Common Prayer. Until the middle of the twentieth century, Prayer Book evolution was limited to adjustments and variations upon the classic texts of the sixteenth century as they took a definitive form in the book of 1662. The most significant modifications were found in the Prayer Books of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Episcopal Church in the United States. These two books departed in significant ways from the 1662 book with regard to their eucharistic rites which embodied in Scottish Episcopalianism the influence of the patristic-minded Usager party through the inclusion of an *epiclesis* and a prayer of oblation in their eucharistic prayers.

Ultimately liturgical developments would move far beyond these elements into a widened horizon that would embrace a greater awareness of perspectives to the evolution of eucharistic rites which would in turn influence the development of new liturgical texts. Whereas the official Prayer Books had been influenced by political factors which had constrained liturgical developments, the influence of the study of early eucharistic sources within a more ecumenical framework created a larger room within which Christians of diverse traditions might find common ground for common prayer. By the mid-twentieth century, the combination of renewed liturgical scholarship and the emergence of new pastoral and cultural contexts in the life of the Church signalled that the stability which had once been characteristic of Anglican liturgical practice could no longer hold as an unchangeable norm.

A parallel movement of renewal—the Ecumenical Movement—influenced the shaping of a wider horizon for liturgical practice, not confined to the sources within a single tradition, but looking rather to early sources which, in a real sense, were the common heritage of all Christians, whatever their tradition might be. Early sources were studied and analysed, and also found their way into experimental use, often where Christians of different traditions might worship together. In this way, liturgical renewal and ecumenical renewal in the Church became fused in the experience of many Christians. This created a shared movement into a larger context which was not defined by denominational divisions.

Thus there was liturgical development not only within a given tradition, as with Prayer Book revision in the various provinces, but also in the common

use of ancient sources and also in the development of new liturgical materials which could claim a wider ecumenical basis. These common sources became a point of reference in the various traditions in the revision of their official liturgical texts.

Within the Anglican Communion, these developments would unfold differently in the various ways that each province would engage in the process of Prayer Book revision. In the Church of England this meant that eventually, for clergy and people with a strong commitment to the Established Church but who shared a sense that reforms were needed, the future path would require a revision of the 1662 Prayer Book. Yet given the role which Parliament would play in any such process of revision, working within the canonical system proved to be problematic when such a revision was attempted in the Proposed Book of 1928. Evangelicals in the Church of England saw the proposal as an introduction of 'popish' liturgical practices into the worship of the Church of England. Enormous conflict developed within the Church which revealed the sharp divide between how Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals understood the nature of the Church and its public worship. In the end, Parliament voted against the Proposed Book and the movement towards Prayer Book revision was subverted for several decades.³ Yet the imperatives for liturgical renewal in the lives of ordinary Christians remained. There were new social realities which required new forms of liturgical expression, as the Church found itself in a multi-cultural world in which the forms associated with the English heritage in Anglican worship—pre-eminently embodied in the iconic texts of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer—could no longer serve the Communion as a whole. Greater diversity would be required in all aspects of liturgical practice.

It is in this perspective that we see the shift of focus in the Liturgical Movement from its nostalgia for historical rites in their classic forms towards the renewal of the liturgy with a double focus; first for the pastoral needs and social realities of contemporary society, and also towards a newly energized ecumenical vision of the Church's worship which emphasized how much the various liturgical traditions shared in their patterns of worship.

The recovery of genuinely primitive documents offered new insight into the nature of early Christian worship. It is now generally admitted that recent study of these sources has revealed that initial engagement with such early documents was rather naïve and simplistic. The most famous example of this is the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* associated with the Roman presbyter Hippolytus of the early third century. As recently as the 1960s, the best scholarship of the time identified the document as one of the writings of Hippolytus, and thus dating from the early third century. Scientific editions of the text from that period revealed that it was a reconstructed work

³ Cf. G. J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (2nd edn., London, 1982), pp. 165–90.

which had drawn upon several different sources, but offered more precise detail in regard to author, date, and place than scholars today can accept.⁴ A 'hermeneutic of suspicion' among scholars led to a greater humility with regard to such documents. Yet it must be admitted that these documents, even when approached uncritically, served to open up the horizon of liturgical history and to detach us from a narrow focus upon either medieval or Reformation models.

THE ECUMENICAL DIMENSION

Beginning in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, several developments contributed to a coming together of the Liturgical Movement and the Ecumenical Movement in the recognition of the fundamental unity which all Christians share through common baptism, an emphasis which deeply affected the renewal of the rites of Christian initiation in the twentieth century. Among the members of diverse Christian traditions, ecumenism was engaged in two ways: first, in the creation of official bilateral dialogues which, over a period of years, engaged the gifts of bishops, parish clergy and laity, and of theologians, in extended official conversations on the most important theological issues which divided the traditions; and second, in the greatly increased frequency of unofficial ecumenism in which Christians of different traditions shared in personal experiences of common ministry, such as, for example, shared ministry among the poor. This work engaged them in the implementation of their common faith at the ground level.

In the official encounters, the documents which were the fruit of these dialogues were often published and commended to the respective traditions as a basis for study and reflection at the diocesan level (as among clergy under the leadership of their bishop), and at the parish level (as a focus for adult education for the laity). In the sharing of a common ministry, there was the discovery of the authenticity of the Christian faith of Christians of a different tradition. This enabled the people who shared such ministry to see the differences between their traditions in a new way, as complementary rather than adversarial. Even in situations in which it was felt that communion could not be shared, there developed a variety of ways in which clergy and laity of different traditions might work and pray together. This was seen, for example, in the sharing of ministry to the poor and the homeless, in the shared preparation of meals, and in the care of those in need. It was also expressed in occasions for common prayer: the most widely recognized of these, and

⁴ See Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN, 2002).

one which often enjoyed official support by Church leadership, was the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity which takes place in each year from 18–25 January, that is, between the feast days of the apostles Peter and Paul. It was instituted by the Community of Franciscans of the Atonement in 1908. Today, the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity invites Christians throughout the world to pray in communion with the prayer of Jesus ‘that they all may be one’ (John 17:21).

Inevitably, within this emerging context of Christian fellowship, the question of the sharing of communion was raised. The practice in virtually all Christian denominations had been that Holy Communion could not be shared with non-members. Even within a given tradition, there were often inhibiting requirements regarding the reception of communion, for example in Anglicanism the expectation that confirmation would precede the first reception of the eucharist. In the ecumenical context of shared experience, on the other hand, the question did emerge: why can we not share the eucharist? In the official dialogues it was the general understanding that members should not take this step even if they felt a desire to do so, recognizing that the official status of such a dialogue implied an expectation of obedience to the official norms of each tradition. In a related context, however, in the founding of ecumenical societies of liturgical scholars, who generally worked together on major issues in liturgical theology and practice, the same question arose, and often members felt that they were not bound in that context by the restraints of the official dialogues. Thus at academic conferences the sharing of the eucharist became a general if not a universal norm.

The ecumenical movement and the liturgical movement thus influenced each other. For many of those who taught ecumenical studies or liturgical studies, the first experience of the sharing of Holy Communion with Christians of another tradition was in the context either of an ecumenical meeting or an academic congress. Work together fostered a sense of mutual trust grounded in common faith which nourished an imperative that Christians should share communion at the eucharist in spite of the official divisions between traditions. Those involved were not indifferent to those divisions and their causes, but their work and prayer together compelled them to move towards sacramental sharing: *communicatio in vita* led them to *communicatio in sacris*. On this question there were, of course, different views among the participants, even among people of the same ecclesial tradition. The understanding was always that individual conscience on this question must be the criterion for whether a person would or would not come forward to receive communion—the operating principle was one of mutual respect.

In the emergence and evolution of the various ecumenical dialogues, members of one tradition gained first-hand experience of the patterns of worship of the dialogue partner. This opened a horizon of awareness which had been impossible during the centuries in which serious encounter between members

of different Christian traditions was rare and benefited from no official sanction. The other level was through the non-official engagement of Christians of different traditions who through personal encounter discovered that they had far more in common in their Christian faith than the differences which divided their traditions. It was also discovered that at times there emerged greater divergence among the members of the same Church than there were among the members of the dialogue commissions who represented different Churches.

This interplay is difficult to define because such personal experiences, which were very diverse, reshaped individual liturgical expectations in different ways. Shared experiences during sessions of the various ecumenical dialogues and conversations often led to the preparation of a joint statement in which that newly discovered common ground opened a member's knowledge of one tradition to a wider horizon of faith and of liturgical practice. Such statements had implications beyond personal experience in that they were directed towards the entire ecclesiastical institution. In these dialogues, through working together with Christians of another tradition, often over a period of years, a level of trust developed which enabled the members to understand the theological tradition of the dialogue partner as a different strand of Christian theology from their own, rather than an erroneous teaching. Participants were enabled to move into a dialogue of complementarity rather than the adversarial stance which had been typical of the often hostile character of denominationalism.

This level of engagement, however, was not easily communicated to the respective institutions as a whole since the ordinary members had not shared the personal experience of the members of the dialogue and thus did not share the mutual trust which had emerged in the more substantial engagement permitted by an official dialogue. The early optimism which had characterized the ecumenical developments of the mid-twentieth century eventually gave way to the stressful realities of the need for reform and change within each tradition, as well as to negative reactions within each tradition to what both movements—ecumenical and liturgical—claimed as common ground in the various dialogue statements. Institutional priorities were a powerful deterrent to the realization of one Church finding its unity embodied in 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism'.

Each tradition was caught up in its own internal debates: in the Roman Church, for example, this was seen in attempts to redefine the role of the papacy in relation to the collegiality of the bishops as taught by Vatican II. This was a debate about the exercise of centralized versus diffused authority. In the Anglican Communion, much of the internal debate ran in an opposite direction: was the diffusion of authority so great that when debated issues arise, such as that of the ordination of women to the episcopate and the priesthood, a diffused approach to authority led towards irreconcilable

differences? These were, of course, debates about the nature of authority and how it would be exercised.

Such internal debates tended to work in opposition to developments in regard to liturgical common ground. In this area, one of the most significant developments was the effort to create a common lectionary.⁵ The first document promulgated by Vatican II, 'The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy', had specified on this subject that 'In sacred celebrations there is to be more reading from holy scripture, and it is to be more varied and suitable.'⁶ A long process of lectionary reform had thus been inaugurated, the impact of which would be a substantial increase in the use of the Bible in the Roman Rite. After the council had ended, in 1969, the Roman Ordo Lectionum Missae (OLM) was authorized.⁷

This undertaking had ecumenical significance among the Western liturgical Churches. There had been a growing discontent with the authorized eucharistic lectionaries among Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans, and Old Catholics, all of whose lectionaries were based upon the medieval system of pericopes of the Western Church. Although these lectionaries were similar, in the course of history they had lost the integrity of their original sequential order. They also employed a one-year cycle, which meant that as a whole they utilized only a minimal part of the biblical texts. An additional problem was that at the celebration of the eucharist, readings from the Old Testament were almost never appointed, whereas the ancient Roman practice had included a reading from the Hebrew scriptures.

Although there had been no official engagement on the part of the Roman Church with other Churches to participate in a period of experimentation of the new lectionary, the OLM was nevertheless taken up by other Churches and adapted for liturgical celebrations in their own traditions. Gradually this use of OLM by diverse Christian traditions led to considerable divergence from the authorized Roman Catholic source. Ironically, what had originated as a contribution to the unity of Christians had become, in effect, another expression of division. A consensus among the non-Roman traditions, recognizing how the intention of a common lectionary had been undermined, reaffirmed their hope that such a resource might yet be developed as an instrument of unity.

In 1978, at a meeting in Washington sponsored by the Consultation on Common Texts (CCT), the representatives of the participating Churches took as their first principle that the OLM calendar and structure would serve as the starting-point for the project, but adapted in the light of the experience of the

⁵ Cf. D. Holeton, 'Liturgy and Ecumenism', in P. A. Muroi and O.-M. Saar (eds.), *Tra Memoriae Profezia. Ecclesia Orans*, 29 (2012): 117–35.

⁶ *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 35.1.

⁷ Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948–1975*, trans. M. J. O'Connell (Collegeville, MN, 1983), pp. 406–25.

Churches where it had been in use. This work resulted first in the publication of the Common Lectionary in 1983, which was then used and tested for almost a decade, and then in revised form was published in 1992 as the Revised Common Lectionary (RCL). This version was still seen as essentially an adaptation of the OLM. The RCL subsequently came into liturgical use in all parts of the world, taken up by at least fifty Churches representing a wide range of Christian faith and practice.

What was disappointing to many was that a document which had served so well in bringing Christians of many traditions on to a common Scriptural foundation in their Sunday celebrations of the Lord's resurrection had not benefited from an active and official participation by the Roman Catholic Church. It was simply a fact that during the pontificate of Pope John Paul II, the energy which had characterized the ecumenical movement waned. The impact of this was felt not only in the Roman Church, but within the movement as a whole.

In the early 1990s, the CCT appealed to the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, asking that Rome might take up leadership in working towards the goal of a common lectionary, but this was not accepted. Nor would there be authorization for some Roman Catholic centres to undertake experimental use of RCL. Such policies had, of course, a chilling effect on the hope for not only a common lectionary but also for the use of common liturgical texts. The late Horace Allen, who was chair of the CCT and a dedicated supporter of the RCL, lamented this situation. Allen was also the joint chair of the International Consultation on English Texts, which produced the 'common texts' used by most English-speaking Churches today. In an article which appeared in a Roman Catholic publication, he observed: 'This is too bad, since the similarities of the two lectionaries have... created considerable joy and harmony as the faithful, Roman Catholic and Protestant, have discovered a large measure of unity and agreement around the liturgical use of scripture.'⁸ There was similar disappointment among Anglicans who had participated in the work of the CCT from the beginning and who had seen in this united work, in the creation of a common ground both in the liturgy and the assigned scriptural readings, a powerful contribution to the goal of the reunion of Christians.⁹

Yet even with such set-backs, a quiet ground-level ecumenism continued to develop. Christians worshipped together in each other's churches more frequently than could have been imagined in an earlier period. The important thing was the ecumenical affirmation that what Christians of different traditions shared was more fundamental and more important than what had

⁸ *National Catholic Reporter*, 29 June 2001.

⁹ David R. Holeton, 'Ecumenical Liturgical Consensus: A Bumpy Road to Christian Unity', *Studia Liturgica*, 34 (2008): 1–16.

divided them. The Liturgical Movement was itself a powerful force among Christians in a common realization that what was shared through the sacrament of baptism was the foundation for what Christians were invited to share in the sacrament of the eucharist.

THE INTERNATIONAL ANGLICAN LITURGICAL CONSULTATION

The Liturgical Movement within the Anglican Communion reached an important new stage of development with the founding in the 1980s of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC). Given that the Anglican tradition is often characterized by its liturgical heritage, it is perhaps surprising that at the official level of the Church's life, as at meetings of the episcopate, these matters sometimes received rather modest attention. This may reflect the fact that until the mid-twentieth century, the authority of the Prayer Book and conformity to it had not been questioned.

The Canadian liturgist Paul Gibson made the interesting observation that the role of the Prayer Book was linked to the question of authority in Anglicanism. Gibson suggested that it was the Articles of Religion which served as the defining document of Anglican theology, but that they had gradually lost that role when, in many provinces, assent to them ceased to be required at the time of ordination. As the official status of the articles went down, 'the unofficial status of the Book of Common Prayer became, by a process of consensus, the organ of normative authority in the Anglican Communion'.¹⁰ As Gibson noted, the Book of Common Prayer had not always been seen as the fundamental symbol of Anglican unity.

A significant weakening of the authority which Cranmer's texts had enjoyed for the first four hundred years of Anglican history took place as Prayer Book reforms throughout the Communion began to take a new direction. Although there had been variants among the various national versions of the Prayer Book, by and large these were variants on Cranmer's texts in the books of 1549 and 1552. The first indication of an opening towards change, albeit a very modest one, was found in a resolution affirmed at the 1908 Lambeth Conference: 'While maintaining the authority of the Book of Common Prayer as the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice, we consider that liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity throughout the Anglican Communion.'¹¹

¹⁰ P. Gibson, 'What is the Future Role of Liturgy in Anglican Unity?' in David R. Holeton (ed.), *Liturgical Inculturation in the Anglican Communion* (Nottingham, 1990), p. 20.

¹¹ Resolution 36 of the 1908 Lambeth Conference.

By the early twentieth century, it should be noted, there were only three orders which varied from the English book of 1662: the Scottish and American books which were noted earlier, and to which the Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland had been added. Once into the twentieth century, however, Prayer Book revision became more frequent, although still developing under the shadow of Cranmer's classic texts. This dominant role was reflected in another Lambeth resolution, in this case from the 1948 Conference: 'The Conference holds that the Book of Common Prayer has been, and is, so strong a bond of unity throughout the Anglican Communion that great care must be taken to ensure that revisions of the Book shall be in accordance with the doctrine and accepted liturgical worship of the Anglican Communion.'¹²

Although the book of 1662 had continued to enjoy the favour of large numbers of traditionalist Anglicans, by the middle of the twentieth century there was a developing consensus that the Cranmer era was waning in its authority with regard to future liturgical developments. The Proposed Book which was defeated in Parliament in 1927–8, but adopted unofficially in many dioceses after 1929, had continued the use of Cranmer-like language even in its modification of existing prayers or in the composition of new ones. Some of the resulting texts were stilted, though occasional recourse was had to the first Book of Common Prayer, issued in 1549. This attempt to create new liturgical models using traditional language—language no longer used in everyday speech—was short-lived. Issues of language and cultural ethos required that the path of Prayer Book reform needed to move in a new direction. The 1962 Book of the Anglican Church of Canada was, in the words of Thomas Talley, a distinguished American liturgical scholar, 'the last band-aid on the work of Archbishop Cranmer'. It was from that time on that new liturgical texts began to find a place in Prayer Book revisions which were now occurring in many provinces of the Communion.

The principles of liturgical renewal associated with the Liturgical Movement thus had, during the first half of the twentieth century, only a modest impact upon Anglican Prayer Books, such as the American book of 1928 in which some reforms of liturgical structure are evident. From the mid-twentieth century, on the other hand, those principles played a major role in subsequent revisions. Yet there was a serious problem with the lack of an adequate instrument of communication between the various provinces with regard to liturgical issues. During his tenure as Secretary-General of the Anglican Consultative Council from 1983 to 1994, the Reverend Canon Sam Van Culin took an active role in addressing the need for the formation of some type of liturgical group which would bring together at regular intervals representatives of the almost forty Anglican provinces. Van Culin himself

¹² Resolution 78(a) of the 1948 Lambeth Conference.

sought the opinions of various Anglican leaders including liturgical scholars about the need for such a consultative body. This led in 1985 to an unofficial gathering which took place during the three days prior to the Boston meeting of *Societas Liturgica*, the international ecumenical liturgical society. This coordination between the two meetings permitted Anglican members of *Societas Liturgica* simply to arrive a few days early in order to participate in both; this link between the two bodies was maintained subsequently.

Some of the Anglican members of *Societas* had already demonstrated a particular commitment, through both teaching and writing, to the chosen topic, the communion of baptized infants and children prior to confirmation. During that first meeting, in spite of its brevity, those present produced 'Children and Communion', a significant proposal that, on the basis of the conviction that baptism effects full membership in the Church, the reception of communion should be affirmed as the normative practice of the Church for all the baptized, whether adults or children, without the traditional expectation that a person be confirmed prior to first communion. This was clearly a revolutionary proposal, although well-grounded both historically and theologically in the practice of the first millennium. Because this initial meeting took place in Boston, the document 'Children and Communion' came to be known as 'The Boston Statement'.

Although there remained opposition to the communion of small children in some Anglican provinces, and also in parishes within some national Churches, the deliberations of the Boston Consultation had significant effect within the Anglican Communion. The statement was published and along with it a collection of supportive essays which enjoyed a wide distribution. A decade later, the subject received further consideration in an American publication, *Children at the Table* (1995). The Boston meeting thus created a new horizon of inter-provincial cooperation within the Anglican Communion, although at that time it had no official status.

The positive impact of the Boston meeting confirmed the hope that the creation of an International Anglican Liturgical Consultation would make a valuable contribution to communication on liturgical and sacramental issues between the provinces of the Anglican Communion.¹³ Through the creation of the IALC, liturgical developments in one province could become known throughout the entire Communion. The collegial work of the consultation led to the preparation of a series of liturgical documents that were addressed to the Communion. These documents covered a wide range of issues as the liturgical horizon of Anglicanism expanded well beyond its Cranmerian heritage. Worship in the Anglican Communion was being reshaped in the light of major new concerns whose impact would greatly alter the role of the

¹³ Cf. David Holeton and Colin Buchanan (eds.), *A History of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations 1983–2007* (London, 2007).

Book of Common Prayer as a symbol of unity within the Communion. A new era of liturgical coordination between the provinces was about to begin.

After the Boston meeting, those who were present at that gathering began to plan a second meeting for 1987, again in tandem with the bi-annual *Societas Liturgica* congress. The question remained, however, as to what status the IALC gatherings might have within the Communion. An extended conversation between IALC representatives and members of the Anglican Consultative Council addressed this concern, and at the second IALC meeting, held in Brixen, Italy, a proposal was prepared which laid out an impressive agenda for their future work, and also indicated that each province would be invited to send a representation to these meetings, plus, of course, the Anglican members of *Societas Liturgica* and one or two guests. That last factor was based on the consensus among those who had been present in Boston that an ecumenical partner should also take part in these meetings, as had begun at that meeting.

The range of subjects engaged at these meetings was an indication of the broad scope of the IALC agenda, including work on liturgical formation, on initiation, eucharist, and orders. Even without knowing what the future work of the IALC would be, it was clear that major liturgical and sacramental questions had been engaged pertaining to the life of the Church throughout the world. These were international and not merely national concerns. Perhaps the most important fruit of the work of the IALC over some three decades was an enlarged awareness of the complexity of the Anglican liturgical heritage as it developed in very diverse cultures. Prior to the mid-twentieth century, there was an appearance of unity which, given cultural diversity, was more apparent than real. The British liturgical scholar Phillip Tovey raised the question:

If the Book of Common Prayer ceases to be the norm throughout the Anglican Communion, what is it that holds it together? Anglicans are only just beginning to realize that a Communion of only one form of worship is in fact a myth which has never existed.¹⁴

The question that Tovey posed continued to stand: what was it that held the Anglican Communion together? The answer to that lay only partially in the realm of liturgy and sacraments. In that context, the work of the IALC greatly contributed to a reorientation of perspective to the question. The more fundamental question for Anglicans remained the question of authority, a question whose many facets were shared with other Christian traditions, and for which the answers were not yet clear.

These questions remain as the Anglican Communion as well as other Christian traditions finds itself in a very different world from the one in which its classical rites, and the understanding of those rites, were shaped. It

¹⁴ P. Tovey, *Inculturation: The Eucharist in Africa* (Nottingham, 1988), pp. 39–40.

is an intimidating reality that Christians are called in this twenty-first century to proclaim Christ and to form Christian communities within societal structures which do not support those tasks in the ways which the Christendom model of Christianity assumed as its foundation for many centuries. During the twentieth century, prophetic voices insisted that this foundation disappeared long ago, and that the Church had continued to function with a nostalgic presumption that the former paradigm could be recovered. All of the Christian traditions continued to have members who longed for this former time. Their clergy and laity experienced a profound anger that the Christian society was subverted by forces which were indifferent or even hostile to the faith and to the values which were identified with Christianity.

Yet in many ways, the Church today is placed within a world more akin to that of early Christianity than to the establishment models which emerged with Christendom. This reality faces the Church in this time and place with extraordinary challenges: how can Christianity adapt to this multi-cultural dazzlingly diverse world? This challenge exists at every level of the Church's life, but in the context of this chapter we may appropriately focus the challenge to our patterns of worship. One of the fruits of the Liturgical Movement was a recovery of the basic principle that the liturgy is pre-eminently 'the work of the people of God'. In the course of its engagement with the structures of medieval society, that primary characteristic of the liturgical assembly was subverted under the impact of numerous aspects of the societal realities of the time. Perhaps most significantly, it was in this context that the domination of liturgical celebrations by the ordained reshaped the understanding of the very nature of the liturgy itself. This one development had far-reaching consequences in all the various Christian traditions. Clericalism took many forms, not only with regard to sacramental practice in the marginalization of the laity, but also in the separation of Christian faith from the context of ordinary human life into a kind of sacred realm. This seems now to have been a strange development in a religion based upon the Incarnation of God—the coming of the Divine Presence into the fabric of our human reality. For that is what Christian liturgy in its fragile forms seeks to do: to embody the Divine Presence in the ordinary physical realities of human life—in water, in bread and wine, in human touch.

If one asks whether this significant shift has a particular reference to the liturgical scene in Western Anglicanism, we must first acknowledge that the divisions which characterized the various Christian traditions were shaped by the gradual disintegration of the Christendom model. Our modern world is characterized by diversity, and so the diversity of various liturgical traditions is not in itself a problem to be conquered. The cultural diversity which has influenced developments in the evolution of the Book of Common Prayer is a gift to be welcomed, but at the same time it challenges us to understand human diversity not as adversarial but as a complementary aspect of the larger

reality of our common humanity. The Lord's prayer 'that they may all be one', points us to the unity of which baptism is the sign—the sign which sends all Christians out from our assemblies of worship in which our identity as the Body of Christ is renewed, to be a sign of God's call to all humanity that we be reconciled with each other and with God.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldovin, J. F., S. J., *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville, MN, 2008).
- Beckwith, Roger and Andrew Daunton-Fear, *The Water and the Wine: A Contribution to the Debate on Children and Holy Communion*. Latimer Studies 61 (London, 2005).
- Botte, Bernard, O. S. B., *From Silence to Participation: An Insider's View of Liturgical Renewal* (Washington, DC, 1988).
- Bremner, G. A., *Imperial Gothic: Religious Architecture and High Anglican Culture in the British Empire, 1840–1870* (New Haven, CT, 2013).
- Clark, Kenneth, *The Gothic Revival* (3rd edn., New York, 1962).
- Cuming, G. J., *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (2nd edn., London 1982).
- Earey, Mark and Phillip Tovey, *Liturgical Formation and Common Worship* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Holeton, David R., 'Ecumenical Liturgical Consensus: A Bumpy Road to Christian Unity', *Studia Liturgica*, 34 (2008): 1–16.
- Holeton, David R., 'Liturgy and Ecumenism', in P. A. Muroi and O.-M. Saar (eds.), *Tra Memoriae Profezia. Ecclesia Orans*, 29 (2012): 117–35.
- Holeton, David R. and Colin Buchanan (eds.), *A History of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations 1983–2007*. Joint Liturgical Studies 63 (London, 2007).
- Larson-Miller, Lizette, *Sacramentality Renewed* (Collegeville, MN, 2016).
- Meyers, Ruth A. (ed.), *Children at the Table: The Communion of All the Baptized in Anglicanism Today* (New York, 1995).
- Meyers, Ruth A. (ed.), *A Prayer Book for the 21st Century* (New York, 1996).
- Price, Charles P. and Louis Weil, *Liturgy for Living* (2nd edn., Harrisburg, PA, 2000).
- Puglisi, James F. (ed.), *Liturgical Renewal as a Way to Christian Unity* (Collegeville, MN, 2005).
- Shepherd, Massey H., Jr, *The Reform of Liturgical Worship* (New York, 1961).
- Weil, Louis, 'Baptismal Ecclesiology: Uncovering a Paradigm', in Ronald L. Dowling and David R. Holeton (eds.), *Equipping the Saints: Ordination in Anglicanism Today* (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, 2006), pp. 18–34.
- White, James F., *The Cambridge Movement* (Cambridge, 1962).

4

Gender Perspectives

Women and Anglicanism

Cordelia Moyse

INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the twentieth century the Anglican Churches which made up Western Anglicanism largely took for granted the status and nature of women's participation in Church life. Women's supposed primary God-given identity was to be found in marriage and family life and so women nurtured the young in the faith, dutifully sat in the pews, and helped build the kingdom of God through prayer, service, fundraising, and fellowship. Women participated in Church life as individuals, members of Church organizations, and as paid Church workers but they did not exercise institutional leadership. In a Church both catholic and reformed, leadership was exercised by a male episcopate and clergy with limited male lay involvement. While women like men were called to holiness, a woman's Christian identity was seen as distinct from a man's and generally of lesser status.¹ Women's relationship to the institution of the Church was very different to men's, with their call to 'domestic Christianity' exercised through their own organizations and gender-specific roles as deaconesses and religious sisters. Women, in effect, belonged to what Joan Gundersen calls 'a parallel Church'.²

In the course of the twentieth century, however, women were admitted to the 'mainstream' Church after having become a major subject of concern and contention. The first period in which this happened occurred immediately

¹ Sean Gill, *Women and the Church of England: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (London, 1996), pp. 76–111.

² Joan R. Gundersen, 'Women and the Parallel Church: A View from Congregations', in Catherine M. Prelinger (ed.), *Episcopal Women: Gender, Spirituality and Commitment in an American Mainline Denomination* (New York, 1992), pp. 111–32.

after the Great War (1914–18) when women in Britain obtained the vote and traditional economic and cultural barriers to work and fulfilment outside the home seemed to be lifting. At the Lambeth Conference in 1920 the bishops called on national Churches to increase female participation in Church government and seemed to recognize deaconesses as part of the traditional ordained hierarchy.³ The reality was that the latter proved to be too radical a step as it opened up the possibility of female priests. The resolution failed to overcome the will of some national Churches to maintain women in the role of subservient voluntary labour rather than as leaders. Yet most women continued to exercise their Christian vocation in the home while offering their practical and fundraising skills to both their local church and the evangelization and care of people across the British Empire. Some women, however, found that they could serve the Church and God outside the norms of marriage and motherhood by working in remote parts of their nation or the empire as missionaries or lay workers.

It was not until the 1960s that the bishops of the Anglican Communion wanted to open up again a discussion of women's role in the Church. Issues such as lay ministry, social justice, and the decline in numbers of deaconesses and male clergy in some parts of the world drove the discussion. The wider context was a culture of widespread questioning of tradition and authority within and without the Church. At the same time some Anglican women along with some male supporters, often inspired by the civil rights and the women's liberation movement wished to see women admitted to all aspects of Church life and articulated a new vision of the Church. As a consequence the place of women in the life of the Western Church became an important test case as to the relevance of the Anglican faith to contemporary society.

At the end of the twentieth-century mainstream, Western Anglicanism judged that women were capable of exercising domestic and institutional leadership from the home and the Sunday school room to the pulpit and the altar. The Anglican Churches had gradually moved from emphasizing difference (and often inferiority) to recognizing the equal nature of women's ministry and incorporating it institutionally. Due to the dispersed nature of authority in the Communion and its hermeneutic of discernment—scripture, tradition, and reason—change occurred in a slow and piecemeal fashion. By 2016 across Western Anglicanism women were actively involved at all levels of Church life and in every order of ministry. In Britain, only the Episcopal Church of Scotland and the Church in Wales had not yet appointed a woman to the episcopate. Women's full inclusion in the body of Christ has also

³ Resolutions 46–8, The Lambeth Conference Official Website (<<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1920/1920-46.cfm>>; <<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1920/1920-47.cfm>>; <<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1920/1920-48.cfm>> accessed 12 Jan. 2014).

required that the Church's language, both officially and liturgically, speaks increasingly to the whole people of God in a language without gender assumptions and values.

THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

The nineteenth-century assumption that Christian women expressed their faith through lives grounded in domesticity did not end on Queen Victoria's death in 1901. Women continued to be extolled as dutiful daughters, loving wives, and mothers, finding self-worth by serving the material and spiritual needs of their families. The ideology of maternalism was particularly strong at this time as good mothering was believed across the political spectrum to be the solution to such problems as the poor quality of military recruits, the declining birth rate (so-called 'race suicide'), and sexual immorality. Mothers were needed to bring the caring and nurturing values of the domestic sphere into the public sphere in order to save the nation, the empire, and the Church.⁴ Across the Western Anglican world women participated in activities which reflected the values of female domesticity, and the intrinsic maternal nature of all women irrespective of biological motherhood. In nearly every parish there was a recognizable women's sphere in which women's particular skills were harnessed for the greater good. Women came together as members of an altar guild, a women's prayer group like the Daughters of the King, the Mothers' Union, or Girls' Friendly Society.⁵ They also ran the Sunday school or fundraising committee.⁶ Through such groups and activities women found fellowship in service for others and practised their faith outside the home. Their work was voluntary, however, fitted in around their domestic lives, and unpaid, befitting its 'natural' gendered nature.

The domestic and maternal nature of women's religious vocation was most publicly articulated and effectively channelled by two pan-Anglican

⁴ Anna Davin, 'Imperialism and Motherhood', in Raphael Samuel (ed.), *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, vol. 1 (London, 1989), pp. 203–35; John Rickard, *Australia: A Cultural History* (New York, 1996), pp. 106–7, 168–9; Anne O'Brien, *God's Willing Workers: Women and Religion in Australia* (Sydney, 2005), pp. 36–49.

⁵ Mary Sudman Donovan, *A Different Call: Women's Ministries in the Episcopal Church* (Wilton, CT, 1986), pp. 81–3.

⁶ Oonagh Walsh, *Anglican Women in Dublin: Philanthropy, Politics and Education in the Early Twentieth Century* (Dublin, 2005); Rima Lunin Schultz, 'Woman's Work and Woman's Calling in the Episcopal Church: Chicago, 1880–1989' and 'Episcopal Women as Community Leaders: Galveston, 1900–1989', both in Prelinger (ed.), *Episcopal Women*, pp. 19–45, pp. 72–90; Anne O'Brien, 'Anglicanism and Gender Issues', in Bruce Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia: A History* (Melbourne, 2002), pp. 270–81.

organizations. The Mothers' Union (MU) founded in England in 1876 by Mary Sumner, the wife of a rector, had taken root across the British Isles and in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand by the early 1900s. The MU brought women together to support each other as the carers and nurturers of children.⁷ Originally founded to be a spiritual support for women as mothers, it sought to influence political decisions, even before women had the vote, which it felt undermined Christian family life such as secular education or divorce reform. Led by clergy wives and the well-to-do in parishes and dioceses, the MU presented the maternal ideal as universal. In the Girls' Friendly Society (GFS) the maternal took form with similarly powerful and influential women running an organization to ensure the safety and purity of working-class girls as they worked and travelled away from home. Unlike the MU, the GFS proved popular not only with Anglican women in the British Empire but also in the United States.⁸

While the simple equation of women and maternalism predominated and was ubiquitous, the Church did offer two other models of Christian life for women. Due to the Church's own ambivalence towards them, unsurprisingly they were not very popular with women. Both the order of deaconess and religious sisterhoods were revived in the mid-nineteenth century. Deaconesses were unmarried women who undertook pastoral parish work at the request of a parish priest operating under an episcopal licence after a period of practical and spiritual training. Deaconesses visited parishioners, attended women's meetings, conducted Bible studies, and taught Sunday school. They did not have the status of deacons and did not engage in leading public worship. Deaconesses tended to be able, educated, and ambitious women but they occupied a subordinate role within the structures of the Church by assisting but never challenging male authority.⁹ As the order was an innovation and dependent on the will of individual bishops, deaconess deployment and status varied across the Anglican Communion. By 1917 it was reckoned that there were around 300 deaconesses in England and between 300 and 400 outside England including Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Scotland, and the United States.¹⁰ Sydney and Toronto dioceses with their strong Evangelical identity were leaders in deaconess training as they wished to offer women an

⁷ Cordelia Moyse, *A History of the Mothers' Union: Women, Anglicanism and Globalisation, 1876–2008* (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 78–94.

⁸ Brian Harrison, 'For Church, Queen and Family: The Girls' Friendly Society 1874–1920', *Past & Present*, 61 (Nov. 1973): 107–38.

⁹ Patricia Grimshaw, 'In Pursuit of True Anglican Womanhood in Victoria, 1880–1914', *Women's History Review*, 2 (1993): 340–1; Gill, *Women and the Church of England*, pp. 163–7; Donovan, *A Different Call*, pp. 120–2.

¹⁰ The Ministry of Women, *A Report by a committee appointed by His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1919), p. 28.

opportunity for service which had a clear Protestant identity, unlike Anglican sisterhoods.¹¹

Sisterhoods too relieved the monoculture of Anglican women's sphere. Sisterhoods like deaconesses were based on a service vocation. While with few exceptions they were governed ultimately by men, they implicitly established a female form of independent spiritual life which the episcopate, to varying degrees, felt the need to direct and control. A fruit of the Oxford movement, Anglican sisters were virgins or widowed faithful wives. Mainly focused on practical action, sisters were nurses, teachers, and administrators in the context of a prayerful community; they were also pioneers working with working-class women and children in orphanages and refuges. By 1900 there were more than ninety sisterhoods in England.¹² By the late nineteenth century there were two sisterhoods in Canada, the Sisterhood of St John the Divine, the first permanent Canadian Anglican religious order, and the English religious order, the Sisters of the Church.¹³ In the United States sisterhoods both American and English in origin sprang up after the civil war. By 1900 there were over twenty Episcopal women's orders responsible for a range of hospitals, orphanages, schools, and homes for the elderly.¹⁴ Among the sisterhoods established in the southern hemisphere were the Order of the Good Shepherd in Auckland and the Sisters of the Church in Australia and New Zealand.¹⁵ Both sisterhoods and deaconesses allowed women to escape the tyranny of personal domestic responsibilities even if most of their work was of a traditional feminine nature: pastoral care, education of children and women, and nursing. Yet the sisterhoods and the institutions they ran were female administered and staffed, giving some women an unusual level of administrative and managerial experience.¹⁶

Faithful lives of service whether as a deaconess or sister allowed individual women to create a larger women's sphere in their local church and community, but there was one area of Church service where this was even easier, the mission field. In the early twentieth century more women than ever before were deployed for this work as a result of the large missionary societies like the Church Missionary Society (CMS) choosing to deploy single women, and the fact

¹¹ Muriel Porter, *Women in the Church: The Great Ordination Debate in Australia* (Ringwood, Victoria, 1989), pp. 43–4; Wendy Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden* (Dundas, 1995), p. 57.

¹² Susan Mumm, *All Saints Sisters of the Poor: An Anglican Sisterhood in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2001), pp. xi–xii; Brian Heeney, *The Women's Movement in the Church of England 1850–1930* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 63–5.

¹³ Alan L. Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada: Controversies and Identity in Historical Perspective* (Champaign, IL, 2004), p. 173.

¹⁴ Donovan, *A Different Call*, pp. 29–51.

¹⁵ Ian Breward, *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (Oxford, 2001), p. 209.

¹⁶ Timothy Willem Jones, *Sexual Politics in the Church of England, 1875–1957* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 63–72.

that women's auxiliaries were providing substantial funding for them. In Australia, Canada, and the United States, the Anglican Churches, unlike in the British Isles, each had its own mission board through which they channelled personnel and funding to missionaries at home or overseas. In the American Episcopal Church, for example, the Women's Auxiliary (WA) through its annual United Offering provided much-needed funds for secondary schools for women and the recruitment and training of women workers. In 1919 the WA was supporting directly as United Offering workers 91 of the 181 Episcopal women missionaries.¹⁷ Under its aegis those with teaching and nursing skills, including many deaconesses, served in Appalachia, American Indian reservations, and mining camps; as well as China, Japan, Liberia, and the Philippines. The beneficiaries of such mission work were taught, nursed, and provided with church leadership where clergymen were unaffordable.¹⁸ Missionaries, especially foreign missionaries, found freedom from the many gender constraints experienced at home. Often sole leaders in the community, they were responsible for administration, service delivery, pastoral care, and worship.

Yet neither the reality of women's missionary experience nor the work and generosity of millions of women led to any challenging of women's subordinate position in the Church's structure. The WA, led by the Emery dynasty—Mary, Julia Chester, Susan Lavinia, and Margaret Theresa—was content to play a subordinate role to the Episcopal Church's missionary board with no executive power while funding all women workers through its annual United Offering and donating \$100,000 to general operating funds. Celebrating its fifty years of service in 1921 it was reported that the WA had given \$14 million to the Church's Mission, of which \$2 million had been through the United Offering.¹⁹ In Canada the Women's Auxiliary modelled on the PECUSA WA was responsible for women and children in the mission field and WA delegates were elected to the Missionary Society's board. While not being an equal partnership there was some formal recognition of women's contribution.²⁰

The creation of 'a parallel Church', a separate world for women within the Church, was not without strengths and significance. At the parish level women had a sphere of influence running their own organizations, thereby developing skills and clearly finding some personal fulfilment. Women contributed to

¹⁷ Ian T. Douglas, 'Thankful for Their Offering? Episcopal Women in Foreign Mission Work', in Fredrica Harris Thompsett and Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook (eds.), *Deeper Joy: Lay Women and Vocation in the 20th Century Episcopal Church* (New York, 2005), pp. 135–50 (p. 137); Pamela W. Darling, *New Wine: The Story of Women Transforming Leadership and Power in the Episcopal Church* (Cambridge, MA, 1994), pp. 18–28.

¹⁸ Donovan, *A Different Call*, p. 129.

¹⁹ David Hein and Gardiner H. Shattuck Jr, *The Episcopalians* (Westport, CT, 2004), p. 95; Donovan, *A Different Call*, pp. 127–8; Douglas, 'Thankful for Their Offering?', p. 138.

²⁰ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, pp. 170, 291–3.

church and community life by building up and running a range of institutions and programmes. Women's presumed moral and spiritual responsibility for the home, children, and other women gave cover for some pioneering work and for the transgressing of some gender boundaries. What Anglican women lacked, however, was real status and power in ecclesiastical life. Women were never seen near the altar or the pulpit and rarely participated in denominational decision-making bodies.²¹

THE INTER-WAR PERIOD

The years immediately following the end of the Great War seemed promising for greater female participation and status within Western Anglicanism. During the war itself more women had worked outside the home in a greater variety of jobs beyond the traditional domestic sphere than ever before and many had enjoyed greater social freedom.²² Within the Anglican Churches there was a desire to bring about various internal reforms. The war had undermined the assumption of many Anglicans that their religious and moral values were widely shared. This sense of mission failure, combined with the imminent granting of universal suffrage in many Western countries, called into question the legitimacy of current Church government and even the relevance of the Church in a democratic age.²³ In particular, women's exclusion from the ecclesial franchise threatened to become a scandal. For some the opening up of opportunities of service and participation to women in the Church was crucial to the life, and even survival, of the institution.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, considering the 'establishment' nature of Western Anglican Churches (though a formal Church-state connection only existed in the case of the Church of England), the struggle for female representation within Anglican Church decision-making bodies was not unrelated to the progress of secular female political representation. The 1920 Lambeth Conference resolution 46 declaring that women should be admitted on equal terms to all Church councils left to each diocesan, provincial, and national synod the decision as to when and how this principle should be brought into effect. And indeed different diocesan and national synods came to different decisions reflecting local culture and churchmanship.

²¹ Peter Sherlock, "Leave it to the Women": The Exclusion of Women from Anglican Church Government in Australia', *Australian Historical Studies*, 39 (2008): 288–304 (p. 291); Heeney, *The Women's Movement*, pp. 94–104.

²² Susan R. Grayzel, *Women and the First World War* (Harlow, 2002), pp. 27–50, 62–78.

²³ Donovan, *A Different Call*, pp. 160–1; Sheila Fletcher, *Maude Royden: A Life* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 145–51, 167–73.

In 1920 the Church of England admitted women on the same terms as men as representatives to the newly-created Church Assembly. Of the 357 laity who first met in 1920, 40 were women.²⁴ This undoubtedly owed something to what historian Brian Heeney has called a 'church feminist' movement which was led by a group of prominent English clerics and laywomen who established the Church League for Women's Suffrage in 1909 and had publicly worked for female parliamentary enfranchisement.²⁵ In 1920, however, the women's cause in PECUSA went backwards when, following debate on women's participation in the General Convention and the Board of Mission, the words 'male' and 'laymen' were inserted into the canons regarding electors. Any future change would therefore require a majority of both the house of deputies and clergy. The idea that women were a separate and subordinate entity in the Church was further reiterated when the WA was made auxiliary to the new Presiding Bishop and National Council Structure rather than to the board of missions. Reflecting the 'auxiliary' state of mind of its leadership and rank and file, the WA voiced no complaint.²⁶

Elsewhere Anglican women obtained equal suffrage and the right to stand for election long before PECUSA women. Women in New Zealand could vote at parish meetings from 1919 and from 1922 be elected to parish and synodical offices. Canadian women had to wait until 1943 to gain the franchise, and by 1950 only one woman had served on General Synod as a voting member. In 1967 out of twenty-eight dioceses, twenty-one still did not allow women to serve as churchwardens.²⁷ In Australia women's participation in Church government varied widely according to diocese. The range of female participation can be seen in the fact that in conservative Protestant Sydney women could not serve on vestries before 1921, nor attend the diocesan synod before 1972, nor be churchwardens before 1978. In contrast, women in Adelaide could serve on vestries and be churchwardens before and attend diocesan synod from 1946.²⁸

As with women's ecclesial suffrage, the post-war period promised to be a watershed moment for deaconesses in a number of ways: increased official status, improved training opportunities, and perhaps recognition as a stage towards priesthood. *The Ministry of Women* report commissioned by the archbishop of Canterbury and published in 1919 described the revival of the order of deaconesses as 'only partially...successful' and gave as reasons the lack of clear status, role, and one authorized form of 'ordination'.²⁹ The 1920 Lambeth Conference in resolution 48 seemed to bring greater clarity as to where deaconesses fitted into the threefold ordained order, defining

²⁴ Heeney, *The Women's Movement*, p. 111.

²⁵ Heeney, *The Women's Movement*, pp. 16, 105–8.

²⁶ Donovan, *A Different Call*, pp. 160–5.

²⁸ Sherlock, "Leave it to the Women", p. 291.

²⁷ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, p. 186.

²⁹ Ministry of Women, *Report*, pp. 25–7.

deaconesses as 'the one and only Order of the Ministry which has the stamp of Apostolic approval, and is for women the only Order of the Ministry which we can recommend that our branch of the catholic church should recognize and use'. This suggested that deaconesses were not laywomen but ordained in the same way as male deacons.

In England the nature of deaconesses' ordination became a vehicle for advancing the cause of women's ordination to the priesthood. The League of the Church Militant took over from the Church League for Women's Suffrage in 1919 following the granting of women's suffrage to campaign for the fullest opportunities of service for women in the Church and state, including women's ordination.³⁰ Maude Royden, a brilliant preacher and theologian whose gifts the Church of England could not fully accept or deploy, was the public face of both organizations whose leadership included several bishops, and the theologian Charles E. Raven, author of *Women and the Ministry* (1929).³¹ The league disbanded in 1928 under the mistaken assumption that talk on women's service had advanced so rapidly that ordination to the priesthood must inevitably follow in due time. The Anglican Group for the Ordination of Women to the Historic Ministry of the Church arose in its stead and sent a deputation to the 1930 Lambeth Conference to put the case for women's ordination. In 1930, however, the Lambeth Conference went back on its 1920 definition of deaconesses by removing the words 'which has the stamp of Apostolic approval' and defined the office as 'an Order *sui generis*' thereby making it distinct from the historic ordained order.³²

In 1935 another archbishop's commission on the ministry of women, formed in response to the request of the Lambeth Committee on Ministry for a theological statement on the ordination of women, issued its report. Having studied the theological, psychological, physiological, and sociological arguments against women's ordination the commission concluded that it needed far more evidence of the need for change before it could recommend the overturning of 'an established arrangement resting on long-standing, powerful and sometimes unconscious motives'.³³ It stated that while a deaconess was in Holy Orders and the grace of orders was bestowed on her by the Holy Spirit, the order was not equivalent to the diaconate of men but a distinctive order for women. Women were not permitted, unlike male deacons, to assist with the chalice at Holy Communion, read the gospel at the eucharist, wear a deacon's stole, or be addressed as the Reverend. Their field of work was women and children. While the expectation was that deaconesses, unlike deacons, would remain single in the American and Canadian Churches

³⁰ Heeney, *The Women's Movement*, pp. 112–14.

³¹ Heeney, *The Women's Movement*, pp. 89–90, 115; Fletcher, *Maude Royden*.

³² Gill, *Women and the Church of England*, p. 238.

³³ Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden*, pp. 174–6.

they were expected to vacate the office on marriage. Across the Anglican Communion the ambiguity concerning the nature of a deaconess combined with poor terms and conditions produced many reports, much inaction, and few deaconesses.³⁴

While the struggle to redefine and expand the ministry of deaconesses was a failure, the numbers of women in paid ministries increased and some new ministries were created. It was no coincidence that this happened in overseas and home mission fields where the institutional Church could not exercise close management or police gender roles. The increased opportunities for service often arose as it was easier and cheaper to deploy women as substitutes for expensive male clergy. The domestic and foreign missionary fields in Australia, Canada, and the United States attracted large numbers of women. The Anglican Board of Mission, the Bush Church Aid Society, and the CMS gave Australian women the opportunity to work in remote regions with settlers and indigenous Australians, as well as China, Africa, and the Pacific. Of the 153 missionaries the CMS sent out from Australia from 1914 to 1932 over 100 were women.³⁵ Among the most well-known female missionaries were Mary Andrews, who remained in China during Japanese occupation, Narelle Bullard, a medical missionary in Tanganyika from the 1920s to 1960, and Edith Jones, whose experience of living in Thursday Island as the wife of a clergyman led her to campaign for Aboriginal rights.³⁶ In 1923 the WA in Canada, with its 75,000 members, financed 43 per cent of the Church's domestic and foreign mission work. By 1947 they were supporting twenty overseas and forty-seven home missionaries.³⁷

Western Canada was the beneficiary of several new forms of women's ministry delivered by English and Canadian women. Eva Hasell founded the motor caravan mission dedicated to educating women and children in the faith.³⁸ The Fellowship of the Maple Leaf employed around 400 teachers, mainly women, to impart Christian and imperial values in remote public

³⁴ For a list of Canadian and Church of England reports see Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden*, pp. xi–xiv.

³⁵ Stuart Piggin, *Evangelical Christianity in Australia: Spirit, Word and World* (Oxford, 1996), p. 82.

³⁶ O'Brien, *God's Willing Workers*, pp. 79, 155–62. More information on Edith Jones is available at <<http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/jones-edith-emily-13012>>, accessed 20 Dec. 2013.

³⁷ Myra Rutherford, *Women and the White Man's God: Gender and Race in the Canadian Mission Field* (Vancouver, 2002), p. 21; Wendy Fletcher-Marsh, 'The Limitation and Opportunity of Gender: Women and the Ecclesiastical Structures in Canadian Anglicanism, 1920–1955', *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society*, 37 (1995): 41–54 (p. 47).

³⁸ Marilyn Barber, 'The Motor Caravan Mission: Anglican Women Workers on the Canadian Frontier in the New Era', in Elizabeth Gillan Muir and Marilyn Färdig Whiteley (eds.), *Changing Roles of Women within the Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto, 1995), pp. 219–37; Vera K. Fast, 'Eva Hasell and the Caravan Mission', in Barry Ferguson (ed.), *The Anglican Church and the World of Western Canada, 1820–1970* (Regina, Saskatchewan, 1991), pp. 167–75.

schools.³⁹ Bishop's Messengers started by Marguerite Fowler in Brandon Diocese were charged with running baptism and confirmation preparation classes and children's Sunday schools, but they also established parish churches in the missions and encouraged local people to build their own churches. As was the case with other women working in remote areas they had to be adaptable and on occasion overstep their remit by exercising a quasi-priestly role.⁴⁰

These and other forms of churchwomen's work were the fruits of both existing women's training schools and new educational initiatives. In England the desire to improve the training of teachers and parish visitors led to attempts to form a single training institution. When this failed, an Inter-diocesan Council on training and its successor, the Central Council for Women's Church Work, attempted to create a standard of training for teachers, and for rescue and social workers.⁴¹ As part of the American Episcopal Church's Women's Auxiliary fiftieth anniversary celebrations two new Church training schools for women were created—Windham House, New York, opened in 1928, as a graduate training school for women church workers, and Bishop Tuttle School, Raleigh, NC, founded in 1925, for training black Episcopal women for parish and social work in rural congregations that were unable to afford a priest's salary. By 1940 the former had sent 211 women into Church work at home and abroad, and the latter sixty-seven.⁴²

While some Anglican women created or took up new vocational opportunities, most women continued to live out their Christian vocation primarily as wives and mothers even if there was some shift in understanding of these roles. Despite some progress towards political and economic equality in many ways, these norms were strengthened by the popularization of a new ideal of male/female relationships, 'the companionate marriage'. Greater value was placed on the quality of the couple's emotional and sexual bond rather than the economic and public status of the relationship. The spouses still had gendered spheres of influence and responsibility (with women's realm still primarily considered to be the home), but the private world of the family was seen as more of a shared partnership requiring emotional investment and sensitivity from men.⁴³

³⁹ Marilyn Barber, 'The Fellowship of the Maple Leaf Teachers', in Ferguson (ed.), *The Anglican Church and the World of Western Canada*, pp. 154–66.

⁴⁰ Alyson Barnett-Cowan, 'The Bishop's Messengers: Women in Ministry in Northwestern Manitoba, 1928–1979', in Ferguson (ed.), *The Anglican Church and the World of Western Canada*, pp. 176–87.

⁴¹ Heeney, *The Women's Movement*, pp. 82–3, 119.

⁴² Fredrica H. Thompson, 'Windham House Women 1928–67: An Overlooked Chapter in Episcopal Women's History' and Patricia N. Page, '"Looking Backward—to Look Forward": Grace Lindley, Margaret Sherman and Frances Young', both in Thompson and Kujawa-Holbrook (eds.), *Deeper Joy*, pp. 120–34 and pp. 234–50 (p. 238).

⁴³ Jane Lewis, 'Public Institution, Private Relationship: Marriage and Marriage Guidance, 1920–68', *Twentieth Century British History*, 1 (1990): 233–63.

The Anglican Churches were not immune to this social change. When revising the 1662 Prayer Book the Church of England created an alternative marriage service in which the vows were made the same for the man and woman, and the woman no longer had to promise to obey her husband.⁴⁴ In 1930 the Lambeth Conference overturned its opposition to birth control which it had articulated since 1908, moving away from its earlier concerns about the morality of separating procreation from the emotional side of sexual union and about making sex an object in itself, with possibly deleterious effects on the birth rate, individual health, and racial and national strength. Intercourse was now deemed to have a value of its own in marriage though the primary purpose of marriage was procreation. Sex came to be seen as a sacrament with man and woman working in direct cooperation with God. On the face of it the Lambeth Conference's rigid stance on divorce was an anomaly in the Church's increasingly pastoral and relational approach to marriage. In 1920 it affirmed as 'our Lord's principle and standard of marriage lifelong and indissoluble union' and in 1930 recommended that the Church should refuse to celebrate the marriage of a divorced person who had a living partner, while the eligibility of the innocent party was left to the discretion of the bishop.⁴⁵ In fact it made logical sense. If marriage could create a deeper and more meaningful relationship, then its dissolution was a more serious matter.

While the views of the vast majority of Anglican women on various issues are hard to discover, it is possible to get some sense of their lives in this period. A number of historians argue that Western Anglican churchwomen in the 1920s and 1930s can be fairly characterized as respectable matrons running church bazaars and fashion shows. In the United States it is claimed that the culture of volunteerism became detached from a progressive political culture which led to fewer pioneering female activists.⁴⁶ The home and the family, often in new suburbs and with new labour-saving appliances, fed a more inward domestic Christianity.⁴⁷ The largest Anglican women's organization, the Mothers' Union, committed to upholding marriage and family life, and resisted the modern ideal of companionate marriage as it related to divorce and birth control. Divorced women could not be members and publicly the MU fought fiercely against any liberalization of the law which would extend divorce grounds.⁴⁸ This period also saw the re-creation of Mothering Sunday, the life's work of Constance Adelaide Smith, which was taken up across the

⁴⁴ Jones, *Sexual Politics*, pp. 41–5.

⁴⁵ The Lambeth Conference Official Website (<<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1920/1920-67.cfm>> and <<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1930/1930-11.cfm>>, accessed 12 Jan. 2014).

⁴⁶ Schultz, 'Woman's Work and Woman's Calling', pp. 24–5.

⁴⁷ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, pp. 183–4; David Hilliard, 'Popular Religion in Australia in the 1950s: A Study of Adelaide and Brisbane', *Journal of Religious History*, 15 (1988): 219–35.

⁴⁸ Moyses, *A History of the Mothers' Union*, pp. 116–31; O'Brien, *God's Willing Workers*, pp. 70–1.

Anglican Communion, with the exception of PECUSA. Intended to reclaim Mothering Sunday for Mother Church, it in fact heightened the visibility and status of motherhood in women's lives.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, despite the domestic vocation of so many Anglican women and the resistance to women playing a larger role in the institutional life of the Church, it was possible for some, usually single, women to exercise unique pioneering ministries as teachers, spiritual writers, and social justice activists. Among them were Louise DeKoven Bowen, Adelaide Teague Case, Emily Morgan, Dorothy L. Sayers, Vida Scudder, and Evelyn Underhill.⁵⁰

THE IMMEDIATE POST-WAR YEARS

Despite the major social and political disruption caused to millions of lives by the Second World War, women's roles and responsibilities remained unchanged. During the war only a few women had taken on some non-traditional pastoral responsibilities and there was no marked change in the Church's view on women's ministries and no great challenge from women themselves.⁵¹ The post-war world for many women across the developed world saw rising affluence, a rapid growth of suburban living, and a boom in the birth rate. In many countries there was a revival of Church membership, often on a wave of new church building.⁵² These factors tended to reinforce traditional women's roles within the Church as wives and mothers serving church and community through voluntary service.⁵³ The 1950s were in many ways the golden age of women's organizations. In 1947, for example, it was reported that there were 44,400 Canadian Anglican women including members of the WA, MU, GFS, and the Daughters of the King, undertaking voluntary work and raising \$196,274 for the Church.⁵⁴ The MU remained a

⁴⁹ <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/public/dnb/103415.html>>, accessed 12 Sept. 2012.

⁵⁰ Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook, 'Catalysts for the Gospel: Adelaide Teague Case and Episcopal Women in Education, 1940–70', in Thompson and Kujawa-Holbrook (eds.), *Deeper Joy*, pp. 89–103; for Underhill and Sayer see Trevor Beeson, *The Church's Other Half* (London, 2011), pp. 142–9; for DeKoven see Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook (ed.), *Freedom is a Dream: A Documentary History of Women in the Episcopal Church* (New York, 2002), pp. 103–4; for Scudder and Morgan see Darling, *New Wine*, pp. 29–41.

⁵¹ Kathleen Bliss, *The Service and Status of Women in the Churches* (London, 1952), pp. 130–1.

⁵² Callum G. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularization 1800–2000* (London, 2000), pp. 5–10; David Hilliard, 'Church, Family and Sexuality in Australia in the 1950s', *Australian Historical Studies*, 28 (1997): 133–46 (pp. 135–6); Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 119–20.

⁵³ Schultz, 'Woman's Work and Woman's Calling', p. 25.

⁵⁴ Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden*, p. 61.

major feature of laywomen's lives, although there were anxieties about the ageing profile of its membership and some pointed criticism from clergy about its exclusion of divorced women.⁵⁵

However, questions about the value of gender-segregated organizations and their relationship to the wider mission of the Church were weakening the concept and reality of the female 'parallel Church'. The American WA may have seen its integration into the National Council as a way of increasing its status and role within the Church, but the reality was that its distinctive portfolio and *raison d'être* were slipping away. While the WA continued to give grants to the national budget its members were no longer closely involved in supporting women missionaries or directly participating in mission projects. The 1940s saw the end of the Supply Box Program through which ordinary women sent items like clothes to missionaries and the abolition of the title 'United Thank Offering worker' which meant that the majority of the United Thank Offering money went to the National Council who then supported women missionaries. Women remained confined to the parallel WA which held its meeting in conjunction with diocesan and national conventions but outside the membership of General Convention. By the end of the 1950s American WA women were tired of their organization being an auxiliary of the National Council and sought complete integration as equals of laymen in Church structures. In 1958 the WA became the General Division of Women's Work of the National Council. To reflect this change of status local WA groups were encouraged to rename themselves Episcopal Church Women.⁵⁶

The 1950s were a mixed picture for women's service to God and the Church beyond the domestic sphere. In the American Episcopal Church women's ministry was subjected to new pressures that contributed to an overall decline. According to the 1952 World Council of Churches' report on women there were 3,000 full-time women Church workers in PECUSA operating in parishes or in church institutions as nurses, social workers, and secretaries.⁵⁷ In the United States women accessed theological education in larger numbers than ever before in order to manage Christian education and children's programmes in suburban parishes. From 1958 Episcopal Divinity School admitted women as degree candidates for bachelor of divinity degrees, beginning a wider trend. Yet while female numbers as Christian educators increased in the short term, men were employed in greater numbers when the field became more established.⁵⁸ Women's Church work also came under pressure as the traditional female skills of nursing and caring were taken over by secular

⁵⁵ Moyse, *A History of the Mothers' Union*, pp. 163–73.

⁵⁶ Ian T. Douglas, 'Thankful for Their Offering?', pp. 142–4; Darling, *New Wine*, p. 87.

⁵⁷ Bliss, *The Service and Status of Women*, p. 95.

⁵⁸ Kujawa-Holbrook, 'Catalysts for the Gospel', pp. 97–8.

agencies, and ministries in remote regions became more attractive and accessible due to the automobile. By 1960 there were only eighty-six deaconesses in the United States as opportunities to serve decreased. At the same time there was a dramatic fall in the number of women serving as foreign missionaries. Only fourteen women were serving as missionaries in 1970 in comparison to 137 in 1940.⁵⁹ New understandings of mission in a post-colonial world, the closure of the largest mission field for the American Church, China, following the Communist takeover, combined with the desire of indigenous bishops for priests rather than laywomen to fulfil both pastoral and liturgical roles, contributed to the decline in female missionaries.⁶⁰ In contrast, in Canada more women than ever were serving the Church in more capacities. Student numbers at the Anglican Women's Training College in Toronto were at an all-time high.⁶¹ The late 1950s were the peak years for the motor caravan mission, when thirty-one vehicles were working in fifteen dioceses.⁶² Adaptation was the challenge of the Bishop's Messengers. With the opening up of once-isolated communities through roads and telephones and the increasing deployment of clergy, the Messengers concentrated on serving native communities.⁶³

THE 1960S ONWARDS

In 1960 there were few signs to Anglicans that they were entering a revolutionary era. The next few decades were ones in which the Church would be judged and often found wanting in its understanding of, and mission to, the world. Consequently, Western Anglicans would have to engage in deep and painful reflection on its very being and nature. Women and their place in the Church were one of the major sources of this disquiet. In the 1960s the Church's long struggle to define and appropriately recognize women's ministry as deaconesses and paid Church workers continued while the relevance of traditional Church authority and teaching was being questioned; 'second-wave' feminism was stressing women's liberation and Western women had more economic and social choices than ever before.⁶⁴ Yet in 1960 there was no widespread questioning of women's role in the Church community or agitation for women's ordination to the priesthood. While the origins of change can be found in the 1960s it took at least another two decades for it to be

⁵⁹ Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 127–8.

⁶⁰ Douglas, 'Thankful for Their Offering?', pp. 140–2.

⁶¹ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, pp. 184, 186.

⁶² Fast, 'Eva Hasell', p. 168.

⁶³ Barnett-Cowan, 'The Bishop's Messengers', pp. 184–5.

⁶⁴ Best-selling feminist books included: Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York, 1963) and Germaine Greer, *The Female Eunuch* (London, 1970).

implemented. Among the fruits would be women's admission to the ordained ministry; the abolition of the female 'parallel Church'; the decline of mass membership of women's organizations in Western Anglicanism; and recognition that the Anglican Communion needed consciously to work to maintain unity in diversity.

What is so striking about the placing of women's ordained ministry on the Church's agenda is how little it initially owed to grass-roots pressure from women in the Western countries of the Communion. The first woman to be a priest, Deaconess Florence Tim-Oi, was ordained in China in 1944 to serve an isolated community during the war. After the war she resigned her title after pressure was applied by the archbishop of Canterbury, via the Chinese Church's House of Bishops, to the Bishop of Hong Kong, Ronald Hall, who had ordained her. At the first post-war Lambeth Conference a proposal that for an experimental period of twenty years some deaconesses could be ordained to the priesthood in the Chinese Church was rejected.⁶⁵ In the 1960s both the Church of England and the American Episcopal Church produced reports on the issue of women's ordination.⁶⁶ Both studies were driven by a recognition that women were increasingly involved in professional and public life, that female ordination was an important issue in ecumenical relationships, and that the contemporary Church had need of more trained workers, a need in the case of the Church of England arising from a shortage of clergy. The resulting reports laid out the various emotional, psychological, theological, and vocational arguments and were not afraid to dismiss traditional arguments against women exercising leadership. Their authors, however, felt they lacked the authority to resolve the issue finally, and looked to the next Lambeth Conference to bring clarity to the subject. The 1968 conference, while prepared to state categorically that deaconesses were 'within the diaconate', declared that the theological arguments regarding women and the priesthood were 'inconclusive' and pushed the discernment back to the provinces, asking them to report back to the first Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) in 1971 which was largely constituted to deal with the 'urgent' matter of women's ordination.⁶⁷ Although not all provinces did discuss the issue, at the 1971 ACC meeting the decision was made to permit dioceses to ordain women. The first women to be ordained were from Hong Kong.

How different provinces of the Anglican Communion responded to the two historic decisions permitting women to enter two of the three ordained orders of the Church (diaconate, priesthood, and episcopate) varied according to

⁶⁵ Beeson, *The Church's Other Half*, pp. 158–68.

⁶⁶ *Women and Holy Orders being the Report of a Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York* (London, 1966); *Progress Report to the House of Bishops from the Committee to Study the Proper Place of Women in the Ministry of the Church*, Oct. 1966.

⁶⁷ Resolutions 32 and 34; Kwok Pui-lan, Judith A. Berling, and Jenny Plane Te Paa, *Anglican Women on Church and Mission* (New York, 2012), p. xiv.

local context. The American Episcopal Church, committed to social justice in the light of the challenge of the civil rights movement for African Americans and then for women, took immediate action.⁶⁸ From being the laggard regarding women's participation in the Church it became a front-runner. In 1970 for the first time women were elected as delegates to the General Convention. At that convention a canon was passed that eliminated all distinctions between male deacons and female deaconesses. The first women deacons were ordained the following year. At the same convention a resolution failed to pass in favour of women priests. As women's ordination came to seem more likely, the opposition increased not just to the issue on its own terms, but as symbolic of what was perceived as a wide agenda of radical social and liturgical change being pushed by 'the establishment' on rank and file Episcopalians. Anglo-Catholic opponents objected to women's ordination as going against nearly 2,000 years of ecclesiastical tradition and the practice of male-only clergy upheld by historic Churches. Evangelical opponents believed female ordination was against Scripture which appeared to hold that women were subordinate to men. At the General Convention in 1973 a measure for women's ordination failed to pass due to a parliamentary technicality despite the support of the majority of lay and clerical deputies.⁶⁹ In 1974 eleven female deacons, with the support of three bishops and the vice-president of the House of Deputies, were illegally ordained in Philadelphia. After much debate and angst, the 1977 General Convention voted to open the three orders of ordained ministry to women. In 1977 the House of Bishops also passed a resolution allowing their colleagues both to disagree with women's ordination and to refuse to ordain or license women clergy in their diocese. This was never ratified by the General Convention, and in 1997 it was overturned when the Church's canons affirming the ordination and deployment of women clergy were made mandatory in all dioceses.

In two provinces the ordination of women proceeded more quickly and in a more orderly fashion. In Canada women's ordination was not discussed until after the 1968 Lambeth Conference, when women were admitted to the diaconate. Canadian women entered the priesthood in 1976. Women's ordination was less contentious and divisive than elsewhere largely because of strong leadership by Archbishop Edward Scott and long experience of women's ministry in regions where male priests would not serve. Nevertheless the Canadian Church had a conscience clause for those priests opposed to women exercising

⁶⁸ Mary Sudman Donovan, 'Beyond the Parallel Church: Strategies of Separatism and Integration in the Governing Councils of the Episcopal Church', in Prelinger (ed.), *Episcopal Women*, pp. 133–63 (pp. 138–40). Links between the civil rights movement and women's ministry were exemplified by Pauli Murray, a lawyer, activist and co-founder in 1966 of NOW, the National Organization for Women, the largest organization for feminists, and the first African American woman to be ordained.

⁶⁹ Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 139–40.

a priestly ministry which was revoked in 1986.⁷⁰ By the early 1990s every diocese had women priests. Suzanne Haitt, one of the Philadelphia eleven, said of the different way the two North American Anglican Churches approached women's ordination, 'Canadians accepted as a gift what we Americans demanded as our right.'⁷¹ Anglican women in New Zealand quickly and smoothly entered the ordained ministry in 1977 without a conscience clause for dissenters.⁷²

In the Anglican Churches in Australia and the United Kingdom women's ordination was a much slower process. As in the United States the opposition came from two very different traditions: the Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical wings of the Church. As the debates went on they gave rise to organizations such as the Movement for the Ordination of Women and Women Against the Ordination of Women in both England and Australia, Cost of Conscience in England, and the international Association for the Apostolic Ministry. In Australia opposition came mainly from Evangelicals from Sydney diocese, the largest Australian diocese, who promoted a doctrine of gender differentiation and male headship.⁷³ The first women deacons were ordained in 1986 in Australia and in 1987 in England, many of them former deaconesses. Legislation for women priests finally passed the General Synod of the Church of England in 1992 and the first women were ordained in 1994. Anxiety about the feelings of those against women's ordination was so strong that alternative episcopal oversight was created for parishes who could not accept women's ministry.⁷⁴ In 1992 ordinations by the Perth archbishop Peter Carney acted as a catalyst for legislation which enabled individual dioceses to ordain women.⁷⁵ Some dioceses, including Sydney, still had no women priests by the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century. In 2007 for the first time in the Church of England more women than men were ordained as priests and in 2008 one in four clergy were female.⁷⁶ The other Anglican Churches in the United Kingdom opened up the priesthood to women in the 1990s: the Church of Ireland permitted the ordination of women to all three orders in 1990, the Episcopal

⁷⁰ Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden*, pp. 108–21.

⁷¹ Quoted in Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden*, p. 118.

⁷² Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden*, p. 50.

⁷³ Susan Dowell and Jane Williams, *Bread, Wine and Women: The Ordination Debates in the Church of England* (London, 1994), pp. 87–92, 99; O'Brien, *God's Willing Workers*, p. 242; Piggin, *Evangelical Christianity in Australia*, pp. 208–10; David Hilliard, 'The Organized Opposition: "How Can a Woman...?"' in Elaine Lindsay and Janet Scarfe (eds.), *Preachers, Prophets and Heretics: Anglican Women's Ministry* (Sydney, 2012), pp. 95–116.

⁷⁴ Jane Shaw, 'The Ordination of Anglican Women: Challenging Tradition', in Lindsay and Scarfe (eds.), *Preachers, Prophets and Heretics*, pp. 14–29 (pp. 27–8).

⁷⁵ Peter Carnley, 'The Perth Ordination: Reflecting on Law and Grace', in Lindsay and Scarfe (eds.), *Preachers, Prophets and Heretics*, pp. 165–77.

⁷⁶ Ian Jones, 'Afterword', in Ian Jones, Kirsty Thorpe, and Janet Wootton (eds.), *Women and Ordination in the Christian Churches: International Perspectives* (London, 2008), pp. 225–8 (p. 227).

Church of Scotland admitted women to the priesthood in 1994, and the Church in Wales did the same in 1997. This did not mean that men and women subsequently had similar career paths. Women were more likely to be self-supporting or part-time and to work in sector ministries than men, and were under-represented in senior positions.⁷⁷

By 1978 there were ordained women in four Anglican provinces: Canada, Hong Kong, New Zealand, and the United States. While it had been decided at the ACC in 1971 that the decision to ordain women was a provincial one, it did have direct Communion-wide implications when it became likely that some senior women could become eligible to be bishops. At the 1978 Lambeth Conference, therefore, it was recommended that consultation take part regarding the consecration of a woman as bishop. In 1988 a working party established by the Primates' Meeting reported to the Lambeth Conference on the issues of women clergy. It recognized that the Lambeth Quadrilateral had understood that episcopal Churches could be locally adapted. It then placed women's ordination in the context of the doctrine of reception, ecumenical relations, and mission.⁷⁸ As a consequence of discussions at the conference, the archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie, appointed the Primate of Ireland, Robin Eames, to chair a commission on the Anglican Communion and women in the episcopate. This Commission was not charged with finding whether women could or should be ordained, but instead with finding ways to keep Churches with different views on women's ordination together. Placing fellowship or *koinonia* at the heart of the issue, the Eames Commission rejected the idea that the Anglican Churches were simply a federation and instead stressed their nature as part of a world-wide communion of Churches. Communion unity was to be seen in mutual recognition of ministerial orders. The Commission favoured episcopal visitations for minorities, but opposed parallel jurisdictions and the non-recognition of confirmations by women bishops.⁷⁹ The Eames Commission's vision and its subsequent monitoring of relationships became the context in which women bishops were accepted. In 1989 the first woman bishop of the Anglican Communion, Barbara Harris, suffragan of Massachusetts, and the first woman diocesan bishop, Dr Penny Jamieson of Dunedin, New Zealand, were consecrated. In 2006 Katharine

⁷⁷ Adair T. Lummis, 'Forever Pruning? The Path to Ordained Women's Full Participation in the Episcopal Church of the USA', in Jones, Thorpe, and Wootton (eds.), *Women and Ordination*, pp. 157–76; Rosie Ward, 'Doing Leadership Differently? Women and Senior Leadership in the Church of England', in Jones, Thorpe, and Wootton (eds.), *Women and Ordination*, pp. 76–86; Paula D. Nesbitt, *Feminization of the Clergy in America: Occupational and Organizational Perspectives* (New York, 1997).

⁷⁸ *Report of the Working Party Appointed by the Primates of the Anglican Communion on Women and the Episcopate: To Aid Discussion in Preparation for the Lambeth Conference 1988* (London, 1987).

⁷⁹ Bruce Kaye, *An Introduction to World Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 165–6.

Jefferts Schori became Presiding Bishop of the American Episcopal Church and thus the first female primate in Anglicanism. By 2013 there were thirty women bishops in the Anglican Communion, and in that year the first woman bishop in the British Isles was consecrated as bishop of Meath and Kildare in the Church of Ireland. The Episcopal Church of Scotland was still to appoint its first female bishop, although women had been eligible since 2004. The Church in Wales decided in 2013 that women could be bishops. In January 2015 Libby Lane was consecrated the first female bishop in the Church of England as suffragan bishop of Stockport. Since then seven more women have become bishops in the Church of England: five suffragan bishops and two diocesan bishops.

The ordination of women was not the only change in Anglican Churches that communicated new thinking about women's role and status as Christian disciples in this period. From the late 1960s the Church came to a renewed understanding of the laity as the whole people of God. It began to overturn what it saw as artificial barriers to Christian discipleship based simply on natural characteristics such as race and gender. It embraced a vision of the work of laity being not simply voluntary service but having the vocational status and meaning of 'ministry' as for clergy. The American Episcopal Church, building on its democratic and individual rights instincts, most clearly expressed this with its revised Prayer Book in 1979 and its new baptismal ecclesiology. In these it gave a theological framework for a fourfold model of ministry, the fourth order being the laity.⁸⁰ In this new paradigm, gender-specific organizations and institutions were now commonly perceived as old-fashioned and symbolic of female marginalization.⁸¹ The politics of inclusion led the American Episcopal Church to eliminate the General Division of Women's Work in 1970 and thus also ended a distinctive women's voice in the structure of the national Church.

In Canada in 1971 the umbrella organization Anglican Church Women (ACW), created in 1967 for all women's groups, was dissolved in order to bring women's energies and resources directly into the mission of the Church. Individual dioceses could choose whether to dissolve their ACW, but only six did so. Apart from a lack of desire to change, resistance centred on recognition that the ACW was an important source of parish and mission funding and that its combination of prayer, education, projects, and social time were of value to the community. Nevertheless the ACW along with many other Anglican organizations battled with the issue of ageing members and declining active membership.⁸²

⁸⁰ Kaye, *An Introduction*, pp. 226–7.

⁸¹ Joanna B. Gillespie, 'Gender and Generations in Congregations', in Prelinger (ed.), *Episcopal Women*, pp. 167–221 (pp. 199–201).

⁸² Wendy Fletcher-Marsh, *Like Water on Rock* (Guelph, Ontario, 2002), pp. 28–50.

The opening up of ordained ministry to women, the increasing number of women working outside the home, and a general devaluing of single-sex organizations brought about by changing attitudes to male and female relationships had other consequences. Not only did they lead to a large decline in vocations to the religious life, but they reduced the number of women able and willing to engage in traditional voluntary models of women's Church work focused on the family and of a domestic and nurturing nature. Some women's organizations did attempt to maintain and update their particular vision of female piety and service, the largest being the transnational MU. Nevertheless the MU experienced a large fall in its membership across the developed world, and continued to decline in those countries into the twenty-first century. In addition to being subject to what the historian Callum Brown has characterized as the 'de-pietisation of femininity and de-feminisation of piety from the 1960s',⁸³ the MU's resistance until the early 1970s to the liberalization of divorce was the major cause of it haemorrhaging members. The MU found itself out of step with the Church's prioritizing of the experiential and pastoral over traditional Church teaching and discipline. The problem was exacerbated by the fact that when provincial MUs had to choose between loyalty to local church canons or the world-wide policy of the organization they chose the former.⁸⁴ However while the MU did adopt a more inclusive policy from the 1970s, it was not enough to regain its position in women's lives in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. In Australia membership fell from 26,561 in 1971 to 9,500 in 2004.⁸⁵ From the 1980s the majority of the MU's membership world-wide was no longer from Western countries. By 2013, of over a million members, the majority lived in sub-Saharan Africa or India. Yet the MU remained an important and influential Anglican organization, having embraced in particular the fifth mark of mission of the Communion, 'to respond to human need by loving service and to seek to transform the unjust structures of society', to rally its disparate membership to work for justice and poverty eradication for women and their families. Moreover when the Anglican Communion was riven by debate about homosexuality, MU members, working across theological and cultural divisions, remained united and were repeatedly called the fifth instrument of unity of the Anglican Communion.⁸⁶

There were downsides to the gospel of inclusion. The loss of female parish organizations often meant a reduction in laypeople dedicated to mission, to outreach programmes, or to fundraising for the care and maintenance of the local church. The danger was that church life was being reduced to worship on a Sunday morning by those with a deep faith, instead of being at the heart of a

⁸³ Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain*, p. 192.

⁸⁴ Moyse, *A History of the Mothers' Union*, pp. 173–4.

⁸⁵ Moyse, *A History of the Mothers' Union*, p. 225.

⁸⁶ Moyse, *A History of the Mothers' Union*, pp. x, 234–8.

community built from special purpose groups which had created a network of doers and adherents with a measure of faith or none.⁸⁷ Furthermore the inclusion of women in Church leadership following either professional education or in-house training arguably meant the continuing under-valuing and under-resourcing of much Church voluntary work. Volunteers were still needed to run the Church, but the image of volunteering was tarnished. Moreover while women and men might equally serve on the vestry or church council and participate in public worship, the gender division of other tasks remained strong. Women still predominated in such tasks as teaching Sunday school, the provision of flowers and altar linen, and church cleaning, and men still predominated in maintaining the building and grounds. Female inclusion could also mean under-representation at national or provincial level when there was no longer a distinctive female platform, however marginal, from which to speak. While women could now be ordained, institutional support for lay women's vocations had not greatly changed over a century.

The desire to have a more inclusive body of Christ owed much to feminist thinking and writing about women's place in theology, biblical studies, and Church history. At the same time women were active in larger numbers than ever before as researchers and teachers of these subjects. Mary Daly, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Rosemary Radford Ruether, and Valerie Saiving, working in a North American context, were among the first female Christian theologians to bring to the surface important questions about women's relationship to the Bible and theology and their role in Church history, but important Anglican popularizers were Susan Dowell, Monica Furlong, and Sarah Maitland.⁸⁸ For Australian Anglicans, *Women, Faith and Fetes* (1977), edited by the historian Sabine Willis, was a groundbreaking book. Among influential Anglican theologians were Sarah Coakley, Marilyn McCord Adams, and Jenny Plane Te Paa who, in 1995, became the first indigenous lay woman to head an Anglican theological college, St John's College, Auckland. Women's studies programmes at seminaries, commissions to monitor women's status, and feminist educational materials for congregations were all signs of change. Another significant development was the inaugural conference of Anglican female theological educators at Canterbury in the United Kingdom in 2009.

Feminist research and teaching was not only one of the drivers for inclusive ministry, but also for inclusive language for prayer and worship. Starting in

⁸⁷ Irene Q. Brown, 'Women's Works of Devotion: Feasts, Fairs, and Festivities', in Prelinger (ed.), *Episcopal Women*, pp. 239–62 (pp. 251–60).

⁸⁸ Pamela Dickey Young, 'Women in Christianity', in Leona M. Anderson (ed.), *Women and Religious Traditions* (2nd edn., Oxford, 2010), pp. 179–212 (pp. 185–6); Susan Dowell and Linda Hurcombe, *Dispossessed Daughters of Eve: Faith and Feminism* (London, 1981); Monica Furlong, *A Dangerous Delight: Women and Power in the Church* (London, 1991); Sara Maitland, *Daughter of Jerusalem* (London, 1978) and *A Map of the New Country: Women and Christianity* (London, 1983).

1986 the St Hilda Community in East London was one of the pioneering centres for non-sexist liturgy. Liturgists, and prayer and hymn writers, attempted to incorporate a female perspective, whether in terms of subjects, use of language to describe the people of God, or more controversially language to describe God. From the 1980s most male-gendered language disappeared from official Church publications, and revised Books of Common Prayer in each province to varying degrees grappled with the issue of inclusive language. More women now appeared in Church lectionaries and calendars of saints.⁸⁹ Although the issue of inclusive language for the body of Christ was largely won, the use of such language for God remained contested.

CONCLUSION

By the end of the twentieth century the Western Anglican Churches shared a common understanding that women did not automatically have a different Christian vocation and relationship to the institutional Church from those of men, based simply on their gender. Women were equal partners with men in serving God and should have the same opportunities to participate in all aspects of Church life as they felt called. This view was evident in the existence of female churchwardens, General Synod representatives, and clergy.

However, while a common, new understanding of women's place in Western Anglicanism had emerged in the course of a hundred years, there were significant national variations arising from different local cultural and ecclesial contexts. One illustration of this was the varied relationships between women's organizations and their national Churches. Perhaps the most obvious differences were over the timing of women's admission to holy orders, but also important were variations in the character of the prime movers, the initial motivation, and the treatment of an oppositional minority.

While the position of women in Western Anglicanism appears to be a story of steady 'progress', it is important to consider what was lost as well as gained. Not every woman could or wanted to be visible at the altar or in the pulpit. Among the unintended consequences of the changing status and role of women in the Church were the loss of a distinctive women's sphere and agenda, however marginal that may have seemed to the institutional Church, and the devaluing of traditional skills and activities through which many women practised their faith and built community. The inclusion of women

⁸⁹ The Saint Hilda Community, *Women Included: A Book of Services and Prayers* (London, 1991); Furlong, *Dangerous Delight*, pp. 69–87; Janet Nelson, 'The Good News in Our Own Language' and Elizabeth J. Smith, 'Sexism in Song to Lyrics of Liberation', both in Lindsay and Scarfe (eds.), *Preachers, Prophets and Heretics*, pp. 269–90 and pp. 291–307.

in official Church ministries arguably downplayed the value of the volunteer, and in the case of ordained ministry potentially ran the risk of increasing the clericalization of the Church at the expense of lay ministry.

For much of this period recognition of women's equal ability and opportunity to serve the Church in official capacities was seen as a source of division in national Churches which contained a range of theological and biblical views on women. Debates surrounding women's ministry and place in the Church provided some of the greatest challenges and opportunities for the Anglican Communion as it sought to maintain unity in the context of a growing theological and cultural diversity in which the Churches of the global South were larger and generally more conservative than their Western counterparts. This often led to the creation of new instruments and thinking to try to incorporate different perspectives on the issue. At the national level conscience clauses and episcopal visitors were deployed. At the world-wide level new international deliberative bodies, the ACC and the Primates' meeting, were charged with finding ways to maintain unity in diversity. When faced with the issue of women in the episcopate the doctrine of reception was deployed, and the Eames Commission set up to monitor provincial relationships and encourage continuing consultation on the issue.⁹⁰ One of the unforeseen consequences of conflict and debate around women's role in the Church was perhaps a greater awareness of Anglicanism as a world-wide church.⁹¹

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beeson, Trevor, *The Church's Other Half* (London, 2011).
- Darling, Pamela W., *New Wine: The Story of Women Transforming Leadership and Power in the Episcopal Church* (Cambridge, MA, 1994).
- Donovan, Mary Sudman, *A Different Call: Women's Ministries in the Episcopal Church* (Wilton, CT, 1986).
- Fletcher-Marsh, Wendy, *Beyond the Walled Garden* (Dundas, 1995).
- Gill, Sean, *Women and the Church of England: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (London, 1996).
- Heeney, Brian, *The Women's Movement in the Church of England 1850–1930* (Oxford, 1988).
- Kujawa-Holbrook, Sheryl A. (ed.), *Freedom is a Dream: A Documentary History of Women in the Episcopal Church* (New York, 2002).

⁹⁰ Muriel Porter, 'Women Bishops in Australia: Leadership and Authority', in Lindsay and Scarfe (eds.), *Preachers, Prophets and Heretics*, pp. 205–23 (pp. 207–10).

⁹¹ For Australian examples see Hilliard, 'The Organized Opposition', p. 109; and Janet Scarfe, 'Movement for the Ordination of Women: Their Hearts in their Mouths', in Lindsay and Scarfe (eds.), *Preachers, Prophets and Heretics*, pp. 117–45 (p. 125).

- Lindsay, Elaine and Janet Scarfe, *Preachers, Prophets and Heretics: Anglican Women's Ministry* (Sydney, 2012).
- Moyse, Cordelia, *A History of the Mothers' Union: Women, Anglicanism and Globalisation, 1876–2008* (Woodbridge, 2009).
- Muir, Elizabeth Gillan and Marilyn Färdig Whiteley, *Changing Roles of Women within the Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto, 1995).
- O'Brien, Anne, *God's Willing Workers: Women and Religion in Australia* (Sydney, 2005).
- Porter, Muriel, *Women in the Church: The Great Ordination Debate in Australia* (Ringwood, Victoria, 1989).
- Prelinger, Catherine M. (ed.), *Episcopal Women: Gender, Spirituality and Commitment in an American Mainline Denomination* (New York, 1992).
- Thompsett, Federica Harris and Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook (eds.), *Deeper Joy: Lay Women and Vocation in the 20th Century Episcopal Church* (New York, 2005).

Sexuality and Anglicanism

William L. Sachs

INTRODUCTION

The consecration of Gene Robinson, a gay man, as a bishop of the Episcopal Church in 2003, was a watershed in Anglican life. The action confirmed fragmentation of the Anglican world into opposed camps. Division occurred as some American and Canadian opponents formed clusters aligned with other parts of the Anglican world sympathetic to their views. More than Robinson's episcopate was at stake. Debate over the blessing of same-sex unions, and the status of homosexuality in general, was intense. The issue framed a pivotal moment in Anglican life, building on a division over human sexuality and moral teaching that had been developing since at least the middle of the century.

Both advocates and opponents of a normative status for homosexual persons in the Church drew links between this debate and prior Christian and Anglican history. Both used activist styles to anathematize opponents and to expand their bases of support. By the time of Robinson's election to the episcopate in New Hampshire, the assumption that homosexuality was a decisive issue was widespread. For many this one issue was the basis for assessing the state of Anglican life and for plotting the Church's future course.

There was considerable evidence for the importance of the debate. Influential sectors of the Anglican world, such as Nigeria, Kenya, and Uganda, joined the opposition to a normative status for homosexuality in the Church. They intervened outside their own provinces to elevate dissenting American clergy to the episcopate to supervise dissident North American congregations. Alternative bodies to the Episcopal Church in the United States arose and several American dioceses aligned themselves with African and Latin American branches of Anglicanism. Dissenters claimed they embodied true Anglicanism rather than its errant American expressions. Unprecedented division of Anglicanism loomed.

More than the issue of homosexuality was at stake. The question of homosexuality's status among Anglicans subsumed various issues with deep historical roots, including in the broadest sense the nature of human sexuality and its relationship with the biblical witness. Homosexuality represented an amalgam of issues focused divisively by the consecration of 2003. How this issue, contentious for many, became the point of division is the main focus of this chapter. The forces that surfaced must be identified and their interconnections traced in historical perspective.

Homosexuality became emblematic of long-standing tensions over Anglican faith and mission. An erosion of consensus over how to interpret and to express Christian belief and practice lay at the heart of the conflict. Reflective of prior divisions among Christians over belief and practice, the conflict bespoke Anglican growth outside its place of origin. The conflict embodied uncertainty over the normative form of the Christian life and the locus of authority. The Anglican ability to mediate among its global variations faltered.

Opponents of Robinson's consecration claimed it was the product of Church decline, and that correct belief and practice had been eroded by a drift towards cultural relevancy over many years. Advocates of Robinson's elevation linked the triumph to earlier struggles for social justice, liturgical revision, and the ordination of women. The fulfilment of Christian intention, not familiar Church assumptions, was at stake. Thus, homosexuality gathered Anglican tensions and galvanized activists intent on securing their different visions. This stance was not unprecedented for Christians generally or for Anglicans particularly. Debates among Christians over the shape of tradition and morality have recurred and prompted divisions. But the extent of Anglican division and the manner in which one issue subsumed others were unprecedented.

Addressing the rise of the conflict over homosexuality requires some comparison with prior disputes over Christian teaching. Similarly, we must consider how Anglicans have debated the nature of tradition and the shape of Church life. We will find that the theme of purity surfaces powerfully. As Mary Douglas traced in a notable work, purity in religious life originated in ancient concerns about cleanliness. Douglas concluded that this meant more than health in the consumption of proper foods. Purity has come to mean the maintenance of religious identity through performance of proper ritual and adherence to correct belief.¹ In the twentieth century, the rise of religious traditionalist movements such as fundamentalism represented a widespread perception that true belief and practice were being challenged by compromised religious and cultural trends. But religious progressives also claimed to be leading the Church towards pure expressions of its intentions through

¹ Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York, 2002).

advancing such ideals as justice. For both traditionalists and progressives, homosexuality became an important symbolic issue that engaged questions of pure faith and practice. Purity became the lever for mobilizing efforts to change the Church.

THE SHAPE OF HISTORICAL PRECEDENT

Such intention reveals what is central to the debate over homosexuality: the locus of authority for Anglicans has shifted from historic, centralized structures towards contextual identity and initiative. The conflict over homosexuality has brought to the surface the issue of how to mediate among Anglicanism's variations, with some hoping to refashion Church life along idealized lines. This is not the first instance of such an effort, but the first highlighting homosexuality. Across the history of Christianity, homosexuality has been condemned, but more often overlooked. At times, persecution of homosexual persons has occurred. Influential clerics such as the medieval figure Bernardino of Siena listed homosexuality as one of the worst sins. In a sense the question would seem to be why the issue would be disputed, not why it caused Anglican division.

As a fault-line among Anglicans, homosexuality has a brief history. Citing the ordination of gay persons in global North branches of the Anglican Communion, a gathering of global South Anglicans in Kuala Lumpur in 1997 called for affirmation of what they saw as traditional sexual mores. Homosexuality was condemned and sexual activity was deemed appropriate only within monogamous, heterosexual marriage.² The Kuala Lumpur statement challenged the direction of life among Anglicans in the global North. Traditionalist Anglicans endorsing Kuala Lumpur observed that homosexuality was one of various aberrations in global North Church life. By some accounts disregard for Christian tradition was apparent among global North Anglicans.

Criticism of British and North American branches of the Church was not the sole reason for the Kuala Lumpur gathering. By 1994, the dramatic growth of Anglicanism in parts of the global South had become plain. A periodic gathering of Anglicans from African, Asian, and Latin American provinces of the Communion first convened in that year. The meeting seemed warranted as much by growth and common perspectives as by opposition to ecclesiastical missteps. Various post-colonial parts of the Anglican world revealed dramatic growth and evangelical conviction. Flexing their spiritual muscles, global South

² 'The Kuala Lumpur Statement', 10–15 Feb. 1997 (<<http://www.globalsouthanglican.org>>, accessed June 2016).

Anglicans once under missionary control asserted the vitality and purity of their faith apart from global North influences. Many believed they embodied authentic Anglicanism. A fault-line that would prompt division was surfacing.

Although never previously traced to homosexuality, such division in Church life has abundant Christian precedent. More importantly, conflict and division among Christians historically has repeatedly been linked to searches for purity of Church belief and practice. An early instance was the rise of the Donatist movement in North Africa in the fifth century. This fragmentation of Church life reflected differing notions of the relation of Christian belief and practice to cultural settings. Donatists feared the loss of religious purity for the sake of cultural accommodation while their opponents welcomed social roles for the Church. In ancient Catholic Christianity there was a basis for consensus that the Church must engage the world around it. But Donatists perceived undue cultural influence and sought distance by cultivating an essential purity of belief and practice. Donatists feared the faith's threats arose within its own ranks as well as without. Their vision of the Church required separation from compromised practices and leaders. The purity of Church life was gauged by the actions of its leaders. Their apparent apostasy inspired activism to the point of division. Such activism would become a recurring phenomenon in Christian history, and frames the Anglican conflict over homosexuality.

Arguably, the Protestant Reformation would take similar form. Certainly, it became one of the most decisive divisions of Christianity. But the magisterial branches of the Reformation developed broad, socially attuned patterns of Church life, and rejected sectarian religious identity. The Reformed, Lutheran, and English Reformations presumed that belief and practice could not be narrowly construed and must be engaged in the redemption of society. The major branches of the Reformation debated how the Church could be neither accommodated to society nor disengaged from it. A crucial instance was divorce, accepted in most major Protestant traditions as a matter of pastoral necessity in rare instances. Another was the very conception of marriage itself, acknowledged even in the Book of Common Prayer as not only a remedy against sin, but as a companionable or sociable state of life. To be sure, there were sectarian expressions of the Protestant intention. England hosted a variety of such movements. Puritanism began within the Church of England and moved towards revolution and a short-lived Commonwealth. Puritanism became a spectrum of movements, some bent on political change, some intent on an exclusivist religious identity. Ultimately unable to govern England, the puritan movement fell apart, leaving dissenting groups as its legacy. Puritanism sparked revolution and beheaded a king; but it could not transition from protest to governance.³

³ Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain, 1603–1714* (London, 1997).

Among Christians there has been an historic readiness to divide as the Church's purity has appeared threatened. The relation of the Church to its cultural setting has been a critical factor, and the perceived accommodation of some Christians to political authority has been a breaking point. The Evangelical movement of which Methodism was a part approached culture in a new way. Evangelicalism emphasized moral reform of self and society. The idea was not original. After the Glorious Revolution, a priest of the Church of England, Josiah Woodward, had led the creation of the Society for the Reformation of Manners in 1691, challenging public immorality with special attention to profanity and prostitution.⁴

The precedent set by Woodward's effort at moral reform surfaced in Evangelicalism a century later. After his awakening to an Evangelical faith in 1785, William Wilberforce devoted the remaining forty-eight years of his life to religiously inspired moral reform. Already a Member of Parliament and layperson of the Church of England, Wilberforce drew together a coterie known as the Clapham Sect because many lived as neighbours in the London suburb of Clapham. The term at first was derisory, but their influence grew. They sought a broad, compelling public morality.⁵ Like Woodward, Wilberforce and his colleagues confronted public vice. More than personal failings troubled them. The Clapham group saw moral failings in public policy and the Established Church. They identified one symbolic sin: slavery. Because of their political efforts, the English slave trade was abolished by Parliament in 1807 and British slavery was ended in 1833. For the first time religious initiative overcame a public sin that subsumed various sins. The link to mission was clear.

With the rise of Evangelicalism, recognizable aspects of the later crisis over homosexuality were surfacing. Already there was precedent for Church division over the moral qualities of leaders and for seeming compromise of the Church's proper relation to society. With Evangelicalism, campaigns for moral reform originating outside recognized ecclesiastical channels gained credence. Sexuality, though not specifically homosexuality, was cited as a major aspect of social vice. Clapham Evangelicals set the precedent of identifying a socially symbolic moral issue, one which identified a pressing social issue and not only individual moral failings. On that basis, they pursued religious and political change. Clapham set a precedent for later activism by various religious groups. The theme of social justice would link some religious activists to political liberalism. But activism arising among Evangelicals would also be espoused

⁴ John Spurr, 'The Church, the Societies, and the Moral Revolution of 1688', in John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor (eds.), *The Church of England c.1689–c.1833* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 127–42.

⁵ Eric Metaxas, *Amazing Grace: William Wilberforce and the Heroic Campaign to End Slavery* (San Francisco, 2007).

by traditionalist groups in their efforts to stave off changes that might compromise the faith.

An ironic parallel to Evangelical moral protest was the religious protest that arose from a different perspective in the Church of England, namely the Oxford movement. Over more than a decade, in sermons and lectures, books and thematic tracts, the Oxford figures called for a Church purified of secular and political influences. Yet the influence they feared most was that of Evangelicalism. In their view Evangelicalism had been compromised by an overly-friendly relation to the state that obscured the Church's religious deposit. Instead, the Oxford movement, and then Anglo-Catholicism, revived a sense of the Church's apostolic character and linked it to the Church's ministry as a basis. This traditionalism created further precedent for Anglicans inclined to distinguish between themselves and the world, especially for those who would break from the Church because of its perceived impurities. However liberal activism, as well as forms of progressivism, also arose among Anglo-Catholics.

There were echoes in the colonies too. The global mission of the Church of England expanded dramatically over the course of the nineteenth century, as a result of both Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical initiative. The Church of England spawned a global religious body, and the structures of the Anglican Communion coalesced. The Anglican conflict over sexuality in the late twentieth century had this expansion and these structures as its backdrop. The division of sentiment over sexuality had regional contours framed by how missionaries proclaimed the gospel and built the Church as they knew it. However, what was preached and what was embodied could vary across the various colonial and foreign missions of global Anglicanism.

J. D. Y. Peel has charted how this happened among the Yoruba in what is now Nigeria. Church Missionary Society (CMS) missionaries laid great emphasis upon teaching the Bible to converts. Two factors afforded the CMS success. First, the Yoruba heard Scripture in terms of their own religious and cultural background. In part this inclined them to a more literal interpretation. As a result, second, the Yoruba appropriation of Christianity was energetic, marked with concern that the faith's endurance could not be presumed. Unlike Britain and North America, Christianity's presence and resilience were untested. Missionaries could sense the uncertain course that lay before Anglican Christianity in a new environment. For the most astute missionaries, innovative yet faithful adaptation of the Church was the path to indigenous faith. In the early twentieth century, for example, Bishop Frank Weston of Zanzibar, of decidedly Anglo-Catholic sympathies, devised a form of the liturgy that would be known as the Zanzibar Rite. He was moved by the idea of a distinctive and vigorous African Church. In time his vision would be realized.⁶

⁶ J. D. Y. Peel, *Religious Encounter and the Making of the Yoruba* (Bloomington, IN, 2003); H. Maynard Smith, *Frank Bishop of Zanzibar* (London, 1926).

As Anglicans sought faithful adaptations of Church life in mission fields, an issue of sexuality became prominent. It was the question of polygamy, especially the status of male converts in polygamous relationships. The issue raised questions of the purity of belief and practice, and of the Church's relation to culture, especially in unfamiliar settings. The question of polygamy was made more vexing because it was raised in the nineteenth century by Bishop J. W. Colenso of Natal, South Africa. Also known for his controversial views on biblical interpretation and later for his refusal to be deprived of his see, Colenso in 1861 published an essay that argued for acceptance of polygamy because of its cultural suitability. He anticipated late twentieth-century progressive arguments that the Church must adapt to culture rather than transform it. Colenso's position, and his personality, sharpened debate without resolving it.⁷

On the matter of polygamy, Anglicans became caught between an instinct to adapt to culture, especially when their mission presence appeared tenuous, and urge to transform errant moral practices for the sake of the Church's purity. Resolution of the issue took over a century. The Lambeth Conference of 1988 voted to admit those who were polygamists at the time of their conversion to Christianity subject to certain restrictions. Affirming both monogamy and the authority of the local church, the Conference declared that polygamists must promise not to marry again, nor to put away any wife. The Conference of 2008 added that polygamists should not be admitted to positions of Church leadership. This decision seemingly reflected the disquiet over the consecration of an openly gay American bishop that loomed large in 2008.⁸

THE CONTEST FOR CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Another sign of imminent confusion and division amongst Anglicans over sexuality concerned the question of birth control. The growing availability of contraceptives in both North America and Europe provoked at first moral outrage and resistance from Anglican leaders. But anxiety about child poverty and health persuaded Anglican bishops at the Lambeth Conference in 1930 to make a guarded, limited concession on family planning. To some, this seemed to drive a wedge between traditional Christian teaching on sexual relations

⁷ Jeff Guy, *The Heretic: A Study of the Life of John William Colenso, 1814–1883* (Johannesburg, 1983).

⁸ Resolution 26 of the 1988 Lambeth Conference (<<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/resources/document-library.aspx?author=Lambeth+Conference&year=1988>>). For 2008, see *Lambeth Reader, 2008* (London, 2008).

within marriage as mandated by the need to reproduce, and a newly emergent notion of sexuality as involving personal satisfaction. To others it was simply a matter of pastoral necessity. The Lambeth Conference of 1958 went one step further, acknowledging specifically the practice of contraception. But arguments over birth control, as over divorce, were as yet small-scale, and did not seem to entail a fundamental modification of traditional Christian teaching.

The same was not true of homosexuality. No aspect of the crisis over sexuality is more apparent than the divergence among Anglicans over key aspects of Christian belief and practice. No wider context for this split was more apparent than the culture wars that surfaced in North America in the late twentieth century. Historic liberalism and resurgent conservatism clashed, with no hint of resolution as the twenty-first century began. Their competing cultural values, and opposed social visions, created steamy rhetoric and bitter electoral contests. It was 'a struggle to define America', one commentator noted.⁹ Certain social issues became contested ground, especially abortion, family life, popular culture and the media, and homosexuality. The battlegrounds became political venues such as Congress and the Supreme Court. Locally the struggle arose in schools, city councils, and churches. No level of American life was exempt. Political alienation seemed complete.

This had political and social resonances that stretched well beyond the Anglican community, and especially beyond the Episcopal Church in the United States. The conflict gained momentum in 1992 when conservative commentator Pat Buchanan devoted an address to the Republican National Convention to this theme. He depicted competing visions of public good and of religious identity's role in shaping it. For Buchanan, an assault on traditional religious and social values was well underway. He called it 'a religious war going on in our country for the soul of America. It is a culture war, as critical to the kind of nation we will one day be as was the Cold War itself.'¹⁰ Buchanan's rhetoric solidified perceptions and intentions that already were apparent among conservatives, religious and political. His depiction of an assault on values fused disparate fears into unified conviction. Issues such as homosexuality and abortion bespoke moral decline in society, he supposed. Legitimized by misguided liberal sentiment, these trends signalled an assault on the Churches and on their beliefs which served as society's moral anchor. The issue was personal because sinister individuals were doing the undermining, and because people of faith were disregarded when they protested against America's loss of moral stature.

As a result, political and religious conservatism became almost indistinguishable. The threat both faced was the same: liberalism on a destructive

⁹ James Davison Hunter, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America* (New York, 1992).

¹⁰ Patrick J. Buchanan, 'The Culture War for the Soul of America', 14 Sept. 1992 (<<http://buchanan.org>>).

swathe through American life. The mobilization of a conservative phalanx benefited from the resurgence of Evangelicalism. Once consigned to society's margins by many pundits, Evangelicalism in the United States grew in the late twentieth century, creating social and political ripples. Its resurgence was multi-faceted, creating an array of groups, congregations, and leaders. In part Evangelicalism drew from the growth of suburban America, especially in the south and south-west. In part Evangelicals realized the opportunities afforded by technology, first television and later the Internet, but they also benefited from the rise of the charismatic movement. By the last quarter of the twentieth century, Evangelicalism was socially and religiously broad and growing, and this was true in Britain too, although less obviously than in the United States.

The confirmation of Evangelicalism's rise seemed to be the election of Jimmy Carter as President of the United States in 1976. A Southern Baptist from Georgia and former governor of that state, Carter's political career defied assumptions of regional and religious obscurity. Instead, what had seemed marginal to American life in the eyes of many commentators had moved towards the centre. But Carter disappointed conservatives by liberal policies, and by a deeply personal faith that seemed to have no social bearing. A Democrat, he left office in 1980 as Evangelicals moved headlong into political conservatism, swelling the Republican Party.¹¹

Some Evangelical leaders became public figures beyond the religious realm, courted by Republican politicians and offering unrestrained political commentary. Thus the Moral Majority, founded by Jerry Falwell in 1979, became a prominent source of conservative opinion for over a decade. But by the late 1980s it had proved to be a fragile, cash-strapped organization. Better organized and with similar resolve, the Christian Coalition was founded in 1989 and through the 1990s became the most obvious crossroads of Evangelicalism and political conservatism. The Christian Coalition benefited from the political energies of leaders who held conservative religious views. Distinctions among Evangelicals, and with other Christians faded. They united to save America from itself, especially from liberals whose actions pointed to social and religious doom.¹² Founded by media figure and activist Pat Robertson, the Coalition took a step away from local congregations and towards grass-roots activism. Robertson's television programme, *The 700 Club*, focused more on social and political commentary, tinged with Evangelical categories, than it did on saving souls. The Coalition translated conservative anger into effective politics. This meant securing the elections of sympathetic candidates for public office at all levels of government. From the grass-roots conservative reform spread nationally. Thus, in 1994, during the first term of President Bill

¹¹ Randall Balmer, *Redeemer: The Life of Jimmy Carter* (New York, 2014).

¹² Randall Balmer, *The Making of Evangelicalism* (Waco, TX, 2010).

Clinton, conservatives seized a majority of seats in the Congress in elections that became known as the Republican Revolution. At the same time, a similar consensus was forming among Anglican conservatives internationally. Soon the focus of their animus became homosexuality.¹³ In all this, Episcopalian clergy were a relatively small force, but the echoes of the wider conflict were heard even within the Episcopal Church.

Like the culture wars, the Anglican conflict in the United States over homosexuality was a dispute over social and political issues in which basic values were at stake. Anglicanism has long had Church parties and divergences, back to recusant Catholics and Puritans of the Elizabethan and Stuart eras, but the factions in the dispute over homosexuality have updated historic Church divisions with 'culture wars' energies. Like the Church of England, the Episcopal Church also experienced division over issues of liturgy, theology, and, above all, the Church's relation to culture. The earliest breakaway instance of note was the rise of the Reformed Episcopal Church in 1873, led by bishop George David Cummins of Kentucky. Cummins feared the intrusion of Roman Catholic liturgy and example onto Episcopal soil. However, the impulse to divide largely subsided among Episcopalians until after the Second World War. Then a North Carolina parish priest, James P. Dees, became alarmed at what he viewed as the steady advance of political and theological liberalism among Episcopalians. Dees was already linked to fringe conservative figures, such as the fundamentalist Presbyterian minister Carl McIntire. It was McIntire who discouraged Dees from approaching the Reformed Episcopal Church. Instead Dees established the Anglican Orthodox Church in 1963, securing consecration as a bishop from sympathetic minority movements among Orthodox Christians. Dees joined a cluster of small, dissident groups protesting against incipient Episcopal liberalism in sectarian fashion.

Dissident Episcopal groups began to coalesce and a broad traditionalist position began to emerge, with two contemporaneous events in the Episcopal Church. The Church's 1976 General Convention approved both the ordination of women to the priesthood and, on first reading, a revision of the 1928 Book of Common Prayer. Final approval of revision was secured at the next Convention in 1979. The juxtaposition benefited a widespread traditionalist claim: that a liberal phalanx had seized control of the Church, forcing violations of Christian belief and Anglican tradition upon faithful people. It might have been anticipated that traditionalists could not make common cause: High Church and Anglo-Catholic offence at the ordination of women seemed to diverge from Low Church and Evangelical umbrage at Prayer Book revision. But both High Church and Low Church opponents of these far-reaching changes in the Episcopal Church shared the feeling of having been dismissed

¹³ 'Republican Revolution Fades', *USA Today*, 19 Jan. 2003; E. J. Dionne, *Our Divided Political Heart* (London, 2012).

within the Church. In 1977, a gathering of traditionalists in St Louis, Missouri, led to the formation of the Anglican Catholic Church, one of various precursors to the Anglican Church of North America that would try to rally all traditionalists a generation later. For the first time some parishes openly broke with the Episcopal Church, notably St Mary's Church in Denver where the rector, James O. Mote, secured the office of bishop in a sectarian group. For the first time, in the late twentieth century, historic divisions of High and Low were bridged by alarm at the direction of Episcopal life.¹⁴

To traditionalists, the historic faith, which they presumed to embody albeit in varying ways, was being diluted and abandoned. Traditionalists had been troubled by the apparent advance of theological liberalism, notably the voices of such bishops as James Pike and John Spong. Approval of the ordination of women and liturgical revision intensified their fear that such liberalism was taking hold. The disintegration of the Episcopal Church as a faithful body seemed at hand. This fear would be confirmed if one fateful step were taken: if, by some means, homosexuality was affirmed. Homosexuality became symbolic of complete apostasy, because acceptance of it seemed an abandonment not only of the biblical standard, but of traditional Christian morality.¹⁵

On close examination, traditionalists represented aspects of protest from the Christian past framed by varieties of Anglican experience. They were unified by an urge to revive a Church that had allowed moral transgression and theological error. More than an echo of the culture wars, Anglican traditionalism was animated by an historic sense of cultural intrusion onto the Church's sacred space. Coalesced by pessimism about the social world and a dread of the Church losing its essence, the critique was sharpened by the Evangelical legacy of moral protest translated into organizational intention. Sectors of the traditionalist consensus also reflected the High Church and Anglo-Catholic emphasis on purity for liturgy and ministry. Church life must be measured by idealized, apostolic standards such as the Oxford movement nurtured.

The narrative here has focused particularly on developments in the Episcopal Church, which became the focus of the most intense and significant conflict over human sexuality in the Anglican Communion. But it was paralleled by events in other parts of the global North. In Britain, the rapid changes in popular culture associated with the 'permissive society' of the 1960s and 1970s brought in their wake not only a sharp decline in church-going—something not as such replicated in North America—but changes in popular sexual mores. Increasingly, to many people traditional Christian morality looked joyless and constricting. Attempts to 'update' Church life to reflect

¹⁴ Douglas Bess, *Divided We Stand: A History of the Continuing Anglican Movement* (Berkeley, CA, 2006); on the St Louis meeting, see the archival section of <<http://www.anglicancatholic.org>>.

¹⁵ Cf. David M. Robertson, *A Passionate Pilgrim: A Biography of Bishop James A. Pike* (New York, 2004); also John Shelby Spong, *Here I Stand* (San Francisco, 1999).

these changes merely served to highlight the gulf between traditionalists and progressives. A series of legislative changes in the 1960s—legalization of abortion, decriminalization of homosexual practices, lowering of the age of consent, divorce reform, amongst others—occurred against a background of internal Church division and acute tension.

Much the same was true of Australia and New Zealand. Traditionalist opinion here too was relatively muted amongst Anglicans, though it was particularly fierce in the conservative Evangelical parishes of the archdiocese of Sydney. In all these countries, and amongst progressive Anglicans, as much as attitudes began to change in favour of accepting and approving same-sex relations, including partnerships and the ordination of homosexuals, they were resented and resisted by many others.

More than an echo of the culture wars, Anglican traditionalism was animated by an historic sense of cultural intrusion into the Church's sacred space. Coalesced by pessimism about the social world and a dread of the Church losing its essence, the critique was sharpened by the Evangelical legacy of moral protest translated into organizational intention. Sectors of the traditionalist consensus also reflected the High Church and Anglo-Catholic emphasis on purity for liturgy and ministry.¹⁶ The essence of the traditionalist view was that Anglican progressives, and social liberals generally, had accommodated religious life to cultural trends too easily and completely. Seeing no divine intention for culture, traditionalists required a strict boundary between the Church and the world. Homosexuality represented a dire stage of the cultural challenge; the fact of a debate over it made clear to traditionalists that the Church needed to be rebuilt from what would corrupt the 'faith once delivered to the saints'. Traditionalists were unified by a conviction that the faith has been fixed, revealed whole, and must remain inviolate. In the face of sin, necessary beliefs and practices had to be secured, not diluted.¹⁷ For traditionalists the world contained more threat than opportunity. There was an acute need to join with those of similar conviction, who shared the sense of challenge in the Church and the world. Images of being a persecuted Church loomed large, and links to Christians who had minority status in various parts of the world were emphasized. 'Persecuted' and 'Orthodox' often surfaced as descriptors of traditionalist ranks.

This traditionalist conviction had a progressive counterpart. For both there was a strong sense of the reality of evil. For both, activism was necessary to

¹⁶ Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760–1857* (Cambridge, 1997); Frank M. Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven, CT and London, 2002); John F. Nash, *The Sacramental Church: The Story of Anglo-Catholicism* (Eugene, OR, 2011).

¹⁷ R. R. Reno, *In the Ruins of the Church: Sustaining Faith in an Age of Diminished Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2002); Peter C. Moore, *One Lord, One Faith: Getting Back to the Basics of Your Christianity in an Age of Confusion* (Nashville, TN, 1994).

recapture something precious that had been lost. For both, the world beyond the Church was susceptible to corruption. But traditionalists viewed evil as a distortion of the sacred for the sake of personal gratification. Homosexuality, along with a broader liberalism on sexual ethics, reflected a temptation to be culturally relevant and so embodied fallible human choice. The emphasis on choice became central. Much discussion centred on how to 'convert' or 'heal' homosexual persons by reversing their errant choice; homosexual practice was a moral failing. An emphasis on conversion reflected the Evangelical legacy and the impact of the charismatic movement.¹⁸

In the second half of the twentieth century, a grass-roots Pentecostal movement arose among Anglicans in North America. Soon linked with Anglican charismatics in the global North, including Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, the movement set about recovery of the faith from perceived lackadaisical attention to it in the Church. Key parishes and clergy surfaced and networks appeared. These networks extended to parts of Asia and, especially, Africa. Thanks to the movement's energies, Anglicanism in West and East Africa grew dramatically. Earlier instances of Evangelical and Pentecostal movements, such as the East Africa Revival of the first half of the twentieth century, proved decisive. Philip Jenkins has noted that growth of a vibrant Evangelicalism in Africa signalled a new centre of gravity for global Christianity. Much of African Anglicanism became stamped by a literal reading of the Bible and a strict moralism.¹⁹

Charismatic energies generated suspicion of progressives who seemed to embody betrayal of the faith. Homosexuality gained symbolic importance as proof of betrayal. In turn, mutual affirmations and suspicions drew Anglican Evangelicals and charismatics towards one another, and towards a conviction that the Anglican progressivist programme, especially its effort to recognize homosexuality in the Church, should be opposed vigorously. Miranda Hassett has used ethnographic lenses to explain how international networks formed linking Anglicans in East and West Africa with North American traditionalists. Such networking became the framework for alternative Anglican bodies that appeared after 2003, as I shall explain.

ANGLICAN PROGRESSIVISM

Ironically Anglican progressives shared key perceptions with their traditionalist opponents. Progressives espoused no uncritical reverence for culture,

¹⁸ For example, see 'The Road to Healing', *Christianity Today*, 13 Apr. 2007.

¹⁹ See Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (3rd edn., Oxford, 2011); Miranda Hassett, *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissenters and their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ, 2007).

though they were inclined to believe that God acted through culture, requiring careful attention to trends. But they readily saw evil taking cultural root. The emphasis on social justice that pervaded progressive thought was predicated on the idea that culture could readily go astray. The heart of the progressive position was more an emphasis on the inherent goodness of people than an instinct to bless culture. Thus people of recognizable identity, notably African Americans, women, and now gay persons, had faced forms of social degradation and had been mocked in popular culture. The progressive task was to remake society by reframing key institutions, especially the Church. In other words, social institutions must be remade so that people could be honoured, and their inherent worth reclaimed. Thus traditionalists and progressives were diametrically opposed on the locus of evil and on the means of overcoming it. The one attempted to retrieve Christian tradition by overcoming evil rooted in personal life, the other attempted to realize Christian intention by overcoming the collective evil that blunted the God-given humanity of diverse people.

In traditionalist perceptions, progressive intentions were linked to the heretical programmes of certain British and American bishops, with Gene Robinson being confirmation of flaws in the episcopate. In the 1960s, Bishop James Pike became a controversial speaker and writer on theological topics, even questioning the Trinity and other core doctrines. The failure of the Episcopal Church to silence Pike, as traditionalists saw it, was exacerbated by the appearance of Bishop John Spong in the last quarter of the century. A prolific writer and assertive speaker, Spong extended Pike's legacy of challenging literal interpretations of the Bible and adherence to certain historic doctrines. Spong styled himself a modern-day Martin Luther, intent on reforming Christianity. His programme seemed to build on such English counterparts in bishops John A. T. Robinson and David Jenkins, who were thought to have joined the chorus of challenge to inherited theological categories, and to the Church which proclaimed them, though a closer reading disclosed their theologies as broadly 'orthodox' in intent. For traditionalists, then, there had already been aberrations in the episcopate in Britain and America.²⁰

The progressive programme entailed more than generating outrage. Its antecedent, theological liberalism, had arisen in the second half of the nineteenth century. Intellectual and social trends had triggered the movement, notably the theory of evolution and the rise of urban industrial society. It would be erroneous to portray liberals as cultural sycophants. Liberals had responded to intellectual trends, but not always approvingly. Even more, liberals had protested against social injustice. The emergence of liberalism had much to do with a sense of advocacy on behalf of people whose lives were

²⁰ David Hein and Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr, *The Episcopalians* (Westport, CT, 2004).

diminished by social circumstances beyond their control. Liberalism's focus had been as much on the person in society as on society itself. Moved by the Christian Socialism of F. D. Maurice and later Charles Gore, Anglican liberalism emphasized the kingdom of God on earth. In this vision, God's heavenly kingdom was to be anticipated by the Church as a witness to sinful society. People otherwise demeaned would be included and honoured in this earthly anticipation of the eternal realm. The fusion of Anglo-Catholic instincts and liberal imprint was inspired in part by the rise of new religious orders, notably the Society of St John the Evangelist (Cowley) and the Order of the Holy Cross.²¹

This new emphasis on community held more than ecclesiastical intentions. Anglican liberals on both sides of the Atlantic found common cause with other religious and political liberals alike in an emphasis on 'social justice'. For liberals, like later progressives, Christian faith and the Church had profound social implications. The Church must embody the nature of social relations to which society as a whole must aspire. The Church's witness to the kingdom of God must address distorted social conditions. As a result, Episcopalian liberals were calling for civil rights for African American persons in the first half of the twentieth century. But they sought to secure these rights by changing the Church so it could be an example to society.²²

As traditionalists feared, theological liberalism gained broad sympathy in the Church. It did so less as an effective movement than as a broad consensus on certain issues. A majority of Episcopalians came to agree, by whatever path, that securing civil rights for African Americans was proper. They also reached agreement that the ordination of women to the priesthood and the revision of the Book of Common Prayer were demanded. There was little evidence of a liberal conspiracy; there was simply the gradual emergence of broad agreement on these key issues.

What became known as Progressivism among Episcopalians, and in wider Anglican circles, had coalesced around the issues of liturgical revision and the ordination of women. The continuum was less a sheer political programme than a sense of Christian faith moving towards earthly realization. For progressives the faith was not fixed for all time, but an unfolding realization of God's kingdom on earth. Changing the Church moved the process forward. True 'inclusion' brought nearer the presence of the kingdom. Here the Church would reflect the sweep of human variety, all divinely created. The world's inherent goodness, bequeathed by God, would triumph over sin and alienation.

²¹ B. M. G. Reardon, *Religious Thought in the Victorian Age: A Survey from Coleridge to Gore* (London, 1996).

²² Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr, *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington, KY, 2003).

Homosexuality was a late entry onto the list of progressive causes. Long known as a subculture in British and American life, homosexuality became more prominent socially and politically over the last three decades of the twentieth century. Embracing the ideal of social justice framed by the civil rights movement, advocacy groups for recognition of homosexual persons mobilized. Rejecting accusations that homosexuality was a chosen life-style, gay activists insisted that theirs was an innate identity worthy of respect like any cultural or ethnic designation. The only choice, activists insisted, was the decision to be publicly assertive.²³

There had been an Anglican homosexual underground for many years, whose evidence had been largely anecdotal and biographical. Some leaders at all levels of Church life and their children can be presumed to have been gay. Activism by Anglican leaders on behalf of gay persons was another matter. The first instance seems to have occurred in 1895 and then in 1897, during and after the trial of Oscar Wilde. A literary figure who led a double life, openly married and clandestinely gay, Wilde was tried for sodomy after an infamous civil procedure in which he claimed he had been defamed. Instead, his identity was made plain in a criminal trial, for homosexuality was considered a crime. During the trial, Wilde was convicted of the lesser charge of indecency, while Church of England priest Stewart Headlam sat in the courtroom. Upon Wilde's release from prison in 1897, Headlam took him into hiding for several days before he left for France to regroup.²⁴

Headlam was not known to be gay, nor to focus his social activism on England's homosexual population. A product of late nineteenth-century Christian Socialism and an Anglo-Catholic, he had been a parish priest and activist in East London's slums. There he resolved to act on behalf of marginalized persons in English society. As he escorted Wilde from prison, Headlam was already known for his defence of saloon keepers, prostitutes, and industrial workers. Assisting Wilde's relocation simply expanded Headlam's retinue. But his example was not immediately emulated. Homosexuality remained outlawed in society and condemned in the Church. Activism to legitimize homosexuality and to recognize gay persons in the Church would not coalesce for decades. When calls for recognition began, they arose on the basis of widening conclusions that being gay was neither pathological nor chosen. A few of the first women priests in the Episcopal Church made their sexual orientation public, notably Ellen Barrett, ordained in the diocese of New York in 1977.

That event sparked a declaration by the Episcopal House of Bishops in 1979 that the ordination of homosexual persons was inappropriate, but the statement had no binding power. The indefatigable bishop John Spong ordained

²³ David Carter, *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution* (New York, 2004).

²⁴ Neal McKenna, *The Secret Life of Oscar Wilde* (New York, 2006).

Robert Williams, an openly gay man, as priest in 1989. But Williams soon condemned the Church and Spong, and died from AIDS. Nevertheless one of Spong's most notable books, *Living In Sin: A Bishop Rethinks Human Sexuality* (1990) called for recognition of gay persons by the Church, and argued that gay persons were an innate part of human experience.²⁵ In the same year, Spong's assisting bishop in the diocese of Newark, Walter Righter, ordained Barry Stopfel, a gay man living with a partner, as a deacon. In 1991 Spong himself ordained Stopfel as priest. But Righter's action drew ire. In 1996 ten bishops filed a presentment, or accusation, against Righter, charging him with violating Church doctrine. If confirmed, the charge could have led to an ecclesiastical trial in which Righter could have faced loss of his ordination. But a Church court dismissed the presentment, declaring that the 'core doctrine' of the Episcopal Church had not been violated.²⁶ Traditionalists took the decision as one more sign that pure belief and practice had become corrupted. Preservation of the faith required measures that did not rely on Episcopal Church procedures. The Church's confirmation of the election of Gene Robinson as bishop in 2003 gave proof that drastic steps were required.

THE UNFOLDING OF CONFLICT

In September 1997, soon after the Kuala Lumpur declaration, thirty Episcopal priests launched a new traditionalist group. Known as First Promise, it consolidated ideals and strategies, setting an example that later groups would follow. Led by Charles H. ('Chuck') Murphy, III of All Saints Church, Pawleys Island, South Carolina, First Promise declared the Episcopal Church to be 'fundamentally impaired' because it no longer upheld 'the truth of the gospel'.²⁷ First Promise bypassed Episcopal structures to evangelize a sinful society and to seek fellowship with any who were not tainted by Church misdirection, especially faithful Anglicans outside the United States. Further precedent was set in 1998 when T. J. Johnston, priest at St Andrew's Church, Little Rock, Arkansas, declared that he and his congregation were affiliated with the Anglican Church of Rwanda, not the Episcopal Church. Johnston previously served as assistant to Murphy at Pawleys Island. A traditionalist network soon grew dramatically. In January 2000, Murphy and John H. Rodgers were made bishops in a liturgy held at St Andrew's Cathedral,

²⁵ See Paul Moore, *Presences: A Bishop's Life in the City* (Boston, MA, 1999); also, John Shelby Spong, *Living in Sin: A Bishop Rethinks Human Sexuality* (San Francisco, 1990).

²⁶ Gustav Niebuhr, 'Episcopal Bishop Absolved in Gay Ordination', *New York Times*, 16 May 1998.

²⁷ I. Arten and W. Glass, *A House Divided? Ways Forward for North American Anglicans* (Eugene, OR, 2015), p. 20.

Singapore. Six bishops, led by Emmanuel Kolini of Rwanda and Moses Tay of Singapore, conducted the consecration. One of the six was C. Fitzsimmons Allison, retired bishop of South Carolina. The goal was to pursue mission untainted by US Episcopal errors. Murphy and Rodgers represented two of traditionalism's centres: South Carolina and Pittsburgh. First Promise became the Anglican Mission in America as Murphy became a bishop. Rodgers had been dean at the new Trinity School for Ministry, in a Pittsburgh suburb. Trinity would tie traditionalist conviction and international links to training a new generation of leaders.²⁸

As the new century began, traditionalism was poised to expand. Condemnation by the archbishop of Canterbury George Carey was to no avail. There was an influential cluster of traditionalist parishes, clergy, and a few bishops still within the Episcopal Church but wavering. For the time being they were caught between their beliefs and connections, and a reluctance to break with the Episcopal Church. The precedent of breakaway groups was not impressive, but they were certain the Episcopal Church would dismay them further. In 2003 their fears were confirmed.

For progressives and most senior Church leaders, the General Convention of 2003 was a triumph. Few questioned the correctness of approving the election of Gene Robinson as bishop of New Hampshire, though some disliked the glare of media attention and others wished the matter had been delayed. But there was an assurance among most bishops and headquarters staff that the Church's process had worked and little else mattered. Threats of Church division were viewed as inconsequential. But Episcopalian leaders and progressives failed to grasp the extent of traditionalist outrage. Weeks before Robinson's election in New Hampshire, the Canadian diocese of New Westminster had permitted its first blessing of a same-sex union. This issue would linger in traditionalist fears long after Robinson arrived in the episcopate. Traditionalists north and south of the equator saw a wave of theological error threatening the faith.²⁹

Events in the United States were paralleled to some extent in the Church of England, though with a very different outcome. Encouraged by the bishop of Oxford, Richard Harries, the new archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, in the same year as Gene Robinson's election, permitted the name of Jeffrey John, a gay man in a permanent relationship with another man, to go forward for the suffragan bishopric of Reading. The decision triggered intense hostility from Evangelicals and other traditionalists, especially within the diocese of Oxford, and eventually the archbishop was obliged to withdraw the nomination. John made no secret of his sexuality and

²⁸ Ross Lindsay, *Out of Africa: The Breakaway Anglican Churches* (Camarillo, CA, 2011); Frank G. Kirkpatrick, *The Episcopal Church in Crisis* (Westport, CT, 2008).

²⁹ Stephen Bates, *A Church at War: Anglicans and Homosexuality* (London, 2004).

his personal relationship—indeed, he was widely known as a moderate advocate of greater tolerance for homosexual relations within the Church, and as author of an influential pamphlet, *Permanent, Faithful, Stable* (2000), arguing for the full acceptance of faithful, committed same-sex relationships.³⁰

Jeffrey John's withdrawn nomination stood as a striking contrast to events in America, and by rights, perhaps, ought to have given traditionalists in the Church of England some reassurance. But that was not to be. The coincidence of the Jeffrey John affair with Robinson's election fuelled impressions that Anglicanism was under 'attack', as traditionalists saw it, from a liberal conspiracy. It deepened their determination to resist, and encouraged the formation of new, traditionalist alignments. Indeed, in retrospect 2003 was to look, in the Church of England, like a 'high water mark' for the advance of support for homosexuality, as subsequently the growing influence of Evangelicalism ensured that such a thing was very unlikely to happen again. It also fuelled growing pressure for the provision of alternative ecclesiastical organization for those conscientiously opposed to the ordination of women, something that eventually provoked the formation of the Anglican Ordinariate, an umbrella within the Roman Catholic Church for Anglicans disaffected by the ordination of women and by liberal teaching on human sexuality.

Over the next five years, Church division reached unprecedented heights and cast its shadow over the Anglican Communion. After 2003, traditionalists began to organize a flurry of caucuses. In the United States, opposition did not always translate into readiness to leave the Church, though some did leave. Of the forty bishops who opposed Robinson, four would lead their dioceses out, and another diocese and bishop would later join them, as would a few retired bishops. One bishop who voted against Robinson's approval would become Roman Catholic upon retirement.

By 2008 there had been an unwieldy set of departures from the Episcopal Church. Various parishes claimed affiliation with one or another dissident group which linked themselves to sympathetic Anglican provinces on other continents. Over time, links to Anglicans in Nigeria, Uganda, Kenya, and the Southern Cone (a portion of South America) arose, as well as Rwanda. Sympathy from traditionalist leaders in other Anglican provinces was forthcoming. There was heated discussion of 'interventions', that is, Anglican provinces in one part of the world intervening in other provinces. The issue became intense but traditionalists were not dissuaded. Movement to sanction the blessing of same-sex unions, and the election of Katherine Jefferts Schori, bishop of Nevada as presiding bishop in 2006, were the final straws for many in the traditionalist camp. Further, in 2010, Mary Glasspool was elected a

³⁰ Jeffrey John, *Permanent, Faithful, Stable: Christian Same-Sex Marriage* (new edn., London, 2012).

suffragan bishop in Los Angeles. She had been forthcoming about being gay and having a partner.

Before Mary Glasspool's election, traditionalist groups had shifted their energies from leaving the Episcopal Church to creating a unified alternative to it. There had been a flurry of people and parishes looking for new ecclesiastical affiliation; African provinces had ordained Americans as dissident bishops offering oversight to breakaway parishes and clergy. In some cases new coalitions arose, such as CANA, the Convocation of Anglicans in North America, which had a primary identification with the Anglican Church of Nigeria. The Anglican Mission in America (AMiA) also began to ordain bishops in the name of the Rwandan Church, and would elevate twelve men to the episcopate. Episcopal dissent became a chaotic landscape. Legal battles added to the chaos. Departing parishes, and eventually five dioceses, claimed to take their church property with them as they shifted their affiliation. But Episcopal dioceses were not prepared to suffer such loss quietly. In several states legal battles unfolded, notably in Virginia where, at first, eleven parishes of more than 190 in the diocese sought realignment. A protracted legal battle unfolded, beginning in 2007 and stretching to the state Supreme Court which upheld the diocesan argument and property was required to be returned. In 2014 the United States Supreme Court refused to hear further argument.³¹ Dissidents met in any available space and maintained a few congregations of respectable size. The case for a new, traditionalist confession was apparent.

Consequently, the early twenty-first century saw a decisive turn in the development of liberal attitudes towards human sexuality amongst Anglicans in the global North. The sources of this ethical liberalism were manifold, and certainly as much cultural as they were theological, encompassing the impact of the 'permissive' post-war popular culture, high literary scorn for traditional morality, and the massive expansion of digital media, which made pornography widely available. There also was growing sympathy for a theological anthropology prevalent in liberal Protestantism that emphasized human potential and the God-given nature of sexuality, and that instinctively sided with those once regarded as deviant or 'outsiders' such as gays and lesbians and trans-gendered people. In Britain, perhaps the most significant development had happened long before in the publication of the Wolfenden Report on homosexuality in 1957. In recommending the decriminalization of homosexuality, this report effectively ended the presumption that public life and law ought to be based on traditional Christian morality. Yet the report was welcomed widely in the Churches and helped to set the stage for the acceptance of homosexuality by theological liberals. At the same time, the growth of Evangelicalism and its opposition to what the Wolfenden Report

³¹ See <<http://www.episcopalcafe.com>>, accessed 11 Mar. 2014.

foreshadowed also created the conditions for division within the Church. Growing tolerance of homosexuality would provoke a backlash.

The effort to demonstrate traditionalist strength began spectacularly in June 2008. In Jordan and Jerusalem, hundreds of traditionalists from various Anglican provinces convened the first Global Anglican Futures Conference (GAFCON). The effort to create a parallel Anglican universe was apparent, as this body aspired to be a periodic international convention that would dwarf other Anglican assemblies. The effort was recreated in 2013, again with declarations of triumph. The Nairobi communiqué, issued after the 2013 meeting, accused a 'false gospel' of spreading through the Communion and promoting 'homosexual practice as consistent with holiness, despite the fact that the Bible clearly identifies it as sinful'.³² Traditionalists declared themselves to be the true Anglicans, a contrast to misguided North American and British Church leadership. Similarly, in the United States, a traditionalist gathering in June 2009 announced the formation of the Anglican Church of North America (ACNA). By then four dioceses had renounced the Episcopal Church and Robert Duncan, bishop of Pittsburgh, whose diocese was one of the departing bodies, was chosen ACNA's archbishop. By 2014, ACNA claimed 112,000 people in twenty-nine dioceses with 983 congregations and seventy-five bishops.³³

Yet fault-lines of various sorts plagued ACNA. A rift with the AMiA and Chuck Murphy led to his retirement and a recasting of the relation. Some traditionalist bodies resisted ACNA's call for unity, and claims of rapid growth could not be documented. Meanwhile wider Anglican bodies debated the idea of a 'covenant' to realign relations and to ensure that Church provinces adhered to uniform standards of belief and procedure. The Anglican world was splintering; parallel bodies had emerged, all claiming the mantle of genuine Anglicanism. The familiar instruments of unity barely held Anglicans together and could not resolve the fragmentation. But even as Anglicans fractured, religious circumstances outpaced their perceptions and intentions.

As the weight of traditionalist departure into separate jurisdictions was felt, senior Anglican leaders pursued mediation. A special commission on unity, created by Rowan Williams, published the Windsor Report in October 2004. A moratorium on further consecrations of gay bishops and blessings of same-sex unions was recommended. The report also urged creation of an 'Anglican Covenant' to commit Churches of the Communion to consultation when making major internal decisions, and encouraged those who acted divisively, including interventions in other provinces, to express regret. When the text of a Covenant appeared in 2009, it challenged progressives for it seemed to

³² <<http://gafcon.org/resources/nairobi-communiqué/>>, accessed Mar. 2016.

³³ See the website of the Anglican Church in North America, <<http://www.anglicanchurch.net>> for 28 June 2014.

restrict provincial autonomy. For many traditionalists, the idea of a Covenant appealed, if it was grounded in the theological standards they accepted. However, the Covenant struggled to win acceptance. A major hindrance was its rejection by the Church of England in 2012. The Episcopal Church attempted a 'pastoral response' that neither accepted nor rejected, but tried to honour diverse points of view among Anglicans.³⁴

Broadly, American Episcopalians began to explore restructuring of their Church. Without repudiating the action of 2003, they pursued a Church more effectively focused on mission and ministry. Belying claims of laxity from traditionalists, Episcopalians already had tightened clergy standards. Sexual misconduct had been anathematized and procedures for clergy discipline reinforced. More importantly, most Episcopalians refused to align with traditionalists or progressives. While a majority accepted the election of Gene Robinson and recognition of gay people, they were dismayed by a fractured Church. Many blamed national Church leaders for mismanagement. Most focused on church life in their own locales and shunned wider debates.

CONCLUSION

Even by 2003 most Americans had tired of the culture wars. They were satiated with anger and division. They were also drawn to fresh forms of spirituality that arose outside institutional religion. Talk of an 'emerging Church' across American religion reflected fatigue with institutions but renewed attention to divine possibility at the grass-roots. By 2014, nearly one-quarter of Americans, and perhaps more Canadians, reported they had no religious affiliation but most believed in God. Most were young adults seeking ways to develop spiritually with others while avoiding institutional preoccupations.³⁵

This reality represented a crossroads for Episcopal and Anglican congregations of the global North. It reflected wider changes in culture and concepts of human sexuality. By the 1990s, in various countries, homosexuality had passed beyond a phase of radical advocacy in an earlier generation, and in many social circles and among the media had ceased to attract much comment, or to seem in any way unusual or marginal. In many Church circles traditional Christian ethics had undergone revision: what was once regarded as inherently sinful was now seen as a legitimate expression of formerly suppressed human

³⁴ Ephraim Radner and Philip Turner, *The Fate of Communion* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2007); General Convention of the Episcopal Church, 2012, Resolution B005, 'Ongoing Commitment to the Anglican Covenant Process'.

³⁵ Diana Butler Bass, *Christianity After Religion* (San Francisco, 2013).

identity. Christians were searching for a new approach to spirituality consonant with these new forms of awareness. Some found innovative ways to benefit from the new spirituality. Others, like Church headquarters, tried to do what they had always done, only better. Bishops were caught in the vortex. Some tried to blend familiar allegiance with innovative programmes. A rash of energetic initiatives was inconclusive.

Yet another dynamic surfaced among Anglicans widely. While Anglican leaders faced discord, grass-roots life showed promise. Spirituality and congregational life replaced hierarchy and religion as the centre of allegiance. This was not unprecedented. In its mission contexts Anglican life had taken a similar turn as it faced novel circumstances. Now there was only passing recourse to authority beyond one's context. Relations with bishops were valued to the extent they were personal and spiritual. Anglicanism splintered as efforts to restore connections faltered. Instead the Church found fresh unity from the grass-roots outward. Informal initiatives launched by parishes, unofficial coalitions, and some dioceses linked Anglicans in forms of mission, study, and fellowship. While Anglican leaders anathematized one another, local clergy and laity collaborated. Whether this trend portended a larger sense of Anglican purpose was unclear. No conclusive mediation emerged among the leadership of Anglicanism's various branches.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arten, I. and W. Glass, *A House Divided? Ways Forward for North American Anglicans* (Eugene, OR, 2015).
- Balmer, R., *The Making of Evangelicalism* (New York, 2010).
- Bass, D. B., *Christianity After Religion* (San Francisco, 2013).
- Bates, S., *A Church at War: Anglicans and Homosexuality* (London, 2004).
- Bess, D., *Divided We Stand: A History of the Continuing Anglican Movement* (Riverside, CA, 2006).
- Carter, D., *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution* (New York, 2004).
- Douglas, M., *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York, 2002).
- Guelzo, A., *For the Unity of Evangelical Christendom: The Irony of the Reformed Episcopalians* (University Park, PA, 2005).
- Hassett, M., *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissenters and their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ, 2007).
- Hein, D. and G. H. Shattuck, Jr., *The Episcopalians* (Westport, CT, 2004).
- Hunter, J. D., *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America* (New York, 1992).
- Jenkins, P., *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (3rd edn., Oxford, 2011).
- John, J., *Permanent, Stable, Faithful: Christian Same-Sex Partnerships* (new edn., London, 2012).

- Kirkpatrick, F. G., *The Episcopal Church in Crisis* (Westport, CT, 2008).
- Lindsay, R., *Out of Africa: The Breakaway Anglican Churches* (Camarillo, CA, 2011).
- Radner, E. and P. Turner, *The Fate of Communion* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2007).
- Reno, R. R., *In the Ruins of the Church: Sustaining Faith in an Age of Diminished Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2002).
- Robertson, D. M., *A Passionate Pilgrim: A Biography of Bishop James A. Pike* (London, 2004).
- Sachs, W. L., *Homosexuality and the Crisis of Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Spong, J. S., *Living in Sin: A Bishop Rethinks Human Sexuality* (San Francisco, 1990).
- Spong, J. S., *Here I Stand* (New York, 1999).

The State, Nationalism, and Anglican Identities

Matthew Grimley

INTRODUCTION: *THE BATTLE OF THE FLAGS*

During the First World War, Conrad Noel, the socialist vicar of Thaxted in Essex, placed three flags, the Sinn Fein tricolour, the cross of St George, and the red flag, in his church, and on 1 May 1921 he held a procession of the flags around it. This provoked protests, and the theft of the red flag. Cambridge undergraduates later removed a replacement red flag and the Irish tricolour, and further thefts ensued. In his book *The Battle of the Flags*, published the following year, Noel justified his display of the three flags, and in particular his preference for the cross of St George over the Union flag. 'The Union Jack is not the old flag of this country,' he explained. 'It is the modern flag of brute-force dominion... constructed to celebrate the triumph of a swollen, greedy Empire.'¹ For Noel, empire (and hence the Union flag) denoted recent scandals such as child prostitution in Hong Kong, the Amritsar massacre, and the violence of the Black and Tans in Ireland.² The Irish tricolour represented national self-determination. The red flag was a symbol of internationalism and equality, but it was only right that it should be flown alongside national flags, because nationalism and internationalism had to go together. Noel was critical of some internationalists' condescending assumption that nationalism was 'a passing phase', insisting that 'Christ's Co-operative Commonwealth was to be no mere cosmopolitan world, secured at the expense of national variety'.³ 'National flags, symbolising that love of country which is so marked in the teaching of Christ, and His Church, so natural to normal men, will always have their place in Christian Churches,' he said.⁴

¹ Conrad Noel, *The Battle of the Flags* (London, 1922), p. 17.

² Noel, *Battle of the Flags*, p. 21.

³ Noel, *Battle of the Flags*, pp. 62–3.

⁴ Noel, *Battle of the Flags*, p. 93.

The 'Battle of the Flags', as the event was familiarly called, illustrates the complex relationships between state, nation, and empire since 1910, and their implications for Anglicans. It demonstrates the variety of versions of nationalism on offer in the early twentieth century. An English Anglican in Noel's day could espouse Englishness, Britishness, or imperialism, or even one of the nationalist movements rebelling against the British Empire, or a number of these identities at once. Noel also illustrates how anti-imperialism and anti-militarism were often wrapped in the garb of nationalism or patriotism. For Noel, empire was 'the disease that is destroying English patriotism', and a leaflet handed out by his supporters in the town on Empire Day in the 1920s proclaimed that 'it is unpatriotic and unchristian to glory in empire'.⁵ As a concept, the nation was part of the mental furniture of the Anglophone world, and hard to avoid, even for Anglicans who were critical of the conduct of their own states or the British Empire.

Throughout the twentieth century, Anglicans in Britain, in the empire and Commonwealth, and even in the United States, found it hard to conceive of their Church as anything other than a national Church. As William L. Sachs has pointed out, 'sporadic protests against the Church's alignment with the nation suggested the presence of counter-currents within the Church, but did not sway Anglicans from their national course'.⁶ Although some branches of the Anglican Communion had already experienced disestablishment, and others had never been established, most shared a sense of being a public religion, with public responsibilities. The Anglican missionary leader Max Warren observed in the 1960s that a 'quasi-establishment', which assumed the interconnectedness of Church and state even where this had no statutory basis, had survived in many regions until decolonization.⁷ Ruth Frappell has described the Church of England in inter-war Australia as 'very much an "established" church in a social sense though not as a legal reality'.⁸ In the case of Canada, Marguerite Van Die has suggested that an 'informal' or 'shadow' establishment' of the Anglican and other large Protestant Churches lasted until after the Second World War, and William Westfall has argued that Anglican ideas of establishment had actually been revitalized after formal disestablishment in the mid-nineteenth century.⁹ In the United States, many Episcopalians continued to adhere to the idea of a national Church espoused

⁵ Noel, *Battle of the Flags*, p. 93; undated hand bill, quoted in Arthur Burns, 'Beyond the "Red Vicar": Community and Christian Socialism in Thaxted, Essex, 1910–84', *History Workshop Journal*, 75 (2013): 101–24 (p. 108).

⁶ William L. Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism: From State Church to Global Communion* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 304–5.

⁷ Max Warren, *Social History and Christian Mission* (London, 1967), p. 13.

⁸ Ruth Frappell, 'Imperial Fervour and Anglican Loyalty 1901–1929', in Bruce Kaye and others, *Anglicanism in Australia: A History* (Victoria, 2002), pp. 76–99 (p. 98).

⁹ Marguerite Van Die (ed.), *Religion and Public Life in Canada* (Toronto, 2001), p. 7.

by William Reed Huntington in the late nineteenth century, which found expression in the National Cathedral in Washington, begun in 1907 but not completed until 1990. Establishment, then, was a state of mind, as well as a legal state.

There were several reasons why the nexus of Anglicanism and nationalism proved so durable during the first half of the twentieth century. First of all, the Great War consolidated it. Many Anglican bishops in Britain, Canada, the United States, and Australia fervently supported military recruitment, though they sometimes also warned their own side against vindictive nationalism or reprisals. After the war, Anglican clergy played a key role in improvising new mourning rituals, the Australian former army chaplain Canon David Garland devising and popularizing Anzac Day; while his English counterpart, David Railton, proposed and—with Herbert Ryle, dean of Westminster—choreographed the burial of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey. The words ‘for God, for King and Country’ which formed part of the inscription on the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior, were also widely used on other memorials, affirming the connection between religion and nation. Many local war memorials were situated in parish churches or churchyards. In one of the most prominent Anglican churches in Canada, St Paul’s Toronto, a war memorial reredos was erected, flanked by statues of assorted figures from English history, including Richard the Lionheart, Henry V, Francis Drake, Horatio Nelson, and Florence Nightingale, as well as the living figures of Earl Haig, and Lord Byng, commander of the Canadian Corps and later Governor-General of Canada.¹⁰ Although the demands of Archbishop Davidson and other senior Anglicans that Christians should be commemorated by cross-shaped headstones in military cemeteries were resisted by the new Imperial War Graves Commission on the grounds that uniform headstones would affirm the equal sacrifice of all, including non-Christians, their protests did ensure that there was a Christian presence in the cemeteries. Crosses were engraved on headstones, and the Cross of Sacrifice designed by Reginald Blomfield (grandson of the famous nineteenth-century bishop of London) featured in many cemeteries, alongside Edwin Lutyens’s more syncretistic Stone of Remembrance.¹¹

As an essential marker of identity, the British nation emerged intact, if a little battered, from the First World War. At the 1920 Lambeth Conference, as at the Paris Peace Conference the year before, the nation (and the associated idea of national self-determination) was presented as the key building-block of

¹⁰ William Westfall, ‘Constructing Public Religions at Private Sites: The Anglican Church in the Shadow of Disestablishment’, in Van Die (ed.), *Religion and Public Life in Canada*, pp. 23–49 (p. 39).

¹¹ David Crane, *Empires of the Dead: How One Man’s Vision led to the Creation of WWI’s War Graves* (London, 2013), ch. 7.

the post-war international order. The bishops at Lambeth resolved that 'the road to internationalism, as has been well said, "lies through nationalism"' and predicted that 'the glory of the Kingdom will be the sum total of the glory of the nations, not some new thing in which the nation will be submerged and disappear'.¹² Some prominent British Anglicans invested their hopes for the future peace in the League of Nations, but only a very few saw it as portending the abolition of nation states. When the League failed to avert another world war, Anglicans again rallied behind their nations' war efforts. As in the First World War, some criticized specific policies or acts of war; Bishop George Bell of Chichester criticized the obliteration bombing of German cities, while some Episcopalians protested against the internment of Japanese Americans. But these protests were in the context of near-universal support from Anglicans around the world for the Second World War.

The British Empire's survival until the aftermath of the Second World War also perpetuated the connection of Anglicanism and nationalism. Australian bishops were enthusiastic supporters of imperialist movements like the Round Table movement and the Victoria League for Commonwealth Friendship. As W. M. Jacob has pointed out, the Anglican Communion continued to look like an 'almost accidental imperial and missionary prolongation of the established Church of the English nation' until the 1958 Lambeth Conference.¹³ The 1930 Lambeth Encyclical's description of the Anglican Communion as 'a commonwealth of Churches without a central constitution... a federation without a federal government' which had 'come into existence without any deliberate policy, by the extension of the Churches of Great Britain and Ireland beyond the limits of these islands' echoed contemporary imperialist rhetoric.¹⁴ Even when Archbishop Geoffrey Fisher granted autonomy to Anglican provinces in Africa after the Second World War, the process seemed to be running in tandem with the British government's policy of decolonization.

Church, state, and empire were also connected to one another via the monarch, who stood at the head of all three. There were close links between ecclesiastical and court hierarchies (even the rebellious Conrad Noel was the son of one of Queen Victoria's courtiers), and the Church played a key role in royal ceremonial, including new innovations such as George V's Silver Jubilee in 1935, and his Christmas broadcasts to the nation and empire. The 1935 Archbishops' Commission on the Relations between Church and State cited the Jubilee as evidence of the importance of public recognition of religion for the nation and empire alike:

¹² *The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1920* (London, 1929), pp. 33, 52.

¹³ W. M. Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997), p. 282.

¹⁴ *Lambeth Conference 1930: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with the Resolutions and Reports* (London, 1930), p. 28.

No one who remembers occasions of great national emotion will question the sincerity of the crowds which on such occasions throng the cathedrals and churches of the establishment. It is impossible to estimate the precise amount of value which should be attributed to the national recognition of Christianity, so expressed, from the standpoint of the Church, commissioned to call the nation into allegiance to Christ, or the extent to which its existence depends on the fact of establishment. But we are persuaded that its value is great, and that if it were lost, Christian faith would count for less in the national and civic life of England and in the minds of our fellow countrymen overseas.¹⁵

Archbishop Cosmo Lang drafted George V's 1935 Silver Jubilee broadcast, and two of his Christmas broadcasts. During the Abdication Crisis, along with the Dominion prime ministers, Lang played a crucial role in supporting the Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin's view that Edward VIII must abdicate. He was also one of two people charged with choreographing George VI's coronation, and approving film footage of it for cinema transmission. The association of monarchy, Anglicanism, and empire remained close until the period of decolonization, as was clear from the coronation of Elizabeth II, broadcast live across the Commonwealth in 1953. When, two years later, Princess Margaret announced that she would not be marrying her divorced paramour, Group Captain Peter Townsend, she did so 'mindful of the Church's teaching that Christian marriage is indissoluble, and conscious of my duty to the Commonwealth'.¹⁶ The long reign of Elizabeth II, and the continued (and controversial) exclusion of Catholics from the throne because of the Act of Settlement, meant that vestiges of the nexus of monarchy, Commonwealth, and Anglicanism survived into the early decades of the twenty-first century.

Until after the Second World War, large parts of the Anglican Communion lacked institutional independence, either from the British state (in the case of the Church of England), or from the Church of England itself. Although the Church of England gained a measure of self-government in the 1919 Enabling Act, this still left Parliament with ultimate control over worship and doctrine, a situation which became painfully apparent in the Prayer Book controversy of 1927–8 and which was not formally remedied until 1974. Despite reforms in the 1970s, British prime ministers continued to have the final say over the appointment of English bishops until 2007. Links to the British state also persisted elsewhere in the empire. Despite the 1927 Indian Church Act, the British government was still paying for some salaries and church building costs until independence in 1947. Although the Anglican Church in Australia had cut its formal ties with the state in the nineteenth century, court judgments in 1911 and 1912 affirmed that its dioceses did not have a separate

¹⁵ *Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relations between Church and State* (London, 1935), vol. 1, pp. 49–50.

¹⁶ *The Times*, 1 Nov. 1955.

identity from the Church of England, so they remained overseas branches of an Established Church until 1962. Even then, the Church bore the ungainly and ambivalent name of 'the Church of England in Australia' until 1982.

As Martyn Percy's chapter in this volume demonstrates, there were also close personal ties between political and clerical elites. In England, a number of senior Conservative politicians, many of them members of the Cecil family, were prominent in Church of England politics in the inter-war period. While senior English bishops were represented *ex officio* in the House of Lords, some Anglican clergy elsewhere held elected office; H. J. Cody, vicar of St Paul's, Toronto, and a leading Canadian evangelical, briefly served as minister of education in Ontario.¹⁷ Although many Anglican clergy were politically conservative, some also belonged to progressive networks. Paul Moore, bishop of New York in the 1970s and 1980s, was linked to prominent figures in the Democratic Party from his undergraduate days at Yale.¹⁸ Throughout the Anglican Communion, political and ecclesiastical elites became more meritocratic and distinct from one another in the later part of our period, but there was still some overlap between them, as demonstrated by the appointment of Justin Welby, the Old Etonian great-nephew of the Conservative statesman Rab Butler, as Anglican primate in 2011.

ANGLICANISM AND ENGLISHNESS

Although the ties between civil and ecclesiastical authority were remarkably resilient, this was not how it had seemed in 1910, when there were signs that the Anglican Church was disengaging from the British state and its imperial offshoots. This was symbolized by the removal of anti-Catholic clauses from the Accession Declaration made to Parliament by the new king, George V, in 1910, and the use of a less specifically Anglican, and more generically Protestant, wording. In the same year, a Royal Commission on Religion in Wales recommended the disestablishment of the Church of Wales, and the formation of a Liberal government with a mandate for constitutional reform finally removed the principal obstacle to it (though its implementation ended up being delayed by the First World War). The 1910 Edinburgh World Missionary Conference presaged what Andrew Porter has described as a new global missionary movement characterized by 'distance from and willingness to

¹⁷ William Katerberg, *Modernity and the Dilemma of North American Anglican Identities, 1880–1950* (Montreal, 2001), p. 182.

¹⁸ Geoffrey Kabaservice, *The Guardians: Kingman Brewster, His Circle and the Rise of the Liberal Establishment* (New York, 2004).

criticise Britain's imperial policy and colonial practice'.¹⁹ In the decades that followed 1910, further developments seemed to portend disengagement from the state. For some, the First World War led to a greater scepticism about Established Churches; the bellicose support of some senior clergy for the war was later judged to be distasteful, and Wilfred Owen wrote to his mother from the Somme that Christ's message of peace was 'a light which will never filter into the dogma of any national church'.²⁰ After the war there were legislative moves towards self-government in some parts of the Anglican Communion, such as the 1919 Enabling Act and the 1927 Indian Church Act, which withdrew government funding from the bishoprics of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay.

Before the First World War, the demands of some Anglicans for autonomy from the state seemed to be the key terrain on which the battle against state power was being conducted. In 1915 the political theorist Ernest Barker argued that Anglo-Catholics had replaced Nonconformists as the main voices challenging the state's pretensions.²¹ Barker was referring to the Mirfield monk and pluralist political theorist J. N. Figgis, whose *Churches in the Modern State* (1911) used the issue of state erosion of the rights of Churches to mount a wider critique of state sovereignty. The pluralist Harold Laski, himself a secular Jew, approved of Anglo-Catholic political thought because it represented 'the plea of the corporate body which is distinct from the state to a separate and free existence'.²² In Britain and Australia, Anglo-Catholic demands for autonomy over worship widened into campaigns for Church self-government. A measure of this was attained for England in the 1919 Enabling Act, but it was to take much longer in Australia, where opponents saw it as an erosion of imperial and Protestant identity.

One prominent Anglo-Catholic advocate of Church self-government, Charles Gore, began to argue during the debates about Welsh disestablishment that full English disestablishment might be necessary. Parliament's repeated rejection of the revised Prayer Book in 1927 and 1928 seemed to confirm this, and converted the maverick bishop of Durham, Hensley Henson, to disestablishment. But the outcome of the Prayer Book controversy was, unexpectedly, to strengthen support for a national Church. Although it had revealed the Church of England was still (in spite of self-government) under parliamentary control, it also revealed the degree to which the Prayer Book was seen as a symbol of national character by supporters and opponents of revision alike. This was true not just in England, but across the British Empire;

¹⁹ Andrew Porter, *Religion Versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion* (Manchester, 2004), p. 306.

²⁰ Quoted in Jon Stallworthy, *Wilfred Owen* (London, 1974), p. 185.

²¹ Ernest Barker, 'The Discredited State', in Barker, *Church, State and Study* (London, 1930), pp. 155–6.

²² Harold Laski, *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty* (New Haven, CT, 1917), p. 108.

although Prayer Book revision in the South African, Canadian, American, and Scottish Episcopal Churches passed with little controversy, it was much more contentious in the Church of England because the Book of Common Prayer was so tied up with national, and imperial, identity.²³ Australian Evangelicals in particular saw the revised Prayer Book as a warning that the Reformation was in peril in England.

The Prayer Book crisis also revealed little remaining enthusiasm for the disestablishment of the Church of England from Nonconformists. With some notable exceptions, Nonconformists were increasingly keen to project themselves as integral, rather than peripheral, to the English nation. Although reunion negotiations between the Free Churches and the Church of England at the end of the First World War had proved abortive, it is striking that the sticking point had been episcopacy and the sacraments, not disestablishment.²⁴ Welsh disestablishment had satisfied demands for disestablishment, and Nonconformists increasingly stressed their shared national identity with the Church of England. The acceptance by some Nonconformists of a national Church allowed the Church of England to project itself as representative of other denominations in the 1920s and 1930s. This role was evident in the National Days of Prayer, which began in their modern form in the First World War and continued until 1947. As Philip Williamson has argued, these national ceremonies, convened by the archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of other Churches, 'created a tacit alliance between the churches, the monarchy and the government which sustained the public role of religion, gave the Church of England a new position of leadership among the churches of the United Kingdom, and endorsed a non-sectarian form of public religion which had considerable ideological significance'.²⁵ The National Days of Prayer were also observed in the empire, furthering the identification of Anglicanism with imperial British identity.

In popular culture, and especially in the vast amount of inter-war writing about Englishness, the Church of England was often presented as embodying national character. The Anglican *via media* was presented as an example of the English genius for compromise and moderation. W. R. Inge, dean of St Paul's, wrote in 1926 that 'the spirit of compromise has guided the Church of England at all times. It has aimed at being the nation on its spiritual side, and has not thought it necessary to be more logical or consistent than the nation as a whole.'²⁶ The idea that Anglicanism and Englishness went together

²³ John Maiden, *National Religion and the Prayer Book Controversy, 1927–1928* (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 28, 37–8, 75–105.

²⁴ John Newton, 'Protestant Nonconformists and Ecumenism', in Alan P. F. Sell and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Protestant Nonconformity in the Twentieth Century* (Carlisle, 2003), pp. 362–4.

²⁵ Philip Williamson, 'National Days of Prayer: The Churches, the State and Public Worship in Britain, 1899–1957', *English Historical Review*, 128 (2013): 324–66 (p. 325).

²⁶ W. R. Inge, *England* (London, 1926), p. 75.

even appealed to non-believers who had a reverence for the King James Bible and the Prayer Book. George Orwell's biographer Bernard Crick pointed out that 'the language and liturgies of the church were part of the Englishness he felt so deeply'; though a non-believer, Orwell famously insisted on being buried according to the rites of the Church of England.²⁷ The elision of Anglicanism and Englishness was satirized by W. C. Sellar and R. J. Yeatman in their spoof history textbook, *1066 and All That* (1930), which claimed that, after the Anglo-Saxon invasion, 'the country was almost entirely inhabited by Saxons, and was therefore renamed England, and thus naturally soon became C of E. This was a GOOD THING.'²⁸

The rise of totalitarian regimes in continental Europe offered new justifications for a national Church as a counter to arbitrary state power. In rejecting disestablishment, the 1935 Church and State Report warned that 'if England, by disestablishment, should seem to be neutral in the fight between faith and unfaith in Christianity, that would be a calamity for our own people, and, indeed for the whole world'.²⁹ T. S. Eliot warned in 1939 that disestablishment would be an 'abdication' of the Church's responsibility to the nation, with 'incalculable' risks.³⁰

As Eliot's own poem *Little Gidding* (1942) showed, Anglican churches and cathedrals became particularly powerful symbols of Englishness during the Second World War. Images of them abounded in wartime paintings (John Piper), posters (Frank Newbould), and films such as Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger's *A Canterbury Tale* (1944).³¹ Most evocative of all was Herbert Mason's photograph, 'The Miracle of St Paul's', showing the cathedral intact amid the fires and smoke of the London Blitz on 29 December 1940, which became a powerful symbol of national resilience and providential deliverance.³² St Paul's had acquired the soubriquet 'the parish church of the British Empire', and the image had a resonance across the Anglican Communion and beyond.

Anglicanism was also closely associated with English identity in Australia for much of the twentieth century. A large number of Australian Anglican churches were dedicated to Anglo-Saxon saints, and Ruth Frappell has argued

²⁷ Bernard Crick, 'Eric Arthur Blair [pseud. George Orwell]', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31915?docPos=1>>, accessed 19 Aug. 2015.

²⁸ W. C. Sellar and R. J. Yeatman, *1066 and All That* (London, 1930), p. 6, original emphasis.

²⁹ *Church and State* (1935), vol. 1, p. 49.

³⁰ T. S. Eliot, *The Idea of a Christian Society* (London, 1939), pp. 48–9.

³¹ Matthew Grimley, 'The Religion of Englishness: Puritanism, Providentialism, and "National Character," 1918–1945', *Journal of British Studies*, 46 (2007): 884–906 (p. 884); Paul B. Rich, *Prospero's Return: Historical Essays on Race, Culture, and Society* (London, 1994), pp. 38–9.

³² Derek Keene, Arthur Burns, and Andrew Saint (eds.), *St. Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604–2004* (London, 2004), pp. 100, 334, 461.

that 'at a time when being Australian was synonymous with being British, the Church of England was widely perceived as a bastion of an *English* cultural heritage, just as Presbyterians were seen as synonymous with being Scottish or the Roman Catholic Church with being Irish'.³³ This identification was initially a boon to the Church, giving it what one Anglican observer in the 1950s called the 'advantage of being not merely a form of worship but a cultural lifeline', though he added that its downside was 'the lack of any clear idea of the essential nature of Anglicanism and of its role in Australian society'.³⁴ Different bishops projected different ideas of this role. At his enthronement as bishop of Goulburn in 1934, the Australian-born Ernest Burgmann said of the Church that 'the making of the Australian nation is her special task... she must become a focus where the best religious forces of the nation can meet and find articulation and expression'.³⁵ But Francis De Witt Batty, the English-born bishop of Newcastle, New South Wales, insisted to Burgmann in 1937 that British identity still trumped Australian: 'While I believe quite strongly in the Nationhood of Australia, I am inclined to think that it is our duty rather to emphasise the solidarity of the British race and the contribution which the British people as a whole can make to the world'.³⁶ There were attempts to align the Church with nascent Australian national identity, but these were frustrated by continuing disputes over churchmanship, and by a continuing deference (later dubbed the 'cultural cringe') towards Britain. Burgmann observed that 'the colonial mind clings to the Anglican Church in Australia more adhesively than to any other national institution'.³⁷

In England and (until the 1980s) Australia, Anglicans were the largest denomination, but in the non-English nations of the British Isles, where Anglicans were a minority, some espoused resurgent Celtic nationalisms, while others were more detached. Disestablishment enabled Welsh Anglicans to embrace Welsh language and culture, and, in the later celebrated case of the poet and clergyman R. S. Thomas, a fervent anti-Englishness. In Southern Ireland, where nationalism was so firmly identified with Catholicism, Anglicans had a more angular attitude to nationalism. Robert Tobin has demonstrated how Anglican intellectuals like Hubert Butler maintained a critical, liberal voice in Ireland after 1922, which grew gradually louder at

³³ Frappell, 'Imperial Fervour and Anglican Loyalty', p. 93.

³⁴ Leicester Webb, *The Conciliar Element in the Anglican Tradition* (Canberra, 1957), pp. 2, 20.

³⁵ *Southern Churchman*, June 1934, p. 3, quoted in Ian Breward, *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (Oxford, 2001), p. 272.

³⁶ Quoted in Brian Fletcher, 'Anglicanism and the Shaping of Australian Society', in Kaye and others, *Anglicanism in Australia*, p. 308.

³⁷ Ernest Burgmann, 'An Australian Catholic Church', *Anglican Review*, 4 (May 1954), quoted in Fletcher, 'Anglicanism and Nationalism in Australia', pp. 232–3.

the end of the twentieth century, as the political authority of the Catholic Church diminished.³⁸

ANGLICANISM AND THE WELFARE STATE

Three nineteenth-century traditions—the Arnoldian idea of the national Church as an agent of social reform, the incarnational theology of Gore and Scott Holland, and the British idealism of T. H. Green—continued to shape Anglican thought about national community and the state in the first decades of the twentieth century, and offered ways of responding to the economic problems of the inter-war period. The most influential Anglican social theorist (across the whole Anglican Communion, not just in England) was William Temple, who was archbishop of York (1929–42) and archbishop of Canterbury (1942–4). Temple invoked national community against the sectionalism of governments, big business, and the trade union movement. His ideas were taken up by Australian Christian socialists like Ernest Burgmann, culminating in the Christian Social Order Movement, which flourished from 1943 to 1951.³⁹ Incarnationalist social thought was less influential in Canada, where Methodists or Presbyterians took more of a lead in the Social Gospel movement than Anglicans.⁴⁰

Temple was the first person to use the phrase ‘welfare state’ in English, as early as 1928, and his wartime Penguin Special *Christianity and Social Order* (1942) offered a series of proposals for post-war reconstruction.⁴¹ Temple died too early to see the welfare state’s introduction in the later 1940s, but other Anglican bishops broadly supported it. The 1948 Lambeth Conference resolved that ‘we believe that the State is under the moral law of God, and is intended by Him to be an instrument for human welfare. We therefore welcome the growing concern and care of the modern State for its citizens, and call upon Church members to accept its officers in their work.’ But mindful of the Communist takeover of Eastern Europe as well as Nazi Germany, the resolution also lamented ‘a tendency of the state to encroach on the freedom of individuals and voluntary associations’ and its encyclical

³⁸ Robert Tobin, *The Minority Voice: Hubert Butler and Southern Irish Protestantism, 1900–1991* (Oxford, 2012).

³⁹ Joan Mansfield, ‘The Social Gospel and the Church of England in New South Wales in the 1930s’, *Journal of Religious History*, 13 (1985): 411–33; Mansfield, ‘The Christian Social Order Movement, 1943–1951’, *Journal of Religious History*, 15 (1988): 109–27.

⁴⁰ Richard Allen, *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada 1914–1928* (Toronto, 1971), p. 6.

⁴¹ William Temple, *Christianity and the State* (London, 1928), pp. 169–70.

warned that 'there must be constant endeavour to resist encroachments by the state which endanger human personality'.⁴²

As the Lambeth encyclical suggested, the welfare state potentially threatened the traditional welfare role of the Church in those parts of the Anglican Communion where it was introduced. W. H. Vanstone, a priest in Northern England in the 1950s, recalled clergy fears that the social role of the Churches 'would soon be anticipated and made obsolete by the almost automatic response of some agency of the state to any need or difficulty that might arise'.⁴³ But in fact, the welfare state was never comprehensive or effective enough to render Church provision otiose. In England, the Church actually consolidated its role as a provider of education by resolving the long-running issue of the funding of its schools, and by securing a daily act of worship in all schools.⁴⁴ The heyday of welfare states was also short-lived in several Commonwealth countries. From the 1980s onwards, the reduction of welfare provision by governments in both Britain and Australia left a renewed need for Anglican welfare agencies, which assumed the umbrella name 'Anglicare' in Australia from 1997.

ANGLICANISM AND THE IMPERIAL STATE

A belief in the providential role of Britain and its empire remained pervasive in the first half of the twentieth century, in Britain and across the colonies and dominions. At its most extreme, this manifested itself in the continuing membership by some Anglican Evangelicals of the British Israelite movement, which held that the British were descendants of the lost tribes of Israel, and which was associated with die-hard opposition to Indian self-government. More intellectually respectable was a belief that the gradual development and preparation of colonies for self-government was providentially ordained. This was advanced by the imperial publicist Lionel Curtis, and by his friend William Temple, who argued in 1926 that the empire was 'fashioned in the providence of God for the fulfilment of his purpose... to educate the less politically developed peoples to an even further participation in their own government, until they are able to take a complete charge of it'.⁴⁵ The Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, used a similar argument in an Empire Day speech in May 1929, calling the British Empire 'less... a human achievement... than

⁴² *The Lambeth Conference 1948: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops; together with the Resolutions and Reports*, pp. 32, 20–1.

⁴³ W. H. Vanstone, *Love's Endeavour, Love's Expense* (London, 1977), p. 221.

⁴⁴ S. J. D. Green, *The Passing of Protestant England: Secularisation and Social Change, c.1920–1960* (Cambridge, 2011), ch. 6.

⁴⁵ William Temple, 'Christianity and the Empire', *The Pilgrim*, 6 (1926): 447–57.

an instrument of Divine Providence for the promotion of the progress of mankind', and describing the Simon Commission on Indian self-governance as acting 'under providence'.⁴⁶ For Canadian Anglicans in the early twentieth century, providential interpretations of empire were not inconsistent with Canadian nationalism; William Westfall has argued that they saw the rising Canadian nation state as part of the wider providential project of empire.⁴⁷

As long as the British Empire was expanding and winning wars, Providence remained a compelling explanation for its success. In his broadcast on D-Day, King George VI told his listeners that 'tested as never before, in God's providence we survived the test' of 1940, adding that 'we dare to believe that God has used our nation and Empire as an instrument for fulfilling his divine purpose'.⁴⁸ But as the empire began its post-war contraction, appeals to Providence lost conviction. The last National Day of Prayer in Britain was held in 1947, at the time of the loss of India and the dollar crisis. At the service in St Paul's, the dean, W. R. Matthews, tried to cheer up the king and congregation by telling them that 'we must resist the temptation to become disheartened and careless and to despair amid our difficulties... God has a place for our nation and commonwealth in bringing peace, order and justice into human life'.⁴⁹ But Matthews was whistling to keep his listeners' spirits up. The government rejected a proposal for another Day of Prayer following the embarrassing Suez campaign in 1956.⁵⁰

The belief in the providential role of empire meant that it was sometimes difficult for missionaries to find ways to criticize the state. David Maxwell has argued that British Protestant missionaries in general 'lacked a theology of the State to help them engage with politics, apart from a simplistic recognition of the secular authority of the state grounded on Romans 13', and that after the Treaty of Versailles, 'despite their increasing democratic sensibilities, missionaries became a pillar of colonial rule'. As Maxwell and others have pointed out, there were notable Anglican exceptions.⁵¹ Some Anglo-Catholic members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel eschewed entanglement in the colonial state. C. F. Andrews renounced imperialism (and his priesthood) and espoused Indian nationalism, while Arthur Shearly Cripps refused to accept state funding for his mission schools in Southern Rhodesia. A number of Anglicans, including the Anglo-Catholic bishop Frank Weston and the moderate Evangelical W. E. Owen, successfully campaigned against a 1919 government circular in Kenya that permitted forced labour. Like many of his

⁴⁶ Stanley Baldwin, *This Torch of Freedom* (London, 1935), pp. 26–8.

⁴⁷ Westfall, 'Constructing Public Religions at Private Sites', p. 42.

⁴⁸ *King George VI to his Peoples, 1936–1951: Selected Broadcasts and Speeches* (London, 1952), p. 38.

⁴⁹ *The Times*, 7 July 1947, p. 8.

⁵⁰ Williamson, 'National Days of Prayer', p. 359.

⁵¹ David Maxwell, 'Decolonisation', in Norman Etherington (ed.), *Missions and Empire* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 285–306 (pp. 289–91).

contemporaries, though, Owen still believed in empire as a form of trusteeship, which had brought advancement to Africa.

It was not until they experienced the decline of imperial power in the 1940s and 1950s, and the extreme forms of nationalism or Communism that replaced it, that Anglican missionaries began to question fundamental assumptions about the relationships between Church and state. After the new Chinese Communist regime expelled missionaries, for example, David Paton called for a 'more critically independent' attitude to relations with the state.⁵² John V. Taylor's experience in 1950s Africa led him to conclude that 'colonial power, however idealistic, is essentially one of those things which go bad'.⁵³ Above all, the introduction of apartheid in South Africa prompted Anglicans to criticize the exclusivity of nationalism, and also to challenge the ethnocentric assumptions of their own Church. 'There is no reason why our Anglican Church should always retain its English colour,' Geoffrey Clayton, archbishop of Cape Town, told the Provincial Synod of Southern Africa in 1950: 'Most of us naturally value English culture; but the Church does not exist to disseminate English culture. The Church exists for the proclamation of the Gospel and there is no special English Gospel for English-speaking people.' By 1953, Clayton had widened his critique to include other sorts of nationalism:

There is and can be nothing final about nationalism in itself. In this country, whether it be the nationalism of isolationist Europeans, or the nationalism of those who would build an England beyond the seas, or whether it be the Bantu nationalism; all these things are merely an enlarged tribalism. There can be nothing final about them. But there is something final about Christ.⁵⁴

Clayton had initially opposed the resistance to government of other Anglican clergy like Michael Scott and Trevor Huddleston, but eventually himself sanctioned civil disobedience against apartheid; his death in 1957 came a day after he had signed a letter on behalf of the South African bishops to their prime minister indicating that they would refuse to obey a law restricting freedom of movement for non-whites.

Huddleston also criticized the unthinking nationalism of the British, warning in his 1956 book, *Naught for Your Comfort*, that 'there is no purpose in a loyalty either to Queen or Commonwealth if neither meets your life at any point. There is a fearful cynicism about the catchphrases "free association of free people," "constitutional sovereignty," and the like when you are trying to explain to an intelligent African boy why he cannot hold a British passport nor

⁵² David M. Paton, *Christian Missions and the Judgement of God* (London, 1953), p. 23.

⁵³ John V. Taylor, *Christianity and Politics in Africa* (London, 1957), p. 94.

⁵⁴ Geoffrey Clayton, speech to Provincial Synod, 1950, in *Where we Stand: Archbishop Clayton's Charges, 1948-57, chiefly relating to Church and State in South Africa* (Cape Town, 1960), pp. 12, 28; this discussion draws partly on Sachs, *Transformation of Anglicanism*, pp. 315-17.

move out of the country to complete his education.’ Huddleston’s objection to apartheid as an abuse of state power recalled the arguments of his fellow member of the Community of the Resurrection, J. N. Figgis. ‘As a Christian, I cannot believe either in the right or in the possibility of a Government (particularly when that government is a minority group in its own country) directing and planning the destiny of a whole people and enforcing a pattern of life upon them for all their future years.’⁵⁵ Huddleston’s book was a best-seller, and ensured that his arguments against arbitrary state power found an audience outside South Africa.

BACKLASH AND ADAPTATION

As the 1968 Lambeth Conference demonstrated, critical attitudes to the nation state had become more widespread by the later 1960s. A conference resolution cited approvingly the World Council of Churches’ recent statement that ‘racism is a blatant denial of the Christian faith’, and an accompanying report argued that the Church’s identification with nations had been a stumbling-block in the past. ‘The Church must exhibit its true character as a supra-national society whose members can experience within the context of their own nation a wider spiritual unity.’ ‘This will involve self-criticism, for while the Church must speak, it would speak more effectively in favour of international justice and order were it united and able to free itself entirely from narrow nationalism.’ In the past, the report said, ‘we have been too much identified with our national situation to give any prophetic witness to our own people’, instead urging that ‘the Church must act more explicitly as a universal body concerned for mankind as a whole’.⁵⁶

This more distant and critical attitude to nation states was prompted not just by apartheid, but by other recent developments including the civil rights movement, and protests against Vietnam and nuclear weapons. In Western societies, there was a more iconoclastic attitude to authority of all sorts, ecclesiastical and civil; the ecclesiastical term ‘establishment’ was broadened by British satirists to denote, and lampoon, the ruling classes in general. Some radical Anglicans began to argue that the Church should ally itself with protest movements, and that its future would be as a counter-cultural movement in a secular modern society.

In the half-century from Suez to Iraq and Afghanistan, wars and military interventions became more contentious than the two world wars had been,

⁵⁵ Trevor Huddleston, *Naught for Your Comfort* (London, 1956), pp. 156, 242–3.

⁵⁶ *The 1968 Lambeth Conference: Resolutions and Reports* (London and New York, 1968), pp. 78–9.

with divisions in the Church of England over nuclear weapons, and in PECUSA and the Australian Church over Vietnam. Preaching in front of Lyndon Johnson in 1967, Cotesworth Pinkney Lewis, a parish priest from Williamsburg, Virginia, criticized his president's Vietnam policy, arguing that the war had forced loyal citizens like him to re-evaluate their relations to the state:

Relatively few of us plan even the mildest form of disloyal action against constituted authority. 'United we stand, divided we fall.' We know the necessity of supporting our leader. But we cannot close our Christian consciences to consideration of the rightness of actions as they are reported to us... We are appalled that apparently this is the only war in our history which has had three times as many civilian as military casualties. It is particularly regrettable that to so many nations the struggle's purpose appears as neo-colonialism.⁵⁷

Opposition to war and racism led some Anglicans in Britain and the United States to civil disobedience. Some Episcopalian clergy took part in civil disobedience in support of civil rights. In Britain, some Anglicans broke the law in opposing nuclear weapons. Michael Scott, who had by now been expelled from South Africa, served two prison sentences in Britain in the 1960s for his involvement in direct action by the anti-nuclear Committee of 100, of which he was vice-president.

By the 1960s, then, decolonization, anti-racism, and the peace movement all seemed to represent a reaction against nationalism among Western Anglicans. But as after the First World War, national perspectives proved to be more durable than expected, and Anglican internationalism often again turned out to be bound up with inherited nationalist assumptions. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, for example, founded in 1958 in John Collins's canon's house at St Paul's Cathedral, was premised on what has been called 'a strange form of inverted nationalism'—the belief that the world would be bound to listen if a great power like Britain unilaterally renounced its nuclear weapons.⁵⁸ The consecration of the new Coventry Cathedral in 1962 also demonstrated how internationalism coexisted with, rather than replaced, national identities. After its bombing in 1940, Coventry Cathedral had been celebrated for its ministry of reconciliation, and its association with anti-militarism was emphasized by the premiere of Benjamin Britten's *War Requiem* as part of its consecration celebrations. But even here, the national and the military were still present. The consecration service was attended by the queen and large numbers of foreign diplomats, and days before it, the 79-foot manganese bronze fleche had been lowered into place on the cathedral roof by a Royal

⁵⁷ Quoted in John Booty, *The Episcopal Church in Crisis* (Cambridge, MA, 1988), p. 76.

⁵⁸ Christopher Driver, *The Disarmers: A Study in Protest* (London, 1964), p. 200.

Air Force helicopter. In Coventry, as elsewhere, the Church still sometimes needed the state's help to put its sacred canopy in place.

What happened in several parts of the Anglican Communion from the 1960s onwards was not that Anglican Churches moved away from national identity, but that they redefined and broadened their definition of national identity to include groups that had hitherto been excluded. Brian Fletcher has detailed how, in Australia, 'originally male and white-dominated, national identity was widened to accommodate changing attitudes to race, ethnicity and gender', and how the Church 'brought itself into line with the more inclusive variety of nationalism'.⁵⁹ Anglican bishops like J. S. Moyes of Armidale protested against the White Australia immigration policy. In Britain and the United States, Anglicans also redefined national community to incorporate non-white people. Inaugurating the 1967 General Convention Special Program, which offered funding to black organizations, Presiding Bishop John Hines called upon Episcopalians to take their place 'alongside the dispossessed and oppressed peoples of the country for the healing of our national life'.⁶⁰ In Britain, Archbishop Michael Ramsey condemned successive governments' restrictions on immigration in the 1960s, serving as chair of the National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants, his anti-racist stance singled out for criticism by the maverick Conservative Enoch Powell in his 1968 'Rivers of Blood' speech.⁶¹

Progressive Anglicans like Ramsey also used their established status to advocate legal reforms of personal morality, again espousing a more tolerant and inclusive idea of the nation. Implicit in its reports favouring limited reform of the criminal law on abortion, suicide, divorce, and homosexuality in the 1950s and 1960s was the assumption that the Church of England still guided the nation on moral questions. The report on *The Problem of Homosexuality* (1954) influenced the later arguments of the Wolfenden Report (1957), and the support of Michael Ramsey in the House of Lords debate helped to secure the eventual passage of homosexual law reform in 1967. Those Anglicans who supported homosexual law reform were in some ways promoting a separation of Church and state (by separating the criminal law from Christian teaching), but their campaign was itself also testimony to their continuing belief in the Church's role as a form of national conscience. Some senior Anglicans in Australia and New Zealand took their cue from their English counterparts and offered their own cautious support for homosexual

⁵⁹ Fletcher, 'Anglicanism and the Shaping of Australian Society', in Kaye and others, *Anglicanism in Australia*, p. 313.

⁶⁰ Quoted in David Hein and Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr, *The Episcopalians* (Westport, CT, 2004), p. 135.

⁶¹ Matthew Grimley, 'The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism, 1962–2012', in Jane Garnett and Alana Harris (eds.), *Rescripting Religion in the City: Migration and Religious Identity in the Modern Metropolis* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 207–21.

law reform.⁶² Opponents of permissiveness invoked a different, more morally cohesive, vision of the nation. The Nationwide Festival of Light, founded first in Britain (1971), and then in Australia (1973), sought to counter permissiveness with an uneasy mix of counter-cultural happenings like protest marches and pop festivals and traditional Evangelical warnings of a nation under divine judgement.⁶³ Ramsey's more evangelical successor, Donald Coggan, issued a 'Call to the Nation' for moral regeneration in 1975.

The arguments between the Church of England and the Thatcher governments of the 1980s were partly arguments about the proper role of the national Church. Though he had supported the 1982 Falklands War, Archbishop Robert Runcie pointedly enjoined reconciliation at the service in St Paul's Cathedral that followed it, warning the congregation, which included Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, that 'those who interpret God's will must never claim he is an asset for one nation or group rather than another'.⁶⁴ John Habgood, archbishop of York, argued that 'only the Church of England could have insisted on counter-balancing the nationalistic thrust of the Falklands celebrations, precisely because of its relationship with the nation'.⁶⁵ The 1985 *Faith in the City* report, which criticized the effects on the urban poor of Thatcherism, was subtitled 'A Call for Action by Church and Nation', recalling nineteenth-century (and earlier) Anglican appeals to the nation.⁶⁶ Thatcher's objection to the Church of England, though, was that it was offering the nation moral guidance on the wrong subjects. Her famous remark in 1987 that 'there's no such thing as society' occurred in an interview in which she attacked the Churches (and by implication the Established Church in particular) for not being 'forthright' enough in enjoining high standards of personal behaviour during the AIDS crisis.⁶⁷ Herself a Methodist turned Anglican (and thus a representative of the rapprochement of Nonconformity and national Church described earlier in this chapter), Thatcher had a vision of the role of a national Church that was very different from that of many senior clergy.

⁶² Laurie Guy, 'Between a Hard Rock and Shifting Sands: Churches and the Issue of Homosexuality in New Zealand 1960–1986', *Journal of Religious History*, 30 (2006): 61–76.

⁶³ Matthew Grimley, 'Anglican Evangelicals and Anti-Permissiveness: The Nationwide Festival of Light, 1971–1983', in Andrew Atherstone and John Maiden (eds.), *Evangelicalism and the Church of England in the Twentieth Century: Reform, Resistance and Renewal* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 183–205; David Hilliard, 'Sydney Anglicans and Homosexuality', *Journal of Homosexuality*, 33 (1997): 101–23.

⁶⁴ *The Times*, 27 July 1982, p. 12, quoted in John Wolffe, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland, 1843–1945* (London, 1994), p. 264.

⁶⁵ John Habgood, *Church and Nation in a Secular Age* (London, 1983), p. 110.

⁶⁶ Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas, *Faith in the City: A Call for Action by Church and Nation* (London, 1985).

⁶⁷ Transcript of interview with *Woman's Own*, 23 Sept. 1987 (<<http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106689>>, accessed 19 Aug. 2015).

Multi-culturalism meant different things in those countries (especially Britain, Australia, and Canada) where it was implemented, and had different implications for Anglicans. But in Britain, it unexpectedly produced a new justification for establishment, that the Church of England was a defender of *all* faiths.⁶⁸ From the 1989 Rushdie Affair onwards, some Muslims began to welcome the idea of an Established Church as a defender of all religions. David Feldman has argued that the British variant of multi-culturalism was in part a continuation of nineteenth-century governments' approach to religious diversity, which sought to shore up the privileges of the Established Church by extending them to other denominations. The Blair governments' policy of funding Muslim schools was thus a logical extension of the funding of Catholic and Jewish schools. Feldman argues that the paradoxical effect has been that contemporary multi-culturalism 'buttresses the position of an otherwise beleaguered Anglican establishment'.⁶⁹ Even the queen argued that the Church of England existed to represent other faiths in a speech to multi-faith leaders at Lambeth Palace to mark her Diamond Jubilee in 2012. 'The concept of our established Church is occasionally misunderstood and, I believe, commonly under-appreciated,' she said. 'Its role is *not* to defend Anglicanism to the exclusion of other religions. Instead, the Church has a duty to protect the free practice of all faiths in this country.'⁷⁰

CONCLUSION

By 1939, Bishop Hensley Henson confidently proclaimed that 'the day of nationalism is over ... it follows that the epoch of national churches is now closed'.⁷¹ Henson was wrong about nationalism and national Churches, both of which survived, in attenuated form, the massive changes that ensued over the next seventy-five years—the Second World War, the end of the British Empire, welfare states, the Cold War, European integration, civil rights, and multi-culturalism. Though the concepts of nation, state, and empire were contested, with different resonances and meanings in different times and

⁶⁸ S. J. D. Green, 'Survival and Autonomy: On the Strange Fortunes and Peculiar Legacy of Ecclesiastical Establishment in the Modern British State, c.1920 to the Present Day', in S. J. D. Green and R. C. Whiting (eds.), *The Boundaries of the State in Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 319–24.

⁶⁹ David Feldman, 'Why the English like Turbans: Multicultural Politics in British History', in David Feldman and Jon Lawrence (eds.), *Structures and Transformations in Modern British History* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 281–302 (pp. 300–1).

⁷⁰ Queen Elizabeth II, speech at Lambeth Palace, 15 Feb. 2012 (<<http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/2358/the-queen-attends-multi-faith-reception-at-lambeth-palace>>, accessed 19 Aug. 2015).

⁷¹ Herbert Hensley Henson, *The Church of England* (Cambridge, 1939), p. 256.

places, each remained central to Anglican vocabulary and debate, even when that debate was ostensibly about something else. Arguments about personal morality, for example, sometimes invoked the nation or the empire. This remained true at the turn of the twenty-first century; in the debates about homosexuality which raged following the 1998 Lambeth Conference, conservative Evangelicals from former colonies often accused British and American liberals of colonial condescension. The shadows cast over Anglicanism by national flags were long ones indeed.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brewitt-Taylor, Sam, 'The Invention of a "Secular Society"? Christianity and the Sudden Appearance of Secularization Discourses in the British National Media, 1961–4', *Twentieth Century British History*, 24 (2013): 327–50.
- Christie, Nancy and Michael Gauvreau, *A Full-Orbed Christianity: The Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada, 1900–1940* (Montreal, 1996).
- Fletcher, Brian H., 'Anglicanism and Nationalism in Australia 1901–1962', *Journal of Religious History*, 23 (1999): 215–33.
- Green, S. J. D. and R. C. Whiting (eds.), *The Boundaries of the State in Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Grimley, Matthew, *Citizenship, Community and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (Oxford, 2004).
- Grimley, Matthew, 'The Church and the Bomb: Anglicans and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, c.1958–1984', in Stephen G. Parker and Tom Lawson (eds.), *God and War: The Church of England and Armed Conflict in the Twentieth Century* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 147–64.
- Habgood, John, *Church and Nation in a Secular Age* (London, 1983).
- Katerberg, William, *Modernity and the Dilemma of North American Anglican Identities, 1880–1950* (Montreal, 2001).
- Maiden, John, *National Religion and the Prayer Book Controversy, 1927–1928* (Woodbridge, 2009).
- Modood, Tariq, 'Establishment, Multiculturalism and British Citizenship', *Political Quarterly*, 65 (1994): 53–73.
- Morgan, Kenneth O., *Freedom or Sacrilege? A History of the Campaign for Welsh Disestablishment* (Penarth, 1965).
- Van Die, Marguerite (ed.), *Religion and Public Life in Canada* (Toronto, 2001).
- Wolffe, John, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland, 1843–1945* (London, 1994).

Sociology and Anglicanism in the Twentieth Century

Class, Ethnicity, and Education

Martyn Percy

Every generation of Christians lives in ‘modern’ times. Every era and epoch in the life of a denomination is partly formed through a reciprocal relationship with a social context, leading to a trinity of resonance, relevance, and relativism. Christianity is inescapably social; it mutates within society as much as it also transforms it.

Any sociology of Western Anglicanism in the twentieth century has to be set within the context of the emerging factors that were to affect all denominations throughout the developed world. The primary narrative for the majority of the twentieth century was that of secularization. Secularization was not a fact, *per se*. It was, rather, a social construction of reality that appeared to give a helpful explanation for understanding society and individuals, presuming that the more technological and industrialized societies became the less religious people would become. Data, behaviour patterns, and other indices in the developed world appeared to confirm this.

Though the twentieth century had begun as an age of cautious optimism for Christians in Britain, the aspirations of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910—the ‘evangelization of the world in this generation’—were not met. Yet as the century closed, the singularity of the secularization narrative remained far from convincing. The developed world still maintained some sense of public space for the contributions made by national Churches. Globalism, pluralism, consumerism, and migration had all increased religion’s salience. New religious movements, forms of fundamentalism, and newer effervescent expressions of faith, including Pentecostalism and Evangelicalism, also pointed to a resurgence of interest in spirituality and religion.

If the developed world in the twentieth century did witness any shift in relation to religion, it was arguably twofold. First, there was a steady decrease in the numbers who chose to identify as regular church-goers. Despite the fact that the calendars, seasons, and festivals meant that common social existence still had a Christian shape, many chose not to belong to a Church, even if they self-identified as spiritual (i.e. believing without belonging).¹ Nonetheless, many Europeans still returned to their Churches at liminal moments of celebration or grief. Second, for those still actively church-going, faith came to be understood more as a commodity than a utility, chosen rather than inherited. Increasingly, individuals operated with a model of choice, rather than duty. There was, admittedly, nothing new about the exercise of choice in relation to religion. But what was arguably different about the twentieth century—through the rise of consumerism, globalization, and access to information—was the range of choice available, and the power of the consumer to choose. In all of this, it should be remembered that European patterns of religious life were exceptional: religion flourished in North America or South Korea, for example, and in the developing world Christianity grew at an unparalleled rate.

Generally, Anglicanism replicated similar sociological patterns to those experienced by other Protestant denominations, such as Methodism or Presbyterianism. Numbers of Churches and adherents grew significantly in the developing world. In the developed world, numbers of adherents steadily depleted, though the Churches remained highly visible, with resilient public presence and attendant ministries. The denominations were both renewed and challenged by Evangelicalism and charismatic renewal. Other movements contributing to the reconfiguration of denominations were neo-conservative in character (on sexuality or gender, for example), which caused some Churches to realign. Increasing migration—leading to a richer, more diverse ethnicity in society and Churches—and greater economic prosperity also meant that constructs of class and ethnicity were rather different at the close of the twentieth century than at its beginning. The ‘capitalist’ class was transformed into the ‘managerial’ class. Ministry in the developed world, and the emerging training and education that shaped individuals as ministers, increasingly focused on management.

This was undoubtedly a sociological shift. Reminiscing in his last public lecture—entitled ‘Humanity, Holiness and Humour’—in 1995 the theologian Christopher Evans described his initial discernment process for ordination. Evans was directed to Lincoln Theological College to pursue his training, but was clearly perturbed that at an interview with his theological teacher, Edward Hoskyns, Evans’s friend was directed elsewhere: ‘Now your friend,’ he

¹ Cf. G. Davie, *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without Belonging* (Oxford, 1994).

(Hoskyns) continued, 'I have advised to go to Cuddesdon. After all, Cuddesdon is for gentlemen.'² The mere mention of 'gentlemen' as a category of person particularly suited for ordained ministry would puzzle most modern commentators. Yet it was out of this 'class' of gentlemen that the eighteenth century produced significant numbers of Church of England clergy who served as parish priests.

In the twentieth century, however, it was the emergent middle class that tended to produce clergy, even though the latter part of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first centuries saw a significant decline in England in clergy drawn from public school backgrounds.³ Class, wealth, aspiration, and other factors continued to play a part in the gradual broadening of the social make-up of clergy in British Anglicanism, as they did in the evolution of seminaries in the wider Anglican Communion. The Bishop Payne Divinity School, for example, was founded in Petersburg, Virginia, in 1878, to train African Americans for ministry in the Episcopal Church of the United States. When it closed in 1949 and merged with Virginia Theological Seminary, the latter institution inherited its records and its heritage. The merger led to a richer culture of formation and training; hymnody changed, and new commemorations and events were celebrated. The post-war racial tensions in the United States were also replicated in South Africa during the apartheid regime. St Bede's College, Mthatha, South Africa, existed to prepare black ordinands to serve in Transkei, Zululand, and on South African farms. The constitution of St Paul's College, Grahamstown, contained a clause restricting students to 'Europeans' for some years, although two bishops did send black students to St Paul's in the 1960s. St Paul's appointed a black chaplain in 1973, with the first 'coloured' students entering the college as students in 1976, and the first black African students in 1978. St Bede's and St Paul's eventually merged to form the College of the Transfiguration.

In New Zealand, the separate formational seminaries that had catered for Polynesian, European-descent (Pākehā), and Māori students came together as a single college, following the Reeves-Beck report of 2010. A Principal (or *Manukura*) was placed in overall executive charge of the new St John's College, Auckland, with three deans—one for each *Tikanga* (or cultural/ethnic identity) of the Church. Thus some ethnic streaming for training, education, and formation remained. The Pākehā students (but also including Melanesians, Chinese, Indian, Fijians, and other Asians), Māori students (including ethnic Pākehā), and Polynesian students comprised a rich ethnic group of seminarians, who trained both together and apart.

² Christopher Evans, in personal conversation with the author.

³ R. Reiss, *The Testing of Vocation: 100 Years of Ministry Selection in the Church of England* (London, 2013).

In the Church of England, numerous schemes sought to extend and shape theological training for ethnic groups and the working class. The Simon of Cyrene Institute in London was augmented in the 1980s (later merging with the Queen's Foundation, Birmingham) to encourage more ethnic minority vocations to ordained ministry. Initiatives such as Industrial Mission sought to connect the cares and concerns of the working class with the mission and ministry of the Church. Reports such as *Faith in the City* (1985) set out to 'examine the strengths, insights, problems and needs of the Church's life and mission in Urban Priority Areas and, as a result, to reflect on the challenge which God may be making to Church and nation: and to make recommendations to appropriate bodies', making over sixty recommendations concerning levels of unemployment, overcrowding, deprivation, and racial discrimination, as well as issues of clergy provision and training.⁴

In each of these examples, Anglican Churches sought to address specific issues of ethnicity and class, and in turn the need for greater clerical diversity. This was not a neat or sequential history, however. Anglicanism—even in the Western (or developed) world—evolved a broad range of responses in relation to cultural change. Attention to the sociology of Anglicanism is therefore vital to gaining some comprehension of the different types of ecclesial and theological formation that emerged in the twentieth century.

So what of class and ethnicity? Weber was clear that class was not a specific 'entity' with a 'membership'. According to Giddens, the distinction between so-called 'mass' and 'elite' society is part of the social construction of reality, an interpretative rather than descriptive perspective.⁵ Great care may need to be taken in using class-based distinctions. That said, many sociologists have found it helpful to delineate societies through the distribution of power and the control of resources (capitalism) through class. Thus, Frank Parkin, Pitrim Sorokin, and Talcott Parsons speak easily of the distinction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the transformation of the capitalist class into the managerial class, and the identification of vested interests in ownership.⁶ Class analysis is a theory of relations and interconnections, with the potential to explain social mobility, and to define the difference between 'public issues' and (shared) 'personal troubles'.⁷ This of course helps to explain why

⁴ Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas, *Faith in the City: A Call for Action by Church and Nation* (London, 1985).

⁵ A. Giddens, *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies* (London, 1980 edn.), p. 106.

⁶ F. Parkin, *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique* (London, 1979), pp. 45–6; P. Sorokin, 'What is a Social Class?' in R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification* (London, 1954), p. 90; T. Parsons, 'A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification', in Bendix and Lipset (eds.), *Class, Status and Power*, p. 122.

⁷ J. H. Goldthorpe and G. Marshall, 'The Promising Future of Class Analysis: A Response to Recent Critiques', *Sociology*, 26 (1992): 381–400 (p. 382).

Churches, speaking on issues such as poverty, encountered a mixed reception in the media. The complex reaction of the media to *Faith in the City* (1985) was not merely ideological (the report dubbed 'Marxist' by one politician), but also sociological, touching on the distinction between the personal and the public.

Ethnicity, in contrast, is a less contentious concept. Weber saw that ethnic groups were those that entertained 'a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or of both, or because of memories of colonization and migration'.⁸ As John Wilson argued in *Religion in American Society*, 'likeness' and 'commonality' consolidate a sense of identity, as do feelings of community, the sense of association, tribalism, and common religion, suggesting primordial ties.⁹ In wider society, this has enabled the very idea of ethnicity to surface as an explanation for difference (in religion, language, or customs), which in turn consolidates the identity of a group around real or imagined narratives of common origin and culture.¹⁰ Accepting this interpretative lens may help to account for the shaping of Anglican ordination training in New Zealand in relation to ethnicity (that is, integrated, yet separate), and at the same time illuminate why other provinces of the Communion (for example, the United States) have evolved differently.

SOCIOLOGY AND THE SHAPING OF ANGLICAN ECCLESIOLOGY

Sociologists study religion for two major reasons. First, religion is important and constitutive to the lives of many individuals; it shapes how they think, what they believe, and why they behave as they do. Second, the people and communities who hold religious values are significant actors within society; a religion has a dynamic impact upon society, and in turn is shaped by it. Sociology is concerned with the social dimensions of change and continuity; religion is an inescapable dimension of these social dimensions.

The social dynamics of change and continuity are an important component in comprehending how Churches are shaped by contemporary culture. The volume of recent commentary on religion in Britain and the well-being of the

⁸ M. Weber, *Economy and Society*, vol. 1 (new edn., New York, 1968), p. 389.

⁹ J. Wilson, *Religion in American Society: The Effective Presence* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1978), p. 309.

¹⁰ J. Milton Yinger, 'Ethnicity in Complex Societies: Structural, Cultural, and Characterological Factors', in Lewis A. Coser and Otto N. Larsen (eds.), *The Uses of Controversy in Sociology* (New York, 1976), pp. 197–216 (pp. 200–2).

Churches in relation to social change is equally instructive. David Hare's play *Racing Demon* (1990) focused on the Church of England, especially the rapid changes in urban ministry. Hare offered rich sociological sketches of class, ethnicity, and poverty through the parishes and clergy with which the play was concerned, conveying a tone of panic in a Church looking to maintain its position in society, but uncertain if this was best achieved through conservatism or through progressivism. Many of the clerical characters in the play seemed confused by the world in which they ministered, despite their passionate convictions.

In some respects, *Racing Demon* reflected issues highlighted in a number of academic studies of the modern Church of England. Books by Lloyd, Welsby, Martin, and Wilkinson narrated a Church disturbed by the new contexts of late modernity, but remaining essentially secure.¹¹ Wilkinson's work, in particular, was sensitive to the issue of class that emerged in the wake of the Great War. Lloyd, Welsby, and Martin also provided vibrant accounts of the social changes taking place in twentieth-century Britain, and their impact on English Anglicanism. Other writers such as Davie, Gill, and McLeod have also offered nuanced, empathetic accounts of the Church adapting to social change.¹²

At the same time, more critical perspectives on the capacity of the Church to adapt were offered by sociologists such as Brown, Bruce, Aldridge, Parsons, and Woodhead.¹³ The more critical accounts stressed the challenges brought to the Churches by ethnic diversity, increasing spiritual diversity, and the seemingly inexorable move from sacred to secular frames of reference.

Whether sceptical or hopeful about the capacity of the Church to adapt to social change, sociologists typically concerned themselves with the intelligibility of social arrangements. They made evaluative judgements about the movements and forces shaping individual and social situations, moving from the particular to the general, and back. In this process of interpretation,

¹¹ R. Lloyd, *The Ferment in the Church* (London, 1964) and *The Church of England 1900–1965* (London, 1966); P. Welsby, *A History of the Church of England, 1945–80* (Oxford, 1987); D. Martin, *A Sociology of English Religion* (London, 1967); A. Wilkinson, *The Church of England and the First World War* (2nd edn., London, 1996).

¹² Davie, *Religion in Britain since 1945*; R. Gill, *Beyond Decline: A Challenge to the Churches* (London, 1988), *Changing Worlds: Can the Church Respond?* (Edinburgh, 2002), *The Myth of the Empty Church* (London, 1993), and *The 'Empty' Church Revisited* (Aldershot, 2003); D. H. McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s* (Oxford, 2010).

¹³ C. G. Brown, *Religion and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain* (London, 2006) and *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800–2000* (2nd edn., London, 2009); S. Bruce, *Religion in Modern Britain* (Oxford, 1995), *God is Dead: Secularization in the West* (Oxford, 2002), and *Religion in the Modern World: From Cathedrals to Cults* (Oxford, 1996); A. Aldridge, *Religion in the Contemporary World: A Sociological Introduction* (Cambridge, 2007); G. Parsons, *The Growth of Religious Diversity: Britain from 1945* (Milton Keynes, 1993); Paul Heelas and L. Woodhead, *The Spiritual Revolution: Why Religion is Giving Way to Spirituality* (Oxford, 2005); L. Woodhead and R. Catto (eds.), *Religion and Change in Modern Britain* (London, 2012).

vignettes and brief accounts could form an important part of the sociologist's repertoire, as with Evans's encounter with Hoskyns. Quantitative data, and perhaps how this is particularly understood and accounted for by groups and individuals, remained important, however. Rather like social anthropology, the sociology of religion has depended on observation, making connections and seeing the detail, and taking due account of constructions of reality, ethos, and world-view, as well as larger contexts.

Understanding context, then, is an important starting-point for a sociological account of Anglicanism in the developed world. In Europe, the context shifted quickly in the post-war era from religion as a utility to religion as a market-led choice, from being a shaper of social discourses to being a subject of discourse. The social forms religion took in this new European situation were inevitably shaped by the context in which faiths found themselves. Some might say—in the loosest sense—that the developed world as a whole became more 'Americanized'. That is to say, diversification, choice, and more intense, compressed identities for both historic denominations and new religious movements emerged. This was certainly true in Australia, where, after 1945, with social and cultural diversification, Roman Catholicism overtook Anglicanism as the largest denomination. In Canada the growth of religious diversity, and, with it the choice to opt out of religion altogether, led to falling attendance, and concomitantly, an intensification of ecumenical efforts. In the United States, the diversification of the Church was reflected in the bewildering proliferation of Churches bearing similar names, such as the Episcopal Church, the American Church in America, and the Anglican Catholic Church. The effects—indeed, the consequences—of this were multiple. Some monopolies hitherto enjoyed by denominations (for example, on marriages and funerals) were now subject to a widening of choice in the spiritual marketplace. At the same time, concerns with spirituality entered into the workplace, education, and citizenship in ways that belied the secularization narrative.

The sociology of religion is, arguably, a contestable discipline, offering interpretative insights that cast illumination on the subject.¹⁴ Put another way, it confers intelligibility on material that at first sight seems complex and confusing. What follows, therefore, is an interpretative collage—a sketch of how class, ethnicity, and education are manifest within a broad sociology of twentieth-century Anglicanism, taking account of how clergy are formed for leadership in parishes and with congregations. It is a perspective that reveals subtle changes in emphasis within ecclesial polity, but also how the Church of England, Western Anglicanism, and Churches of the wider Anglican Communion have adapted and shaped their character in response to social change, as much as they also sought to shape and adapt the societies they encountered.

¹⁴ M. McGuire, *Religion: The Social Context* (Belmont, CA, 1992), p. 7.

For example, we might note that, sociologically, Anglicans attempted to chart and organize the new worlds they encountered from the seventeenth century onwards. It was Thomas Cromwell that we have to thank for introducing parish registers in 1538, recording all births, deaths, and marriages in a parish—and therefore who was related to whom—and often with details of class or wealth recorded or inferred. Naturally enough, the first English colonies, established in nascent form throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and across the world, took this practice with them. As Simon Szreter highlights, one of the reasons we know so much about early settlements in Jamaica, for example, is that the clergy and parish officials made accurate records of the population from the outset, as they would have done in England. The emerging growth and complexity of these societies was recorded and monitored, in order that it could be, as necessary, organized and addressed.¹⁵ Anglican clergy knew who were the slaves, landowners, freemen, foreigners, and so forth; knowing these numbers could help in designing the proportions of a new church, for example.

Szreter has also shown how Anglican clergy in England moved from encouraging large families to advocating smaller ones, and from being against contraception to affirming it at the 1930 Lambeth Conference, depending on the socio-economic groups to which they were ministered.¹⁶ Large families came to be viewed early in the century as problematic both economically and in terms of social control. Greater empowerment for women also had some role in this development.¹⁷ For example, in New Zealand, although the Mothers' Union emerged as a significant body during the late nineteenth century, and although New Zealand gave women the vote as early as 1893, the Church, still heavily influenced by English culture, did not allow women in vestries and synods until 1922. As the leadership of the Church transferred to the New Zealanders themselves, so Church practice began to reflect the wider values of the society in which it was embedded, eventually producing the consecration of the first woman bishop in the Anglican Communion in 1990.

Sociologists also seek to root their perspectives and base their interpretations on the empirical and verifiable.¹⁸ The generalizations and extrapolations that form around the larger societal picture are then further tested. So we can advance with some simple observations. Some sociologists have observed that upper-class persons in the United States are more likely to belong to certain kinds of denomination than lower-class people—Episcopalians

¹⁵ S. Szreter, 'Registration of Identities in Early Modern English Parishes and Amongst Parishes Overseas', in K. Breckenridge and S. Szreter (eds.), *Registration and Recognition: Documenting the Person in World History* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 67–92.

¹⁶ S. Szreter, *Fertility, Class and Gender in Britain, 1860–1940* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 410.

¹⁷ See also S. Todd, *The People: The Rise and Fall of the Working Class 1910–2010* (London, 2014).

¹⁸ McGuire, *Religion: The Social Context*, p. 8.

especially so, when wealth is taken into account. Yet wealth does not necessarily indicate—let alone confer—social status in the United States in quite the same way as Europe. From the outset, the United States was a commercial and pragmatic society, with little power conferred upon or residing within the ‘chattering classes’—hence the telling North American taunt: ‘if you’re so smart, how come you ain’t so rich?’¹⁹

That said, Max Weber, in his essay on American Protestantism, recounted the story of a German dentist who had recently settled in America.²⁰ A new patient came to see him and, before treatment, informed him of the denomination he belonged to. To any European, this would seem an odd piece of information to convey to a dentist. But in North America, denominational membership would invariably give some indication of class and wealth. Indeed, despite the pluralism of the American religious market, coupled to extensive geographical mobility, class-denominational connections still persisted at the beginning of the twenty-first century, even though there were local and regional variations. Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists were usually regarded as numbering amongst the ‘upper’ denominations of class, with both Baptists and Evangelicals of various persuasions being ‘lower’. Hence the rather waspish and classist remark in the opening of Norman Maclean’s novella, *A River Runs Through It* (1976): ‘My father was a Scotch Presbyterian minister. He was intellectual and somewhat poetical and referred to Methodists as Baptists who could read.’²¹

This partly explains why American Protestants, including Episcopalians, invented something that would not have occurred to their European counterparts in state-Church systems: the ‘letter of transfer’. This was issued to those moving a significant distance to settle in other parts of the United States. The letter effectively confirmed their membership of the church and denomination back home, and commended them to the minister of their new church. The letter, of course, not only certified their religious affinity, but also their capacity to help sustain the local church financially. In addition to wealth and class, there were also ethnic aspects to denominational identity. Certain Pentecostal and ‘Gospel’ Churches were primarily African American in composition. Other denominations were primarily shaped by white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant culture. Many American Episcopalians were active in the civil rights movement, actively rejecting and resisting entrenched cultural divides.

The purpose, as ever, of sociological perspectives is to bring order and interpretation to complex social phenomena. In North America, H. Richard Niebuhr’s work paid particular attention to the ways in which congregations

¹⁹ P. Berger, G. Davie, and E. Fokas, *Religious America, Secular Europe? A Theme and Variation* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 18–21.

²⁰ Berger, Davie, and Fokas, *Religious America, Secular Europe?*, p. 21.

²¹ N. Maclean, *A River Runs Through It, and Other Stories* (new edn., London, 1990), p. 1.

and Churches were shaped by their context. *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (1929) was a 'practical contribution to the ethical problem of denominationalism', seeing division through the lens of dialectics—the disinherited and established, nationalism and sectionalism, and immigrants (European) and the Churches of 'the colour line' (black).²² In sketching a basic sociology of denominationalism, Niebuhr sought to navigate some potential paths to deeper unity. But it was his almost incidental observations that particularly distinguished the book. Niebuhr saw that the formation of American Christianity was dependent not only on ecclesial and doctrinal tendencies, but also on deep-rooted social, economic, and political dimensions. Methodists and Baptists, for example, by eliding their identity with a 'frontier ethos' in the south and west of the United States, were able to outstrip their more established competition (for example, Episcopalians and Presbyterians). Episcopalians took to heart the call to justice and equality that lay at the heart of American ideals, and came to be defined by their liberal, justice-orientated politics.

It is partly for this reason that theorists and practitioners in congregational studies have strongly advocated a deep engagement with and analysis of the socio-cultural constitution of a given parish, in order to understand the congregation as a by-product of that context. Timothy Jenkins, from a social-anthropological perspective, suggested a similar starting-point for understanding the contours of local ministry in his analysis of church processions in a neighbourhood in Bristol, England.²³ In Jenkins's thinking, it was through understanding the bonds in a community—associational, familial, trading, and voluntary—that one could begin to understand how religion, and therefore the Church, functioned in a community. His work disclosed the complex patterns and compulsions of ordinary lives, including both moral and historical dimensions, together with reputation and conflict, and the continuities of place and identity.

CLASS, CHURCH, AND CLERGY—SOME OBSERVATIONS

Social status and wealth are inextricably linked to occupation and aspiration. Anthony Russell's *The Clerical Profession* (1980) argued that the clergy only became 'professionalized' in the late nineteenth century. The emerging Industrial Revolution ensured that clergy gradually lost their stake-holdings as landowners, gentlemen, magistrates, almoners, essayists, political figures,

²² H. R. Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (new edn., New York, 1957), p. vii.

²³ T. D. Jenkins, *Religion in English Everyday Life* (Oxford, 1999).

and generators of improvement in health, education, and overall social well-being. Rapid industrialization squeezed clergy out of 'soft' public roles, and intensified pressure towards the 'professionalization' associated with a burgeoning middle class.²⁴

In one direction, the Oxford movement had perhaps assisted this process, with an emphasis on the frequent celebration of Holy Communion, and an emerging identity for clergy formed around new (it was claimed 'ancient') rubrics, customs, and protocol. Clergy now wore albs, amices, cinctures, and stoles. The communion cup was now augmented with a pall, priest's wafer, paten, purificator, and corporal, together with a ciborium, lavabo bowl and jugs, and cruets. Some fifty years earlier, most English people had received the sacrament a few times a year, and it was a much simpler affair. The Evangelical revival also encouraged the intensification of professionalism, with emphases on discipline, systematic visiting, schools for preaching, and catechizing. Within a very short space of time, English clergy—whether 'high' or 'low'—began to dress differently from other 'gentlemanly professions' by sporting dog-collars. Furthermore, the nineteenth century saw Church of England clergy now being 'trained' at special theological colleges rather than being taught divinity at university (another new development), which also enhanced the emerging professional identity. As extensive forms of social influence faded, intensive forms of ecclesial identity and clerisy strengthened. This increased specialization—and the internal conflicts that accompanied it—were mirrored across the Atlantic in the Canadian Church in the late nineteenth century. There, the Church assumed significant administrative responsibility in Canada and British North America. With influence came some very high-profile divisions, with competing theological colleges established to reflect and perpetuate competing Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical allegiances.

By paying attention to the relationship between class, wealth, and status, we can perhaps see how the identity of clergy depended on fiscal sustenance, and it allows us to make three brief observations. First, and perhaps obviously, wealth creates the basis for independence. In both the pre-Reformation and Hanoverian age, when religious orders or parish clergy were economically prosperous, 'religious professionals' enjoyed power and status, and were comparatively free to define their role within society. Second, despite the considerable power and status clergy enjoyed, their prosperity attracted widespread resentment. Third, when the wealth of the Church began to recede in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, clergy were inevitably pressed into collusion with their congregations and dioceses who were becoming responsible for providing their funding. This led, inevitably, to a gradual loss of clerical independence, resulting in the

²⁴ A. Russell, *The Clerical Profession* (London, 1980), p. 40.

profession becoming less desirable to the middle and upper classes from which clergy had traditionally been recruited.

By paying attention to detail, context, and difference, sociologists are often able to sketch more nuanced accounts of how religion is practised on the ground. This may contradict more general interpretative frameworks such as secularization theories, enabling a richer and more perceptive reading of church-going habits. Historians have noted low levels of church-going amongst the working classes in the nineteenth century, although with significant denominational and regional variation.²⁵ Church-going in working-class South Yorkshire at the beginning of the twenty-first century was roughly half that of the comparable areas of Lancashire. Amongst the factors contributing to this statistical disparity were religious competition (distinctive Protestant and Catholic identities in Lancashire), which had generated growth in the past. Ted Wickham's *Church and People in an Industrial City* sought to analyse the apparent indifference of the South Yorkshire working classes towards the Church, and then, through industrial mission, to pioneer new forms of ministry to address it.²⁶ Church-going remained, however, stubbornly 'middle class', although by 2000 new patterns of immigration into major cities were beginning to have a major impact on church-going statistics, the profile of attendees, and the emergence of new denominations.²⁷ Immigrants moving into economically deprived neighbourhoods were now part of a more vibrant religious economy, with house churches, community churches, and mosques amicably jostling for attendees. Economic deprivation no longer automatically went hand-in-hand with a decline in religious observance.

Grace Davie's sociology was also sensitive to the different 'regional climates' in Britain. These have been shaped by history, class, economics, and ethnicity. The delicate calibration of each region will have some contribution to make to an account explaining church-going, as Jenkins also acknowledges.²⁸ David Clark's study of the North Yorkshire fishing village of Staithes revealed a class-related gap between church and chapel, and a swathe of local heterodox customs and rituals amongst the working class that sat more or less comfortably alongside chapel worship.²⁹ Martin Stringer's study, through a series of ethnographic vignettes, built a complex picture of religion in England, one that was largely pragmatic and vernacular, as well as stubbornly enduring within

²⁵ G. Vincent and E. Olson, 'Case Study 3: The Religiosity of Young People Growing Up in Poverty', in Woodhead and Catto (eds.), *Religion and Change in Modern Britain*, p. 197.

²⁶ E. R. Wickham, *Church and People in an Industrial City* (London, 1957).

²⁷ Peter Berger, cited in Vincent and Olson, 'Case Study 3', p. 197.

²⁸ Davie, *Religion in Britain since 1945*; Jenkins, *Religion in English Everyday Life*, p. 35.

²⁹ D. Clark, *Between Pulpit and Pew: Folk Religion in a North Yorkshire Fishing Village* (Cambridge, 1982).

specific social strata.³⁰ Ellen Clark-King's study of working-class women in the north-east of England revealed vernacular forms of personal piety that were pastoral and pragmatic, and rooted in the social contingencies in which spirituality found expression.³¹ While in England these subtle variations generally evolved organically, in New Zealand conscious decisions were made to ensure the flourishing of distinctive cultural regions. In 1992, the New Zealand Church created three *tikanga*, or cultural streams, consisting of Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia, giving the Church the flexibility to serve the hugely diverse needs of its people. By contrast with this comfort with, and embrace of, regional diversity, differences across the United States were fiercely contested. The wishes of local dioceses to depart from the Episcopal Church over issues such as women bishops and gay bishops gave rise to legal conflict as the Church fought out its local differences in the courts.

The shaping of belief and ecclesial polity by social class was evident in Anglican conservative Evangelicalism, which through elite, fee-paying schools, and socially selective summer camps (the 'Bash Camps'), continued to exercise considerable influence in Christian Unions at established universities, with a particular concentration on Oxford and Cambridge.³² The reserved, cerebral, and propositional faith expounded in conservative Anglican Evangelicalism was arguably only capable of taking root amongst the professional classes. The Alpha courses, a formula of teaching, discussion, and eating, used as an evangelistic tool, could also be understood as partially 'class-based'. Although Alpha had significant success in moving beyond its original roots, it nonetheless continued to exist as a creature of its origins, its upper-middle-class ethos, derived from its roots in Holy Trinity Church, Brompton, in West London, coupled with an emphasis on personal enhancement and individualism. Similarly, certain kinds of Anglo-Catholicism, with their emphasis on aesthetics and values, continued to cater for and shape the middle and upper-middle classes. As has been argued, 'Christianity becomes a vehicle for social class and class cultures become potent indicators of Christian propriety.'³³

To speak of class at all by the end of the twentieth century was to utilize a questionable taxonomy. The everyday 'historic' distinctions between upper, middle, and low could, by common consent, no longer command collective conscription. Rupa Huq's work (2013), for example, presented a subtle, nuanced range of dwellers in suburbia that now belied the description 'middle class'.³⁴

³⁰ M. Stringer, *Contemporary Western Ethnography and the Definition of Religion* (London, 2011).

³¹ E. Clark-King, *Theology by Heart: Women, the Church and God* (Peterborough, 2004).

³² R. Manwaring, *From Controversy to Co-existence: Evangelicals in the Church of England 1914–1980* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 57–8.

³³ M. Guest, E. Olson, and J. Wolffe, 'Christianity: Loss of Monopoly', in Woodhead and Catto (eds.), *Religion and Change in Modern Britain*, p. 69.

³⁴ R. Huq, *On the Edge: The Contested Cultures of English Suburbia* (London, 2013).

What were once enclaves of settled middle-class culture were now teeming with ethnic diversity and socio-economic difference. Class had, it seems, melted down to be replaced by the kinds of cultural bricolage more normally associated with cities. This was a slow-but-steady development, as Alwyn Turner acknowledged.³⁵ The economic liberalism of the 1960s led to the social liberalism of the last years of the twentieth century, with a new emphasis on equality and meritocracy, sweeping away the powers and privileges of older institutions, and most especially their assumptions about normative social ordering.

Gibson Winter noted in *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches* (1961) that churches could lose a sense of time, patience, depth, and relationality when they became subject to programmes originating from middle-class and wealth-related suburban contexts.³⁶ Such churches were invariably rooted in assumptions about growth and effectiveness. They were particularly successful in bourgeois contexts where the Protestant work ethic prevailed. Indeed, the Church Growth Movement, fostered and promoted by the work of Donald McGavran, and later, by C. Peter Wagner, depended on accepting the outlooks and legacies of late capitalism. Those who were formed in a different social context will have believed and belonged to their churches differently. They will also have had quite different indices for measuring growth and success.

The class and ethnic divisions of the early twentieth century had changed by the end, however. In terms of mission, the emergence of cities as more complex and integrated spaces in the developed world at the close of the twentieth century had led to a new impetus in church-planting and evangelism. For example, a number of dioceses in the Episcopal Church (United States) were intentionally planting congregations in deprived blue-collar ethnic areas in older cities. And in new cities—Houston, Texas, for example—congregations established amongst immigrant Hispanics were forming new, integrated, and multi-racial churches.

Some sociologists have argued that by the twenty-first century Britain had several classes: an elite (with significant wealth and privilege); an established middle class; an emergent technical middle class; newly affluent workers; a traditional working class; emergent service workers; and finally a ‘precariat’ (or precarious proletariat).³⁷ Devine and Savage suggested that there was now considerable fluidity between the traditional working class and the traditional middle class, largely caused by the emergent strata of socio-economic groups which connected hitherto quite disconnected elements.³⁸ Indeed, class was no

³⁵ A. Turner, *A Classless Society: Britain in the 1990s* (London, 2013).

³⁶ G. Winter, *The Suburban Captivity of the Churches* (New York, 1961).

³⁷ Cf. G. Standing, ‘The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class’ (<http://www.policy-network.net/pno_detail.aspx?ID=4004&title=+The+Precariat+%e2%80%93+The+new+dangerous+class>, accessed 22 Jan. 2016).

³⁸ M. Savage, F. Devine, N. Cunningham et al., ‘A New Model of Class? Findings from the BBC’s Great British Class Survey Experiment’, *Sociology*, 47 (2013): 219–50.

longer a reliable indicator of wealth. Increasingly, it could be more easily identified through social and familial habits and other behavioural patterns—for example, practices in eating together (around the table or around the television?), diet, and where and how leisure time was spent.

For Marx and Engels, the history of all ‘hitherto existing society’ had been ‘the history of class struggle’.³⁹ By ‘class’, they meant forms of human aggregation and self-awareness that were social, economic, and political, involving the prioritizing of class conflict over confrontations rooted in religion, other values, or ethnic identity. Class was certainly a critical indicator of difference; but ethnicity as a form of taxonomy emerged about the same time.⁴⁰ Cannadine argued that there was a common denominator to emerge from late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century conflicts over class and race.⁴¹ Intellectuals, historians, politicians, and religious leaders often asserted a binary Manichean ‘us-and-them’ view of humanity. The temptation to order society, to categorize and develop taxonomies, though in some respects both comprehensible and laudable, was, however, to prove divisive.

Social classes are differently configured from place to place. In Europe, church-going in the twentieth century was primarily a middle-class activity, although this was more true for Northern than Southern Europe.⁴² It was often seen as much as a sign of respectability as of belief. Working-class membership was patterned differently, with belonging assumed, though not necessarily active: belief did not necessarily correlate to any pattern of belonging. Attendance or non-attendance, equally, did not circumscribe membership and the sense of belonging. There were also other differences to note in the generalized pattern of believing and belonging in Europe. Women tended to be more active and visible participants than men, for example. And there were further variations to account for in situations in which denominational identity was elided with a sense of ‘otherness’, or even oppression. In Britain, attendance at Roman Catholic churches in cities was reinvigorated by waves of Irish immigration in the nineteenth century, and was again in the late twentieth, to a lesser extent, by economic migrants from Eastern Europe. Anglicanism saw little direct growth from Afro-Caribbean immigration. But there was some evidence for increased congregational numbers in inner-city Anglican churches where ethnic diversity produced fresh mutations of church-going.

In the United States, although the relationship between church attendance and social class was also apparent, it was so for different reasons. Because each denomination was self-supporting (indeed, most congregations were), the

³⁹ K. Marx and F. Engels, ‘The Communist Manifesto’, in D. Fernbach (ed.), *Karl Marx: The Political Revolutions of 1848* (Harmondsworth, 1973), p. 67.

⁴⁰ D. Cannadine, *The Undivided Past: History Beyond Our Differences* (London, 2013), p. 174.

⁴¹ Cannadine, *Undivided Past*.

⁴² Berger, Davie, and Fokas, *Religious America, Secular Europe?*, p. 98.

general relationship between the middle class and church-going was unlike that of Europe. The historic denominations of the United States displayed strong residual class differentiation, but this was no longer related to wealth, though it did not rule out forms of elitism. One could perhaps perceive the subtleties of this in the response of an American Episcopalian to the initiative of the former archbishop of Canterbury, George Carey, in announcing a 'Decade of Evangelism': 'I thought everyone who *deserved* to be an Episcopalian already was one'. This was perhaps less a defence of social class and church-going than an almost tribal articulation of what it meant to belong to a denomination—something only truly understood from the inside. It was perhaps something of a paradox that the class system of Britain, for all its rootedness in certain kinds of circumscribed church-going, would struggle to match such elitism. In Australia, conscious efforts were made to serve all social classes. The 145 or so schools within the Australian Anglican Schools Network ranged from elite, high-cost establishments to special needs and inexpensive regional schools, reflecting its desire to cut across social divisions. In the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia, the deeply held principle of bicultural development and partnership created fertile ground for working across differences of class and culture.

Yet if the relationships between class and ecclesial formation and composition were problematic, there were, arguably for Anglicans, some redemptive characteristics. Anglicanism—theologically, ecclesologically, and culturally—did not regard itself as complete and self-sufficient. Typical self-descriptions included the *via media*—neither fully Reformed nor (Roman) Catholic, but rather a synergistic compromise hospitable to competing convictions. As a polity, Anglicanism was formed through various forms of hybridity, causing it to look confidently outwards rather than inwards. This reflex, fused to the legacy of the British Empire, arguably enabled it to take root in more countries and cultures than many denominations. It was, after Roman Catholicism, the most extensive Christian denomination in the world. Anglican identity, at the same time, claimed no unique doctrines to itself, but it did appear to have an ecclesial ethos with particular depth of character.

Education supplied a telling example of Anglicanism's capacity to adjust. The bishop of Exeter chaired a conference in 1915 that explored the testing and training for ordination of those who had received little school education. It concluded that a considerable number of 'vigorous, intelligent and earnest lads' at work in dockyards, factories, collieries, and other industrial works believed themselves to be called for holy orders.⁴³ Ordination training could be adjusted so that 'very possibly it will be found advisable not to require both

⁴³ Reiss, *Testing of Vocation*, p. 327.

Latin and Greek from these candidates'.⁴⁴ In context, this was a bold, even provocative measure.

The formation of education for leadership within Anglicanism to a large extent emerged out of the socio-historic characteristics described above, namely, the migration of the clerical role from the upper-middle-class gentleman (with a poorer clerk in holy orders to assist) to a more 'professionalized' and middle-class understanding of ordained ministry. The development and status of the clerical profession in the twentieth century was complex, and pointed in two directions: on the one hand to greater specialization, but on the other to greater generalization (at least for parish clergy), as clerical roles and responsibilities became more extensive within the Church. That said, the role of the clergy continued to be public, performative, and pastoral, and in Europe at least, religion still had a vicarious function: faith was assumed.

Where religion competed within a marketplace—as in the United States particularly, but also elsewhere in the West—faith was 'consumed'. In the United States this was reflected in the power of a congregation to hire and fire, and to pay according to means—a system so far resisted in England, where the parish share system ensured clergy could be stationed without regard to congregational means. In New Zealand, each diocese set stipends for its clergy, with each parish responsible for raising those funds separate from parish assessments. Parish clergy were appointed by the bishop in consultation with a Board of Nominations. But this applied only to *Tikanga* Pākehā; generally speaking Māori clergy were non-stipendiary.

A person set aside for a symbolic, pastoral, and priestly role was, by the end of the century, in an increasingly unusual position. The work was often not paid, at least in the strict sense of remuneration, and the role was not 'work', strictly speaking—there were few prescribed hours, duties, and tasks—and yet it was highly demanding. There were numerous supporting paradigms, rooted in people and practices drawn from the richness of Christian tradition. Yet curiously ministry remained difficult to *define*.

Coxon and Towler understood the ambiguity in the role of the clergy in the latter part of the twentieth century. Their articulation of a crisis of identity and function is worth reflecting upon.⁴⁵ They described ministry not as work, nor as a profession, but as an 'occupation'—something that consumed time, energy, and lives, but was not paid or recognized as 'work' in the way that the secular world had come to understand the term. This, they argued, made ministry an uncommon occupation, a sphere of activity where remuneration was no longer linked to the value of the endeavour (which in itself was hard to measure), either for the practitioner or for the public at large. Understandings

⁴⁴ Reiss, *Testing of Vocation*, p. 328.

⁴⁵ R. Coxon and A. Towler, *The Fate of the Anglican Clergy* (London, 1979), pp. 54–5.

of ministry had become more marginal, even though its symbolic and public functions remained public, visible, and symbolic.

For this reason, 'formation' became a highly significant concept in theological training. The person being shaped and formed for ministry was not merely banking knowledge, nor simply acquiring new skills.⁴⁶ They were being shaped and moulded into a person of character and virtue. Theological training was a collective and shared exercise, and could not be done alone. It followed that the diversity of local churches and denominations (a simple fact of ecclesiology) lay at the root of diverse approaches to theological education. There was no agreement as to where theology began and ended, because God touched the whole of a person's life.

CULTURE, CONTEXT, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING

The origins of Anglican seminaries and theological colleges for training ministers were complex. Arguably, these institutions, at least in Great Britain, were rooted in a combination of reactive and proactive processes that could be traced to the dramatic social and cultural upheavals of the nineteenth century. Their emergence could be read sociologically as an attempt to move from the general to the specialized, from the emergent secular to the (recovered) sacred, from the informally vocational to specifically professional, and from the latent to the manifest. The cultural pressures that produced the context for change included a growing secularization (or at least, some widely held perceptions of this), a movement from the mostly unarticulated hegemony of the Church of England to a climate of religious tolerance and pluralism, and the emergence of middle-class professions. The Church could no longer presume to establish itself solely as of right, but only through being distinctive and competitive.⁴⁷

A distinction between organizations and institutions may act as a helpful aid in discerning the contrasting attitudes to ministerial training that characterized Anglican theological education. According to Selznick, organizations are technical instruments, designed as tools or means for definite goals.⁴⁸ The institutional leader, in contrast, is primarily an expert in the promotion and protection of values. The more associational and congregational the pattern of church-going, the more likely it is that the sponsoring pedagogy for ministers

⁴⁶ Cf. C. Foster, L. Dahill, L. Golemon et al., *Educating Clergy: Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination* (San Francisco, 2005).

⁴⁷ Coxon and Towler, *Fate of the Anglican Clergy*; Russell, *The Clerical Profession*; M. Percy, *Clergy: The Origin of Species* (London, 2006).

⁴⁸ T. Selznick, *Leadership in Administration* (Evanston, IL, 1957), pp. 4–7.

will be rooted in organizational and pragmatic assumptions. Mainline Protestant seminaries in North America were the best examples of this approach, including Evangelical colleges and courses where forms of pragmatism could often be sacralized or consecrated, as for example with the 'science' of the church growth movement. Education for clergy was seen largely in terms of gaining knowledge and acquiring skills.

An education for the leadership of institutions, on the other hand, might begin with a quite different set of pedagogical assumptions, following Selznick. First, it might presume that the minister was not simply there to perform a set of tasks, but was, rather, continuously and vocationally engaged in discovering his or her role. Second, the formation of the minister—their character, wisdom, growth, and development—was a more subtle form of education, and rooted in the values and identity of the institution. Third, ministry was better thought of as a vocation rather than as a job for which individuals needed to be equipped. So the formation of the minister did not take place through achieving goals or successfully undertaking tasks, but rather through the recognition that she or he grew through discovering and developing capacities, virtues, and dispositions.

According to Dan Hardy, education and training for ordained ministry took place within contextually specific places and times that operate within a kind of 'grid' of creative tensions, comprising institutional, formational, instrumental, and organizational characteristics.⁴⁹ They were rooted, in other words, in the present shape of the Church. Put simply, we might say that formational and institutional visions of the Church on this view were also replicated in pedagogies more typically located in 'Catholic' seminaries, whereas the organizational and instrumental pedagogical approach was more usually encountered amongst Evangelicals.

The reality was more complex than this, admittedly, because each seminary, college, or course belonged within the larger grid outlined above, rather than simply on its own axis. The ethos of any course, college, or seminary invariably consisted of a mixture of characteristics, histories, and cultures. Thus, to focus on the incidental ecclesial proclivities or the apparent theological priorities of institutions was to miss the shared but broad pedagogical outlook.

Hardy's original, if understated, critique of theological education foresaw that instrumental and organizational pedagogies were in the ascendancy. In contrast, he sought to re-emphasize the institutional and formational, drawing participants into deeper kinds of formational wisdom. Unable to make the lengthy journey into the wisdom of God, according to Hardy, Anglican theological education risked becoming thin and technique-orientated, satisfying 'criteria' consisting of aims, objectives, and outcomes. It risked pandering

⁴⁹ Cf. D. W. Hardy, 'Theological Education in the Mission of the Church', in Hardy, *Finding the Church: The Dynamic Truth of Anglicanism* (London, 2001), pp. 168–82.

to narrow, associational, and organizational views of the Church. Whilst instrumental views of education and training flourished, the actual ecclesial identity and density of the Church suffered. End-of-century approaches to Anglican education for ministry—at least in the Church of England—tended to favour ‘functionalist’ approaches, failing to understand the complexity of the Church in its dense and extensive catholicity, or to comprehend the variables located in parochial life.⁵⁰

There were pedagogical tensions, then, between the instrumental and the formational, and also between the institutional and the organizational. These same tensions found expression in intra-ecclesial life, as well as in mission and ministry. Tensions, of course, do not necessarily constitute problems. Anglican theological education, wherever it was found in the developed world, could locate its identity within a grid formed by these four axes, namely the instrumental, formational, institutional, and organizational axes. An alternative grid was provided by William Bergquist, who proposed collegial, managerial, developmental, and advocacy axes, adding, more recently, virtual culture and tangible culture.⁵¹ In that respect, the purpose, identity, and shape of Anglican theological education in the early twenty-first century could be viewed as a creative dilemma rather than as a problem, involving and engaging the balancing of interests.

CONCLUSION

One of the challenges facing all denominations by the end of the twentieth century in the developed world was the movement from homogeneous society and cultures rooted in values and class, to increasingly heterogeneous societies rooted in ‘life-styles’, beliefs, and practices. The greater diversity forged through the late-capitalist and post-modern landscape encouraged association and sociality. In the more fluid and heterogeneous societies that had emerged, replete with great potential in technical and communicative possibilities, Churches had struggled with the very pace of social change. In many respects, they had failed to read the signs of the times, and their record of intelligent social engagement remained deficient.

Nonetheless, the challenges faced by Anglicanism had prompted a range of initiatives that had sought to address the problems posed by class, ethnicity, and gender, and in training for leadership for such contexts. Some initiatives had sought to combine unity and diversity, as in St John’s College Auckland.

⁵⁰ D. Grierson, *Transforming a People of God* (Melbourne, 1984), pp. 14–27.

⁵¹ W. Bergquist and K. Pawlak, *Engaging the Six Cultures of the Academy* (San Francisco, 2008).

What these initiatives showed, generally, was that Anglicanism tended to recognize its incompleteness, and that it had an ecclesial reflex that attended to local and particular otherness, be that class-based, ethnic, or otherwise. This was not unique to Anglicanism, but it occurred there in a particular and concentrated form. Anglican ministry, therefore, was a blend of the local, particular, and reformed on the one hand, and on the other hand of the Catholic and therefore somewhat putative.

At the heart of the challenges posed by social class and ethnicity there was a more generic question: what skills and knowledge did Anglicans expect from the ordained ministry for leading congregations and parishes? It was a question to which a variety of answers could be offered, from several different parts of the Anglican Communion, and from different ages. Attention to Scripture and tradition could be assumed, but what could not, perhaps, be taken for granted were the levels and types of critical engagement. The necessary arts and skills of ministry varied from culture to culture. The curriculum varied too, according to the ecclesial proclivity of the training institution and the cultural context of its ministers. In short, identifying common curricular denominators in the training of Anglican clergy across the Communion was not a straightforward matter. One could not assume a reservoir of putatively transferable skills and knowledge that would work in all provinces. This was not in itself an unusual feature in the training of clergy: most denominations, in one way or another, wrestled with this conundrum. Yet it was arguably a more acute issue for Anglicans, for whom theological concreteness, provisionality, and interdependence were as important as they were contested. Even the teaching of Anglican polity—not necessarily a part of the curriculum in theological colleges, courses, or seminaries—had a variable dependence on English Reformation history.

Yet although skills and knowledge could be regarded as the two chief curricular components of preparation for ordination by the end of the twentieth century, a third element, and no less significant common denominator, was formation. Anglicans, in their contested and provisional ecclesiology, were often better able to express their theology by pointing to their practices rather than to their stated beliefs. The formational aspects of training frequently shaped the character of believing and practising. The Methodist William Willimon, commenting on the particularity of this, noted that ‘all ministerial education worthy of the name consists of various forms of apprenticeship because the goal is the formation of consistent clerical character’.⁵² It did not matter whether the ordained leader of a congregation was a gentleman from the landed upper classes, an executive manager shaped by the bourgeois values of the middle class, or a working-class person selected and trained to fit

⁵² W. H. Willimon, *Calling and Character: Virtues of the Ordained Life* (Nashville, TN, 2000), pp. 43–4.

into the context from which they were drawn, or from a different ethnic group. Ordination and the good leadership of Churches cut across class and ethnicity. For all the challenges that Anglicanism faced, the issue for the leadership of Churches was not simply the content or context of Christian witness, but also the character and virtue of its leaders.

Thus, perhaps the most important thing about being a minister was vested in the notion of occupation. To be sure, the North American model of theological education was more technically and content-inclined, pragmatic, and managerial, firmly establishing the role of minister as a middle-class professional. The European model, in turn, was more about the holding of an office, and arguably less 'classist', though the office-holder would need to be educated. But irrespective of class, ethnicity, or education, there was an expectation that Anglican priests were to be occupied with God, and then with all the people, places, and parishes that were given by God for their care.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldridge, A., *Religion in the Contemporary World: A Sociological Introduction* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas, *Faith in the City: A Call for Action by Church and Nation* (London, 1985).
- Berger, P., G. Davie, and E. Fokas, *Religious America, Secular Europe? A Theme and Variation* (Aldershot, 2008).
- Brown, C. G., *Religion and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain* (London, 2006).
- Brown, C. G., *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800–2000* (2nd edn., London, 2009).
- Bruce, S., *Religion in Modern Britain* (Oxford, 1995).
- Bruce, S., *Religion in the Modern World: From Cathedrals to Cults* (Oxford, 1996).
- Clark, D., *Between Pulpit and Pew: Folk Religion in a North Yorkshire Fishing Village* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Coxon, R. and A. Towler, *The Fate of the Anglican Clergy* (London, 1979).
- Davie, G., *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without Belonging* (Oxford, 1994).
- Giddens, A., *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies* (London, 1980 edn.).
- Gill, R., *Beyond Decline: A Challenge to the Churches* (London, 1988).
- Gill, R., *The 'Empty' Church Revisited* (Aldershot, 2003).
- Heelas, P. and L. Woodhead, *The Spiritual Revolution: Why Religion is Giving Way to Spirituality* (Oxford, 2005).
- Jenkins, T. D., *Religion in English Everyday Life* (Oxford, 1999).
- McLeod, D. H., *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s* (Oxford, 2010).
- Martin, D., *A Sociology of English Religion* (London, 1967).
- Parkin, F., *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique* (London, 1979).
- Reiss, R., *The Testing of Vocation: 100 Years of Ministry Selection in the Church of England* (London, 2013).

- Russell, A., *The Clerical Profession* (London, 1980).
- Szreter, S., *Fertility, Class and Gender in Britain, 1860–1940* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Wickham, E. R., *Church and People in an Industrial City* (London, 1957).
- Willimon, W. H., *Calling and Character: Virtues of the Ordained Life* (Nashville, TN, 2000).
- Wilson, J., *Religion in American Society: The Effective Presence* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1978).
- Woodhead, L. and R. Catto (eds.), *Religion and Change in Modern Britain* (London, 2012).

Anglicanism in the Era of Decolonization

Sarah Stockwell

Preparing a draft sermon to deliver in Freetown, Sierra Leone, in 1951 at the inauguration of the new West Africa province of the Anglican Communion Geoffrey Fisher, archbishop of Canterbury (1945–61)—perhaps more than any other figure principal architect of Anglicanism’s own ‘decolonization’ project—invoked a future in which the historic dynamics of the relationship of the Church of England to empire would be inverted.¹ ‘We have seen enough,’ he proposed, ‘of the witness of African priests and laymen . . . greatly to look forward to the day when African missionaries will come to England to help us evangelise the many who know not the God and Father of us all.’²

Spoken in the midst of an ‘era of decolonization’, Fisher’s observations look remarkably prescient. Anglicanism remained by the twenty-first century one of the world’s most important Churches, and regions which attained their constitutional independence after the war now constituted its numerical, and increasingly its political, centres of gravity. Anglicanism not only outlived empire but thrived in areas which were once former colonial domains. Differences of theology and party among Anglican missionary Churches and the very different ends of empire in diverse locations make generalization difficult. But in broad terms, the constitutional end of the European empires did not prove especially traumatic for Anglicanism, as for other Christian Churches, certainly in comparison to earlier crises such as that occasioned by the 1900 Boxer Rising. That this was the case was in large part because its standing world-wide was not tied to the continuation of empire. Rather, for all that British overseas expansion in particular had provided the context for the

¹ I am grateful to Arthur Burns, Archdeacon W. M. Jacob, and Andrew Porter for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this chapter. Throughout the chapter I refer to colonies by the names used in the colonial period and for the post-colonial era by new names adopted at independence.

² Lambeth Palace Library (LPL), Fisher 93, fos. 200–5, ‘Sermon for the Archbishop’s West African Visit’.

spread overseas of Anglican settler and missionary Churches, the Communion's relationship to empire was in many respects highly ambiguous. Within an empire striking for its religious plurality, the Church of England had rarely replicated its domestic establishment status, and in its non-settler colonies the British government had not generally accorded Anglicanism particular privileges. Equally for their part, British Anglicans engaged with the British Empire, as Rowan Strong has argued, 'primarily from a perspective of belief' rather than from one of ideological attachment to it.³

The era of 'decolonization' was nevertheless of profound significance for Anglicanism. It presented particular difficulties in countries whose transition to independence assumed a violent form, and to Churches whose hierarchies were still organized on racial grounds, especially but not only in sub-Saharan Africa, at this date the biggest area of British missionary activity. In this respect the experience of Anglicanism was not greatly different to that of missionary Christianity more generally. However, this chapter will argue for a distinctive Anglican history of decolonization, which reflected the Church of England's position as an established Church within the British imperial state, its episcopal government, and its particular theological traditions. Further, both the transformation in the international order, and decline of colonial ideologies and cultures of which European decolonization was both symptom and cause, had consequences for Anglicanism in other regions of the world-wide Communion too. At the outset of our period, Britain's former colonies of white settlement, while formally independent, retained significant associations with the old mother country and had yet to experience a full 'decolonization' process. In Australia, where Anglicanism constituted the majority Christian denomination, the Anglican Church (an important source of ongoing 'Britishness') remained legally subordinate to the Church of England. Within the empire-Commonwealth and also beyond, Britain's eclipse by two new superpowers and the emergence of a bipolar world during the Cold War was of consequence for post-war Anglicanism. America's post-war economic hegemony impacted on the Church too, with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (PECUSA), independent since the American Revolution, increasingly influential within the Anglican Communion.

The first part of this chapter discusses Anglican experiences of colonial political change, and also Anglican involvement in the political movements of the era. How Anglican leaders reformed their own institutional structures to adapt to the new ideological and political currents of the period forms the subject of the second section. The final part considers other developments associated with the 'era of decolonization', including those significant for the Church in England.

³ Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c.1700–1850* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 283, 294.

ANGLICANISM AND POLITICAL CHANGE IN THE COLONIES

The 'era of decolonization' transformed the international political order. The widespread collapse of European empires (although not necessarily of European influence and institutions) within regions destabilized by war and by the emergence of new and stronger anti-colonial ideologies and movements resulted in the creation of numerous new independent states. Within the British Empire constitutional decolonization occurred first in South Asia but was not immediately replicated elsewhere. A second phase of British decolonization followed from the late 1950s. As the 'wind of change' gathered pace, the majority of Britain's remaining colonies were led swiftly to independence in the early 1960s. The process continued among scattered island territories in the Pacific through the 1970s. By then with the exception of the Portuguese, who clung on to power in southern Africa until 1974, other European colonial empires had also collapsed, following the Dutch loss of Indonesia, French wars in Indo-China and Algeria, the comprehensive French withdrawal from their other African colonies, and the Belgian departure from the Congo.

The role of religion in these developments was varied and complex. In a few locations religion was central to emergent national identities. This was the case in India. Yet here missionary influence, while small relative to the population as a whole, buoyed by its role in higher education and medicine, peaked in north-west India in the 1930s even as anti-colonial nationalism gathered pace, giving it sufficient strength to carry it through the turbulent 1940s.⁴ Their experience as Christian minorities among a Hindu majority encouraged the four dioceses of the Anglican Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon to enter into a Scheme of Union with the non-episcopal Churches in the region, finally enacted in south India in 1947 and north India in 1970. The controversy this provoked among British Anglicans was among the most significant of William Temple's archiepiscopate, although Temple himself was sympathetic to the scheme, and the relationship of the initial south India union to the wider Communion remained unresolved at its formation.

Elsewhere missionary Christianity of all denominations was part and parcel of the mix from which within the European colonial empires new political formations and anti-colonial movements emerged. Via the translation of the Bible, Christian missionary societies had played a key role in the transcription of oral cultures and development of vernacular literatures, reshaping local identities and contributing to the emergence of new forms of political and national consciousness. As Christianity and the mission Churches were

⁴ Jeffrey Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines: Christianity and Colonial Power in India, 1818–1940* (Stanford, CA, 2002), pp. 246–9 (pp. 253–4).

reinterpreted, the colonized also adapted Christianity to their own purposes, including the mobilization of a variety of forms of resistance, and the formation of breakaway Churches. Independency was especially common in Africa. In southern Africa the development of African-initiated Churches dated to the late nineteenth century, attracting former Anglicans as well as Christians of other Protestant denominations. A desire to escape European control might form part of the context in which prophetic movements emerged, although these cannot be straightforwardly accommodated in narratives of anti-colonial nationalism.⁵

Through their educational institutions the mission Churches played a significant role in the formation of new colonial elites, and many of those who led political organizations in the post-war era had been educated in missionary schools. For a small number, the experience of participating in Christian networks including the interdenominational conferences of the developing international ecumenical movement further broadened horizons and ambitions, as it did for Methodist Thompson Samkange, future president of the Bantu Congress in Southern Rhodesia, who in 1938 attended the International Missionary Council Conference at Tambaram.⁶ In these ways mission Christianity contributed both institutionally and through its gospel to the decolonization of colonial cultures as it had also to their construction.

In part because in many areas of the colonial empires, especially in Africa, Christianity had been indigenized, and might be the religion of the new elites who led nationalist movements in the 1940s and 1950s, anti-colonialism at the end of empire was not generally also anti-Christian. Indeed in some instances, as in Tanzania, the principal nationalist organization attempted to mobilize all missionary Churches in support of independence.⁷ There were only a few locations where Christians—both European and local converts—found themselves the subject of violence. This was the case in Kenya, where Christians, including Anglicans, of all races were among the victims of the Mau Mau war. With its adherents required to swear allegiance in oath-taking ceremonies, Mau Mau quickly came to be perceived as anti-Christian, and by some as a political response to the strength of the East African Christian Revival of the 1930s, but it was not primarily a religious movement or one which universally targeted Christians.⁸

⁵ Elizabeth Elbourne, 'Religion in the British Empire', in Sarah Stockwell (ed.), *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 131–56 (pp. 146–7).

⁶ Terence Ranger, *Are We Not Also Men? The Samkange Family and African Politics in Zimbabwe, 1920–64* (Oxford, 1995), p. 62.

⁷ Frieder Ludwig, *Church and State in Tanzania: Aspects of a Changing Relationship, 1961–1994* (Leiden, 1999), p. 229.

⁸ John Lonsdale, 'Kikuyu Christianities: A History of Intimate Diversity', in David Maxwell (ed.), *Christianity and the African Imagination: Essays in Honour of Adrian Hastings* (Leiden, Boston, and Köln, 2001), pp. 157–97 (esp. pp. 181–3).

In Kenya, as in many colonies, the late colonial period was violent and troubled, but Anglican experiences of decolonization varied from location to location reflecting different political contexts and considerable variety in the local situations of Churches. Everywhere, however, the politics of the era introduced new difficulties and tensions. As discussed later in this chapter, the political and ideological currents of the period were felt directly in relation to new demands for local advancement within Churches whose leadership generally still rested in European hands. The politics of decolonization also reconfigured relations between missionary Churches of all denominations and the state as European colonial powers embraced development and welfare as a new legitimization for colonialism. First colonial states and subsequently post-colonial states assumed new roles in relation to social welfare, continuing and extending a process of professionalization in sectors in which the mission Churches had a long tradition of involvement. This increased financial pressures on the missionary societies at an already difficult time as they tried to ensure they did not lose ground in key areas like education;⁹ the Church Missionary Society (CMS) in response sought to maintain standards by concentrating resources on fewer institutions.¹⁰ Greater state intervention—likened by one disgruntled individual to (colonial) ‘government dictatorship’—also generated tensions on the ground where in the past the missions had been able to run schools ‘as they liked’.¹¹

In some locations where the British authorities employed unpopular and controversial measures against colonial politicians and organizations Anglicans too feared that they might be harmed by association with the colonial state. We can see this in relation to Uganda, where Anglicanism, established by the CMS, had achieved in practice the status of an established Church in the Ugandan kingdom of Buganda. In 1953, following tensions over British proposals to democratize the Bugandan assembly of notables and the security of Buganda’s future position within Uganda, the British deported the Bugandan ruler, Kabaka Mutesa II. European Anglicans feared that the actions of the colonial and imperial government might damage the Church’s standing locally, perhaps to the advantage of Roman Catholics.¹² In Cyprus, another location within the British Empire that experienced violent insurgency and counter-insurgency, it was the possible ramifications of imperial policy for the

⁹ *Church Assembly. Proceedings* (1945), pp. 206–7, K. A. Grubb, 19 June 1945.

¹⁰ Andrew Porter, ‘War, Colonialism and the British Experience: The Redefinition of Christian Missionary Policy, 1938–1952’, *Kirkliche Geschichte*, 5 (1992): 269–88 (pp. 284–5).

¹¹ LPL, Fisher 194, fos. 27–30, Eric Lucas, professor of education, Makerere College, Uganda, to Fisher, 14 Aug. 1957.

¹² See Kevin Ward, ‘The Church of Uganda and the Exile of Kabaka Mutesa II, 1953–55’, *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 28 (1998): 411–49; Sarah Stockwell, ‘“Splendidly Leading the Way”? Archbishop Fisher and Decolonisation in British Colonial Africa’, *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36 (2008): 545–64.

Communion's relations with other Christian Churches that troubled British Anglicans. The Cypriot Orthodox Church was at the head of the campaign among the island's Greek majority to persuade Britain to allow *'enosis'* [Ενωσις] or union with Greece. When the British administration deported the Cypriot Orthodox Archbishop Makarios III to the Seychelles, it complicated Anglican dealings with non-Roman Churches, not only in Cyprus and Greece but also in the World Council of Churches (through which Makarios sought to mobilize support of a transnational religious network). In contrast Anglicans in another British Mediterranean dependency, Malta, worried that the colonial state was insufficiently aligned with them. The British administration, anxious to accommodate the island's Catholic majority at a sensitive political juncture, showed in the opinion of one Lambeth official 'a most cynical disregard' for its responsibilities to protect the Anglican minority.¹³

Yet for all that the politics of decolonization introduced new uncertainties and difficulties and might alter the relationship of Church to state, in the 1940s and 1950s the most acute dislocation arising from political change occurred outside the European colonial empires, and was instead a consequence of the Cold War, part of the broader landscape of the era of decolonization, and of the collapse of another empire, the Japanese. In China, Communist success saw the expulsion of all Western missionaries from the country from 1949 to 1950; while in Korea, formerly a colony of Japan, the surrender of Japanese forces in 1945 resulted in the dual occupation of the country under Soviet and American forces, and from 1948 its division into two separate states, North and South Korea. In the Communist North the small Anglican Church, like other Christian missionary Churches, found itself cut off from other Christian communities except for the Chinese. In contrast, in many regions of the former European colonial empires it was only later that the full implications for foreign missions and Christian Churches of constitutional decolonization were experienced and their position became more difficult (as it did in India in the 1980s and 1990s with the rise of Hindu political communalism, or in Africa as democratic systems of government were replaced by authoritarian regimes).

Perhaps because this was the case the Churches are widely held not to have played a great part in nationalist movements and political processes leading to colonial constitutional independence,¹⁴ in contrast to the significant role local church leaders played later in the African context in struggles for democracy

¹³ LPL, Fisher 176, fos. 299–301, 'Note to the Archbishop' (n.d., but 1956), Herbert Waddams.

¹⁴ As e.g. Terence Ranger observed: 'Conference: Summary and Conclusion', in Paul Gifford (ed.), *The Christian Churches and the Democratisation of Africa* (Leiden, 1995), pp. 14–35 (esp. p. 15); also John Stuart, *British Missionaries and the End of Empire: East, Central and Southern Africa, 1939–1964* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, 2011), esp. p. 193; and Brian Stanley (ed.), *Missions, Nationalism, and the End of Empire* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, 2003), esp. p. 6.

in the 1980s.¹⁵ There were notable individual exceptions who associated themselves with anti-colonial movements, such as Revd C. F. Andrews of the Anglican Cambridge Mission to Delhi. In general, however, as Jeffrey Cox argues, the Churches' principal concern was with their own institutional survival rather than association with either one side or the other.¹⁶ Missionaries and clerics in the field aimed not to rock the boat: their responses might be characterized by concern, but they sought also accommodation with emerging elites and politics.

At one level such conclusions hold also for Anglican churchmen and missionaries, whose response it may be difficult to differentiate from that of other European Protestants. This is in part a reflection of the fact that such historical accounts as we have (and we still lack an extensive literature) of missionaries in the era of decolonization are generally written within a regional framework in which the Anglican experience is subsumed within a wider discussion of missionary societies of all denominations. Some notable Protestant missionary societies were interdenominational in character, and, even where this was not the case, in an era of growing ecumenism, ecumenical organizations frequently served as the principal forums in which Protestant missionary responses to the changing colonial political contexts in which they operated were debated and articulated—albeit that senior Anglicans generally occupied significant roles within these bodies.

Identifying an 'Anglican' response is also fraught with other difficulties. There was an extensive and diverse global network of different Anglican missionary societies as well as other lay voluntary organizations, such as the Mothers' Union, which by the Second World War numbered some 500,000 members in the United Kingdom, the dominions, and elsewhere.¹⁷ These different organizations represented quite different traditions within Anglicanism, from the Anglo-Catholic Universities' Mission to Central Africa (UMCA) to the Evangelical CMS, identities which in turn shaped their approach to relations with the state and to politics. Living and working in different locations within the British Empire, Anglicans might also forge new associations and develop distinct perspectives on imperial issues. Equally we cannot assume that the views of senior Anglicans in all these organizations aligned with those of wider Anglican clerical and lay communities. In Britain, it seems likely that the same spectrum of opinion from lack of interest, to liberal opposition to colonialism, to more conservative reactions, was to be found

¹⁵ Explored in Gifford (ed.), *Christian Churches*; T. Ranger (ed.), *Evangelical Christianity and Democracy in Africa* (Oxford, 2008); David Maxwell, 'Post-Colonial Christianity in Africa', in Hugh McLeod (ed.), *Cambridge History of Christianity: World Christianities, c.1914–2000* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 401–21.

¹⁶ Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines*, pp. 246–9, 253.

¹⁷ Cordelia Moyse, *A History of the Mothers' Union: Women, Anglicanism, and Globalisation, 1876–2008* (Woodbridge, 2009), 'Introduction'.

among Anglican laity as in wider British society. One uncompromising stance against colonialism came from an unlikely source in England's rural heartlands, in Thaxted, where under the leadership of the Christian socialist vicar, Jack Putterill, the parochial church council passed a series of resolutions, among other things deploring the British government's deportation of the Greek Cypriot Orthodox archbishop, Makarios III, and calling for independence for Cyprus.¹⁸ However, we lack other studies at parish level from which we could begin to venture broader assessments. Equally, it is difficult within a single account to capture the different politics and approaches of different Anglican Churches world-wide in a Communion that was already by the mid-twentieth century about much more than simply the 'exportation of English Anglicanism',¹⁹ and where the character of different provinces reflected local cultures as well as those of different missionary societies.

Nevertheless there is a distinctive story to be told about Anglicanism during decolonization: it lies not so much in the diverse experiences of mission in different overseas territories during the uncertain transition from colonialism to independence, but concerns instead the particularities of the Church of England as the established Church in England and Wales. In Britain as members of the Established Church, represented within the House of Lords, and part of a wider British social and political elite, senior Anglicans had a platform for intervention in metropolitan discussions of colonial political change and ready access to British officials and ministers of state. For its part, government sought to enlist the support of senior Anglicans over foreign issues, notably against Soviet Communism in the early Cold War.

Several Anglican officials in particular were crucial in shaping Anglican interventions on questions of race and colonial politics, and also, as we shall see, in adapting the structures and hierarchies of their own Churches and organizations to the new political environment, their tenures coinciding with the critical phase of European decolonization. These included the Evangelical Max Warren, from 1942 to 1963 general secretary of the CMS, who in the wake of Indian independence sought to prepare his Church in anticipation of likely developments elsewhere and who stood out as relatively forward-looking among European missionaries and churchmen widely held to have been slow to anticipate the scale and pace with which colonial political change would unfold.²⁰ Another was Canon Gerald W. Broomfield, general secretary from 1937 to 1961 of the UMCA, whose dioceses were located in those British colonies in East and Central Africa which presented some of the most

¹⁸ At its annual meeting to elect a new Parish Church Council: Essex County Record Office, Chelmsford, D/P/16/8/5B, Thaxted Parochial Church Council Minutes, 24 Mar. 1956. I owe this reference to Arthur Burns.

¹⁹ B. Kaye, *An Introduction to World Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2008), p. 44.

²⁰ Porter, 'War, Colonialism', p. 279.

intractable problems of the era, and another again Geoffrey Fisher, archbishop of Canterbury between 1945 and 1961 and metropolitan of the different missionary dioceses. Their successors, Michael Ramsey, archbishop of Canterbury 1961–74, and at the CMS John V. Taylor (general secretary 1963–74) continued initiatives begun under their stewardship and addressed new issues arising from the changing international environment. Concentrating on these senior figures perhaps runs the risk of presenting an unduly Anglo-centric approach to the history of the world-wide Communion. Nonetheless, with the important exception of PECUSA, at the outset of our period leadership within the Communion remained overwhelmingly in English hands. These men were at the heart of a series of overlapping networks, which included the Conference of British Missionary Societies as well as the British Council of Churches, formed in 1942. At Lambeth the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, based in Lambeth Palace and established to advise archbishops on relations with foreign Churches, was also significant in determining Anglican responses on some issues.

European clergy and missionaries, including Anglicans, engaged prominently with the politics of the era of decolonization in relation to issues of race, especially in South Africa following the election in 1948 of the National Party and the formalization of an apartheid regime. Among Anglican clerics in South Africa, Trevor Huddleston emerged as a notable critic, exposing the devastating effects of apartheid on his black parishioners in a book published in 1956, but many others were vocal in their opposition.²¹ In London, St Paul's Cathedral, later home of the OBE chapel, became the perhaps unlikely location for the anti-apartheid campaigning of Canon John Collins. In 1956 Collins established the Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa under the auspices of Christian Action (which he had founded ten years earlier) to meet the legal expenses of South African anti-apartheid activists standing trial for treason and to provide financial assistance to their families.²² White Anglican discussion of race within British *dependencies* focused naturally on those territories in East, Central, and southern Africa with significant white settler minorities. During the war, Anglicans in Britain were to the fore in discussions among missionaries and churchmen about the danger that discrimination on racial grounds in Britain's settler colonies risked escalating racial tension, especially in view of what the more prescient among them perceived as growing national consciousness among African peoples. Critical of the government's failure to address the problem, they feared too that damage might be done to the local standing of their own Church if they were associated in popular perception with white-dominated racial hierarchies.²³

²¹ Trevor Huddleston, *Naught for Your Comfort* (London, 1956).

²² John L. Collins, *Faith Under Fire* (London, 1966), pp. 222–3.

²³ Stuart, *British Missionaries*, ch. 1.

For at least the first decade after the war, however, other evidence points to an ambivalence towards racial equality and the persistence of older notions of race, that might at best be characterized as 'paternalistic'. In the mid-1950s Huddleston was significantly in advance of the leadership of the Anglican Church in South Africa, although the archbishop of Cape Town, Geoffrey Clayton, stood out against discriminatory legislation such as the Native Laws Amendment Bill (1957) which threatened black attendance at churches in 'white' areas.²⁴ In London Archbishop Fisher was wary of Huddleston and especially of Canon Collins; his own more conservative approach to issues of race and attempt to distinguish between the equality of men in 'God's sight' and in 'God's love' prompting a particularly bad-tempered set of exchanges with Collins in 1955.²⁵ As one recent study shows, British Evangelical Anglicans in the early post-war period, while encouraged by some developments among black Christian communities, most notably the East African Revival, also cleaved to a vision of the global Communion in which they would continue to lead rather than learn from non-white Anglicans.²⁶

Such attitudes were evident in Anglican responses to the proposal to bring together in a regional federation the territory of Southern Rhodesia, since 1923 self-governing under a white settler minority, with the two British colonies of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The associated British discourse of multi-racial partnership appeared to many British Christians to offer the prospect of a different model of race relations to the South African. The majority initially responded positively—if also with caution—to the federation established in 1953, with some like Canon Broomfield dismissive of black opposition, reflecting a view of African nationalism as 'strident, intransigent and unreasonable'. During the later 1950s mounting evidence that the federation was failing to deliver inter-racial 'partnership' forced British missionaries and senior Anglicans, including Broomfield, to reconsider their position.²⁷

By the 1960s Christian opposition to racial discrimination was more consistent and had grown in strength. The World Council of Churches in particular became increasingly militant in its stance, declaring its opposition to all forms of racial discrimination at its assembly at Evanston in the United States in 1954. It led international Christian opposition to apartheid and with the inauguration in 1970 of its 'Programme to Combat Racism' began, controversially, channelling funds to liberation movements in Africa. At Lambeth,

²⁴ John W. de Gruchy, *The Church Struggle in South Africa* (London, 2004), pp. 53–61, 83, 93.

²⁵ LPL, Fisher 154, fos. 323–4, 337–9, 341–6, correspondence between Fisher and Collins, 15 Sept.–3 Nov. 1955.

²⁶ Alister Chapman, 'What Anglican Evangelicals in England Learned from the World, 1945–2000', in Andrew Atherstone and John Maiden (eds.), *Evangelicalism and the Church of England in the Twentieth Century: Reform, Resistance and Revival* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 248–67 (esp. pp. 252–3).

²⁷ Stuart, *British Missionaries*, chs. 3–4, quotation p. 83.

Ramsey (while like many English Anglicans dismayed at this last initiative) was an outspoken critic of apartheid and of Ian Smith's minority regime in Rhodesia; closer to home he was active in the Lords in opposing the 1962 and 1968 Commonwealth Immigration Acts, his stance such that in the heated atmosphere of 1968 he required police protection.²⁸ In South Africa the Christian Churches were increasingly important to the campaign against apartheid, especially after the Anglican bishop, Desmond Tutu, assumed the leadership of the ecumenical South African Council of Churches in 1978.²⁹

As indicated earlier, Christian Churches are not generally held to have become significantly involved in the politics of nationalism or of constitutional decolonization. However, located at the interface between the British state and Christian communities overseas, the Church of England, sometimes at its own initiative, sometimes at that of the other parties concerned, occasionally played a role of 'honest broker' between the British government and colonial politicians, even while its officers might be ambivalent about both British policy and the colonial actors involved. Canterbury's personal involvement might extend beyond mediation: both Fisher, and later Ramsey (politically a more radical figure), sometimes also sought to act as the nation's 'conscience', exercising leadership where colonial problems raised moral issues, even where doing so might pit them against wider public opinion. This corresponds to what has been identified for the inter-war years as the Church's growing leadership over a broad 'moral community',³⁰ with the archbishop of Canterbury acting increasingly as 'the representative of the principal churches of the United Kingdom' rather than as primate of the Church of England.³¹ New radio and film media enabled senior Anglicans to reach wider audiences, not just at home, but overseas: national days of prayer were communicated throughout the empire until 1947. A response to the crises of the era, such occasions helped align the government with the Churches, ensuring political support for religious leadership in national life. Yet this also provided the context in which the Church intervened on imperial issues. While this might take the form of support for government initiatives, on other occasions the Church emerged as a significant critic of British imperial policy. At the same time establishment influenced how those at Lambeth perceived their relations to the state in ways which might prompt differences between those in the field, senior British Anglicans, and archbishops of Canterbury, and compromise the Church's ability to exercise that leadership.

²⁸ Owen Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey: A Life* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 166–8, 175–6, 241–72.

²⁹ De Gruchy, *Church*, pp. 58, 84, 114–27, 185–8.

³⁰ Matthew Grimley, *Citizenship, Community and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (Oxford, 2004), chs. 5, 6, Conclusion.

³¹ Philip Williamson, 'National Days of Prayer: The Churches, the State and Public Worship in Britain, 1899–1957', *English Historical Review*, 128 (2013): 323–66.

One such case arose before the war, when the Anglican archbishop of Jerusalem, George Francis Graham Brown, criticized the British administration in the Palestine mandate for violence by the police and military during the Arab Revolt (1936–9), for which he argued British leaders must take moral responsibility. At Lambeth, however, Cosmo Lang's sympathies lay generally with the Zionists, and like both his predecessor and also his successor as archbishop, he formulated his approach to Palestine 'through consultation and acquiescence with the British government generally and the Foreign Office in particular'.³²

Perhaps nothing, however, illustrates the ambiguities of the Church's position as Established Church better than the history of its involvement in late colonial Kenya. Here the position of the CMS-led Churches reflected that colony's particularly troubled history in the 1950s. Although the Kikuyu Churches largely chose to take a neutral stance, Anglicans became partners in the state's efforts to 'rehabilitate' the enormous number of Kikuyu detained in government camps, with both white missionary and Kikuyu revivalists engaging in evangelization among the detainees and in the administration of a confessional service for those who had taken the Mau Mau oath.³³ Yet from these close quarters Anglican personnel also became aware of abuses by the police and home guard, which were eventually to erupt onto wider public consciousness following the deaths of eleven Mau Mau detainees at the Hola detention camp in March 1959. In the 2000s new scholarship, and the release of archival material the existence of which was previously denied by the British government, revealed the extent of state-sponsored violence in the colony, and of British ministerial and administrative knowledge of it.³⁴ At the time the CMS and Lambeth Palace perhaps as much as any other agencies or organizations attempted to call the authorities both in Kenya and in London to account; but the Church's most senior figure also showed a natural tendency to defer to the state authorities that compromised its attempt to exercise moral leadership. Rather than open criticism, it was far wiser (as Fisher wrote to one worried lay English Anglican) 'privately, to approach the authorities and seek to strengthen their hands in tackling any such practice[s], if they exist, of which they would certainly disapprove'.³⁵ While senior Anglicans including

³² Laura Robson, 'Church, State and the Holy Land: British Protestant Approaches to Imperial Policy in Palestine, 1917–1948', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 39 (2011): 457–77 (pp. 461, 469).

³³ John Casson, 'Missionaries, Mau Mau and the Christian Frontier', in Pieter N. Holstrup and Hugh McLeod (eds.), *Missions and Missionaries* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 200–15; Stuart, *British Missionaries*, p. 140.

³⁴ David Anderson, *Histories of the Hanged: Britain's Dirty War in Kenya and the End of Empire* (London, 2005); Caroline Elkins, *Britain's Gulag: The Brutal End of Empire in Africa* (London, 2005).

³⁵ LPL, Fisher 127, fo. 232, Fisher to Miss I. G. Hobart-Hampden, 15 Sept. 1953.

Fisher continued to make representations to the British and Kenyan authorities as further evidence came to their attention, with the archbishop critical of the 'paralysing response' of the administration to prosecuting those suspected of abuse. Fisher had effectively acquiesced in the concealment of abuses being perpetrated in the East African colony.³⁶ Leonard Beecher, bishop of Mombasa, feared that although in private he and colleagues were in 'fairly constant touch' with the colonial authorities, this public silence was potentially injurious to the Church's standing locally. With leaders of Kenya's other Christian Churches, he later issued a statement expressing concern at the situation, and continued to criticize the British authorities over the maltreatment of Mau Mau detainees, and of Kikuyu civilians removed to the 'new villages', as well as expressing concern that not enough was being done to encourage the loyalist Kikuyu.³⁷

While inclined to defer to the British state, senior Anglicans intervened not only on issues to do with the welfare of colonial subjects but also on more overt political questions in those colonies where issues demanded attention as a result of the Church's local presence or where there was pressure from others to intercede. As indicated earlier, this was the case in Uganda and Cyprus, where senior Anglicans feared the actions of the British government would adversely impact upon their Church. Yet in both cases Fisher sought also to exercise leadership where he identified a moral failure at the heart of British policy. He made explicit his own perception of his role in correspondence about Cyprus with the British colonial secretary, Alan Lennox-Boyd. British policy in Cyprus he suggested 'has been a long battle for the retention by the British government of the moral initiative'. Having 'lost it long ago' when a government minister infamously declared Cyprus could 'never' become independent from Britain, they had slowly regained it, only now to bring that 'to an end' with the deportation of Makarios. Referring to a recent speech in the Lords in which he had urged the British government to resume negotiations with Makarios (while also urging the Orthodox archbishop to denounce violence),³⁸ 'I', Fisher went on, 'gave an invitation to the Government to resume the moral initiative and for five weeks they have made no move, and the Prime Minister says they do not intend to make any move in this moral field'.³⁹ Only months later, the British military invasion of Egypt in 1956, following the nationalization of the Suez Canal, provided another occasion on which Fisher sought to lay out what he perceived as the morally right course.⁴⁰

³⁶ LPL, Fisher 158, fo. 65, Fisher to Arthur Phillips, 10 Feb. 1955.

³⁷ LPL, Fisher 127, fos. 259–62, Beecher to Fisher, 4 Dec. 1953; e.g. Fisher 158, fos. 81–6, correspondence from Beecher and Warren, 16 and 29 Apr. 1955.

³⁸ Fisher in the House of Lords, 15 Mar. 1956, *Parliamentary Debates* (Lords), cols. 468–73.

³⁹ LPL, Fisher 170, fos. 62–3, Fisher to Lennox-Boyd, 19 Apr. 1956.

⁴⁰ Fisher in the House of Lords, 1 Nov. 1956, *Parliamentary Debates* (Lords), cols. 1293–7.

Other bishops, notably those of Exeter and Durham, praised the government's 'courage'.⁴¹

When Fisher left office in 1961 Britain had withdrawn from many of its colonies and the process of constitutional decolonization was well underway. It was nevertheless another imperial question, the prospect of Ian Smith's white minority government in Rhodesia making a Unilateral Declaration of Independence from Britain, that plunged his successor, Michael Ramsey, into controversy. In October 1965 Ramsey went beyond a resolution just agreed by the British Council of Churches in publicly endorsing the possibility of military action against Rhodesia, attracting the ire of sections of the press, public, and in the Lords. While public opinion aligned more with Ramsey when Smith finally did declare Rhodesia independent, such was the furore in the immediate aftermath of Ramsey's speech that this was another occasion on which police protection was required.⁴²

These examples do not necessarily support a contention that the Church of England played a significant role in British imperial policy-making even where subsequent developments might correspond to its lobbying and proposals. Both Fisher and Ramsey, like their predecessors at Lambeth, ideally preferred also to remain in step with the government of the day. Perhaps it was concern that it might cast a negative light on British imperial policy which led Fisher to respond discouragingly to one clergyman who proposed a national day of prayer for Cyprus, observing that 'the trouble in Cyprus is unfortunately all in a day's work: it was in Uganda only a short-time ago: it may be Malta tomorrow'.⁴³ Even so in Fisher's case his repeated representations to the Colonial Office and increasingly public denunciations of colonial and imperial policy were becoming an issue in Church-state relations at home, with some in Whitehall asking if the Church was acting in ways that were 'improper and even unconstitutional'.⁴⁴ It was his criticisms of domestic policies which pitted Fisher most visibly against Harold Macmillan's Conservative government.⁴⁵ In Ramsey's case his efforts at moral leadership over Rhodesia have been described as stirring up 'the windiest political storm endured by an Archbishop of Canterbury since the revolution of 1688'.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Paul A. Welsby, *History of the Church of England, 1945–1980* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 97–8.

⁴² Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey*, pp. 241–50.

⁴³ LPL, Fisher 170, fo. 186, Fisher to Revd D. Browne, 3 July 1956.

⁴⁴ The National Archives, CO 926/632, minute by Melville, 7 Feb. 1957, cited in Sarah Stockwell, '“Improper and Even Unconstitutional”: The Involvement of the Church of England in the Politics of the End of Empire in Cyprus', in Melanie Barber and Stephen Taylor with Gabriel Sewell (eds.), *From the Reformation to the Permissive Society: A Miscellany in Celebration of the 400th Anniversary of Lambeth Palace Library* (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 583–656 (p. 599).

⁴⁵ David Hein, *Geoffrey Fisher: Archbishop of Canterbury 1945–1961* (Eugene, OR, 2007), pp. 87–8.

⁴⁶ Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey*, pp. 244–51 (esp. p. 245).

INSTITUTIONAL ADAPTATION

The transition from European colonial rule to self-government also required European Church leaders to reform their own institutional structures and practices. In this Anglicans were of course by no means unique among Western Churches in the colonial empires. However, if one element of a distinctive Anglican experience of decolonization concerns the position of the Church of England as part of the body politic at the nexus of imperial policy-making, the other lies in the ways in which this 'decolonization' of its own structures and hierarchies reflected its distinct and divergent theological traditions and practices.

In the late 1940s Anglican missionary societies and Churches still looked—and were—distinctly 'colonial'. Independent provinces had already been established in India, Burma, and Ceylon (1835), in Britain's former settler colonies in Australia (1847–1914), South Africa (1853), New Zealand (1858), and Canada (1862), as well as in the West Indies (1883), Japan (1887), and China (1930),⁴⁷ but overseas bishoprics elsewhere in the colonial empires remained under the jurisdiction of Canterbury. What is more, despite their heavy reliance on 'native' catechists, long into the post-war era these Churches continued to be organized on racial lines. The absence of local bishops was most marked in the colonial empire. In South Asia the first Indian Anglican bishop, V. S. Azariah had been appointed in 1912; but there were no further Indian diocesan appointments until 1935; and in Pakistan the first local bishop was only appointed in 1957. There had been a few white Creole bishops in the Caribbean since the end of the nineteenth century, but the first West Indian was elected as an assistant bishop in Jamaica in 1947. In 1940s South Africa there were no black African bishops, while elsewhere in British colonial Africa the Anglican episcopate was entirely white as no African diocesan bishop had been appointed since the death of Samuel Crowther in 1891. Nor had much effort been given to the development of theological schools and the formation of an African clergy. The small numbers of African ordinands were in striking contrast to the large numbers of catechists: in Uganda there were seventy African clergy in the 1920s but 4,000 catechists; by 1960 the number of African clergy had risen to 323, and catechists to 5,310.⁴⁸

This state of affairs might have been surprising to Henry Venn, the honorary secretary of the CMS from the 1840s to the 1870s, who had famously articulated a vision of the development of indigenous Churches and of the euthanasia of mission. In areas of white settlement, however, this aspiration had not sat easily with Anglican Churches catering to local European populations, nor accommodated a form of 'institutional' missionary racism that

⁴⁷ W. M. Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997), Appendix.

⁴⁸ Bengt Sundkler and Christopher Steed, *A History of the Church in Africa* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 856.

equated European control with the maintenance of standards.⁴⁹ In Africa, although there had been some limited consideration of the possibilities for African advancement within Anglican missionary societies, caution and uncertainty 'stifled initiative and reinforced conservatism'.⁵⁰ Among Anglican missionary societies and organizations there was anyway a wide spectrum of approaches towards localization. For example, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) sought from the early 1950s to advance the independence of its churches, establishing a fund in 1951 to support the transfer of responsibility for its churches overseas, and agreeing in the case of India and the West Indies to prioritize training of local ordinands over the dispatch of Western missionaries.⁵¹ In contrast, as we shall see, the Anglo-Catholics of the UMCA found adjustment to the new circumstances 'peculiarly difficult'.⁵² The CMS sought to train more ordinands locally, but encountered difficulties in recruiting expatriate staff to fill posts at local theological colleges.⁵³ The Mothers' Union, whose overseas branches were also structured on a racial basis with separate branches in some areas for white and black members, also struggled to adapt to the new environment. While it sought to encourage indigenous leadership and training, it was slower to discard old colonial attitudes. It had to be 'forced to near breaking point' before it eventually agreed (via a new constitution in 1974) to grant autonomy to its overseas branches. Thereafter, however, its new vision of 'unity in diversity' proved a model for its expansion in the 'global South', where, as secularization and social change in its original heartlands in the United Kingdom and the white dominions took their toll, it expanded enormously.⁵⁴

Perhaps most significant in the organizational changes carried through during the era of decolonization was the Church of England's own policy of devolution, grouping overseas dioceses under Canterbury's jurisdiction into new regional provinces with their own archiepiscopal authorities. These initiatives began a process which would later lead to the multiplication of dioceses within the newly established provinces and proliferation of new provinces based on smaller geographical areas. Devolution corresponded to a strategic vision as successive archbishops of Canterbury, especially Fisher, sought to adapt the Church to the political climate of the time, forming

⁴⁹ Sundkler and Steed, *History of the Church*, p. 621; Jeffrey Cox, *The British Missionary Enterprise since 1700* (New York and Abingdon, 2008), pp. 198–200; Daniel O'Connor and others, *Three Centuries of Mission: The United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1701–2000* (London and New York, 2000), p. 92.

⁵⁰ Stuart, *British Missionaries*, p. 27.

⁵¹ O'Connor, *Three Centuries*, pp. 122, 130–1.

⁵² Andrew Porter, 'The Universities' Mission to Central Africa: Anglo-Catholicism and the Twentieth-Century Colonial Encounter', in Stanley (ed.), *Missions*, pp. 79–108 (p. 106).

⁵³ LPL, Fisher 133, fos. 145–8, 'Memo on theological training courses in the dioceses of Uganda and the Upper Nile', enclosed Max Warren to Fisher, 27 July 1953.

⁵⁴ Moyse, *History*, pp. 12, 202–3, 220, 247.

national and regional structures for overseas Anglican Churches that might preserve some role for their own office and maintain Anglicanism in a 'position of influence world-wide in relation to other churches', while creating a context which would accommodate local leadership.⁵⁵ Episcopacy was at the heart of this strategy, reflecting the ways in which, from the metropolitan diocesan revival in the nineteenth century the formation of overseas dioceses had been crucial in the expansion of Anglicanism within the empire.⁵⁶ Episcopacy remained a defining feature of the world-wide Anglican Communion;⁵⁷ diocesan and provincial development hence sat uneasily with regional schemes for union with non-episcopal Churches.

Provincial development was most significant in Africa. In West Africa, the most politically advanced region within Britain's African empire, ambition to achieve a province dated back to the beginning of the century. It was only in 1943, however, that progress properly began with the attainment of the province when Temple wrote proposing it to the local bishops who then met to discuss it at Lagos the following year.⁵⁸ Fisher continued work on the constitution and the province was inaugurated on 17 April 1951 at the oldest see within the new province, Sierra Leone. By acting quickly, Fisher hoped to avoid complications of the kind raised by the new Church of South India, establishing the new province in advance of a similar union of Nigerian Churches being considered in the Niger Diocese in the late 1940s.⁵⁹ Elsewhere in Africa provincial development was complicated by regional rivalries, and, as already indicated, by differences between Anglican missionary societies. With many different missionary societies, variations within Anglicanism were not only replicated overseas but to some extent magnified by what Fisher lamented as the Church's unfortunate dispatch overseas of missionaries with 'discordant methods of teaching and worship', resulting in the development of dioceses reflecting quite different Anglican traditions.⁶⁰ While different societies did cooperate in the formation of provinces, as the SPG and CMS did in West Africa, provincial development in East and Central Africa between the Anglo-Catholic UMCA dioceses of Nyasaland, Zanzibar, Northern Rhodesia, Masasi, and south-west Tanganyika and those of

⁵⁵ Stuart Piggin, 'Australian Anglicanism in a Worldwide Context', in Bruce Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia: A History* (Melbourne, 2002), pp. 213–16; see also Jacob, *Making*, pp. 296–7.

⁵⁶ Strong, *Anglicanism*, p. 293; Arthur Burns, *The Diocesan Revival in the Church of England, c.1800–1870* (Oxford, 1999).

⁵⁷ Kevin Ward, 'The Development of Anglicanism as a Global Communion', in Andrew Wingate, Kevin Ward, Carrie Pemberton, and Wilson Sitshebo (eds.), *Anglicanism: A Global Communion* (London, 1998), pp. 13–21 (esp. p. 20).

⁵⁸ LPL, Fisher 93, fos. 133–9, 'Notes on the Formation of a new Church Province of West Africa' [draft article by bishop of Lagos].

⁵⁹ LPL, Fisher 60, fos. 370–9, esp. 371, Fisher to Bishop of Lagos, 25 June 1949.

⁶⁰ LPL, Fisher 241, fos. 39–52, esp. 50, Copy of [draft?] sermon to be delivered at inauguration of the Province of East Africa [1960].

the more Evangelical CMS in Kenya and Central Tanganyika had to overcome these ongoing differences of Church party. Here, the UMCA worried that the creation of a new province in Central Africa might lead to a loss of control to the CMS 'with its enthusiasm for union and inter-communion'.⁶¹ Even so, further provinces quickly followed: in Central Africa in 1955; and in East Africa in 1960, where a separate province of Uganda was also created the following year. The speed with which provincial development was enacted enabled Fisher to claim that the Church was 'splendidly leading the way'.⁶²

Fisher's ambitions to carry through a similar process of provincial development in the Middle East (from the dioceses of Egypt, the Sudan, and Iran), South East Asia, and the Pacific were not realized within his archiepiscopate, but he nevertheless established structures which laid the foundations for future development in each region, including (in 1957) an archbishopric in Jerusalem to act as metropolitan of an episcopal synod of the bishops in the region.⁶³ It was also left to Fisher's successors to continue the process of provincial development in island territories and in areas with smaller Anglican communities, for example in South America, where Ramsey took steps towards provincial development among Anglican dioceses. Perhaps because he lacked Fisher's administrative talents, the initial plan transferred responsibility for the Church in the Falkland Islands (which Ramsey had promised would remain under his own jurisdiction) to an Argentinian bishop.⁶⁴ The Church in the Province of the Indian Ocean comprising the dioceses of Mauritius, Madagascar, and the Seychelles was only formed in 1973; even then the SPG thought it 'smells of the mothballs of colonialism'.⁶⁵

This period was also notable for the beginning of the transfer of authority from whites to non-Europeans. While historically slow to begin, the transfer of responsibility from whites to local people at diocesan level gathered pace in the 1950s as constitutional progress towards self-government and colonial desire to see local people appointed to posts held by expatriates created their own imperative for change, although it would be some years before overseas diocesans ceased to be overwhelmingly white. Much of the momentum came from non-Europeans within the churches or from the wider local community. This was the case in West Africa where Africanization of the episcopate began first in sub-Saharan Africa. Shortly after the inauguration of the new West African province its first archbishop, Leslie Vining, reported that in Nigeria 'the more critical press watch us with the eyes of a hawk' especially since the colony was now advancing to self-government.⁶⁶ An African was appointed assistant

⁶¹ Porter, 'Universities' Mission', pp. 84, 100–1.

⁶² Quoted in Stockwell, "‘Splendidly Leading the Way’?".

⁶³ Jacob, *Making*, pp. 271–5.

⁶⁴ Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey*, pp. 233–4.

⁶⁵ Quoted in O'Connor, *Three Centuries*, p. 131.

⁶⁶ LPL, Fisher 93, fos. 261–2, Archbishop Vining to Fisher, 5 June 1951.

bishop in Accra in 1951; and the establishment of the new province was quickly followed by steps to increase the number of African bishops, with a synod held for the nomination of several diocesan bishops. Those who were perceived as obstacles to the promotion of local clergy might find themselves forced out, as the Revd J. H. Hoare was from the CMS in India in 1914,⁶⁷ and the Anglican bishop of the UMCA diocese of Masasi, Mark Wray, some decades later in Tanzania. With no African episcopal appointments, African clergy in Tanganyika organized meetings in opposition to Wray, who was perceived as supportive of a 'colour bar'. Wray resigned in 1959. Wary lest, as Broomfield put it, the resignation elicit 'headlines in the Press "English Bishop sacked by Africans"', his resignation was explained in terms of a decision by the local synod to reject one of his recommendations.⁶⁸

Faced with pressures for the appointment of more local diocesans, senior Anglicans acted strategically to sustain the Church's position where necessary in the face of challenges from other Churches, especially Roman Catholic. The discussions over Wray's successor in Tanganyika provide a good illustration (even though here it resulted in the appointment of another European). As it grappled with local opposition and sought also to ensure that Masasi would enter the new East African Province on its formation, the UMCA proposed Trevor Huddleston for the position, his reputation as a campaigner against apartheid ensuring that he would be more acceptable to local African opinion. That Huddleston was, as Lord Howick, former governor of Kenya, put it, one of the few Europeans to 'have won African confidence' yet 'not [be] tarred with the "colonial" brush', gave him an opportunity to exercise influence for good, and helped overcome Archbishop Fisher's own reservation about a man whose public support for direct action against the South African government he initially felt made it 'almost impossible' in 'this country to appoint him'.⁶⁹

Beyond the colonial empires a concurrent decolonization process was unfolding elsewhere within the British world. In Australia, despite the nineteenth-century development of provinces and a general synod, the Church was still legally subordinate to the Church of England and with many of the characteristics of a colonial Church, both in its adherence to English models and practice and in its racial construction. It was only in 1962 that a new constitution was agreed which gave it independence from the Church of England; in 1981 it adopted the title 'Anglican Church of Australia'. Although in the 1950s and 1960s there were some Australian bishops attuned to the wider decolonizing currents of the era who argued that their Church

⁶⁷ Cox, *Imperial Fault Lines*, p. 253.

⁶⁸ Broomfield to Fisher, 25 Sept. 1959, cited in Ludwig, *Church and State*, pp. 45–6.

⁶⁹ LPL, Fisher 249, fos. 93–7, Broomfield to Fisher, 29 Feb. 1960; fos. 105–7, Fisher to Bishop of Mombasa, 22 Mar. 1960; fos. 113–15, Baring to Fisher, 29 Apr. 1960.

needed to increase its independence from the Church of England,⁷⁰ it was Fisher who encouraged the Australian dioceses, riven by regional and factional differences, to take crucial steps in this direction, drafting a new constitution, which served as the basis for subsequent negotiations, during his voyage home from the 1950 Australian General Synod.⁷¹

Here and elsewhere within the independent Commonwealth the leadership of Anglican Churches was still white and often English. As late as 1959 English bishops were still in the majority in New Zealand, while half of all Australian diocesans had been educated in England, a reflection of the dearth of 'good' theological colleges in the dominions (although such assessments among contemporary English Anglicans may have constituted a form of 'imperialist' judgement).⁷² Indeed, in the former white settlement colonies decolonization was a twofold process, entailing the elevation of local candidates over English and the development of national Churches, and also greater non-white representation. Even after its independence from the Church of England, the Anglican Church in Australia resembled long into the 1980s an 'Anglican ghetto in an increasingly multi-cultural Australia' as Bishop George Hearn of Rockhampton put it.⁷³ It was not until 1985 that the first Aboriginal, Arthur Malcolm, was consecrated, serving as an assistant bishop to the Aboriginal people in the diocese of North Queensland.⁷⁴ In New Zealand in the 1970s new consciousness of racism which stemmed from movements initially focused on apartheid in South Africa impacted upon a Church also still colonial in character. In 1992 a revised constitution was introduced, replacing that of 1857. Through recognition of the autonomy of three distinct sets of ecclesiastical structures—the Māori episcopal regions, the Pākehā (i.e. those of European and other non-Māori descent) dioceses, and the diocese of Polynesia—this provided greater allowance for the cultural diversity of the three principal communities within the Church.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE GLOBAL TRANSFORMATION OF ANGLICANISM

These changes within the global Anglican Communion reflected broader changes associated with the 'era of decolonization': the greater purchase of anti-colonial and anti-racial ideologies; the decline of Britain, as well as other

⁷⁰ B. H. Fletcher, 'Anglicanism and National Identity in Australia since 1962', *Journal of Religious History*, 25 (2001): 324–45 (esp. pp. 326–7).

⁷¹ Tom Frame, 'Local Differences, Social and National Identity, 1930–1966', in Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia*, pp. 100–23 (esp. pp. 108–9, 119).

⁷² Jacob, *Making*, p. 293.

⁷³ *Church Scene*, 18 July 1989, p. 2, cited in Fletcher, 'Anglicanism and National Identity', p. 335.

⁷⁴ Ian Breward, *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 264–5.

former European colonial powers, relative to the new superpower states; and the politics of the Cold War. Historians of decolonization argue that after 1945 the British Empire became transformed as part of an 'Anglo-American coalition'.⁷⁵ We can chart a similar process in relation to world-wide Anglicanism, although the same ambivalence towards Americans and their growing global influence evident among British statesmen and officials struggling to come to terms with Britain's new subordinate place in an American-dominated world are also to be found among some British churchmen in the post-war era.⁷⁶ After 1945, the influence of PECUSA, which had emerged as an alternative power base within the Communion, was apparent in a variety of ways. It was instrumental in pushing for the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis in 1954, the first to take place outside Britain, and again for a second congress, which met at Toronto in 1963, which saw the launch of the 'Mutual Responsibility and Inter-Dependence in the Body of Christ' initiative, significant in the overall development of the Anglican Communion. From different locations around the world SPG missionaries reported in the 1950s how American churches were 'pouring' in men and money.⁷⁷

There was also some concurrent weakening in identification with the Church of England, including within the former white settlement colonies in the 'British World'. In Australia, after the First World War the Anglican Church had formed new associations with the Australian nation and assumed a key role in the commemoration of Anzac Day, a focus for emergent Australian nationalism. However, this was a form of nationalism which had sat comfortably alongside an enduring affiliation to Britain and monarchy, with the Anglican Church, then the country's largest Christian denomination, a key reservoir of the persistent Britishness that characterized identity well into the post-war era. In Canada where the Anglican Church was smaller as a proportion of population than it was in Australia, it too had remained deeply attached to Britain and monarchy; but in the 1960s this changed, alongside a process of rapid secularization, especially in Canada's cities.

Gradually within the Anglican Communion more national Churches emerged, both in ethos and institutions in which new approaches to gender, as well as race, were introduced. The mid to later twentieth century also saw the adoption of new liturgies, styles of worship, and of more 'home grown' architecture and musical repertoires. The Anglican churches in Victoria designed by prolific Australian ecclesiastical architect Louis Williams which departed from conventional Gothic style provide one illustration.⁷⁸ In Australia ecclesiastical

⁷⁵ W. R. Louis and R. Robinson, 'The Imperialism of Decolonization', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 22 (1994): 462–511, quotation at p. 462.

⁷⁶ Chapman, 'What Anglican Evangelicals in England Learned from the World', pp. 250–1.

⁷⁷ O'Connor, *Three Centuries*, p. 136.

⁷⁸ Breward, *History*, pp. 363–5.

independence also opened the way for the introduction in 1978 of a new Prayer Book, ending a long period of common liturgical practice.⁷⁹ It was perhaps a vain hope that Archbishop Fisher articulated when he refused to use local variants of the liturgy during his visit to inaugurate the Central African province as likely to undermine an 'essential' purpose of his visit, 'to demonstrate the link with the see of Canterbury and the Church of England'.⁸⁰

It would be simplistic to attribute all such innovations in Anglican style and form to decolonizing forces, neglecting other dynamics at work (from the growth of charismatic worship to the demands posed by urbanization). Nor must we over-emphasize the discontinuities of the decolonization era. In many regions the character of Anglican Churches was already as much the product of local patterns of appropriation and adaptation as it was of the distinct theology and practice of metropolitan-based missionary societies, and might incorporate elements of vernacular culture and religious practice. Conversely, the overseas expansion of English Anglicanism left throughout the world-wide Communion a very visible monumental legacy in the form of neo-classical, Anglo-Norman, and Gothic churches and cathedrals, adapted to local climates and cultures but of recognizable Anglican style.⁸¹ Yet the development of new identities and practices also constituted part of a broader history of decolonization, albeit the full discussion of which belongs to other chapters in this volume.

The developing strength of Evangelicalism within different locations including England was also significant in reconfiguring networks within the Communion. In Australia Sydney Evangelicals proved willing to 'oppose the centralising trends within pan-Anglican ecclesiastical structures', forging new links with the Church of England in South Africa (where Evangelical schismatics had broken away from the Church of the Province of South Africa on its formation in 1870) and, in the 1980s and 1990s, with Anglican Evangelicals in Britain too.⁸² While England increasingly became a 'hub for the global Anglican renewal network', with Anglicans from around the world attending charismatic meetings before the Lambeth Conferences,⁸³ as the numerical importance of the southern Churches had grown, the Anglican Communion had moved towards 'an agonizing global schism along North-South lines'.⁸⁴

⁷⁹ Breward, *History*, pp. 331, 363–5.

⁸⁰ LPL, Fisher 153, fos. 264–5, Fisher to the Bishop of Mashonaland, 29 Jan. 1955.

⁸¹ G. A. Bremner, *Imperial Gothic: Religious Architecture and High Anglican Culture in the British Empire, c.1840–1970* (New Haven, CT and London, 2013), e.g. pp. 68, 321.

⁸² Piggin, 'Australian Anglicanism', pp. 213–16.

⁸³ Andrew Atherstone and John Maiden, 'Anglican Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: Identities and Contexts', in Atherstone and Maiden (eds.), *Evangelicalism*, pp. 1–47, quotation from p. 45.

⁸⁴ Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (3rd edn., Oxford, 2011), p. xii.

The full implications of these developments (which represent the longer-workings out of the decolonization process) for the domestic Church of England were yet to be seen at the beginning of the twenty-first century, but in its more immediate aftermath the unravelling of empires necessitated a process of reinvention and reorganization on the part of the missionary societies. While these became increasingly focused on development work, becoming what David Maxwell dubbed 'NGO-ised', most but not all survived the ends of empires.⁸⁵ The SPG recruited extensively in Britain throughout the 1960s; in 1963 more joined the organization than in any previous year in its history. The UMCA was one casualty, however, in 1965 merging with the SPG to form the USPG (United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel), its independent existence having been rendered more difficult by provincial development in East and Central Africa. Here the UMCA dioceses were not only now dispersed across three separate provinces, but the Anglican leaders of the new provinces were required to liaise with the various Anglican missionary societies whose dioceses had now been brought together in single provinces.⁸⁶ As the UMCA had feared, provincial development also saw the Evangelicals gain in strength, for example in Tanzania, where the number of dioceses with an Evangelical background expanded more rapidly than those with an Anglo-Catholic character following constitutional independence.⁸⁷ Of more symbolic significance, and some practical consequence to Anglican clergy ordained outside England, was the passage of the Overseas and Other Clergy (Ministry and Ordination) Measure (1967), which repealed most provisions of the 1874 Colonial Clergy Act as well as the Ordination of Aliens Act (1784), Ordinations for Colonies Act (1819), and the Colonial Bishops Act (1852). Not only was the title of the 1874 Act now (as one critic alleged) clearly 'nonsensical', but in requiring Anglican clergy ordained overseas to secure various permissions before they could work in England it left some feeling as if they were 'second class clergyman'.⁸⁸ As the bishop of Adelaide opined, it was unlikely the Church of England in England would have accepted such a measure if applied the other way around.⁸⁹

As foreseen by Fisher in 1951, empire increasingly 'came home' in matters affecting the Church of England and Anglican Communion as also in other areas of life, although here again we must be careful not to overstate the

⁸⁵ David Maxwell, 'Post-Colonial Christianity in Africa', in McLeod (ed.), *Cambridge History*, pp. 401–21 (esp. p. 411).

⁸⁶ O'Connor, *Three Centuries*, pp. 153–4, 157, 160–5.

⁸⁷ Ward, 'Church of Uganda', p. 94; Ludwig, *Church and State*, pp. 173–4.

⁸⁸ *Church Assembly. Proceedings* (1965), pp. 485–90, W. S. Wigglesworth introducing the measure, 9 Nov. 1965.

⁸⁹ LPL, Ramsey 56, fos. 272–6, Bishop of Adelaide to Asst. Bishop of Coventry (and former Archdeacon of Melbourne), 2 Apr. 1964; D. M. M. Carey to Michael Nott, Senior Chaplain, Lambeth, 15 Oct. 1964.

discontinuities, and neglect the degree to which Anglicanism within the colonial empire had impacted on the practices of the Church in England in earlier periods. In the post-war era this impact took different forms, including Commonwealth immigrants to Britain, many of whom encountered racism and hostility within Anglican congregations. Beginning with the formation of an Immigrants Group within the Overseas Council of the Church Assembly comprising representatives of all the main Anglican missionary societies in the 1950s, Anglican missionary societies were to the fore in the British Churches' work with these communities. While perhaps understandable in terms of the particular expertise of these societies, the association of Commonwealth immigration to Britain with the 'missionary' sphere indicated the extent to which the domestic Church had yet to experience a full process of domestic 'decolonization'. It also begged the question of how experience and expertise gleaned largely overseas shaped the domestic Church of England in a 'post-imperial' era, including via returning missionaries and clergy entering posts within the home Church: between 1935 and 1945 an estimated 1,000 posts had been found for returned missionaries, either as incumbents or assistant curates, although there were difficulties encountered in placing some formerly employed overseas.⁹⁰ From the 1970s too, as Anglican Churches in former colonies became increasingly independent and British society more secular, the patterns of missionary work among the British societies altered, with declining numbers leaving Britain for overseas, and Britain itself becoming a site of mission as the major Anglican societies like the CMS and USPG began to bring missionaries to Britain. In 1995 this development was reflected in the decision of the former to change its name from the Church Missionary Society to the Church Mission Society.

Understood as a process of broad cultural, social, and economic change, in which ideologies and cultures of colonialism might be discarded, rather than a narrow set of constitutional developments, decolonization was a process that occurred within Britain too. In this context, and more speculatively, we might ask whether the Church's interventions in late colonial politics helped lay some of the foundations for what was in some respects its surprising resurgence as a source of criticism of British state policies on a wider front in the latter twentieth century. But it was the more obviously outspoken Anglicans, such as Collins and Huddleston, whatever the tensions they provoked within Anglicanism in Britain and elsewhere, who perhaps provided a model for the kind of positioning that the Church of England would adopt with some confidence by the 1980s when it would be a dean of Collins's cathedral, Alan Webster, who would help to forge the 'Faith in the City' critique of Thatcherism and help design the service in which Archbishop Robert Runcie

⁹⁰ *Church Assembly. Proceedings* (1945), pp. 206–9, 19 June 1945.

delivered a notoriously un-jingoistic Falklands sermon, drafted by Richard Chartres, later bishop of London. In this sense, perhaps it can be said that a post-imperial Britain acquired one of its distinctive public voices in part through the legacy of decolonization, establishing within the Church something akin to what Adrian Hastings described as 'a cherished memory' that 'actually did something to redeem the shoddy racist record of almost all the Churches over many decades'.⁹¹

CONCLUSION

The 'era of decolonization' was, then, ultimately a profoundly transformative one, in which we can discern particular Anglican experiences and approaches. It was also a protracted one, whose effects might be felt long after the constitutional end of empires. By exploring the complex and diverse involvements of Anglican leaders in decolonization, this chapter has aimed to highlight not only its role in the decolonization process, but also to show that the end of empires was as profoundly constitutive of the Church in Britain as overseas, and in ways that were only beginning to be evident in the early twenty-first century.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Casson, John, 'Missionaries, Mau Mau and the Christian Frontier', in Pieter N. Holstrup and Hugh McLeod (eds.), *Missions and Missionaries* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 200–15.
- Chapman, Alistair, 'What Anglican Evangelicals in England Learned from the World, 1945–2000', in Andrew Atherstone and John Maiden (eds.), *Evangelicalism and the Church of England in the Twentieth Century: Reform, Resistance and Revival* (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 248–67.
- Cox, Jeffrey, *Imperial Fault Lines: Christianity and Colonial Power in India, 1818–1940* (Stanford, CA, 2002).
- de Gruchy, John W., *The Church Struggle in South Africa* (London, 2004).
- Jacob, W. M., *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997).
- Kaye, Bruce (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia: A History* (Melbourne, 2002).
- Lonsdale, John, 'Kikuyu Christianities: A History of Intimate Diversity', in David Maxwell (ed.), *Christianity and the African Imagination: Essays in Honour of Adrian Hastings* (Leiden, Boston, and Koln, 2001), pp. 157–97.

⁹¹ Hastings, *Church in Africa*, p. 570.

- Ludwig, Frieder, *Church and State in Tanzania: Aspects of A Changing Relationship, 1961–1994* (Leiden, 1999).
- Maxwell, David, 'Post-Colonial Christianity in Africa', in Hugh McLeod (ed.), *Cambridge History of Christianity: World Christianities, c.1914–2000* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 401–21.
- O'Connor, Daniel et al., *Three Centuries of Mission: The United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1701–2000* (London and New York, 2000).
- Porter, Andrew, 'War, Colonialism and the British Experience: The Redefinition of Christian Missionary Policy, 1938–1952', *Kirkliche Geschichte*, 5 (1992): 269–88.
- Robson, Laura, 'Church, State and the Holy Land: British Protestant Approaches to Imperial Policy in Palestine, 1917–1948', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 39 (2011): 457–77.
- Stanley, Brian (ed.), *Missions, Nationalism, and the End of Empire* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, 2003).
- Stockwell, Sarah, "'Splendidly Leading the Way"? Archbishop Fisher and Decolonisation in British Colonial Africa', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36 (2008): 545–64.
- Stockwell, Sarah, "'Improper and Even Unconstitutional": The Involvement of the Church of England in the Politics of the End of Empire in Cyprus', in Melanie Barber and Stephen Taylor with Gabriel Sewell (eds.), *From the Reformation to the Permissive Society: A Miscellany in Celebration of the 400th Anniversary of Lambeth Palace Library* (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 583–656.
- Stuart, John, *British Missionaries and the End of Empire: East, Central and Southern Africa, 1939–1964* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, 2011).
- Ward, Kevin, 'The Church of Uganda and the Exile of Kabaka Mutesa II, 1953–55', *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 28 (1998): 411–49.
- Ward, Kevin, 'The Development of Anglicanism as a Global Communion', in Andrew Wingate Kevin Ward, Carrie Pemberton, and Wilson Sitshebo (eds.), *Anglicanism: A Global Communion* (London, 1998), pp. 13–21.

Anglicanism and Christian Unity in the Twentieth Century

Paul Avis

It seems that the history of the Christian Church has been one of continual division and endemic fragmentation. Ceaseless controversy has generated innumerable splits. The first schisms occurred in New Testament times, as the letters of Paul and other canonical writers bear witness. The early councils of the Church produced ostensibly unifying formulae, but did so at the expense of those who could not accept them and were therefore excluded and often persecuted. Christians have often delighted to condemn and anathematize each other, denying salvation to one another. The rhetoric of unity, harmony, and unanimity that figures prominently in the New Testament has been drowned out by the chorus of mutual detestation.

However, that is far from being the whole story. Even the early centuries of the Church saw various attempts at reconciliation. Concerted attempts to heal the wounds of division among Christians were made by the Conciliar Movement of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, a movement of ecclesiological renewal and political action that, a century later, influenced the Reformation and the emergent Church of England.¹ In the sixteenth century Catholic humanists and Protestant reformers made several attempts at reconciliation. Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, John Calvin, and Philip Melancthon shared a vision of a Protestant united front. In the eighteenth century Archbishop William Wake was engaged in negotiations to unite the Anglican and Gallican Churches. As the Methodist movement drifted away from its roots in the Church of England after the death of John Wesley and coalesced into a Church, there were those, like Charles Wesley, who fought to hold Methodism within the Church. In the middle decades of the nineteenth

¹ Paul Avis, *Beyond the Reformation: Authority, Primacy and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition* (London and New York, 2006).

century various Anglican bishops, including the Evangelical archbishop of Canterbury J. B. Sumner, made overtures to the Methodists, sometimes ineptly. In the 1840s British Evangelicals found sufficient common ground to form a united front in the Evangelical Alliance. An international Anglican perspective was achieved when bishops from overseas attended the great celebration of the third Jubilee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in London in 1852. The first Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops from around the world was called by the archbishop of Canterbury (Longley) in 1867 and has continued to meet at roughly ten-yearly intervals, with gaps either side of the two World Wars, until the present day.

These mid-nineteenth-century developments reflected a groundswell among Anglicans, particularly in England, the United States, and Canada, in support of the Church gathering in council. Diocesan and national synods were already springing up across the Anglican Communion. The Convocation of the Clergy of Canterbury had been revived in 1853, after a long period of abeyance, followed by the Convocation of York in 1861. The conciliar ideal was developing momentum in the nineteenth century, aided by technological advances such as the steam-powered ocean liner, the steam locomotive, the telegraph, and a cheap, accessible postal service in some countries, all of which brought people together in an unprecedented way, either physically or virtually (we might say). But the conciliar method reached its zenith in the twentieth century, the inauguration of the World Council of Churches (Amsterdam Assembly, 1948) and the Second Vatican Council (1962–5) being its greatest achievements. The World Council of Churches generally adopted the concept of conciliar fellowship as its model of unity, though that ideal was achieved later only in partial and fragmentary ways.

THE WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE, EDINBURGH 1910—THE ANGLICAN CONTRIBUTION

The World Missionary Conference, held at Edinburgh in 1910, is widely regarded as the inauguration of the world-wide ecumenical movement in institutional form.² It was not the first stirring of the desire for unity, but reflected a concern for greater unity among Christians in a global and

² Brian Stanley, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2009); Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948* (London, 1954), pp. 355–62; for a fervent eyewitness account see W. H. T. Gairdner, *'Edinburgh 1910': An Account and Interpretation of the World Missionary Conference* (Edinburgh and London, 1910); for a critique see Jeremy Morris, 'Edinburgh 1910–2010: A Retrospective Assessment', *Ecclesiology*, 7 (2011): 297–316.

institutional way. It is significant that Edinburgh 1910 was a *missionary* conference. Previous missionary conferences had been held in 1854 (New York and London), 1860 (Liverpool), 1878 and 1888 (London), and 1900 (New York), mainly to drum up evangelistic fervour and finances. What was different about Edinburgh, and remained highly significant for the twentieth-century ecumenical movement as a whole, is that the search for unity among Christians was born out of a missionary vision. The unity quest arose from the challenges of missionary endeavour, fired by the fervour of the religious revivals of the previous century. The origins of the modern ecumenical movement were on the mission field, and 'unity in mission' became once again the watchword of ecumenism in the first decades of the twenty-first century. The divisions of the Church were undermining the credibility of its message, many felt. The Churches proclaimed a gospel of reconciliation and spoke the language of unity and communion, but were themselves divided—often alienated from one another, working in a state of rivalry, competition, and in some cases mutual condemnation. The blatant mismatch between the rhetoric of reconciliation and the fact of institutional division generated a concern for a united witness to non-Christians, a desire to proclaim the gospel with one voice. Never had the missionary vision been as intense as at the beginning of the twentieth century. 'The Evangelization of the World in this Generation' was the slogan of the Student Volunteer Movement, which was led by the energetic American Methodist layman John R. Mott (1865–1955). Mott was the inspiration behind the Edinburgh conference and he chaired it throughout, as well as chairing Commission 1, 'Carrying the Gospel to all the world'. Although the slogan was not invoked in the official proceedings of the conference, the vision and confidence that it embodied pervaded the whole event.³ The archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, in his opening address to the conference, rose to the occasion. Noting that by virtue of his office he was uniquely placed to receive a continual flow of information and persons from the world Church, the archbishop described the conference as 'the most serious attempt which the Church has yet made to look steadily at the whole fact of the non-Christian world, and to understand its meaning and its challenge'. He was frank about the differences between the representatives, including their theological convictions, but affirmed, 'we are absolutely one in our allegiance to our living Lord'. Davidson concluded, 'Be quite sure—it is my single thought tonight that the place of missions in the life of the Church must be the central place and none other.'⁴ Looking back on the conference in his book *The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions*, John Mott wrote:

³ C. Howard Hopkins, *John R. Mott: 1865–1955* (Grand Rapids, MI and Geneva, 1979), pp. 29, 355; also S. Neill, *A History of Christian Missions* (Harmondsworth, 1964), pp. 393–6, on the accusation of triumphalism.

⁴ G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (3rd edn., Oxford, 1952), p. 574.

It is indeed the decisive hour of Christian missions. It is the time of all times for Christians of every name to unite and with quickened loyalty and with reliance upon the living God, to undertake to make Christ known to all men, and to bring his power to bear upon all nations . . . Let all Christians so resolve and so act that if a sufficient number of others will do likewise, all men before this generation passes away may have an adequate opportunity to know of Christ.⁵

The Edinburgh conference took place on the crest of a wave of missionary fervour, albeit tinged with imperialist triumphalism. The report of the commission, on 'The Missionary Message in Relation to the Non-Christian Religions' spoke of 'the advance of the Christian Church along many lines of action to the *conquest* of the five great religions of the modern world'.⁶ Charles Clayton Morrison, the editor of the *Christian Century*, reported from the conference itself: 'Everyone feels the presence of a power not ourselves, deeper than our own devices, which is making for a triumphant advance of Christianity abroad. And not less are the delegates thrilled by the sense that the conference foreshadows a new era for the church at home.'⁷ However, for all the brimming confidence and somewhat triumphalist rhetoric, the kind of unity that was envisaged at Edinburgh in 1910 was largely pragmatic, concerned with cooperation and comity on the mission field, rather than with the visible or organic unity of the Churches. This was as far as the Anglicans would go. Mott, for all his enthusiasm and organizing skills, was not interested in theology; he was a supreme pragmatist, a master operator, though a principled one. All questions of faith and order had been bracketed out from the agenda in order to make it possible for disparate Christian traditions to take part. Only on this condition would Anglo-Catholic Anglicans such as Charles Gore (bishop of Birmingham, soon to be translated to Oxford; the dominant voice in the Church of England at that time), Walter Frere (superior of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield; later bishop of Truro), and Edward Stuart Talbot (bishop of Southwark, an Anglo-Catholic open to new ideas and fresh challenges) agree to take part.⁸ And only if these churchmen were willing to participate could the archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, accept the invitation to give the opening address. The cautious and sagacious Davidson had hesitated. The 1908 Lambeth Conference had recently recognized 'the manifold signs of the increase of the desire for unity among all

⁵ Hopkins, *Mott*, p. 363.

⁶ Cited in Gairdner, 'Edinburgh 1910', p. 135 (my italics).

⁷ Charles Clayton Morrison, 'The World Missionary Conference', *The Christian Century*, 7 July 1910 (<<http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=471>>), cited by Alan Race, 'Guest Editorial: Edinburgh 1910 to 2010', *Modern Believing*, 51 (2010): 2–15 (p. 3).

⁸ C. S. Phillips et al., *Walter Howard Frere, Bishop of Truro* (London, 1947); Benjamin Gordon-Taylor and Nicolas Stebbing (eds.), *Walter Frere: Scholar, Monk, Bishop* (Norwich, 2011); Gwendolen Stephenson, *Edward Stuart Talbot, 1844–1934* (London, 1936), pp. 187–90; Albert Mansbridge, *Edward Stuart Talbot and Charles Gore* (London, 1935).

Christian bodies' and had urged special intercessions for unity on the Anglican Communion. But the relevant section report to the Lambeth Conference had also sounded a warning note about indiscriminate ecumenism.⁹ The Church of England missionary societies were divided about supporting the conference (the Evangelical Church Missionary Society embraced it with enthusiasm; the High Church Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was more cautious, but its secretary, bishop Montgomery played a notable role). A delegation, including Mott and J. H. Oldham, the secretary and administrative genius of the Edinburgh conference, waited on Archbishop Davidson and eventually received a favourable response.¹⁰ Oldham believed that Gore's decision to attend was 'the turning point of the ecumenical movement'.¹¹ Gore too needed to be reassured by Oldham in a personal meeting that matters of faith and order would be excluded, even from the recommendations of the commissions. Consequently, the conference adopted a self-denying ordinance: 'no resolution shall be allowed which involves questions of doctrine or Church polity with regard to which the Churches or Societies taking part in the Conference differ among themselves'.¹² It was no doubt partly due to this limitation that discussion at the conference was generally theologically impoverished; activism ruled.¹³

Missions to Christian lands were another bone of contention. Anglo-Catholics such as Gore deplored evangelistic efforts directed at Roman Catholics or Orthodox. It was, therefore, proposed in advance that interventions in Christian countries should be put into a special category of 'Missions of Help to a Christian Church to renew itself on its own lines', but Gore insisted that all missions in Roman Catholic lands be completely excluded from the agenda. As a result, Edinburgh 1910 became a conference solely about carrying the gospel to the non-Christian parts of the world.¹⁴ Other Church of England representatives included Cosmo Lang (archbishop of York), J. Armitage Robinson (dean of Westminster, later dean of Wells), Fr Herbert Kelly SSM, and the capable and handsome Louise Creighton, a leading laywoman in Church circles, a campaigner for a greater role for women in society, and the biographer of her late husband, Mandell Creighton, bishop of London and eminent historian of the Renaissance papacy.¹⁵ Mrs Creighton was the exception

⁹ Roger Coleman (ed.), *Resolutions of the Twelve Lambeth Conferences 1867–1988* (Toronto, 1992), p. 39 (Resolutions 58 and 59); Bell, *Davidson*, p. 573 and at <<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1908/>>.

¹⁰ Bell, *Davidson*, p. 573.

¹¹ Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, p. 5; Keith Clements, *Faith on the Frontier: A Life of J. H. Oldham* (Edinburgh and Geneva, 1999).

¹² Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, pp. 277 and 38–9.

¹³ Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, p. 88.

¹⁴ Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, pp. 39, 53–9.

¹⁵ J. G. Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang* (London, 1949); Louise Creighton, *Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton*, 2 vols. (London, 1904); James Covert, *A Victorian Marriage: Mandell and Louise Creighton* (London, 2000).

that proves the rule in terms of the male gender domination of the conference. Indeed, its representative character was tenuous in several respects. It was not only a male event, but also almost entirely white, Western, Protestant, and English speaking. Of the 2,015 delegates, a mere seventeen were indigenous people from either Africa or the East.¹⁶ Gore was the dominant Church of England (and indeed Anglican) presence.¹⁷ He chaired the commission on 'Education in Relation to the Christianisation of National Life'. Always a staunch defender of creedal orthodoxy, Gore advocated a method of cultural adaptation or inculturation, as the gospel spread through the world, but one that would remain faithful to doctrinal fundamentals. The key to this strategy was the training of indigenous church leaders, as they were raised up by the Holy Spirit. He expressed horror that young Churches should be saddled with the Thirty-Nine Articles (Anglican) or the Westminster Confession (Reformed, Presbyterian), for these were 'full of controversies', 'partial', and did not contain 'the universal substance of our religion'. Gore and his commission set out a vision, but they were not able to show how it might be implemented in practice.¹⁸ However, one tangible result of Edinburgh 1910 was the setting up of a Continuation Committee. The Anglo-Catholics had now lost some of their fears. Archbishop Davidson backed it and Frere was involved in the early stages. The Anglo-Catholics agreed to support it only on condition that Oldham became its secretary. He had won their confidence. The committee gave rise in 1921 to the International Missionary Conference, which was eventually incorporated into the World Council of Churches as one of its major strands. The missionaries in the field longed for the Churches to achieve greater unity. Charles Clayton Morrison wrote in the *Christian Century*: 'The theme of Christian unity is running through the whole conference like a subterranean stream. It breaks through the ground of any subject the conference may be considering, and bubbles on the surface for a time. It is almost the exception for a speaker to sit down without deploring our divisions. The missionaries are literally plaintive in their appeal that the church of Christ re-establish her long lost unity.'¹⁹

The conference glimpsed a vision of a far-off united 'visible fellowship'.²⁰ To promote unity of action on the mission field was not controversial, but any discussion of how unity might be promoted at home (wherever that was), between the Churches that were sending out the missionaries, was ruled out: the issues of faith and order that would inevitably be raised by this discussion

¹⁶ Morris, 'Edinburgh 1910–2010', p. 302.

¹⁷ G. L. Prestige, *Charles Gore* (London, 1935), pp. 311–12; James Carpenter, *Gore: A Study in Liberal Catholicism* (London, 1960); Paul Avis, *Gore: Construction and Conflict* (Worthing, 1988).

¹⁸ Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, pp. 167–201, esp. 175, 193–4, 198.

¹⁹ Morrison, 'World Missionary Conference'.

²⁰ Cited in Gairdner, 'Edinburgh 1910', p. 204.

were thought to be too sensitive. This illogical situation could not last. It was an Anglican, though not from the Church of England, who showed the way forward. The Canadian Charles Brent, serving in the Philippines as a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (PECUSA), realized that unity could not be advanced unless the Churches were willing to discuss theology. The vision of a world Faith and Order Conference came to him at a celebration of the eucharist at the opening of the Convention of PECUSA in Cincinnati in October 1910. Brent acknowledged that Edinburgh had made him 'an apostle of church unity'.²¹ The result, after delay caused by the First World War, was the first World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927, and the movement that eventually became the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. In the years before and during the Second World War, William Temple (1881–1944), successively archbishop of York and of Canterbury, was a pillar of the ecumenical movement. Aged twenty-eight, Temple took part in Gore's preparatory commission for Edinburgh 1910 and served as a steward at the conference. He made his mark as a delegate at the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927 and was elected chairman of the second World Conference on Faith and Order in 1937 at Edinburgh. Temple worked for the coming together of the Faith and Order and Life and Work strands of the ecumenical movement and chaired the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches (WCC), which, delayed by the war, eventually came into existence in 1948, after his death. In his enthronement sermon in Canterbury Cathedral in 1942 Temple memorably described the ecumenical movement ('the great world fellowship') as 'the great new fact of our era'.²²

George Bell, bishop of Chichester until his death in 1958, documented the history of the ecumenical movement and helped to make it, from 1910 onwards, especially by forging supportive friendships with members of the Confessing Church in Nazi Germany, notably Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Bell was chairman of the Central Committee of the WCC for some years. For Bell there were no short cuts to unity: 'the secret of unity is study and not least the study of differences', he said.²³ Bell wrote of Temple: 'it was to his guiding hand, up to the time of his death, more than to that of any other Christian man, that the World Council of Churches owed its inauguration at Amsterdam'.²⁴ The

²¹ Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, p. 312; Frederick Ward Kates, *Charles Henry Brent: Ambassador of Christ* (London, 1948); Alexander Zabriskie, *Bishop Brent: Crusader for Christian Unity* (Philadelphia, 1948).

²² F. A. Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters* (London, 1948); John Kent, *William Temple* (Cambridge, 1992).

²³ R. C. D. Jasper, *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester* (Oxford, 1967); Andrew Chandler (ed.), *The Church and Humanity: The Life and Work of George Bell, 1883–1958* (Burlington, VT and Farnham, 2012), p. 45.

²⁴ Bell, *Davidson*, p. xvi.

Church of England was to give many dedicated servants to the ecumenical movement and to the WCC in particular: in addition to Gore, Temple, and Bell, we should mention Oliver Tomkins and Patrick Rodger (both bishops), and Mary Tanner.²⁵

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1920: APPEAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE

The Lambeth Conference 1920 was the most influential of all Lambeth Conferences in the twentieth century, and its influence was felt above all in the sphere of Christian unity.²⁶ In the aftermath of the First World War, it was inevitable that the conference should take reconciliation, fellowship, and unity as its theme. The conference's encyclical letter, *To the Faithful in Christ Jesus*, spoke to 'a world that craves for fellowship'. It was to this longing that the conference addressed its message of 'the double fellowship... with God and with men'. The 'reunion of Christendom' was now 'an imperative necessity'. A 'great wind' of the Spirit was blowing across the world, impelling to fellowship. Unity did not mean uniformity, but should embrace diversity. However, unity must be real, not 'some vague federation'.²⁷ Reconciliation was in the air. The ground had been prepared in the same year by the encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarchate *Unto the Churches of Christ Everywhere*. The breadth of vision and of charity that this document exhibited were probably unprecedented in Christian history. A key term was 'rapprochement'. As the title of the Patriarch's encyclical itself demonstrates, it dignified its addressees as 'Churches'. Proselytizing of Eastern Christians was deplored. Separated Christians should be seen as members of one family. They should seek to understand one another better and kindle the spirit of mutual love. The Churches should not lag behind the political authorities who had recently set up the League of Nations. Responses to this proposal were invited. However, concrete results were negligible and the significance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate's initiative remains symbolic.²⁸ The *Appeal to All Christian People* of the 1920 Lambeth Conference was far more effective.

²⁵ Adrian Hastings, *Oliver Tomkins: The Ecumenical Enterprise, 1908–92* (London, 2001).

²⁶ Stephenson, *Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 128–54; R. Lloyd, *The Church of England 1900–1965* (London, 1966), pp. 403–12; Bell, *Davidson*, pp. 1003–15; Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang*, pp. 264–84; H. Hensley Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, vol. 2, 1920–1939 (Oxford, 1943), pp. 1–23.

²⁷ *Lambeth Conferences (1867–1930)* (London, 1948), pp. 23–34 (pp. 23–6).

²⁸ Text in Michael Kinnamon and Brian E. Cope (eds.), *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices* (Geneva and Grand Rapids, MI, 1997), pp. 11–14; for the accompanying Resolutions see Coleman, *Resolutions*, pp. 45–54.

The conference did not augur well. Looming issues included theological modernism and communion with Christians of non-episcopal Churches (as exemplified by the notorious Kikuyu conference of 1913). Many bishops were filled with foreboding. While Anglo-Catholics were muttering about a sell-out to Protestantism, not least in the discussions for a united Church of South India that had begun the previous year, A. C. Headlam, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, later bishop of Gloucester, set the cat among the pigeons when he delivered his Bampton Lectures, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*, on the eve of the conference (they were published the same year).²⁹ Headlam's approach was suspicious towards Rome, especially in the light of the papal bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896) which famously condemned Anglican orders as 'absolutely null and utterly void', but generous and charitable towards Nonconformists.³⁰ Headlam advocated visible or organic unity—not a mere federation—on the basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral (at that time in its 1888 form). He endorsed 'apostolic succession' as a source of unity, continuity, and governance, but not as a conduit of sacramental grace. He took issue with Gore's ecclesiology, particularly his views of apostolic succession and the necessity of confirmation. Headlam's formula for unity was twofold. The ministry of any Church that ordained with prayer and the laying on of hands with the intention to continue the apostolic ministry should be recognized and accepted by the Church of England. But from then on episcopal ordination and oversight should be the norm. Headlam saw things simply and clearly, but his ecumenical theology was superficial and naïve. His theological generosity matched that of the *Appeal*, but his concrete proposals went too far for the Church of England.³¹

As the conference hung in the balance, Lang (archbishop of York; later of Canterbury), assisted by Bell (then secretary to Davidson; later bishop of Chichester) pulled a rabbit out of the hat with the idea of an appeal for unity to the whole Christian world. The secret was to invite and persuade, not to argue; to concentrate on what was positive, not to highlight the difficulties. A committee of all the talents, including Hensley Henson, bishop of Hereford, soon to be of Durham, a defender of liberal theology and an advocate of intercommunion and interchangeable ordained ministry with non-episcopal Churches, and the firebrand and hammer of 'heretics', Frank Weston, bishop of Zanzibar, crafted a text that has stood the test of time. Lang

²⁹ A. C. Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* (London, 1920); see also Ronald Jasper, *Arthur Cayley Headlam: The Life and Letters of a Bishop* (London, 1960), pp. 14–55.

³⁰ *Anglican Orders (English): The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII, September 13, 1896, and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, March 29, 1897* (London, 1957); Paul Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology* (London and New York, 2008), pp. 135–40 and references.

³¹ Headlam, *Doctrine of the Church*, pp. viii–ix, 45, 265, 291, 294–6, 306–7, 311.

‘led and guided the committee with a skill, a tact and a vision which was quite incomparable’.³² Looking back, Bell paid tribute to Lang’s work for unity: ‘there is no man in the whole Anglican Communion who has left a deeper impression on the whole Unity movement in that Communion between 1920 and 1947 than Lang’—not even William Temple, he wrote.³³ Under Lang’s leadership, the committee had found the Holy Grail of ecumenical rhetoric. Even most of the Anglo-Catholic bishops rallied to the *Appeal*, including Weston. Addressing all baptized persons within the universal Church and striking a note of penitence and hope, the *Appeal* declared:

We believe that God wills fellowship. By God’s own act this fellowship was made in and through Jesus Christ, and its life is in his Spirit. We believe that it is God’s purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognised officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. This is what we mean by the Catholic Church.³⁴

With an eye to the Roman Catholic Church, the *Appeal* insisted that this visibly united fellowship was not yet present in the world. The Church was divided: on the one hand were the ancient episcopal communions of East and West, the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches, to which (the *Appeal* noted) ‘ours is bound by many ties of faith and tradition’. On the other hand, there were the ‘great non-episcopal Communions, standing for rich elements of truth, liberty and life which might otherwise have been obscured or neglected’. With these communions (the Lambeth bishops added) ‘we are closely linked by many affinities’. Then we come to the heart of the Lambeth *Appeal*:

The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all ‘who profess and call themselves Christians’, within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and be made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ.

The *Appeal* went on to restate the ‘Lambeth Quadrilateral’ of 1888, which was derived from the ‘Chicago Quadrilateral’ of the (then) Protestant Episcopal

³² Lloyd, *Church of England*, p. 406.

³³ Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang*, p. 273.

³⁴ This and the following quotations from the *Appeal* are from Kinnamon and Cope, *The Ecumenical Movement*, pp. 81–3; for the process of forging the *Appeal*, with documentation, see Charlotte Methuen, ‘Lambeth 1920: The Appeal to All Christian People; An Account by G. K. A. Bell and the Redactions of the Appeal’, in Melanie Barber and Stephen Taylor with Gabriel Sewell (eds.), *From the Reformation to the Permissive Society: A Miscellany in Celebration of the 400th Anniversary of Lambeth Palace Library* (Woodbridge and Rochester, NY, 2010), pp. 521–64.

Church in the United States two years earlier, and was itself shaped by the writings of William Reed Huntington. The Lambeth *Appeal to All Christian People* affirmed that the visible unity of the Church would involve the 'whole-hearted acceptance' of four elements: (1) 'The Holy Scriptures... as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith'; (2) the 'Nicene' (i.e. Nicene-Constantinopolitan) Creed as 'the sufficient statement of the Christian faith' and either it or the Apostles Creed as the baptismal confession; (3) 'The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion'; (4) '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 fourth point, as restated in 1920, omitted the explicit reference to the historic episcopate in the original 1888 version. But this was intended as a persuasive tactic, for the *Appeal* immediately added: 'May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?' The 'historic' aspect of episcopacy is downplayed, though its function in securing continuity is affirmed:

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 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.

ANGLICAN ECUMENISM AND THE FREE PROTESTANT CHURCHES

In England the *Appeal* was welcomed—in some cases ecstatically—by leaders of the Free Churches. J. H. Shakespeare of the Baptist Union spoke of it as 'the finger of God'. Scott Lidgett of the Wesleyan Methodists called it the most remarkable document since the Reformation. R. F. Horton, the leading Congregationalist, said that it ushered in a new epoch in Church relations.³⁵ It generated a momentum in British ecumenism that had not run its course even by the end of the century. Conversations between the Church of England and the Free Churches ran from 1921 to 1925.³⁶ They achieved some clearing of

³⁵ Lockhart, *Cosmo Gordon Lang*, p. 271.

³⁶ G. K. A. Bell, *Documents, Second Series* (London, 1930), pp. 68–115.

the decks, but episcopacy was the main stumbling block to progress and it became clear that a breakthrough was not achievable at the multilateral level. In 1946 the archbishop of Canterbury Geoffrey Fisher attempted to break the log-jam in a Cambridge sermon in which he called upon the Free Churches to 'take episcopacy into their systems' and 'try it out on their own ground'. In the spirit of the Lambeth *Appeal*, Fisher was acknowledging the ecclesial integrity of the Free Churches and inviting them to embrace episcopacy in a way that was true to their own ecclesiologies and polities. In a fraternal tone, Fisher asked, 'Cannot we grow to full communion with each other before we start to write a constitution?'³⁷

Two major initiatives flowed from Fisher's approach. First, ambitious conversations took place in the 1950s and 1960s between the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Presbyterian Church of England (later to become part of the United Reformed Church) which would have resulted in a territorial, parochial Church spanning two nations and united by episcopal oversight. However, there was never any realistic chance of episcopacy being embraced by the Presbyterians.³⁸ In the first decade of the twenty-first century theological conversations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, as two established, territorial Churches, produced *Our Partnership in the Gospel* (2009).³⁹

The second major initiative concerned Anglican-Methodist unity. Sustained conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church of Great Britain emerged out of multilateral conversations between the Established Church and the Free Churches.⁴⁰ Anglicans and Methodists have interacted for two and a half centuries. The first Methodists were Anglicans. The itinerant preaching of John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield—all clergymen of the Church of England—contributed to a movement of evangelization and spiritual renewal, largely within the Established Church, that the Church failed to contain. John Wesley was unwilling to accept the constraints of episcopal discipline and his illegal ordinations made separation inevitable, though Charles fought to hold the movement within the Church of England. It was largely due

³⁷ Geoffrey Fisher, *A Step Forward in Church Relations: Being a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, November 3rd, 1946* (London, 1946); Edward Carpenter, *Archbishop Fisher: His Life and Times* (Norwich, 1991), pp. 310–14; Andrew Chandler and David Hein, *Archbishop Fisher, 1945–1961: Church, State and World* (Burlington, VT and Farnham, 2012), pp. 95–7.

³⁸ *Relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland* (London, 1951); *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches* (London, 1957); *Anglican-Presbyterian Conversations* (Edinburgh and London, 1966).

³⁹ GS 1792, <<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1238083/gs%201792.pdf>>.

⁴⁰ *Church Relations in England: Being the Report of Conversations between Representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches in England; Together with the Sermon Preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury on November 3rd 1946, entitled 'A Step Forward in Church Relations'* (London, 1950).

to a series of contingent social, cultural, and organizational factors, rather than to major theological differences, that Methodism evolved into a Church in its own right. Intra-Methodist reunion in 1932 occurred mid-way between the Lambeth *Appeal* and Fisher's Cambridge sermon. Methodism responded constructively to Anglican overtures. Conversations during the 1950s and 1960s produced a two-stage unity scheme which was endorsed by the Methodist Conference and narrowly rejected by the General Synod in 1972, though advocated passionately by the archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey.⁴¹ A cogently argued alternative model was proposed by a powerful phalanx of Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic opponents of the scheme.⁴² The wounds of rejection and disappointment, especially among Methodists, were slow to heal, but in 1994 the Methodist Church approached the Church of England about exploratory talks. These were followed in 1999 by formal conversations which resulted in the Anglican-Methodist Covenant (2001), agreed by impressive majorities in the Methodist Conference and the General Synod, signed in November 2003 in Methodist Central Hall, Westminster, and celebrated liturgically in Westminster Abbey, both in the presence of Queen Elizabeth II.⁴³ Although the Covenant was premised on comprehensive theological agreement between the two Churches, it was not a unity scheme, but a significant step towards eventual organic unity or full visible communion, the exact lineaments of which had not yet been discerned. It was in fact an example of 'growing into union'. Modelled on the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and the Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland (1991), it consisted of a series of mutual affirmations and commitments. Simultaneously with the signing of the Covenant, a Joint Implementation Commission was set up to 'monitor and promote the implementation of the Covenant'. It produced a series of reports to the two Churches, charting ways in which the covenantal relationship could be deepened. Cultural differences still divided the two Churches, but the main theological issue for the future of the Covenant was the shape of episcopacy in both Churches. Methodists remained unimpressed by the tortuous path that its Covenant partner had taken towards allowing women into the episcopate (finally achieved in 2014, twenty years after the first priestings of women and fourteen years after the synodical process began). Anglicans found it difficult to

⁴¹ *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church 1, 1963; Anglican-Methodist Unity, 1 The Ordinal, 1968; Anglican-Methodist Unity, 2 The Scheme, 1968; Owen Chadwick, Michael Ramsey: A Life* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 333–46; Peter Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey: The Shape of the Church* (Burlington, VT and Farnham, 2012), pp. 41–8.

⁴² C. O. Buchanan, E. L. Mascal, J. I. Packer, and The Bishop of Willesden [Graham Leonard], *Growing into Union* (London, 1970); Andrew Atherstone, 'A Mad Hatter's Tea Party in the Old Mitre Tavern? Ecumenical Reactions to *Growing into Union*', *Eccelesiology*, 6 (2010): 39–67.

⁴³ *An Anglican-Methodist Covenant: Common Statement of the Formal Conversations between the Methodist Church of Great Britain and the Church of England* (London and Peterborough, 2001).

understand why the Methodist Church did not get on with adopting the historic episcopate, given that its Conference had stated many times, over nearly half a century, that it was willing to do so.⁴⁴

Greater understanding between Anglicans and Reformed was enhanced by the dialogue that produced *God's Reign and Our Unity* in 1984, though—strangely—no further international work on this front took place for another thirty years.⁴⁵ Meanwhile, Anglican–Lutheran relations were assisted by *The Niagara Report* (1987) of a consultation on episcopacy, which built on the multilateral ‘Lima’ document *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (1982) in broadening the concept of apostolicity in relation to the historic episcopate.⁴⁶ The Porvoo agreement (1996) for communion between the British and Irish Anglican Churches and the Nordic and Baltic Lutheran Churches, and the Reuilly agreement between those Anglican Churches and the French Protestant [Reformed-Lutheran] Church (2001) reflect the enhanced working together of the four British and Irish Anglican Churches.⁴⁷ The pioneering Meissen agreement of 1991 was between the Church of England alone and the Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland (EKD), mainly because the Church of England had not yet seen the wisdom of working with its sister Anglican Churches in the Atlantic Isles.⁴⁸ In England, the Council for Christian Unity’s policy of ‘all round every level ecumenism’ involved long-running conversations with the Baptist Union of Great Britain from the 1990s and resulted in the innovative report *Pushing at the Boundaries of Unity* (2005), which paralleled the international Anglican–Baptist dialogue which itself followed an innovative method that brought theology and context into conversation. A more reflective and dialogical follow-up report was published ten years later.⁴⁹ A series of working parties of the Church of England and the United Reformed Church that produced led to *Healing the Past, Building the Future* (2011) and a service of ‘Reconciliation, healing of memories and mutual commitment’ in Westminster Abbey in February 2012.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ <<http://www.anglican-methodist.org.uk>>.

⁴⁵ *God's Reign and Our Unity: The Report of the Anglican-Reformed International Commission 1984* (London and Edinburgh, 1984).

⁴⁶ *The Niagara Report... by the Anglican–Lutheran International Continuation Committee* (London and Geneva, 1988); *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Geneva, 1982).

⁴⁷ *Together in Mission and Ministry: The Porvoo Common Statement with Essays on Church and Ministry in Northern Europe* (London, 1993); *Called to Witness and Service: The Reuilly Common Statement with Essays on Church, Eucharist and Ministry* (London, 1999).

⁴⁸ *The Meissen Common Statement* (London, 1988), <<https://www.churchofengland.org/about-us/work-other-churches/europe/the-meissen-agreement.aspx>>.

⁴⁹ *Pushing at the Boundaries of Unity: Anglicans and Baptists in Conversation* (London, 2005); *Conversations Around the World 2000–2005: The Report of the International Conversations between The Anglican Communion and The Baptist World Alliance* (London 2005); Paul S. Fiddes (ed.), *Sharing the Faith at the Boundaries of Unity* (Oxford, 2015).

⁵⁰ GS 1841, <<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1322762/gs%201841%20urc%20relations.pdf>>.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL AND INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVES IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The United Churches of South Asia

The United Churches of South Asia were one of the success stories, in which Anglicans played their part, of the ecumenical movement. The process began in 1919, receiving impetus from the Lambeth Conference *Appeal* in the following year, and the Church of South India (CSI), involving Anglican and Protestant (Methodist, Reformed, and Congregationalist) Churches, was inaugurated in 1947. While the United Church received the historic episcopate from the Anglicans, it also involved immediate interchangeability of ministries without reordination. Mindful of strong Anglo-Catholic reactions, archbishop of Canterbury William Temple had ruled in advance that, because of this factor, the new United Church could not be formally recognized by the Church of England. While the Lambeth Conference of 1948 gave qualified approval to the scheme and 'limited inter-communion' with the Church of England was agreed in 1955, the CSI did not fully participate in the Instruments of the Anglican Communion until after the Lambeth Conference 1988, by which time all its active ministers were episcopally ordained. The United Church of North India (CNI) came into being in 1970, adding Baptists, Brethren, and Disciples of Christ to the CSI mixture. The CNI avoided the difficulties of the CSI in securing wider Anglican recognition by having an ordained ministry unified from the start by means of a liturgy involving the laying on of hands. The Churches of Pakistan and of Bangladesh complete the four United Churches of South Asia that are in communion with the Anglican Communion but also with the world families of their founding Churches. By all accounts, these United Churches continued to experience both the joys of unity and the centrifugal forces of diversity. Even after many years, the original loyalties, traditions, and tensions remained strong.

The Church of England

In the 1980s the Church of England made canonical provision for local ecumenical initiatives: various forms of 'shared' (not interchangeable) ministry with non-episcopal Churches, and Local Ecumenical Partnerships (LEPs) according to several models with varying degrees of closeness, from shared buildings to united congregations. Similar projects were sponsored by the Church in Wales and the Scottish Episcopal Church. LEPs were seen by the Churches as 'the ecumenism of exception', anticipating in practice the visible unity that depended on formal theological agreement, particularly on

episcopacy, at the national level.⁵¹ But there was a sense in which LEPs were left high and dry by the slowness of such progress nationally. The cordial ecumenical climate in the new century was fostered by the 'Swanwick Declaration' of 1987, 'Not Strangers but Pilgrims', promoted by Cardinal Basil Hume, archbishop of Westminster, who encouraged Roman Catholics to move 'from co-operation to commitment'. The Swanwick formula enabled the Roman Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales and the Black Majority Churches to commit themselves to the 'Inter-Church Process', the restructuring of 'ecumenical instruments'.⁵² The result was a national instrument, of varying design, for each nation in Britain and Ireland, together with one that was intended to enable the Churches of the four nations to consult and cooperate (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland). As elsewhere, the British and Irish Anglican Churches found themselves committed to the 'ecumenical instruments' at various levels. For example, the instruments to which the Church of England belonged by the end of the twentieth century were Churches Together in England (CTE), of which the archbishop of Canterbury was an *ex officio* president, Churches Together in Britain and Ireland (CTBI), the successor to the British Council of Churches, the Conference of European Churches (CEC), and the World Council of Churches. It is true to say that all these ecumenical instruments struggled with their role and the need for financial support.

There were many other areas of consultation and cooperation at the national level in England. These could be traced back to the initiative of Cardinal Hinsley, archbishop of Westminster before and during the Second World War, who secured the support of the archbishops of Canterbury and York, Bishop Bell, and the moderator of the Free Church Federal Council for 'Sword of the Spirit', a campaign to promote catholic social values with a view to rebuilding European civilization after the war. Hinsley's ecumenical openness was curtailed by the Vatican and Sword of the Spirit continued without non-Roman Catholic support.

North America, Australasia, and Ireland

Comparable initiatives took place elsewhere in the Anglican Communion. In the United States, Episcopalians made huge efforts on two fronts, multilateral and bilateral, to overcome Christian divisions. The Episcopal Church was a partner in the pan-Protestant Consultation on Church Union (COCU) which emerged as a response to the sermon given in Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, by Eugene Carson Blake, the stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church in

⁵¹ <<http://www.churchofengland.org/media/35588/complete.pdf>>.

⁵² See *Next Steps for Churches Together* (1989), the so-called 'Marigold Book'.

the United States, on the invitation of Episcopal Bishop James Pike, in December 1960, in which Blake proposed the creation of a united Protestant Church in America. COCU began work in 1962 on proposals for organic unity, but after these were rejected in 1970 it lowered its sights and aimed for 'intercommunion' between autonomous Churches. Progress towards this ostensibly more modest goal stalled when the Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church USA were unable to proceed in a direction that they believed would seriously affect their respective polities. In 2002 COCU was reconstituted as Churches Uniting in Christ (CUIC).

Bilaterally, the Episcopal Church was engaged in long-standing dialogue with Lutherans (the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America: ELCA) and Methodists (the United Methodist Church: UMC), the two largest denominations in America after the Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptists, with the aim of establishing 'full communion'. In the North American context, 'full communion' does not mean organic unity, but refers to a shared life of autonomous Churches in the same territory on the basis of an interchangeable ordained ministry. Both the ELCA and the UMC had bishops, but they were not ordained within the historic episcopate. While Episcopalians wanted assurances from Lutherans about the episcopal office, Lutherans wanted to know whether Episcopalians preached the gospel of justification by grace through faith.⁵³ After a first attempt (the *Concordat of Agreement*) failed, revised proposals (*Called to Common Mission*) led to the inauguration of full communion on 6 January 2001 in the Washington National Cathedral.⁵⁴ In the case of the UMC, in addition to the issue of the historic episcopate, Episcopalians were also troubled by Methodist low sacramental doctrine, with lay presidency, use of grape juice, and concerns over the disposal of the consecrated elements.⁵⁵ In 2010 the dialogue team took stock of the situation in *A Theological Foundation for Full Communion between The Episcopal Church and The United Methodist Church* and followed this with a set of essays as commentary and resource.⁵⁶ At this point it was not clear how UMC bishops, whose orders stemmed from John Wesley's presbyteral ordination of Thomas Coke as 'superintendent' in 1784, could be incorporated into the historic episcopate without any suggestion of reordination. In the case of the North American provinces of the Moravian Unity, however, an

⁵³ William A. Norgren and William G. Rusch (eds.), *Implications of the Gospel: Lutheran-Episcopal Dialogue Series III* (Minneapolis and Cincinnati, 1988).

⁵⁴ <<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/page/agreement-full-communion-called-common-mission>>.

⁵⁵ *Make us one with Christ: Study Guide Version* (2006), <<http://library.episcopalchurch.org/sites/default/files/MUOCFINALTEXT.pdf>>.

⁵⁶ <http://library.episcopalchurch.org/sites/default/files/theological_foundation_for_full_communion_tec_and_umc.pdf>; C. Franklin Brookhart and Gregory V. Palmer (eds.), *That They May be One? The Episcopal-United Methodist Dialogue* (New York, 2014).

interchangeable ministry with that of The Episcopal Church had been achieved in 2011 through a nuanced and sensitive liturgy of reconciliation, following years of work on theological agreement.⁵⁷

The Anglican Churches of Canada and Australia resisted being drawn into the United/Uniting Churches with their predominantly liberal Protestant character, though in Australia theological dialogue with both the Uniting Church and the Lutheran Church in Australia, respectively, worked towards an interchangeable ordained ministry and a national covenant in the 1990s and into the new millennium.⁵⁸ In Canada there was an abortive scheme in the 1970s for organic unity between the Anglican Church and the United Church, but theological dialogue continued. The Anglican Church of Canada and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada (ELCC) entered into full communion through the Waterloo Declaration of 2001, without experiencing much of the angst of Lutherans and Episcopalians in the United States. In Ireland, the [Anglican] Church of Ireland and the Methodist Church in Ireland achieved a breakthrough in interchangeable ministries in 2014 on the basis of an earlier covenant and by means of proposals similar to those put forward by the Joint Implementation Commission in England for a Methodist President-Bishop (or 'Episcopal Minister' as the Irish proposals prefer to say). In Aotearoa-New Zealand the Anglican Church was in dialogue with the Methodist Church and initial proposals for an interchangeable ministry were produced for discussion in 2014. All such proposals come to the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Unity, Faith and Order (IASCUFO—the successor to a similar body devoted to ecumenical relations [IASCER], which was set up following the 1998 Lambeth Conference). IASCUFO monitored ecumenical and wider faith and order proposals emerging from the Churches of the Anglican Communion for mutual consistency and for consonance with the faith of the Church as Anglicans had received it.

A Pioneering Agreement with Old Catholics

Conversations between the Church of England and the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht, supported by the 1920 and 1930 Lambeth Conferences, resulted in the first Communion-wide agreement for ecclesial communion with a non-Anglican body. The Bonn Agreement of 1931 was an agreement for intercommunion, later described by Anglicans as 'full communion'. But it was

⁵⁷ *Finding Our Delight in the Lord: A Proposal for Full Communion Between The Episcopal Church; the Moravian Church–Northern Province; and the Moravian Church–Southern Province*, <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/sites/default/files/finding_our_delight_official_text.pdf>.

⁵⁸ <<http://www.anglican.org.au/governance/commissions/ecumenical-relations/Pages/lutheran.aspx>>.

far from 'full visible unity'. The terms of this succinct agreement make clear its scope and its limitations:

1. Each Communion recognizes the Catholicity and independence of the other, and maintains its own.
2. Each Communion agrees to admit members of the other Communion to participate in the sacraments.
3. Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith.

The Bonn Agreement provided for communion in the sacraments, but it showed no awareness of the implications for visible or organic expressions of communion and did not touch on the issue of overlapping episcopal jurisdictions in Europe. It was premised on mutual recognition of orders and has enabled extensive reciprocal participation in episcopal ordinations. Although the necessary theological spade work had already been done, the Bonn Agreement was sewn up in a day (2 July 1931). Stephen Neill commented: 'Perhaps never in the history of the Christian Church has business of such importance been transacted with such speed.'⁵⁹

RELATIONS WITH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Malines Conversations

A remarkable informal initiative in the first half of the century, which therefore predated the Second Vatican Council of 1962–5, sets the scene for later formal overtures between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. Though unofficial, it involved the archbishop of Canterbury and those appointed or encouraged by him. Because the archbishop is not only Primate of All England but also *primus inter pares* among the bishops of the Anglican Communion and convener and president of the Lambeth Conference and other 'instruments of unity', this initiative had implications for the Anglican Communion as a whole.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Neill in Rouse and Neill, *History of the Ecumenical Movement*, p. 469; cf. also Charlotte Methuen, 'The Anglo-German Theological Conferences 1927–1931: Some Preliminary Findings', *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte*, 20 (2007): 418–49; Charlotte Methuen, 'The Bonn Agreement and the Catholicization of Anglicanism: Anglicans and Old Catholics in the Lang Papers and the Douglas Papers', *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 97 (2007): 1–22.

⁶⁰ See further Paul Avis, 'Anglican Conciliarism: The Lambeth Conference as an Instrument of Communion', in M. D. Chapman, S. Clarke, and M. Percy (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* (Oxford, 2016), pp. 46–59.

A series of exploratory conversations took place in Mechelen (French: Malines) in Belgium between 1921 and 1925.⁶¹ What began as a joint private initiative on the part of the indefatigable papalist Anglican layman Lord Halifax, now in his ninth decade, and the Anglophile Abbé Portal, who had written in support of Anglican orders, gradually gained official approval in both Churches until summarily terminated by the Pope. The cautious and canny Randall Davidson was implicated step by step: first he was unofficially informed; then he took 'cognizance'; finally he commissioned participants. He had to defend himself and the conversations in Convocation, to the Anglican Communion, and to leaders of other Churches at home. He had to watch his back as the revised (1928) Prayer Book was making its doomed passage through Parliament. Henson attributed the failure of the Prayer Book Measure in no small part to 'the fears, suspicions, and resentments aroused in the public mind by the approach to Rome into which the ardent zeal of Lord Halifax had led the too complaisant Primate'.⁶² Evangelicals were alarmed and Henson took up the cudgels on behalf of the Protestant patrimony (as he saw it) of the Church of England. Davidson rejected the attitude, grounded in apathy or fear that one should not engage in dialogue with Rome, but he insisted publicly that Anglicans would stand by the principles of the Reformation.⁶³ It helped that at Malines the 1920 Lambeth Conference *Appeal* had been studied clause by clause.

The conversations were taking place against the background of the papal condemnation of Anglican Orders by Leo XIII in 1896 (which had been provoked in part by Halifax's insensitive pressurizing of the Roman authorities and the archbishop of Canterbury, E. W. Benson). *Apostolicae Curae* was a statement that Bell later described as 'one of the sharpest and most public rebuffs that the Church of Rome can ever have administered to a peaceable Christian communion'.⁶⁴ But, undeterred, Halifax and Portal gained the patronage of Cardinal Mercier of Malines, who was already under suspicion in Rome for his modern or liberal outlook, and the conversations took place, almost until the end, under his patronage and chairmanship.

The original Church of England team of Halifax, Armitage Robinson, and Frere was supplemented midstream by the addition of Gore, the biggest

⁶¹ *The conversations at Malines: 1921-1925/Les conversations de Malines: 1921-1925* (London, 1927); Bell, *Documents, Second Series*, pp. 32-63; Walter Frere, CR, *Recollections of Malines* (London, 1935); Bell, *Davidson*, pp. 1254-303; Prestige, Gore, pp. 478-89, 503; J. G. Lockhart, *Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax, Part Two, 1885-1934* (London, 1936), pp. 265-343; Henson, *Retrospect*, pp. 137-50; A. Denaux, in collaboration with J. Dick (ed.), *From Malines to ARCIC: The Malines Conversations Commemorated* (Leuven, 1997).

⁶² Henson, *Retrospect*, p. 146.

⁶³ Frere, *Recollections*, pp. 75-7 (Addendum III) at p. 77; pp. 82-9 (Addendum V).

⁶⁴ G. Bell, *Christian Unity: The Anglican Position* (London, 1948), p. 68; Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (London, 1912); Lockhart, *Halifax, Volume Two*, pp. 38-91; J. J. Hughes, *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void* (Washington and Cleveland, 1968).

heavyweight that the Church of England could provide, and B. J. Kidd, a patristic and medieval scholar of immense erudition. Gore—though an Anglo-Catholic—had written trenchantly about the evils of Roman authoritarianism, centralization, and obscurantism.⁶⁵ He was a critic of the first two rounds of conversations for what he regarded as their ‘disastrous and perilous’ ‘concessiveness’ on the part of the Anglicans (egged on by Halifax), and did not believe that the obstacles created by the comparatively recent dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary (1854) and the declaration of papal infallibility and universal immediate jurisdiction (1870) could be overcome (the dogma of the Assumption was not promulgated until 1950).⁶⁶ But Gore’s involvement hardly compensated for the absence of Evangelicals at Malines. The Anglican team so constituted could neither represent nor hope to carry the Church of England as a whole.

Two remarkable papers distinguished the fourth conversation at Malines (the fifth meeting was perfunctory and procedural). Cardinal Mercier himself read a paper that he had commissioned from a (then) anonymous canonist, later revealed to be Dom Lambert Beauduin: *L’Église Anglicane Unie, non Absorbée* (‘The Anglican Church United not Absorbed’). The paper argued on the basis of historical precedent for the restoration of a Canterbury patriarchy within which the Church of England (and the whole Anglican Communion) would have its own liturgy and canon law, once they had been approved by the Holy See, propose its own bishops to the pope, and have married priests. The Roman Catholic hierarchy that had been restored in the so-called ‘Papal Aggression’ of 1850 would be suppressed.⁶⁷ The proposals were dynamite and the members were urged to treat them as confidential. As Frere recalled, the paper stunned those who heard it.⁶⁸ The 1930 Lambeth Conference spoke warmly and wistfully of the formula ‘united not absorbed’ (it remained a guiding light for ecumenism into the twenty-first century) and deplored the papal prohibition.⁶⁹

Gore took the bull by the horns in his paper, ‘On Unity with Diversity’, in which he pleaded for the ‘widest possible toleration of differences between Churches, both in doctrine and practice, on the basis of agreement on the necessary articles of Catholic communion’.⁷⁰ He explained himself thus:

⁶⁵ Charles Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims* (London, 1888).

⁶⁶ Prestige, Gore, pp. 480, 486.

⁶⁷ <http://www.rore-sanctifica.org/bibliotheque_rore_sanctifica/11-reformateurs_de_1968_&_mouvement_liturgique/dom_lambert_beauduin/1925-dom_beauduin-eglise_anglicane_unie_non_absorbee/DomBEAUDUIN1925L_EgliseAnglicaneUnieNonAbsorbee-a.pdf>. ET in Denaux (ed.), *From Malines to ARCIC*, pp. 35–46.

⁶⁸ Frere, *Recollections*, p. 56.

⁶⁹ Coleman, *Resolutions*, p. 77 (no. 32); cf. the Committee report, ‘The Unity of the Church’: *Lambeth Conferences (1867–1930)*, pp. 229–30.

⁷⁰ Frere, *Recollections*, pp. 110–19 (Addendum VII), at p. 113.

'I write as an Anglican who has not the slightest desire to submit himself as an individual to the Roman authority, but with all his heart would desire to see his own Anglican communion [*sic*], and the communion of the Orthodox Churches, reunited to the Holy See of Rome.'⁷¹ Only due recognition of diversity could make that possible. Gore had resigned the see of Oxford in 1919 out of frustration with Church of England woolliness and the pliability of the bishops, for one thing. He was not known for his tolerant approach to either doctrine or practice. But at Malines his life-long commitment to critical historical scholarship came into play at this point. He argued that the creedal doctrines of the Virginal Conception of Christ and his bodily resurrection rested on good evidence based on original witnesses, while the Roman Catholic dogma of the Immaculate Conception rested 'on nothing that can be called good historical evidence at all'.⁷²

The hostility of Anglican Evangelicals was matched by that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England who once again succeeded in undermining a unity initiative. Mercier had died between the fourth and fifth meetings and Portal died soon afterwards. After the fifth the conversations were stopped by Rome. On 6 January 1928 Pius XI, who had earlier given his blessing to the venture, issued the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* in which he prohibited Roman Catholic involvement in the ecumenical movement and forbade the faithful to participate in ecumenical gatherings. Unity meant the return of schismatics to the true fold, the 'perfect society'.⁷³ Once again Anglicans, including this time the archbishop of Canterbury, had been rebuffed and humiliated.

What, if anything, did the Malines Conversations achieve? Halifax's biographer notes that 'For the first time since the Reformation Anglicans and Roman Catholics had met round a table, spoken with complete candour, argued but not quarrelled, and parted with heightened mutual esteem'.⁷⁴ Therefore, though they failed, 'they failed magnificently'.⁷⁵ In his life of Davidson, Bell recorded that there had been 'progress in understanding, in charity, in desire [for unity]'.⁷⁶ That is no mean achievement. If the conversations were without precedent, they certainly set a precedent; they established the tone for later initiatives of rapprochement, especially meetings between archbishops of Canterbury and popes and the work of ARCIC.

Meetings between Archbishops of Canterbury and Popes

The Second Vatican Council (1962–5), particularly the Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio*, reversed Roman Catholic policy with regard to

⁷¹ Frere, *Recollections*, p. 117.

⁷² Frere, *Recollections*, p. 117.

⁷³ Bell, *Documents, Second Series*, pp. 51–63.

⁷⁴ Lockhart, *Halifax*, p. 341.

⁷⁵ Lockhart, *Halifax*, p. 342.

⁷⁶ Bell, *Davidson*, p. 1302.

ecumenism, creating a climate in which that Church could enter into a wide range of theological dialogues with other world Christian families. Following John XXIII's announcement of an ecumenical council, the archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Fisher, lost no time in seeking a meeting with him. On 2 December 1960, overcoming obstacles from Vatican precedent, protocol, and bureaucracy, they conversed for more than an hour. It was the first visit of an archbishop to the Pope since the Reformation. The Pope attributed his interest in Anglicanism to the Malines Conversations. The archbishop intervened when the Pope used the word 'return' and the Pope accepted the correction.⁷⁷

Fisher's initiative set a trend. In 1966 Archbishop Ramsey visited Paul VI who loved the language of the Book of Common Prayer. They agreed to set up the international theological commission that became the Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC). At their parting the Pope placed his own episcopal ring in Ramsey's hand. The archbishop was dumbstruck as he slipped it on his finger.⁷⁸ The ring is still worn by archbishops of Canterbury on visiting Rome. Ramsey's successor, Donald Coggan, travelled to Rome in 1977, but was not well versed in ecumenical theology. In 1982 John Paul II accepted Archbishop Robert Runcie's invitation to pray together in Canterbury Cathedral and to meet other Church leaders. The archbishop and the Pope prayed at the nave altar, revered the Canterbury Gospels (sent by Gregory the Great to Augustine of Canterbury in 601), jointly blessed the congregation, and knelt silently at the shrine of the martyred Archbishop St Thomas Becket. Archbishop George Carey visited John Paul II in 1996 and in 2000 took part with an Orthodox patriarch in the ceremonial opening of the Holy Door of St Paul Without the Walls, Rome.

When Archbishop Rowan Williams visited the Pope, beginning in 2006, he and Benedict XVI talked theology and Williams could converse in German. In September 2010 Benedict made a 'state visit' to Britain. He addressed an audience of politicians (including four past prime ministers) and civic leaders in Westminster Hall, the historic centre of governance. He came in humility as befits any pastor, but particularly the overseer of a Church that had been dogged by multiple revelations of sexual abuse by priests and culpably inept handling of their crimes by those in authority. Against this background, the Pope did not hector and there was no finger-wagging at moral decline in British society. The Pope was welcomed as a pastor and teacher. Archbishop Williams hosted a joint gathering of the diocesan bishops of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Bishops' Conferences of England and Wales and of Scotland in the Great Hall of Lambeth Palace where both primates gave magisterial addresses. In the impressive liturgy that followed in Westminster

⁷⁷ Carpenter, *Fisher*, pp. 730–44.

⁷⁸ Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey*, pp. 316–23 (p. 322).

Abbey the Pope struck the right note to win over his audience: 'I come as a pilgrim,' he said, 'to pray at the shrine of St Edward' (king and confessor and founder of the present abbey). In a unifying symbol, the archbishop and the Pope revered the Canterbury Gospels. They exchanged the peace with warmth and smiles. The archbishop carefully described the Pope as the chief pastor of the Roman Church, the Church of St Peter and St Paul. At the end of the service archbishop and pope jointly gave the blessing. During this visit they committed themselves to a third series of ARCIC.

The Work of ARCIC

The first official theological dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics was made possible by the *volte face* of the Roman Catholic Church at Vatican II with regard to ecumenism. The Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission began its work in 1970, seeking to move towards 'the restoration of full organic unity' based 'on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions' and, eschewing controversy, 'to discover each other's faith as it is today'. ARCIC continued in three phases until well into the twenty-first century. ARCIC I began by tackling some of the most historically divisive areas of doctrine. The commission believed that it had 'reached agreement on essential points of eucharistic doctrine' and a 'consensus' on ministry and ordination where 'doctrine admits no divergence'. On authority in the Church (particularly the question of universal primacy) ARCIC I made progress and experienced significant convergence, flagging up unresolved issues for further work. A feature of the so-called *Final Report* was a series of 'Elucidations' in which the commission responded to comments and criticisms of its initial statements.⁷⁹ While Anglicans generally welcomed the statements on the eucharist and ministry and ordination, they were much more cautious about the authority material, simply recognizing it as a contribution to further joint reflection.⁸⁰

ARCIC II made a strong start with *Salvation and the Church* (1987) which brought together questions of justification and ecclesiology, *Church as Communion* (1991), a meta-narrative of unity, and *Life in Christ* (1993), on Christian moral principles. But ARCIC II waded into deeper water when it returned to authority and the papacy in *The Gift of Authority* (1999) and *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ* (2005). The latter two documents attempted a

⁷⁹ Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission, *The Final Report* (London, 1982); A. C. Clark and C. Davey (eds.), *Anglican–Roman Catholic Dialogue: The Work of the Preparatory Commission* (London, 1974).

⁸⁰ Cf. Paul Avis, *Ecumenical Theology and the Elusiveness of Doctrine* (London, 1986; republished in the United States as *Truth Beyond Words* [Cambridge, MA, 2006]).

more sophisticated creative reinterpretation of their themes than the earlier more straightforward reports had done with theirs, which some readers found inspiring, while others sensed that difficulties were being papered over. Many Anglicans found it hard to detect a distinctive Anglican voice in these later documents.⁸¹ A parallel body, the International Anglican–Roman Catholic Commission on Unity and Mission (IARCCUM), consisting of bishops and consultants, published a useful synopsis of the work of ARCIC I and II, showing areas of agreement and of remaining difference.⁸²

The year 2013 saw the arrival of a new pope, Francis I, and new archbishop of Canterbury, Justin Welby. They made it a priority to meet. Both were known for their pragmatism, strategic thinking, and straightforward, down-to-earth style of working. They were not theologians like Benedict or Williams. They played to their strengths in presenting a united front against social injustice and exploitation, particularly human trafficking.⁸³ They were modelling unity in practice. It remained to be seen how much progress would be made under their auspices in overcoming the doctrinal barriers that still separated the two communions.

ANGLICAN–ORTHODOX RELATIONS

There are striking similarities between the Anglican and the Orthodox ecclesiologies and Anglican Orders have been recognized by a few Eastern Orthodox Churches in the past. International conversations progressed through the Moscow statement of 1976 and the Dublin statement of 1984 to the substantial joint treatise *The Church of the Triune God* which was launched by the archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, and the Ecumenical Patriarch, Bartholomew I, at a joint service in Westminster Abbey in 2006.⁸⁴ However, the view of the Eastern Churches that their Church alone is the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, and the divergent attitudes towards Western

⁸¹ Christopher Hill and Edward Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (London, 1994). The ARCIC reports are available at <<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/ecumenical/dialogues/catholic/arcic/es/catholic/arcic/>>.

⁸² *Growing Together in Unity and Mission: Building on 40 Years of Anglican–Roman Catholic Dialogue* (London, 2005); Walter Kasper, *Harvesting the Fruits: Basic Aspects of Christian Faith in Ecumenical Dialogue* (London and New York, 2009).

⁸³ 'Two Traditions, One Holy Ground', *The Tablet*, 21 June 2014, pp. 4–5.

⁸⁴ *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Moscow Statement Agreed by the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission 1976 with introductory and supporting material*, ed. Archimandrite K. Ware and The Revd Colin Davey (London, 1977); *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984* (London, 1984); *The Church of the Triune God: The Cyprus Agreed Statement of the International Commission for Anglican-Orthodox Theological Dialogue 2006* (London, 2006).

liberal social mores, made the prospect of communion between the two traditions extremely remote. In 2014 a significant Christological agreement was signed between the Anglican Communion and the Oriental Orthodox Churches, so helping to heal an ancient rift.⁸⁵

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Efforts to heal divisions between warring Christians and to reconcile the disaffected among the faithful have characterized Christianity through the centuries. But the twentieth century was the time when Christians in the historic Churches gradually gave up a separatist mentality and poured thought, prayer, and energy into reconciliation, working towards the reunification of the divided Christian Church. The ecumenical movement was one of the striking phenomena of twentieth-century Christianity. At his enthronement as archbishop of Canterbury in 1942 William Temple spoke of it as the 'great new fact of our era'. It intensified the age-old aspiration towards unity and translated it first into institutional forms. For Anglicans, as for others, its high points were the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910 when the archbishop of Canterbury caught the vision, the Lambeth Conference *Appeal to All Christian People* of 1920, the formation of the WCC in 1948, and the Second Vatican Council's documents on the Church and on Ecumenism in the early 1960s. Vatican II was followed by the frequent fraternal meetings of archbishops of Canterbury and popes throughout the second half of the century. Those close to the multilateral Faith and Order movement (latterly a commission of the WCC) testify to the profound influence of Anglican perceptions of the Church and of unity on the ecumenical movement. Indeed, many Anglicans, from Charles Brent, William Temple, and G. K. A. Bell to Oliver Tomkins, Patrick Rodger, and Mary Tanner, have been intimately involved in the international ecumenical process.⁸⁶

At first glance the ecumenical movement may seem to have amounted to little more than a succession of meetings resulting in reports. The number of successful reunions was limited. But the face-to-face encounters that actually made up those meetings are what changed the mindset of individuals. They were the intellectual equivalent of the innumerable personal encounters, in worship, witness, and service, of persons of different Christian backgrounds in their local contexts. Local ecumenism is often the engine of Christian unity.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ The Christology statement can be accessed via <<http://www.anglicannews.org/media/1416821/Anglican-Oriental-Orthodox-Agreed-Statement-on-Christology-2014.pdf>>.

⁸⁶ In addition to works cited earlier, see Hastings, *Oliver Tomkins*.

⁸⁷ e.g. Clive Barrett (ed.), *Unity in Process: Reflections on Ecumenism* (London, 2012).

The transformation of attitudes from those dominated by ignorance, fear, and hostility to those marked by awareness, attraction, and friendship, was the main achievement of ecumenism and was made possible by modern methods of travel and communication. 'Otherness' can prove an enrichment, rather than a threat. And all those reports that gathered dust on study and library shelves represented the gradual but incremental advance of profound mutual understanding leading to cordial mutual acceptance. While genuine cognitive differences—differences of theology and practice—remained between the separated Christian traditions, the ecumenical movement, in which Anglicans were at the forefront, increasingly made it possible for those differences—those difficulties—to be addressed in a context of mutual respect and tolerance.

At the end of the twentieth century ecumenism seemed to be in decline. The modernistic visions of structural unity seemed repellent rather than attractive. Differences of Christian values and morals, particularly around sex and gender issues, were complicating the quest for visible unity, not only for Anglicans but for all traditions. At the same time, Churches were shifting their budgetary and other resource priorities to outward-looking mission in increasingly secularized societies and to the resolution of internal conflicts. But ecumenism had not been superseded. While the work of building communion between separated Christians continued in a lower key and with more realistic expectations, its values and skills were effectively transposed, absorbed into the bloodstream of the Churches, so that skills in reconciliation, dialogue, and the 'hermeneutics of unity' were now put to work also within Churches, as they aspired to proclaim the gospel with the credibility that comes from unity.⁸⁸

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avis, Paul, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (new edn., London and New York, 2002).
- Avis, Paul, *Beyond the Reformation: Authority, Primacy and Unity in the Conciliar Tradition* (London and New York, 2006).
- Avis, Paul, *Reshaping Ecumenical Theology* (London and New York, 2010).
- Beaken, Robert, *Cosmo Lang: Archbishop in War and Crisis* (London and New York, 2012).
- Bell, G. K. A. (ed.), *Documents on Christian Unity*, 4 vols. (London, 1924–58).
- Chandler, Andrew and David Hein, *Archbishop Fisher, 1945–1961: Church, State and World* (Burlington, VT and Farnham, 2012).
- Fey, Harold E. (ed.), *The Ecumenical Advance: A History of the Ecumenical Movement, Volume 2, 1948–1968* (London, 1970).

⁸⁸ N. Sagovsky and J. Morris (eds.), *The Unity We Have and the Unity We Seek: Ecumenical Prospects for the Third Millennium* (London and New York, 2003); Paul Avis, *Reshaping Ecumenical Theology* (London and New York, 2010).

- Hastings, Adrian, *A History of English Christianity 1920–1985* (London, 1986).
- Kinnamon, Michael and Brian E. Cope (eds.), *The Ecumenical Movement: An Anthology of Key Texts and Voices* (Geneva and Grand Rapids, MI, 1997).
- Lossky, N., J. M. Bonino, J. S. Pobee, T. F. Stransky, G. Wainwright, and P. Webb (eds.), *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva, 1991).
- Rouse, Ruth and Stephen Charles Neill (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948* (London, 1954).
- Webster, Peter, *Archbishop Ramsey: The Shape of the Church* (Burlington, VT and Farnham, 2012).

War and Peace

Michael Snape

INTRODUCTION

The twentieth century, the bloodiest century in world history, saw significant developments in the world-wide Anglican Communion that were closely connected to the impact and legacy of war. National consciousness was heightened in Australia and New Zealand, for example, by such events as the Gallipoli campaign and the capture of Vimy Ridge in the First World War, and by the decline of Great Britain's protective military power in the Second. Inevitably, in their Anglican Churches this growing sense of national selfhood fuelled an increasing desire for autonomy from the Church of England. Although the Anglophone and imperial heritage of Anglicanism in the first half of the twentieth century meant that Anglicans very rarely found themselves fighting each other (something that cannot be said of Catholics, Lutherans, or Orthodox Christians) the totality and destructiveness of twentieth-century conflict complicated Church-state relations and affected Anglican ethics, theology, and liturgy. However, the impact of war upon Anglicans and Anglicanism was uneven across time and space. In scale and reach the World Wars dwarfed all other conflicts, and in Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand the human costs of the First World War exceeded those of any other twentieth-century conflict. Whereas the great majority of the world's Anglicans dutifully followed the British Empire into war in 1914 and 1939, the political independence that accompanied the transition of the British Empire to the Commonwealth, and the emergence of Anglicanism as a largely non-Anglo-Saxon, and non-Anglophone Communion meant that Anglicans were less evenly affected by the ordeal or the threat of war during the latter half of the twentieth century. These factors simply compounded discrepancies that arose from geopolitical realities. For example, during the Second World War Anglicans in North America, the Antipodes, and sub-Saharan Africa were, unlike their co-religionists in Great Britain,

Melanesia, and much of Asia, largely insulated from the effects of aerial bombing and enemy invasion. Similarly, Great Britain, the historic cradle of Anglicanism, stood under the greatest threat of nuclear annihilation during the Cold War, just as it had been most vulnerable to aerial attack in both World Wars. However, and despite its lethal vulnerability in geostrategic terms, Britain was at least spared direct involvement in the Vietnam War, which proved deeply divisive in Australia and New Zealand, as well as in the United States. Similarly, in the 1950s and 1960s the expanding Anglican Churches of East and West Africa were confronted with insurgency in Kenya and civil war in Nigeria which, in terms of their scale and brutality, had no equivalents in Great Britain, North America, or the Antipodes.

While this chapter cannot hope to address every war, civil war, or insurgency in which Anglicans were involved in the course of the twentieth century, and especially its latter half, it can illustrate how profoundly the Anglican Communion could be affected by the experience of war. Grasping the complexity and significance of this subject is not helped by the fact that, with the growth of ecumenism, Anglican perspectives on war have often been subsumed by those of the wider ecumenical movement. This was the case at the 1924 Conference on Politics, Economics and Citizenship (COPEC), which declared that 'all war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ', and in the matter of *The Church and the Atom* report of 1948, which was inspired by an earlier British Council of Churches report *The Era of Atomic Power*. Significantly, the British Council of Churches was itself a wartime creation, being inaugurated in a service at St Paul's Cathedral in 1942 with Archbishop William Temple as its first president. Nor has the situation been helped by the sparse and very patchy treatment of this theme in Anglican historiography. Apart from the role of the Church of England in Great Britain, very little has been written about the impact of war on the global Anglican Communion and its many constituents. Even in the British case, attention has been largely focused on prominent churchmen (notably Randall Davidson, George Bell, and William Temple) and little has been done to illustrate the threat or effects of war on broader Anglican life and religious practice. The picture is further skewed by the black legend that has grown up around the conduct of the Church of England during the First World War. Shrilly indicted by the National Secular Society and various fellow travellers in the 1930s, and hostage to Cold War historians anxious to furnish morality tales of belligerent bishops and compromised establishments in the nuclear era, the response of the Church of England to the bloodiest and most controversial of Britain's conflicts has been traditionally portrayed as naïve and reckless, and even as a major accelerant of the secularization of British society. As Stephen Koss sweepingly averred in 1975, 'However much a commonplace, it is no exaggeration to say that war, when it came unexpectedly in August 1914, dealt a shattering blow to organized religion. The churches never recovered from the

ordeal, either in terms of communicants or self-possession. Thereafter, men looked elsewhere, if anywhere, for their moral certainties.¹ With the Church of England cast as the chief culprit, it has had to bear more than its fair share of retrospective, and often ill-informed, criticism and obloquy. However, it has to be remembered that the just war principles that informed the Church of England's approach to the First World War were—and remained—an integral part of the moral tradition of global Anglicanism, being enshrined in Article XXXVII of the Thirty-Nine Articles and guiding the Anglican Communion throughout the later ordeals of the Second World War and the Cold War. Confronting what he identified as a hopelessly skewed memory of the First World War, in his 1966 'Meditation' on the Church of England in the twentieth century, Canon Roger Lloyd rightly challenged the spurious charges of cravenness and incompetence laid at the door of the Anglican clergy thereafter. While this stand did little to stem the flow of such writing in the 1970s, in recent years comparative study of the British Churches during the First World War shows that the Church of England was relatively critical and restrained in its approach to the conflict, while comparative consideration of the belligerent nations has led Adrian Gregory to the conclusion that 'the moderating instincts' held by 'the vast majority of the Anglican ministry, up to and including the episcopate' deserve far greater recognition.²

ANGLICANISM AND PACIFISM

Whether or not its role in the First World War was the cardinal sin of the Church of England in the twentieth century, industrialized slaughter and the advent of aerial bombing gave an enormous boost to pacifist sentiment within the Anglican Communion in the inter-war years. However, it is important to recognize that the dissentient voice and peace-making role was by no means absent in pre-war Anglicanism. Besides Christian socialists such as Charles Gore, then a canon of Westminster Abbey, Bishop John Percival of Hereford was stridently opposed to the South African War ('a hideous blunder and crime', as he described it in a letter to the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury)³ and became a forthright critic of the British army's use of concentration camps. Subsequently, and with the looming threat of war with Germany, the Church of England played a leading role in the Anglo-German friendship movement,

¹ Stephen Koss, *Nonconformity in British Politics* (London, 1975), p. 125.

² Adrian Gregory, 'Beliefs and Religion', in Jay Winter (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the First World War, Volume III: Civil Society* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 418–44 (pp. 432–3).

³ Margaret Blunden, 'The Anglican Church during the War', in Peter Warwick and S. B. Spies (eds.), *The South African War: The Anglo-Boer War 1899–1902* (London, 1980), pp. 279–91 (p. 279).

the exchange visits and goodwill gestures of prominent British and German churchmen finding a sponsor in the archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson. Out of this irenic milieu the Church of England Peace League emerged in 1910, which counted Gore, now bishop of Birmingham, and Percival among its members. However, fully-fledged *pacifism*, as opposed to *pacificism* (a position which, whilst opposed to violence in general, allows some force in order to preserve peace),⁴ was still very much a rarity among Anglicans in the era of the First World War, and even Gore and Percival firmly endorsed Britain's stand in defence of Belgium and international treaty obligations, the former even branding conscientious objectors as 'among the most aggravating human beings with whom I ever have had to deal'.⁵ From 1916, the mechanics of conscription in mainland Britain showed how few Anglicans were prepared to assume this unpopular stand; according to a contemporary estimate, Anglicans comprised only 7 per cent of the nation's 16,500 or so objectors of military age, a smaller percentage than that provided by the nation's tiny minority of avowed atheists. Significantly, Anglican pacifism caused greater controversy in the United States, where Bishop Paul Jones, president of the Church Socialist League, was effectively forced to resign from the diocese of Utah after pronouncing that war was 'repugnant to the whole spirit of the gospel', regardless of the issues involved.⁶

However, sustained by internationalist aspirations and by a growing, long-term reaction to the trauma of the First World War, an influential pacifist constituency developed within world-wide Anglicanism in the inter-war period. Moving well beyond the advocacy of peaceful arbitration favoured by its pre-war predecessors, the Lambeth Conference of 1930 declared that 'War as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Four years later, Archbishop Lang convened an ecumenical conference on 'The World's Peace' at Lambeth Palace, which concluded that 'an awakened belief in God' was the best means by which international peace could be preserved. With the tide running in their favour, in the early 1930s Anglican pacifists emerged as key figures in the growing peace movement in Great Britain. The distinguished liberal theologian Charles Raven became the chairman of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in 1932, while another clergyman, the charismatic radio star H. R. L. Sheppard, laid the foundations for a mass peace movement, the Peace Pledge Union (PPU), in 1934. Evidently, pacifist sentiment was rife in the Anglican Communion during the early 1930s, stronger than at any

⁴ This helpful distinction is Martin Ceadel's; Cf. Martin Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 1-8.

⁵ Roger Lloyd, *The Church of England 1900-1965* (London, 1966), p. 224.

⁶ Ray H. Abrams, *Preachers Present Arms: The Role of the American Churches and Clergy in World Wars I and II, with Some Observations on the War in Vietnam* (Eugene, OR, 1969), p. 200.

other time in its history. Emblematic of what Winston Churchill branded as the prevailing 'unwarrantable mood of self-abasement', in May 1935 King George V, Defender of the Faith and Supreme Governor of the Church of England, declared to Lloyd George in what he described as 'a most extraordinary outburst' that 'I *will* not have another war. I *will not*. The last war was none of my doing, & if there is another one & we are threatened with being brought into it, I will go to Trafalgar Square and wave a red flag myself sooner than allow this country to be brought in.'⁷ Nevertheless, the unfolding foreign policies of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany caused some searching debate and, when a vote in the Church Assembly in February 1937 reaffirmed Anglican adherence to the just war tradition, it resulted in the formation of the uncompromisingly pacifist Anglican Peace Fellowship (APF). Although this inspired the creation of an Episcopal Peace Fellowship in the United States in November 1939, the Church of England's preference prior to the outbreak of another European conflict had been for appeasement rather than war. Tormented by memories of the First World War, dreading the prospect of a second, and assailed with guilt over the 1919 Treaty of Versailles, the consensus among the Anglican hierarchy was in favour of the Munich Agreement of September 1938. Consequently, and at the instigation of Cosmo Lang, Sunday 2 October 1938 was kept as a 'Day of national thanksgiving for deliverance from the danger of war'—complementing a national day of prayer held a fortnight earlier at the height of the Sudeten crisis. Significantly, and although an agnostic who had been raised a Unitarian, Britain's Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, sought to legitimize the Agreement, and appeal to Anglican sentiment, by claiming to have delivered 'peace in our time', the object of a twice-daily petition in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer.

However, the early course of the Second World War again revealed the relative strength of pacifism and pacificism among British Anglicans. Within twelve months, and through a combination of Nazi barbarism and military catastrophe, a war in defence of Poland had been transformed into an existential struggle for Great Britain, the empire, and even 'Christian Civilization' itself. In these circumstances, the moral appeal of pacifism almost collapsed. Although the APF in Great Britain published, lobbied, and supported conscientious objectors, who were still three times more numerous in the Second World War than in the First, its appeal also diminished, its predicament reflected in a dramatic decline in rates of conscientious objection and in the membership of the PPU. Even pacifist stalwarts wobbled, with Charles Raven, now Regius Professor of Divinity and Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, offering prayers of thanksgiving in the college chapel for the much-needed British victory at El Alamein in 1942. Still, the years of the Second World War

⁷ A. J. P. Taylor (ed.), *Lloyd George: A Diary by Frances Stevenson* (London, 1971), p. 309.

did witness one novelty—an avowedly pacifist wartime bishop of the Church of England, with a platform in the House of Lords. However, the pacifism of Bishop Ernest Barnes of Birmingham was as distinctive as his own brand of modernist theology, being deeply coloured by eugenic concerns regarding the long-term effects of the war on Great Britain's best racial stock. Despite having an enduring ally in Bishop Barnes, Anglican pacifists were not guaranteed a more sympathetic hearing in the Second World War than they had been in the First. When Lang was lobbied by the APF for a meeting during the crisis summer of 1940, William Temple advised him not to allow their encounter to be minuted lest it allow 'these tiresome people blow off their steam in our faces'.⁸

Although unable to exercise a strong and direct influence on the Anglican Communion (let alone Allied governments) during the Second World War, with the dawn of the nuclear age, and the advent of the Cold War, it was apparent that pacifism had nevertheless gained a permanent footing in the Anglican Communion. The breadth of Anglican opinion and experience was no more vividly illustrated in the 1960s than in the configuration of New Zealand's Wellington City Mission, its head being Walter Arnold, a leading pacifist of long standing, whose assistant, Keith Elliott, had been awarded the Victoria Cross for capturing 130 Germans in July 1942. As in the inter-war period, when memories of trench warfare and fear of aerial bombing had brought pacifists and pacifists together in a mass if disparate peace movement, the threat of nuclear Armageddon created a reinvigorated peace movement and pushed more Anglican clergy to the fore. Much as their dubious claims to chaplaincy experience in the First World War had enhanced the standing of H. R. L. Sheppard and Stuart Morris (a Barnes protégé and Sheppard's successor as chairman of the PPU), Canon John Collins, formerly an RAF chaplain attached to Bomber Command Headquarters during the Second World War, was an obvious choice to serve as the first chairman of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). However, if the use of the atom bomb against Hiroshima and Nagasaki quickly divided Anglican opinion as far afield as Great Britain and New Zealand, the Anglican Communion never arrived at a consensus over the moral legitimacy of nuclear weapons. For example, although Bishop George Bell of Chichester condemned the development of the hydrogen bomb in 1950, his strident opposition did not represent the greater part of the Church of England. Again, and despite the prominence of John Collins in CND, it was estimated in the late 1960s that only a third of the practising Christians who supported the organization were actually Anglicans. Even the special working party behind *The Church and the Bomb* (1982), the product of a renewed period of tension in the nuclear arms race,

⁸ Arlie J. Hoover, *God, Britain, and Hitler in World War II: The View of the British Clergy* (Westport, CT, 1999), p. 40.

the revival of CND, and 'the most substantial Anglican consideration of nuclear weapons in the post-war period',⁹ failed to secure agreement over gradual, unilateral nuclear disarmament. Strongly opposed by Anglican multi-lateralists, even in diluted form its arguments failed to win the support of the General Synod when they were debated in February 1983.

Still, neither did the Church of England nor its sister Churches in the Anglican Communion simply fall into step with sundry states and governments in questions relating to peace and war. If, by the 1980s, 'the mantle of Dick Sheppard and John Collins' had fallen on the shoulders of a Roman Catholic, Monsignor Bruce Kent,¹⁰ there was no shortage of turbulent Anglican priests prepared to take up the cudgels on controversial points of foreign and military policy. In 1985, a future archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, then dean and chaplain of Clare College, Cambridge, was arrested during a CND demonstration at RAF Lakenheath. In 1956, Archbishop Geoffrey Fisher condemned the Suez fiasco in the House of Lords, branding the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt a deeply mistaken act of aggression and a violation of the United Nations Charter. Nine years later Fisher's successor, Michael Ramsey, went the other way in urging military action to forestall Rhodesia's Unilateral Declaration of Independence, and the white-minority regime it brought into being (one *Daily Mail* cartoon even portrayed the archbishop sporting a hand grenade in lieu of a pectoral cross). As the pre-eminent prelate of the Anglican Communion, Ramsey also felt compelled to pronounce on the Vietnam War, telling a Canadian audience in 1966 that the United States was fighting with the right motive, namely to stop 'communist aggression'. However, a year later, and at Little Rock, Arkansas, it was clear that Ramsey had reconsidered, now advising Americans of the apparent futility of the conflict in Indo-China. Still, the most celebrated—or notorious—sentiments uttered by a characteristically pacifist archbishop of Canterbury were expressed by Robert Runcie in 1982 at the thanksgiving service for the victorious outcome of the Falklands War. Although Runcie held the conflict to be just—a point he acknowledged in his sermon—he stressed the imperative of Christian compassion in war and voiced concern for the bereaved in Argentina, ending the service with prayers for all casualties of the conflict. Conservative opinion was, predictably, outraged; 'the boss is livid' Denis Thatcher warned one MP,¹¹ while large sections of the Conservative

⁹ Matthew Grimley, 'The Church and the Bomb: Anglicans and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, c.1958–1984', in Stephen G. Parker and Tom Lawson (eds.), *God and War: The Church of England and Armed Conflict in the Twentieth Century* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 147–64 (p. 160).

¹⁰ Adrian Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920–1990* (London, 1991), p. 601.

¹¹ Liza Filby, 'God and Mrs Thatcher: Religion and Politics in 1980s Britain', PhD thesis, University of Warwick, 2010, p. 28.

press railed against a lily-livered Church that was so plainly out of touch with the mood of the British public.

ANGLICANS AND THE MILITARY

Of all the challenges issued by the Church of England to civil government in the twentieth century, few were as dramatic or as symbolic as Runcie's stand in St Paul's Cathedral that July. Here, another highly decorated war veteran, and the primate of a strongly patriarchal Church, seemed to rebuke Great Britain's only female prime minister, at the moment of her greatest triumph, for her unwonted enthusiasm for war. Although his first-hand experience of the blazing tanks and corpse-strewn battlefields of North-West Europe in 1944–5 undoubtedly influenced Runcie's perspectives, as did his exposure to the unspeakable horrors of Belsen, of further significance was the fact that the archbishop's pre-ordination pedigree (sportsman, Oxford undergraduate, and Guards officer) advertised the historic links that obtained between Anglicanism and the military elites and institutions of the Anglophone world. In Great Britain's armed forces, the Church of England remained the dominant and most privileged of all Churches and traditions. For example, the first non-Anglican Chaplain-General of the British army was not appointed until 1987, the first non-Anglican Chaplain of the Fleet until 1998, and the first non-Anglican Chaplain-in-Chief of the RAF had to wait until 2006. Of the four British clergymen to be awarded the Victoria Cross in the twentieth century (all in the First World War), all were Anglicans and one was a combatant officer. Driven primarily by the late-Victorian 'localization' of the British army, the strength of the historic Anglican military tradition, heavily augmented by the experience of both World Wars, was reflected in the scores of regimental chapels that adorned the cathedrals and larger churches of England and Wales. Significantly, and as late as 1958, the year in which CND was launched with Collins at its head, it seemed entirely appropriate that the RAF should have a 'Central Church' of its own, the Westminster church of St Clement Danes being renovated by the Air Council and reconsecrated for this purpose by the bishop of London.

The close ties between Anglicanism and Britain's armed forces were not merely traditional or sentimental, however. Despite the notional parity of the Church of Scotland, and the general emancipation of Roman Catholics and Nonconformists in the course of the nineteenth century, the professional officers of the British army and Royal Navy remained overwhelmingly Anglican throughout the twentieth century. In part, this was a function of the prominent role of the great public schools and the largely Anglican Anglo-Irish gentry in supplying what was deemed to be natural officer material.

Significantly, when the Irish Guards were created in 1900, it was assumed that the regiment's rank and file would be Roman Catholic and its officers Church of Ireland. At the outbreak of the First World War, around 14 per cent of the army's colonels were sons of the Anglican clergy, and when Archbishop Randall Davidson toured the Western Front in May 1916 he could not fail to notice the large number of generals and staff officers who were related to senior Anglican clergymen. These included Bernard Law Montgomery, grandson of Frederic William Farrar and son of Henry Montgomery, former bishop of Tasmania and organizer of the 1908 Pan-Anglican Congress. If the army's reliance on the Anglo-Irish gentry declined over the century, in 1950, and as the American sociologist Morris Janowitz duly noted, the highest ranks of the British army were still dominated by officers recruited from the well-to-do families of rural southern England. If the religious implications of this situation were obvious, the Anglican ascendancy in the Royal Navy was still more pronounced and tenacious. Fortified by the cult of Nelson, a praying commander in his own right and the son of a Norfolk clergyman, the pervasive Anglicanism of the senior service was reflected in the fact that no Roman Catholic mass was said in public on a Royal Navy vessel between 1688 and 1908, and it was not until November 1943 that an Order in Council gave parity to Roman Catholic, Free Church, or even Church of Scotland chaplains. In contrast, Prayer Book services were traditionally led by their commanders on smaller Royal Navy vessels, a scene vividly captured in Noel Coward's famous Second World War drama *In Which We Serve* (1942), the very title of which was taken from the Prayer Book's 'Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea', and from a prayer that was said on a daily basis in the Royal Navy. In such an institutional context, and with the devoutly Anglo-Catholic Admiral 'Jacky' Fisher the main influence upon the Edwardian Royal Navy, it is hardly surprising that Mrs Randall Davidson was invited to launch a new dreadnought on the River Thames in 1911.

It is ironic, however, that the institutional leverage enjoyed by Anglicanism was also pronounced in the armed forces of the United States. Despite the unconstitutionality of any religious test for public office, the notionally rigid separation of Church and state, and the tiny proportion of Americans who were members of the Protestant Episcopal Church (less than 1.5 per cent in 1936), Episcopalianism dominated the regular officer corps of America's army and navy until well into the second half of the twentieth century. In part, this was a function of the close identification of the Protestant Episcopal Church with America's old stock, 'wasp' elite, a section of society that was ideally placed to send its sons to the service academies of West Point and Annapolis, to say nothing of the White House. However, there was also a temperamental affinity between the professional officer corps and the Protestant Episcopal Church, Episcopalianism representing a congenially ordered, hierarchical, genteel and quintessentially 'Anglo' variety of Protestantism. According to

the most reliable estimates, 42 per cent of America's admirals and 40 per cent of its generals were Episcopalians in 1950, and in the years 1898–1950 the proportion of Episcopalian generals was in the order of 50 per cent. Among them were such towering figures as John Pershing, the commander of the American Expeditionary Force (AEF) in the First World War, and Douglas MacArthur, George S. Patton, and George C. Marshall in the Second. Significantly, it seems to have been accepted as axiomatic that an Episcopalian allegiance eased professional advancement in the US army, with the sociologist Morris Janowitz noting of America's Episcopalian generals that 'There is good evidence that a substantial minority adopted the Episcopalian faith, rather than having been born into it.'¹² The privileges of the Protestant Episcopal Church were reflected in the fact that it was Charles Henry Brent, the Protestant Episcopal bishop of the Philippines, who was chosen by Pershing to lead the chaplains of the AEF in 1918. A greater source of controversy, however, arose from the fact that between 1896 and 1959 *all* of West Point's cadet chaplains—who, though civilians, presided at compulsory services every Sunday—were Episcopalians, a monopoly that was condemned as 'calculated and unwarranted discrimination against other denominations' on the part of the academy.¹³ Not until the Vietnam War and its aftermath did this Episcopalian ascendancy unravel, as a combination of demographic factors and political tensions—especially over the Vietnam War and nuclear weapons in the Reagan era—conspired to break the traditional alliance between the Protestant Episcopal Church and America's military leadership. If this breakdown was reflected in the emergence of conservative Evangelicalism as the dominant force in American military religion by the end of the twentieth century, it also had a singular expression in the case of Albion W. Knight, a nuclear weapons expert and doyen of the New Christian Right. An Episcopalian priest for eighteen years of his military career, Knight campaigned vigorously against the perceived 'pacifist and Marxist orientation of the leaders of the Episcopal Church' before defecting to the United Episcopal Church in 1983.¹⁴

WORLD WAR AND THE EPISCOPATE

In Great Britain, the reputation of the Church of England and its conduct during the two World Wars has tended to reflect crude but popular

¹² Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait* (New York, 1960), p. 98.

¹³ Rodger R. R. Venzke, *Confidence in Battle, Inspiration in Peace: The United States Army Chaplaincy 1945–1975* (Washington, DC, 1977), pp. 50–1.

¹⁴ Anne C. Loveland, *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military 1942–1993* (Baton Rouge, LA, 1996), p. 251.

perceptions of the conflicts themselves, with the First World War billed as a costly, futile, and intrinsically bad war, and the Second as some kind of redemptive national epic. Underpinning the former view has been the persistent misrepresentation of the wartime conduct and utterances of the bishop of London, Arthur Foley Winnington Ingram, a trait that has much of its basis in the inter-war propaganda of the National Secular Society, and which has now been persuasively dismissed by Stuart Bell.¹⁵ In actual fact, the role of the Church of England in the two conflicts was in no sense radically divergent. If pre-war conscription and planned manpower policies throughout the Second World War spared that generation of Anglican clergy the invidious part of clerical recruiting officers, the role of the Church as a critical friend of Britain's war effort remained constant. Although George Bell famously declared in 1939 that it was not the role of the Church to act as the 'spiritual auxiliary' of the state in wartime, this was a role that many British patriots would not have readily identified with the Church of England a generation earlier. Far from conniving at an unbridled war effort, Lang spent almost the whole of the First World War in the dog house for speaking respectfully of the young Kaiser Wilhelm II during a speech at York in November 1914. For his part, and irrespective of Germany's conduct, Davidson publicly opposed Britain's use of poisonous gas, the bombing of German civilians, and (along with Lang) the enlistment of clergymen for combatant service. In 1916, he even attempted to save the life of the convicted humanitarian-turned-traitor, Sir Roger Casement. The Anglican clergy were also conspicuous in supporting the rights of religious conscientious objectors—a deeply unpopular breed, despite their professed motivation—with twenty-six bishops and over 200 other clergymen calling for the release of imprisoned absolutists in November 1917 (and all this, it should be pointed out, as the British army was facing its ultimate ordeal at Passchendaele). Because prelates such as Gore, E. S. Talbot, and Davidson were, from the outbreak of war, forthright in enunciating the sins of the nation, the Church of England's 1916 National Mission of Repentance and Hope, which took place as the battle of the Somme raged in northern France, seemed only to confirm the suspicions of the Church's many critics. The influential newsman Horatio Bottomley regarded the whole endeavour as an insulting impertinence and, in 1917, another pundit even railed against what he saw as the 'flabby-babby babble of the Boche-defending Bishops'.¹⁶ Nor did this critical voice abate with the end of the war, with leading bishops of the Church of England disavowing the Treaty of Versailles and becoming 'ardent

¹⁵ Stuart Bell, 'Malign or Maligned? Arthur Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London, in the First World War', *Journal for the History of Modern Theology*, 20 (2013): 117–33.

¹⁶ Trevor Wilson, *The Myriad Faces of War: Britain and the Great War, 1914–1918* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 742.

proponents of changes in the Versailles system' in the 1920s.¹⁷ Prompted by moral concern and by the politics of international ecumenism, William Temple, then archbishop of York, famously condemned the vengeful 'War Guilt' clause of the Treaty of Versailles in a sermon preached in Geneva in 1932, in which he invoked the spirit of the gospel and called for its prompt deletion by the victorious powers.

Much of this familiar role was reprised between 1939 and 1945. Once again, and despite the growing unpopularity of their stand, Anglican bishops and archbishops rallied to the defence of pacifists and religious conscientious objectors. In 1944, and as archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple even wrote a sympathetic introduction to Stephen Hobhouse's essay *Christ and Our Enemies*, which had been published by the Fellowship of Reconciliation three years earlier. Once again, members of the Anglican hierarchy could seem uncomfortably reticent about trumpeting the inherent virtues of the nation and its cause; as Hensley Henson, the former bishop of Durham, wrote in August 1939, 'The conventional patriotic tub-thumping is out of the question. We have got past that phase.'¹⁸ Even Winnington Ingram, also in retirement, readily acknowledged that it was 'easy to mistake patriotism for Christianity'.¹⁹ Temple agreed, stating on the National Day of Prayer of 26 May 1940 that Britons should turn to prayer 'as Christians who happened to be British', and that the ultimate sin of their enemies was to 'put their nationality first'.²⁰ To the consternation of colleagues such as Lang and Garbett, Temple was even reluctant to pray unreservedly for victory and, rather than claim that the war was being fought for Christianity, maintained in *Towards a Christian Order* (1942) that it was being fought in defence of a flawed 'Christian civilization' which had the potential for improvement. From this subtly detached position, Temple could enter public protests against aspects of wartime policy and strategy, notably the Allies' neglect of European Jewry and Jewish refugees, and voice occasional misgivings about reprisals and the RAF's area bombing of Germany. Nevertheless, it was Davidson's former chaplain and biographer, George Bell, who proved the most strident and consistent critic of Britain's prosecution of the war, championing the cause of German and Italian internees after Dunkirk, urging the possibility of a negotiated peace with Germany in his *Christianity and World Order* (1940), and, most famously, opposing the RAF's strategy of area bombing from 1942. Significantly, and on this latter issue in particular, a range of opinion existed among Bell's fellow bishops, with some—notably Mervyn Haigh of Coventry,

¹⁷ Catherine Anne Cline, 'Ecumenism and Appeasement: The Bishops of the Church of England and the Treaty of Versailles', *Journal of Modern History*, 61 (1989): 683–703 (p. 683).

¹⁸ Angus Calder, *The People's War: Britain 1939–1945* (London, 1992), p. 487.

¹⁹ John Wolffe, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland 1843–1945* (London, 1994), p. 250.

²⁰ Richard Weight, *Patriots: National Identity in Britain 1940–2000* (London, 2002), p. 28.

and Kenneth Kirk of Oxford (who had both, unlike Bell, served as army chaplains in the First World War)—viewing the bombing of civilians as a valid military objective, especially given the kind of war being waged by Nazi Germany. More recently, and despite his concern for the fate of European Jewry and the vaunted ‘clarity of his moral vision’,²¹ Bell himself has come under criticism for failing to penetrate the real depths of Nazi anti-Semitism, and for advocating a ‘crusade of conversion’ in post-war Europe as a Christian, ‘monocultural’ bulwark against a recrudescence of National Socialism.²²

ANGLICANS, ANGLOPHILIA, AND WAR

However much the wartime conduct of its bishops has been fought and raked over in succeeding decades, an important outcome of the two World Wars was to confirm the Church of England’s role as the undisputed *primus inter pares* of the principal Protestant churches in Great Britain. While the chronic decline of the English Free Churches served to increase the preponderance of Anglicans (however nominal) in British society, the moral and spiritual stature of the monarchy in wartime also helped to boost the standing of England’s Established Church. Of the twenty-one national days of prayer held between 1899 and 1947, seventeen took place in time of war, and two more in connection with the Munich Crisis of 1938. All of these occurred at the instigation, or with the endorsement, of the sovereign, they depended on the guidance of the archbishop of Canterbury, and they relied upon the collaboration of the established Churches of England and Scotland, the Free Churches, and even the Roman Catholics. If the religious and mainly Anglican tone of British national identity served as a ready source of consolation and support in wartime, then it also helped to define Britain against its enemies and even its erstwhile allies. Hastening the decline of disestablishmentarian sentiment in England, the ordeal of two World Wars enabled the Church of England to show that, although an established Church, it was not the same craven, Erastian beast as the Prussian Church in the First World War, still less the Reich Church in the Second. If the depravities of Nazi neo-paganism helped to underline the positive desirability of a strong Christian underpinning to British national life, the debased secularism of France’s Third Republic

²¹ Tom Lawson, *The Church of England and the Holocaust: Christianity, Memory and Nazism* (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 21.

²² Tom Lawson, ‘The Anglican Understanding of Nazism 1933–1945: Placing the Church of England’s Response to the Holocaust in Context’, *Twentieth Century British History*, 14 (2003): 112–37 (pp. 133–4).

also helped to explain its collapse in 1940, and not only in the eyes of the Anglican press. Significantly, and especially in the Second World War, the moral standing of the Church of England was also recognized internationally. After his appointment as archbishop of York in 1942, Cyril Garbett became 'an international ecclesiastical statesman',²³ helping by means of his wartime travels to validate the new religious freedom enjoyed in the Soviet Union and so help cement the precarious Grand Alliance of Great Britain, the United States, and the USSR. If the patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church appealed to Temple over the Allied bombing of the oilfields at Ploesti, much more significant was the place accorded to the Church of England in American wartime propaganda. Besides the iconic image of St Paul's Cathedral still standing amidst the ravages of the Blitz, the Oscar-winning film *Mrs Miniver* (1942), perhaps the most Anglophile film in Hollywood history, also stressed the Christian character of Great Britain as embodied in the Church of England. Directed by William Wyler, a German-born Jew, the closing scene of the film was that of an indomitable English congregation gathered to worship in their bomb-damaged parish church, where, before launching into 'Onward Christian Soldiers', their vicar concluded his sermon with the words: 'This is the People's War. It is our war. We are the fighters. Fight it then. Fight it with all that is in us. And may God defend the right.'

If war helped to reinforce the links between the Church of England and British national identity, during the two World Wars Anglicans throughout the Dominions appear to have demonstrated an exceptionally strong commitment to the cause of the British Empire. The denominational ties that bound the Dominions' Anglicans so closely to the Mother Country were conspicuously strong in Australia, whose Anglicans remained part of the Church of England in Australia until 1981, when their Church was officially renamed the Anglican Church of Australia (Canadian Anglicans, in contrast, took the equivalent step a quarter of a century earlier). Anglicanism in Australia was heavily Anglicized in its leadership, structures, and ethos for much of the century, and these attachments assumed particular significance in wartime. Prior to the First World War, the celebration of Empire Day was championed in Australia by F. B. Boyce, an Anglican clergyman, and Anglicans of the Great War generation were—in contrast to their Roman Catholic compatriots—liable to place loyalty to empire above loyalty to Australia. For example, in a telling Lenten address of 1915, English-born and Eton-educated St Clair George Alfred Donaldson, archbishop of Brisbane and a future bishop of Salisbury, fretted that the Australian was not sufficiently alive 'to the obligation which rests upon him as a member of

²³ Diane Kirby, 'The Archbishop of York and Anglo-American Relations during the Second World War and Early Cold War, 1942–1955', *Journal of Religious History*, 23 (1999): 327–45 (p. 330).

an Imperial race'.²⁴ Consequently, many Anglican churchmen proved to be keen advocates of conscription, a deeply divisive issue in contemporary Australian politics, and a novel Christological theme to emerge in Anglican wartime rhetoric was that of Christ the supreme conscript. However, and as with Great Britain, it would be easy to overstate Australian bishops' support for the war. In the first (Australian) summer of the war, Bishop Reginald Stephen of Tasmania incurred some criticism for pointing to the sins of Great Britain, some of which (such as territorial aggrandizement at the expense of weaker nations) it shared with Germany. Australian Anglicans' attachment to the empire was also reflected in enthusiastic responses to national days of prayer held in Great Britain. As Philip Williamson has shown, King George V called the whole empire to prayer on the first Sunday of 1918 and again in July 1919 to mark the Treaty of Versailles; it was only during the Second World War that such wider summons became a matter of routine. Nevertheless, as early as January 1915 the Anglican bishops of Australia joined the Churches in Great Britain in marking the first Sunday of the year as a day of prayer. Similarly, Anglican churchmen in Australia and in Canada rejoiced at the perceived success of the day of prayer held on 4 August 1918, the fourth anniversary of the outbreak of war, when King George V prayed with the House of Commons and thereby apparently helped to ensure the success of the subsequent British offensive on the Western Front. While Australian voters twice rejected conscription during the First World War, Anglicans accounted for a disproportionate number of those who voluntarily served overseas in the Australian Imperial Force (AIF), a source of understandable grievance to their Church in view of the fact that AIF chaplains were only appointed in proportion to their Churches' share of the civilian population.

However, such willingness to fight and die on the other side of the world in the cause of the empire was still more conspicuous among Canadian Anglicans. If Canada followed the example of Great Britain by introducing conscription in 1917, prior to the passage of its controversial Military Service Act over 46 per cent of those who had volunteered for the Canadian Expeditionary Force (CEF) were Anglicans, a huge discrepancy in that Anglicans composed only 15 per cent of the Canadian population. Consequently, Melissa Davidson has rightly emphasized the 'enormous impact' of this situation on the Church of England in Canada; with up to 16 per cent of *all* Canadian Anglicans in uniform by 1916, 'the emotional and economic hardships associated with men serving overseas were felt more broadly amongst Anglican families' than among Canadians of any other denomination.²⁵ That a similar

²⁴ Michael McKernan, *Australian Churches at War: Attitudes and Activities of the Major Churches 1914–1918* (Sydney and Canberra, 1980), pp. 69–70.

²⁵ Melissa Davidson, 'The Anglican Church and the Great War', in Gordon L. Heath (ed.), *Canadian Churches and the First World War* (Eugene, OR, 2014), pp. 152–69 (p. 153).

situation obtained in the Dominion between 1939 and 1945 is indicated by figures compiled by the first (and predictably Anglican) head of the Canadian army's Protestant Chaplain Services, Bishop G. A. Wells of Cariboo, in 1943. With Canada relying on a hybrid system of voluntary enlistment for overseas service and limited conscription for home defence, and Protestant chaplains appointed in the ratio of 1:1,000 of their co-religionists, Wells could report that 43 per cent of the army's Protestant chaplains were Anglicans, their numbers far exceeding those supplied by the United Church, then Canada's largest Protestant denomination. Among New Zealand's Māori population, which was exempt from conscription during the Second World War, the picture was much the same. The great majority of the men of the all-volunteer Māori Battalion of the Second New Zealand Expeditionary Force were Anglicans, and 'no other 2NZEF Unit was so served by a single denomination' in the course of the Second World War.²⁶ Five hundred West Indians volunteered to fly with the RAF in the Second World War and, in view of empire-wide recruitment patterns, it is significant that among them was John Ebanks, a navigator with 571 Pathfinder Squadron who, in his own words, was 'the youngest licensed lay preacher in the Anglican Church of Jamaica'.²⁷

American Episcopalians evinced similar symptoms of unusually strong Anglophile and pro-Allied sentiment in the two World Wars, especially in the long months of American neutrality which, on both occasions, preceded their country's entry into the war. If historic religious and cultural ties meant that the Anglophone Churches of the Protestant 'mainline' were most disposed to the Allied cause between 1914 and 1917, Episcopalians yielded to none in their interventionism—despite the aberration of Bishop Jones. Amidst the disillusionment and recriminations that abounded in the United States in the inter-war years, the influential pacifist Ray H. Abrams drew up a damning charge sheet in 1933:

Among the denominations, the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, since its founding, has been a thoroughly English organization, having many ties that bind it to the mother church in England. Its clergy are constantly passing back and forth between the two countries. It is generally appraised as a church of society, it maintains an air of aristocracy, and has within its ranks those who parade their titles and English connections... At the time of the war numerous wealthy bankers, like the Morgans, either belonged to this church or had Episcopalian associations. Hence, with a few notable exceptions, the Episcopalian clergy, steeped in English traditions and culture, and, in general, on the side of the

²⁶ Geoffrey M. R. Haworth, *Marching As To War? The Anglican Church in New Zealand during World War II* (Christchurch, 2008), p. 59.

²⁷ Christopher Somerville, *Our War: How the British Commonwealth Fought the Second World War* (London, 2005), p. 249.

vested interests, simply acted in accord with the conditioning and habit-patterns already well established. Moreover, the Episcopalians, more than any others, have been traditionally tied up with various military organizations and patriotic orders, either through chaplains or social affiliations.²⁸

Despite the strength of pacifist, isolationist, and anti-imperialist opinion in the United States before Pearl Harbor, prominent Episcopalians once again rallied to the cause of the Allies and of Great Britain, especially in the months between Dunkirk and Pearl Harbor. One notable voice was that of Frederick W. Beekman, dean of the Episcopalian pro-cathedral in Paris, who escaped to the United States after the fall of France where he went on to give '509 speeches in the nation's churches, colleges, and Rotary clubs, pointing out the imminence of German victory if the United States didn't join the Allies'.²⁹ In 1941, Bishop William T. Manning of New York even provoked Episcopalian protests when he declared that 'Speaking as an American, as a Christian, and as a bishop of the Christian church, I say that it is our duty as a Nation to take full part in this struggle, to give our whole strength and power to bring this world calamity and world terror to an end, and to do this now while Great Britain still stands.'³⁰ Humanitarian aid also flowed from Episcopalian sources in the United States to Anglicans in Great Britain through organizations such as the British War Relief Society, and the Church Army benefited from mobile tea vans that were used to support rescue workers, bombed-out civilians, and even anti-aircraft batteries in war-torn Britain. However, all of this was eclipsed by the significance of American Lend-Lease aid for Great Britain, which was very much a product of having an interventionist Episcopalian incumbent in the White House in the form of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 'a frustrated clergyman at heart' and the senior warden of St James's Episcopal Church, Hyde Park, even while he served as president.

ANGLICANS AND WAR IN ASIA AND AFRICA

Although attention was focused upon the plight of Anglicanism in the British Isles during the Second World War, Anglicanism in Asia and in the Pacific suffered far more in this era, being a victim of Japanese expansion even before Pearl Harbor and the floodtide of Japanese conquests that followed. Having survived the convulsions of the Boxer rebellion of 1899–1901, and the effects

²⁸ Abrams, *Preachers Present Arms*, p. 31.

²⁹ Ralph Luther Moellering, *Modern War and the American Churches* (New York, 1956), p. 60.

³⁰ Moellering, *Modern War and the American Churches*, p. 266.

of its strong anti-missionary animus, Anglicanism grew steadily in China during the first decades of the twentieth century. Recognized as a province of the Anglican Communion at the Lambeth Conference of 1930, seven years later, when Japan launched its all-out invasion of China, the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui (the Holy Catholic Church of China) comprised twelve dioceses, one missionary district, and 120,000 baptized members and catechumens. However, the eight years of the Sino-Japanese War saw the destruction of much of its property, the dispersal of many of its congregations, and an overall loss of around 20 per cent of its members and catechumens. Mounting tensions between Japan and the Anglo-Americans also led to the ousting of the foreign-born bishops of the Nippon Sei Ko Kwai (the Holy Catholic Church of Japan, or SKK) in 1940–1, and its forced incorporation into a united Japanese Protestant Church. With the Japanese conquest of Hong Kong, Malaya, Singapore, Burma, and the Philippines, and the Japanese advance into Melanesia and New Guinea, the loss of these British and American possessions was accompanied by a further onslaught against European missionaries, who were generally regarded by the Japanese (not unreasonably, it must be said) as Anglo-American agents and therefore arrested, or worse. In the diocese of Singapore, Bishop Leonard Wilson was interned and tortured; in Burma, churches were desecrated as Christians were targeted by the Japanese and by Burmese nationalists, and in the Philippines heavy fighting and air raids destroyed much of the Episcopalian infrastructure, leading to a significant loss of pre-war members. In the Solomon Islands Christian missions were despoiled by the Japanese, and an American marine noted how, at one mission, Anglican hymnbooks were used for toilet paper. In total, the Japanese invasion of the Solomon Islands and New Guinea resulted in the execution of nearly 250 missionaries and Church workers, among them twelve Anglicans. Not surprisingly, and given the perceived cruelty and heathenism of the Japanese, for the Anglo-Americans the conflict in Asia and the Pacific could assume the character of a religious as well as a racial war, and the Anglican church of St John's, Port Moresby, achieved symbolic status as a religious and recreational centre for Australian and American personnel during the New Guinea campaign of 1942–5. However, Allied victory over Japan in 1945 did not bring to an end the trials and tribulations of Anglicanism in Asia. As Christianity in Japan was largely an urban phenomenon, its churches had suffered heavily as a result of American bombing towards the end of the war, and by the summer of 1945 twenty-three out of twenty-eight former SKK churches in Tokyo had been completely destroyed. Furthermore, in China the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui had to suffer the further depredations of the Chinese Civil War, and then of Communist persecution. For the Anglican Church of Korea, the relatively minor constraints experienced under Japanese colonial rule were succeeded by Communist harassment in the north and by the ravages of a full-scale war in the Korean peninsula from 1950 to 1953,

a war that saw the imprisonment of its bishop by the North Koreans and the ravaging of its infrastructure. In fact, and in a poignant reflection of the Church's fortunes during the Korean War, when a regiment of the British army occupied the grounds of the episcopal palace in Seoul in March 1951, its soldiers salvaged and repaired a 1641 mother-of-pearl crucifix that had been recovered from the bishop's garden.

In South Africa, the twentieth century also dawned with the region at war and Anglicanism embattled. With the Church of the Province of South Africa very much identified with the cause of the British Empire in its humiliating, David-and-Goliath struggle with the small Boer republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, the South African War of 1899–1902 saw Anglican clergy displaced, Anglican work in the Transvaal practically suspended, and Anglican bishops take the field to assist British forces. Nevertheless, at the same time Anglicanism in South Africa also benefited from a military influx that brought tens of thousands of Anglicans from across the empire to the seat of war, at least temporarily. Anglicanism in Africa was, however, broadly spared the infrastructural ravages of the two World Wars. Once again, during these conflicts the newer Churches of the Anglican Communion were closely identified with the imperial and Allied cause. During the First World War the CMS bishop of Khartoum, L. H. Gwynne, technically on furlough in England when the war broke out, served as the Anglican Deputy Chaplain-General on the Western Front from 1915 to 1918, steering the work of Anglican chaplains and being credited by General Sir Herbert Plumer (a good churchman, and arguably the best British general of the war) as doing more than anyone else to secure eventual victory. In terms of the logistics of war in sub-Saharan Africa, a great deal hinged on the ability of British missionaries to raise the legions of African porters required to sustain even small armies in the field. In this respect, the contribution of the UMCA bishop of Zanzibar, Frank Weston, proved to be invaluable. Also on leave in England when war broke out, Weston returned to East Africa and raised a corps of more than 2,500 carriers while holding a major's commission. However, the brutalities and iniquities that were visited on African labourers by their colonial masters were not lost on Weston, a Christian socialist, who entered a strong post-war protest in *The Serfs of Great Britain* (1920). In addition to Weston, other Anglican missionaries to sub-Saharan Africa also sought to safeguard the physical, moral, and spiritual well-being of African labourers, among them Robert Keable, a UMCA missionary who went from Basutoland to France as a chaplain with the South African Labour Corps in 1917. Although Keable later left the priesthood, and earned notoriety for a racy novel about a delinquent chaplain, *Simon Called Peter* (1921), during the Second World War Anglicanism's missionary infrastructure again proved essential in mobilizing indigenous support in Africa. As a Ugandan soldier

put it in 1944, concepts of king or empire had little purchase next to that of a 'beloved lady missionary' whose family was in danger of enslavement at home.³¹ Indeed, by the 1940s the increasingly mechanized and technological nature of warfare placed an extra premium on recruiting the well-educated alumni of mission schools, men like Isaac Fadoyebo, an Anglican Yoruba who served as a medical orderly with the 81st (West African) Division in Burma. Similarly, among the many Anglicans who served in the King's African Rifles, which recruited across much of East Africa, was Silvanus Wani, a future archbishop of Uganda, his regiment being described as 'an extended catechumenate' because of the vibrancy of Christianity in its ranks.³²

Nevertheless, the apparently secure position of Anglicanism in East Africa was profoundly shaken in the post-war years by the State of Emergency triggered by the Mau Mau insurgency in Kenya, a conflict that claimed more than 13,000 lives between 1952 and 1960. Having made considerable progress among the Kikuyu, widely regarded as Kenya's most adaptable and advanced tribe, and having helped to nurture and educate anti-colonial sentiment, the largely Kikuyu Mau Mau—with their secret rites, oaths of initiation, and insensate violence—were regarded by Anglican missionaries as a barbaric regression into Kenya's dark, pre-Christian past. Reflecting the position of the CMS as 'a quasi-established Church' in colonial Kenya,³³ according to CMS sources the insurgency represented a cosmic struggle between good and evil, in which many of the Kikuyu victims of Mau Mau violence were easily cast as Christian martyrs. Significantly, CMS missionary clergy (along with pro-government witch doctors, rather ironically) made a prominent contribution to the psychological dimensions of the British counter-insurgency campaign, notably in the form of evangelistic and 'de-oathing' work among the thousands of Mau Mau prisoners held in government detention camps. In the very different setting of the shorter but much bloodier Biafran War of 1967–70, the Anglican Communion once again favoured the status quo. In this case, and despite the pro-Biafran sympathies of its Biafran-based archbishop, the West African Province of the Anglican Communion largely supported the post-colonial federal republic of Nigeria, the stance of one of Nigeria's largest Christian denominations being invaluable to the Nigerian government in confounding Biafran claims that the conflict was a religious war between Christians and Muslims.

³¹ David Killingray and Martin Plaut, *Fighting for Britain: African Soldiers in the Second World War* (Woodbridge, 2010), p. 60.

³² Killingray and Plaut, *Fighting for Britain*, p. 112.

³³ John Casson, 'Missionaries, Mau Mau and the Christian Frontier', in Pieter N. Holtrop and Hugh McLeod (eds.), *Missions and Missionaries* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 200–15 (p. 213).

WAR AND CHURCH LIFE

Whether the horrors and destructiveness of war in the twentieth century were experienced at first hand or at a distance, the upheaval generated by such conflict was clear and could be far-reaching. In the two World Wars especially, the combined impact of mass enlistment (voluntary or otherwise), war work, the displacement of civilians, enemy bombing, and shortages of all kinds inevitably had an effect on Anglican religious life and practice. In Australia, for example, petrol rationing during the Second World War had a major impact on the provision of services in rural areas, and three Australian dioceses (Kalgoorlie, Perth, and Bendigo) lost more than 40 per cent of their clergy to the armed forces. Nevertheless, wartime disruption also brought opportunities. Church attendance was compulsory in Britain's armed forces during both World Wars, a situation that exposed millions of nominal adult Anglicans to Anglican worship and the Anglican clergy. The net effect of this experience is impossible to judge; if compulsory religion in its military trappings was widely resented, the celebrity of figures such as G. A. Studdert Kennedy, P. T. B. Clayton, and even Dick Sheppard in the inter-war years illustrates that it was not necessarily an alienating experience. As to the home front, and according to preliminary research conducted by Clive Field, the early months of the First World War witnessed an initial surge in Anglican church attendance in Great Britain, a surge that ebbed for eminently practical reasons, such as the departure of male church-goers of military age, the rescheduling of services, the need for Sunday labour, and the persistent challenge of secular leisure pursuits. According to Field, in the long term this wartime disruption could prove habit-forming, and had a telling impact on Sunday school education in particular.³⁴ Nevertheless, in some respects it is clear that the war also helped to enlarge the appeal of Anglican public worship, as shown by the success of recurrent national days of prayer and in the evolution of the culture of Remembrance in the inter-war years, with its Armistice Day and Remembrance Sunday services. According to Michael McKernan, the net impact of the First World War on Australian church attendance—Anglican included—was surprisingly slight in overall terms. Despite the departure of so many male church-goers, and the increasingly strained mood of civilian church life, it was 'remarkable that the churches at least held their own'.³⁵ During the Second World War these patterns seem to have recurred on the British home front, albeit against a backdrop of much greater disruption and destruction, and now with the added competition of religion on the radio. Although regular church attendance suffered once again,

³⁴ Clive Field, 'Keeping the Spiritual Home Fires Burning: Religious Belonging in Britain during the First World War', *War and Society*, 33 (2014): 244–68.

³⁵ McKernan, *Australian Churches at War*, p. 100.

especially when Britain stood most beleaguered, this was offset by the continuing appeal of national days of prayer, by the prominence and popularity of religious broadcasting, and by a widespread desire to renew the Christian character of British society, especially through its education system. Once again, there was no indication of a wholesale lapse in public religious observance caused by a wave of protest atheism. In Australia, and despite understandable anguish at the onset of another war with Germany, the outbreak of the Second World War was marked by a fleeting surge in communicants, and a wartime stability seems to have obtained among Anglicans in New Zealand, despite the fact that its armed forces suffered, in proportionate terms, more fatalities than those of any other part of the empire.

To a significant degree, the essential resilience of Anglican faith and practice during the two World Wars reflected how well the Anglican Communion adjusted to the novel and acute pastoral challenges of total war. Quite apart from the scale and diversity of material and spiritual help for servicemen and women, channelled through a gamut of Anglican agents and agencies ranging from military chaplains to organizations such as the Church Army and the venerable SPCK, the Anglican Communion also rallied to the cause of civilian relief work. In January 1915, for instance, a single Toronto parish sent nearly 2,500 bags of flour to occupied Belgium. After the Munich Agreement the Czechs likewise became the objects of Anglican beneficence, although in this case partly to salve bad consciences. In the Second World War, and as Stephen Parker has shown in his study of Birmingham, the work of the Anglican clergy in the heavily bombed urban districts of Britain was aided by the fact that a large proportion of the Anglican clergy had been chaplains in the First World War, and so adapted tried and tested pastoral methods to the air raid shelters and civilians now under their care.³⁶ No less than in the armed forces, the trials and tribulations of war could throw Church and people together to a degree that was unknown in peacetime, as in the case of the Leeds vicar who acted as a conductor on a municipal tram, and the Londoners who rallied to save St Paul's Cathedral from the flames of the London Blitz. The Church Army also adjusted to new conditions in the Second World War, sending a hundred 'Evangelistic teams' to lead nightly services in London's larger air raid shelters. To a striking degree, the Second World War witnessed an elision of Anglican and British national identity, not only in the guise of William Temple—'the People's Archbishop'—but also in the pain and endurance represented by the contrasting fates of Coventry Cathedral and St Paul's. This elision was captured by T. S. Eliot in his celebrated poem *Little Gidding* (1942), and was reflected in British wartime cinema, notably in *Went the Day Well?* (1942), a rousing portrayal of a failed German invasion attempt in which

³⁶ Stephen Parker, *Faith on the Home Front: Aspects of Church Life and Popular Religion in Birmingham 1939–1945* (Oxford, 2005).

the vicar of Bramley End is gunned down while bravely sounding the tocsin, and a local collaborator shot by his avenging daughter. This identification continued to be echoed in the popular mythology of the war in the post-war decades, perhaps most strikingly in the comedy series *Dad's Army* (1968–77), whose unlikely heroes stood sentinel on the English coast from the parish hall of Walmington-on-Sea.

The inherent disruptiveness of full-scale war also served to enlarge the scope for female ministry within the Anglican Communion, much as it enlarged that of Chinese and Indian clergy in the diocese of Singapore, for example, upon the internment of its European clergy by the Japanese in 1942. Although the preponderantly feminine character of Anglican congregations was an established fact by 1914, the war served to accentuate an existing reliance on female activism. In Canada, for example, Anglican Women's Associations flourished during the First World War, with vast quantities of comforts amassed and distributed for the benefit of Canadian soldiers, often in collaboration with the Red Cross or the hyper-patriotic Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire. While the Mothers' Union fortified home life across the Anglican Communion throughout the two World Wars, women also proved to be a mainstay of Church Army work, probably to a greater extent in the Second World War than in the First. In February 1940, for example, the number of 'Voluntary lady workers' working in Church Army huts for the armed forces in Great Britain stood at 178, but had climbed to around 3,000 by the end of 1943. In terms of parish life, wartime conditions created more room for women on church committees and vestries, while the exigencies of the Second World War also helped undermine ancient conventions as to women's apparel, with clothing shortages obliging the archbishops of Canterbury and York—at the request of the Board of Trade—to rule that it was no longer necessary for women to wear hats in church in deference to the injunctions of 1 Corinthians 11:2–16. The First World War also threw up an Anglican martyr, or pseudo-martyr, in the form of Edith Cavell, the daughter of another Norfolk clergyman and Britain's premier war heroine, who was executed by the Germans in 1915 for aiding the escape of fugitive Allied soldiers from occupied Belgium. Nevertheless, the heightened prominence of women in wartime Church life did not overcome ingrained reservations over women's ministry, reservations that had led the Lambeth Conference of 1930 to retreat from the view that deaconesses were in holy orders. Although a few Anglican women served as paid parish assistants during the Second World War, and were even engaged by the Royal Army Chaplains' Department to serve as chaplains' assistants in the British army, their ministry was still heavily circumscribed. In 1940, and despite the depletion of the ranks of the Church of England's lay readers, its bishops rejected a petition calling for the admission of women to that office, citing the overriding threat of German invasion. Even more telling, however, was the fate of Florence Li Tim-Oi, a deaconess

who was ordained in January 1944 by Bishop Ronald Hall of Hong Kong in order that Holy Communion could still be celebrated in the context of the Japanese occupation. Significantly, the defeat of Japan also brought about the end of this experiment, with pressure from across the Anglican Communion resulting in the revocation of her licence.

If, at least in the long term, the exigencies of war helped the cause of women's ministry in the Anglican Communion, the long-term impact on the faith and morals of its members is harder to assess. Although drink and gambling were not quite the shibboleths they were among the British Free Churches and their counterparts overseas, a mutually reinforcing puritanism and providentialism meant that, for most Anglicans during the First World War, the need for purity could not be subtracted from the prosecution of a just and victorious war. It was, for example, a salient theme in the celebrated wartime preaching and poetry of Studdert Kennedy, while the British army's amoral connivance in licensed prostitution proved to be a source of great scandal and consternation for churchmen at home. In 1918, Randall Davidson played a leading role in persuading government to accept that continence and self-control were the best means of keeping venereal disease—that inevitable corollary of vice—firmly in check. Tellingly described by the archbishop as an issue 'which inflames people almost beyond any other',³⁷ the renewed conjunction of Mars and Venus between 1939 and 1945 was the cause of still greater moral concern. After the notable retreat from the stringent standards and restraints of Victorian morality that had characterized British society in the inter-war years, a longer war, more distant and protracted overseas postings, the greater mobilization of women, and the influx of hundreds of thousands of foreign servicemen from 1940 to 1945 placed an even greater strain on traditional moral norms, causing a pandemic of venereal disease and unprecedented levels of divorce. The seriousness of the situation, and the importance of the Church of England's response to it, was reflected in Bishop Geoffrey Fisher's presidency of the Public Morality Council, which in his words sought to 'preserve those things that the public conscience feels ought to be preserved',³⁸ and in William Temple's outspoken opposition to the distribution of prophylactics to members of Britain's armed forces. Despite the conservative moral reaction that took hold in British society following the convulsions of the Second World War, the continued demands of national and imperial defence meant that churchmen could not afford to be complacent in the post-war world. Consequently, and as archbishop of Canterbury, Fisher led a deputation of concerned parties to the War Office in 1947 in order to

³⁷ Alan Wilkinson, *The Church of England and the First World War* (London, 1978), p. 106.

³⁸ Andrea Harris, 'Preaching Morality: Sex, the Church and the Second World War', in Parker and Lawson (eds.), *God and War*, pp. 81–98 (pp. 95–6).

insist that 'positive moral teaching' should characterize the army's approach to its new breed of National Servicemen.

Despite recurrent concerns over the deleterious impact of war on Christian norms, its effect was far more subtle than a widespread lapse into protest atheism, or a general slide into moral turpitude. Significantly, the greatest damage done to Anglicanism in Great Britain appears to have been inflicted by the prolonged disruption caused to peacetime patterns of public religious observance by unprecedented levels of wartime displacement and upheaval. Even before the First World War, the secular, leisured, 'continental Sunday' had been identified as an insidious threat to the British Churches, and it appears that the disruption and distractions of the war years (to say nothing of mass, first-hand exposure to the continental Sunday itself) lessened the church-going impulse in the longer term. According to Clive Field, this phenomenon recurred in the Second World War and its aftermath, thus prolonging pre-war patterns of underlying decline.³⁹ However, and as the abiding appeal of successive national days of prayer illustrates, this is not to say that their religion did not play a major sustaining and even formative role for Anglicans embroiled in these—and other—twentieth-century conflicts. Despite the tenacity of a largely spurious First World War mythology of soldiers' irreligion and irrelevant Anglican padres, pre-combat communion services often attracted levels of attendance that far exceeded civilian norms, an echo of a popular and deep-rooted perception of Holy Communion which held that the sacrament was only for the ultra-devout—or those on the brink of death. A generation later, and in a telling vignette, a British officer at Salerno in 1943 remembered lying all day under German fire: 'I did not see how we could sustain a prolonged attack and just hoped that whatever fate awaited me would be quick. I always carried the Army Prayer Book, and I gained enormous comfort and solace from reading through the order of Matins and Evening Prayer, the familiar canticles, psalms and prayers.'⁴⁰ Just as dramatically, and amidst all the hardships and horrors of captivity in the Far East, from 1942 to 1945 temporary Anglican churches—built spontaneously by Commonwealth prisoners of war—littered Japanese prison camps, a further indication of the comfort that was to be gleaned from Anglicanism's appealing blend of faith and familiarity. One notable example was that of S. George's, Changi, in Singapore, a converted mosque replete with all the fixtures and fittings of a substantial parish church, in which Bishop Leonard Wilson ordained a deacon and confirmed 179 other prisoners in July 1942. Significantly, statistics suggest that a third of all British prisoners at Changi were Anglican communicants throughout their captivity. In addition to the case of

³⁹ Clive D. Field, 'Puzzled People Revisited: Religious Believing and Belonging in Wartime Britain, 1939–45', *Twentieth Century British History*, 19 (2008): 446–79.

⁴⁰ Max Hastings, *All Hell Let Loose: The World at War 1939–1945* (London, 2011), p. 452.

Florence Li Tim-Oi, successive conflicts produced crops of future clergy who went on to play a major role in the Anglican Communion. Besides Robert Runcie, these included figures such as Walter Baddeley, bishop of Melanesia throughout the Second World War, who had served as a British battalion commander on the Western Front in the First World War, and Paul Moore, a future bishop of New York, who traced his priestly vocation to a moment of revelation while serving as a US marine officer on Guadalcanal—part of Baddeley's diocese—in 1942.

The ordeal of war influenced Anglican thought and worship in many other respects. While shared adversity fuelled ecumenism on many different levels, the unprecedented mortality of the First World War led to major readjustments in Anglican theology and practice, most conspicuously in the rapid and general assimilation of prayers for the dead. The mortal trials and tribulations of war also encouraged a greater emphasis on sacramental religion, and so placed a greater premium on the centrality of Holy Communion in public worship. Although the First World War also led to a widespread rejection of German theological influences, in Anglican as in other Church quarters, arguably the most significant and lasting British contribution to twentieth-century Christian theology was made posthumously by G. A. Studdert Kennedy ('Woodbine Willie') in his theology of divine passibility, a theology he developed on the Western Front and which gained in currency and traction after the unsurpassed horrors of the next World War. In terms of pastoral methods, the perceived benefits of military chaplaincy helped to stimulate the rise of industrial chaplaincy in the Church of England after the Second World War. More ambitiously, the World Wars fostered earnest attempts by the Church of England and its luminaries to reconfigure post-war Church and society. As a consequence of the First World War, and especially the work of the National Mission and its later committees of inquiry, the relationship between Parliament and the Church of England was redefined by the Enabling Act of 1919, which created a partly elected Church Assembly and allowed the Church greater freedom in ordering its internal affairs. The First World War also fuelled a strong dynamic in favour of Prayer Book reform, but the cause of the Revised (or Alternative) Prayer Book came to grief in Parliament in 1927, and failed once again the following year. If the work of the National Mission also fostered a new critique of industrial and social problems, and prompted the creation of the Industrial Christian Fellowship in 1919, a generation later, and with the cause of reform focused more on the secular than on the ecclesiastical realm, the Anglican conference on reconstruction held at Malvern College under the chairmanship of William Temple in 1941 helped to place the Church of England centre stage in planning the shape of post-war British society. This position was confirmed in 1942 by the publication of Temple's best-selling *Christianity and Social Order*, and by the mass meetings he presided over as

the leftward-leaning 'People's Archbishop'. The prominence of Temple, and the renewed sense of national and religious purpose that his popularity betrayed, clearly reflected what amounted to a wartime revival of cultural Christianity in Great Britain, a revival that the Church of England was able to turn to some advantage in the form of the 1944 Education Act. Sponsored by R. A. Butler, President of the Board of Education and a devout Anglican layman, this not only provided for mandatory religious instruction and acts of worship in British schools, but its funding arrangements also ensured the survival of around 2,000 Church of England schools at a time when the costs of its school system had become all but prohibitive.

If the blueprints of Great Britain's post-war welfare state plainly bore the imprimatur of the archbishop of Canterbury, what has proved to be a more enduring legacy to British society was the Church of England's influence on the national cult of Remembrance. Although there was controversy over the allegedly secular nature of Edwin Lutyens's design of the permanent cenotaph in Whitehall, its unveiling in November 1920 took place as part of the elaborate ceremonial surrounding the interment of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey—a project conceived by David Railton, a former Anglican army chaplain, and pursued by Herbert Edward Ryle, the dean of Westminster. Over subsequent years, an Anglican ceremony came to mark the nation's annual act of remembrance at the cenotaph and, at the instigation of Dick Sheppard, then vicar of St Martin-in-the Fields, from 1927 the British Legion's annual Festival of Remembrance, which included a religious service, displaced the boozy charity balls that had previously graced the Albert Hall to mark the anniversary of the Armistice. Aided by the emergence of Remembrance Sunday, rather than Armistice Day itself, as the focal point of Remembrance after 1923, a decade after the end of the First World War the Church of England had discovered a new and abiding role as the prime custodian of a national cult of Remembrance which remains largely unchanged to this day. Indeed, even the six years of the Second World War, and the newly contrived Battle of Britain Sunday, failed to add substantially to what was in place by the end of the 1920s. However, remembrance was not simply ritualistic, for the complex human and religious experience of the First World War also gave rise to the Toc H movement, which was inaugurated in 1920 and spread across the British Empire in the interwar years. Born of the activities of Talbot House, the famous Anglican soldiers' home established in the Ypres Salient in 1915, and led by its charismatic incumbent, P. T. B. (or 'Tubby') Clayton, Toc H thrived for some years as a living memorial devoted to Christian service. The sacrifice of the war dead—often cast in the war years in the language of martyrdom—also served to energize efforts to improve social conditions and inter-class relations, being a major spur to the work of the Industrial Christian Fellowship and its mission to advance the kingdom of God in post-war Britain.

CONCLUSION

According to one historian of the British Empire, 'the Anglican Church', like the Post Office Savings Bank, 'was one of those British institutions spread across the globe by virtue of Empire and productively utilized in a time of war'.⁴¹ This essay has shown that there is some truth in this somewhat mischievous remark. In the South African War, the First World War, and the Second World War, the Anglican Communion proved to be a reliable and conspicuous source of support for the imperial war effort, with Anglicans perhaps more susceptible than members of other Christian traditions to mobilize and fight on behalf of the Mother Country. This tendency was also strongly pronounced among American Episcopalians, in a sense the lost sheep of the empire, with critically important results in the darkest months of the Second World War. If the end of empire and the growth of Anglicanism in Africa and Asia in the latter half of the twentieth century underlined the perennial truth that the vicissitudes and vulnerabilities of war could never be shared equally by a global Communion, it is nonetheless suggestive of the intrinsic strength of the Communion's historic just war tradition that pacifism did not become Anglicanism's default position in the course of history's bloodiest century, though many Anglicans took that stance as they engaged with the moral complexities of modern war, and wrestled with the implications of ever more lethal military technologies. Furthermore, such was the breadth of opinion within the Anglican Communion, a breadth that was largely based on the vitality and robustness of its just war traditions, that principled Anglican support for particular conflicts could easily coexist with a strongly critical approach to war-making, a fact that tends to be understated in Anglican historiography. Moreover, war did much more to shape global Anglicanism in the twentieth century than merely provide an arresting focus for ethical debate. While it served to broaden the scope and nature of Anglican ministry, it also coloured Anglican theology, moulded Anglican liturgy, enlarged Anglican ecumenism, and formed Anglican leaders. If the impact of war on church-going and traditional morality could be doubled-edged, in Great Britain at least it served to deepen a diffused cultural attachment to the Church of England, one that was at its strongest during the supreme crisis of the Second World War but which can still be perceived in the Church's largely uncontested role in the nation's abiding cult of Remembrance. In short, and while the scourge of war brought grief and tragedy to the world throughout the twentieth century, its impact on global Anglicanism proved to be much more ambiguous in its impact and in its legacy.

⁴¹ Ashley Jackson, *The British Empire and the Second World War* (London, 2006), p. 203.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrams, Ray H., *Preachers Present Arms: The Role of the American Churches and Clergy in World Wars I and II, with Some Observations on the War in Vietnam* (Eugene, OR, 2009).
- Beaken, Robert, *The Church of England and the Home Front, 1914–1918: Civilians, Soldiers and Religion in Wartime Colchester* (Woodbridge, 2015).
- Bell, Stuart, 'Malign or Maligned? Arthur Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London, in the First World War', *Journal for the History of Modern Theology*, 20 (2013): 117–33.
- Ceadel, Martin, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914–45: Defining of a Faith* (Oxford, 1980).
- Cline, Catherine Anne, 'Ecumenism and Appeasement: The Bishops of the Church of England and the Treaty of Versailles', *Journal of Modern History*, 61 (1989): 683–703.
- Field, Clive, 'Puzzled People Revisited: Religious Believing and Belonging in Wartime Britain, 1939–45', *Twentieth Century British History*, 19 (2008): 446–79.
- Field, Clive, 'Keeping the Spiritual Home Fires Burning: Religious Belonging in Britain during the First World War', *War and Society*, 33 (2014): 244–68.
- Haworth, Geoffrey M. R., *Marching As To War: The Anglican Church in New Zealand during World War II* (Christchurch, 2008).
- Heath, Gordon L. (ed.), *Canadian Churches and the First World War* (Hamilton, ON, 2014).
- Hoover, Arlie J., *God, Britain, and Hitler in World War II: The View of the British Clergy, 1939–1945* (Westport, CT, 1999).
- Killingray, David and Martin Plaut, *Fighting for Britain: African Soldiers in the Second World War* (Woodbridge, 2010).
- McKernan, Michael, *Australian Churches at War: Attitudes and Activities of the Major Churches 1914–1918* (Sydney and Canberra, 1980).
- Madigan, Edward, *Faith Under Fire: Anglican Chaplains and the Great War* (Basingstoke, 2011).
- Parker, Stephen, *Faith on the Home Front: Aspects of Church Life and Popular Religion in Birmingham 1939–1945* (Oxford, 2006).
- Parker, Stephen G. and Tom Lawson (eds.), *God and War: The Church of England and Armed Conflict in the Twentieth Century* (Farnham, 2012).
- Robbins, Keith, *England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales: The Christian Church 1900–2000* (Oxford, 2008).
- Snape, Michael, *God and the British Soldier: Religion and the British Army in the First and Second World Wars* (Abingdon, 2005).
- Snape, Michael, *The Royal Army Chaplains' Department 1796–1953: Clergy Under Fire* (Woodbridge, 2008).
- Snape, Michael, *God and Uncle Sam: Religion and America's Armed Forces in World War II* (Woodbridge, 2015).
- Wilkinson, Alan, *The Church of England and the First World War* (London, 1978).
- Wilkinson, Alan, *Dissent or Conform? War, Peace and the English Churches 1900–1945* (London, 1986).

Global Poverty and Justice

Malcolm Brown

Although Anglicanism can be seen as a coalition of differing doctrinal emphases, the presence of a strongly incarnational tendency, amongst other things, has usually prevented it from ignoring the material lives of people and communities. Consciously part of the world-wide Church, Anglicanism's concern for human well-being has not stopped at the shores of any particular country. Throughout the twentieth century, the Anglican Communion was an important context for the pursuit of international questions, but so were the changing fortunes of the ecumenical movement and the evolving understanding of relationships between developed and developing countries. These strands were still in play by the turn of the twenty-first century, with an unresolved reappraisal of the place of the Christian faith in a world of resurgent religions—a question that continued to influence the Church's concern for justice and the flourishing of peoples around the globe.

The concept of justice itself became problematized as deeper perceptions of plurality revealed the cultural specificity of what was often taken for a universal concept. Approaches of Western Anglicanism to the notion of global justice were an interesting study in this move beyond old certainties which shaped Church contributions to justice and the relief of poverty.

Western Anglican perceptions in the early twentieth century concerning the welfare of other peoples, and the demands of justice, could seem distinctly alien compared to those which developed later. Given the impact of war, European developments in social democracy, and later decades of resurgent capitalism and individualism, such changing attitudes were unsurprising. Yet the Church's approach to global justice had, and retained, a dynamic of its own which was not to be wholly explained by broader social trends.

By the early twenty-first century approaches within the Anglican Communion to particular issues of justice continued to be fraught and unstable. Power relations within the Communion, which profoundly shaped understandings of

what justice required between nations and cultures, were changing in ways which remained unpredictable. Questions of justice went well beyond poverty and mal-distribution of the world's material resources, embracing issues such as gender and sexuality. Four core themes run through the story: the relationship between development and mission; 'Christendom' and the relationship between Christianity and other faiths; ecumenism; and attitudes to race and ethnicity.

WORLD ISSUES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF EDINBURGH 1910

The World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910 has been hailed as a turning point in the history of both missions and ecumenism.¹ That it continued, a century later, to be seen as an event of enduring significance is striking, as the assumptions of the Western world against which the conference took place were thrown awry by the First World War. The conference's objective—'the evangelization of the world in this generation'—was conceived as the global triumph of Christendom. Those who planned the conference had struggled with the question of whether Protestant mission in predominantly Catholic or Orthodox countries 'counted' as mission, and thus whether Latin America, for example, was part of Christendom or not. The decision that not only Europe but also North and South America were understood to lie within Christendom was a political move to prevent the High Church Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) from boycotting the conference.² The consequent geographical understanding of Christendom was significant, since it effectively restricted the mission of the Churches to certain territories, establishing the notion that mission was something the Church did 'out there', distinct from the work of the Churches 'at home'. Missiologically, that distinction not only muted the Churches' response to the decline of Christian belief in the West, but crucially, in terms of global development and justice issues, it obscured an understanding of economic or cultural connectedness in which 'home' and 'global' conceptions of ethics and justice might have been linked.

The report of the conference's Commission VII on 'Missions and Governments' certainly suggested that the mission movements were deeply immersed in imperialism, not least in adopting uncritically core assumptions about racial hierarchies.³ The 1890s had seen the rise of a social Darwinism deployed to

¹ Brian Stanley, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2009), pp. 5f.

² Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, ch. 3.

³ Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, p. 249.

justify the role of white Europeans over inferior peoples. But beneath a widely-shared belief that the white races had evolved further than others (black Africans being predictably at the bottom of the chain) lay contrasting beliefs about the political implications of that theory. Whereas in some contexts—such as Natal—white settlers had used racial theories to maintain the subjugation of indigenous peoples, for some missionaries the ‘utility of evolutionary race theory was precisely that it could be used to enforce the obligations owed by colonial governments to haul their subject populations up the rungs of the ladder of civilization’.⁴ Paternalist it may have been, by the standards of today, but the focus on the obligations of empire and later of the post-colonial powers remained a potent force in Church policy.

If the conference’s approach to race was far removed from the values of the early twenty-first century, the stirrings of consciousness about Islam would continue to sound familiar, if only because Christianity’s relationships with other world faiths, and Islam in particular, were still being worked out. Conversion naturally loomed large in discussion. But whereas the conference reports generally reinforced the idea that the missionary task and the role of colonial governments flowed seamlessly together, there was criticism of the British administration in Egypt, Egyptian Sudan, and northern Nigeria for seemingly favouring Islam over Christianity.⁵ Apparently realpolitik was, then as now, no respecter of theological categories, although some in the Churches clearly thought it should be.

Thanks to the negotiations with the SPG, Church of England participation at Edinburgh 1910 extended beyond Evangelicalism, ensuring the involvement of the archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson. His enthusiasm perhaps helped the Church of England as a whole to relate more intentionally to the rest of the world in the coming decades. The cost of those negotiations in the territorial, rather than confessional, division of the world into ‘Christendom’ and ‘the rest’, may have delayed the later development of a partnership approach to development. Conversely, the ecumenical nature of the Edinburgh conference, albeit without Catholic or Orthodox involvement, and its bringing together of British, American, and European participants, opened the way later to less denominational rigidity in addressing social, economic, and political issues, although political issues were marginal at Edinburgh and economic matters virtually invisible. Ecumenism too would have a cost, as fluctuating commitment to ecumenical collaboration meant that the Church’s engagement with development and justice issues similarly waxed and waned over the decades.

⁴ Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, p. 272.

⁵ *Report of Commission VII*, pp. 51–60, quoted in Stanley, *World Missionary Conference*, p. 265.

REBUILDING CHRISTENDOM

The geographical conception of Christendom at the Edinburgh Conference reflected the European diaspora of earlier centuries. Whilst Anglicanism was not the most characteristic or powerful strand of North American Christianity, it was a growing presence in wealth and numbers in world-wide Anglicanism, a trend which persisted through the twentieth century. In the story of Anglicanism's engagement with global justice, taking Churches in North America, Australasia, and England as standing together for the developed West oversimplifies some of the complex relationships in global Anglicanism. Two important points need to be noted. First, the loose structure of the Anglican Communion meant that action by the Western Anglican Churches across the globe was rarely if ever coordinated. It was not unknown for ventures sponsored by English Anglicans to be working in the same fields as separate US Episcopalian initiatives. Second, by 2000, all the Western Anglican Churches differed internally about how to respond to the shift of numerical power away from the West and towards Africa. Those tensions were, increasingly, understood to necessitate a renegotiation of the role of the archbishop of Canterbury as a locus of spiritual authority across the world-wide Communion although no formal change had taken place by the end of the millennium. In 1910, Euro-centric assumptions were already being influenced by the Churches of North America and Australasia as they grew in power and confidence. Later, a second shift took place from the developed world to the global South. Whilst the latter trend had the most far-reaching implications for conceptions of justice and combating poverty, both displaced the Church of England as the 'centre' of Anglicanism. This was, however, a gradual process. The Church of England remained, for much of the century, the characteristic example of Western Anglicanism—not least in its engagement with issues of poverty and justice.

Not surprisingly, after 1918 the British Anglican Churches' most immediate focus was on their own people and the people of Europe. Christendom had torn itself apart, upsetting theological, social, and political assumptions alike. Missions to the non-Western world continued, but were no longer to the fore. The concept of a secure and superior culture of Christendom, leading the world into enlightenment, had been damaged, if not erased. It continued to inform the Churches' thinking about their own place within British society and their role in generating a vision for a better world.

Between the World Wars, two factors stood out. First, discussion of empire and its impact on subject peoples was conspicuous by its absence. The Churches were not alone in this myopia. George Orwell, writing in the 1930s, was a rare voice who recognized the reliance of British life on the under-rewarded peoples of India and Africa. 'What we always forget', he wrote, 'is that the overwhelming bulk of the British proletariat does not live in Britain, but

in Asia and Africa.⁶ But, in contrast to the strength of missionary purpose exhibited at Edinburgh, the low profile of the world beyond the West in, for example, Church of England publications of the period is noteworthy.

Second, the formation of the League of Nations in 1919, with very wide support from churchmen in Britain, showed the Church aligning itself with a secular initiative and seeing within it something approximating to Christian principles. Alan Suggate has argued that William Temple began from the premise that, without an overt focus on God and a shared commitment to Christian principles, ventures such as the League could not deliver a peaceful world order. Later, he suggested, Temple's pragmatism caused him to value more strongly the mechanisms of the League and the extension of the principle of the rule of law into the international dimension.⁷ When, by the middle of the next war, the failings of the League had become all too obvious, Bishop George Bell turned back to the Christendom principle to reassert that only a shared sense of purpose, grounded in a theology of the universal Church, could have succeeded.⁸ The conviction that a single moral framework—the Christian gospel—was a necessary foundation for global justice was tenacious.

The post-1918 period saw the emergence of other agencies committed to developmental goals and the relief of poverty internationally. The foundation of the Save the Children Fund in 1919 by Eglantyne Jebb and Dorothy Buxton was a response, organized from Britain, to the widespread hunger and suffering in Germany immediately after the war. Save the Children was rapidly endorsed by the Pope, and Jebb and Buxton's work was subsequently hailed by the Church of England for its pioneering example. Save the Children, later pursuing the relief of child poverty world-wide (not excluding Britain), became a model which others followed, but it was never an explicitly religious or denominational venture. Anglican social theology would not have distinguished sharply between Church-led initiatives and other programmes in which Christians participated in pursuing their social vocation, but the example of Save the Children contrasted with the absence of any comparable contemporary Church venture to address international poverty.

The industrial unrest of the 1920s, and the world-wide economic depression which began in 1929, pushed the Church of England in two directions. First—building on the experience of chaplains ministering to the troops during the war—it began to recognize how far it had failed to capture the allegiance of the working classes and to realize that pastoral support for those on the breadline was integral to its vocation as the church for all the people of England. Second,

⁶ George Orwell, 'Not Counting Niggers' (1939), in *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, Volume 1: An Age Like This, 1920–1940* (Harmondsworth, 1970) p. 434.

⁷ Alan M. Suggate, *William Temple and Christian Social Ethics Today* (Edinburgh, 1987), p. 179.

⁸ G. K. A. Bell, *Christianity and World Order* (London, 1940).

theologians like Joseph Oldham (not an Anglican himself, but a key organizer of Edinburgh 1910), William Temple, and others set out to reconstruct the case for the Church's role at the heart of the wider project of political renewal, outlining the principles for a more sustainable society. In the first case, concerns about poverty and destitution in Britain did not immediately encompass a similar practical concern for the well-being of subjects of the Empire, or other peoples. But, in the search for a theological rationale for Church 'interference' in political matters, the principle of addressing government on the morality of its policies later helped shape Anglican engagement with governments on wider global issues.

The rise of totalitarian regimes in Spain, Italy, and most of all in Germany, shocked the Church of England into thinking more deeply about the political demands of justice. This was especially apparent at the Oxford Conference of 1937 where Temple's ideas and personality dominated, but where Oldham's exceptional organizing ability made the initiative a success. Fascist conceptions of the Power State, commanding the total loyalty of citizens in return for the projection of national and racial power, challenged the social theories which informed Edinburgh 1910: the benevolent influence of a superior race, transcending nationality but united within Christendom, no longer could lift all peoples to civilization. Inevitably, therefore, the Oxford Conference spent much time examining the nature of the state and the Christian's obligations to it, trying to strike a balance between home affairs and internationalism. Arguing that the economic depression 'has increased within every nation the conviction that it must rely upon itself for its own security with little regard for considerations of international morality', the conference report noted the speed of transition from optimistic hopes for a new order of international cooperation to suspicious and aggressive nationalism. In that light its proposals for strong ecumenical cooperation coupled with an implicit theory of the state as subject to international law were an important balancing act.⁹

The Oxford Conference also dealt at length with questions of economic order. Social tensions at home, and internationally, were broadly ascribed to economic injustices which grew out of the changing condition of capitalism and the conflicting claims of free trade on the one hand and greater state intervention on the other. Yet in all these discussions, the colonies and the rest of the world were largely absent from the analysis.

The Oxford Conference issued one resolution constituting a major shift from Edinburgh 1910 which was an important harbinger of later approaches to international development. Whilst Edinburgh had done much to lay the foundations of ecumenical cooperation in mission, Oxford in 1937 saw that principle extending to what it called Mutual Church Aid. 'Oecumenical solidarity', it

⁹ J. H. Oldham (ed.), *The Churches Survey Their Task* (London, 1937), p. 167.

affirmed, 'implies that the Churches which are strong in resources should be ready to render help to those which are weak or in distress, anywhere throughout the world... [without] an accompanying claim to the right to dominate'.¹⁰

From 1933 Temple had been deeply concerned at the plight of the Jewish people under Nazism. Nazi ideology prompted the Oxford Conference's handling of race, but in stark contrast to the Edinburgh Conference it was also explicit in acknowledging the responsibilities and failings of Christendom: 'the most acute situations to-day are largely due to movements of population initiated by white and so-called "Christian" nations for their own advantage. Individual Christians and their Churches bear a heavy guilt.'¹¹ Ideas of racial superiority and destiny were explicitly contrary to the gospel—an unequivocal assertion of the equal value of every human being. A six-point programme which 'Christians everywhere should seek to have incorporated in the sentiments and public policies of their nations and communities' included basic rights for all people regardless of race, full participation in 'fellowship and leadership', cooperation and fellowship between leaders of different racial groups, recognition of responsibilities towards 'less privileged persons', and for economic and social change to 'open the way to full opportunity for persons of all races'.¹² Thus the Church made a clear commitment to combating racism (although that term was not then in use) which would be an ongoing hallmark of Christian engagement with international justice.

Oxford 1937 is notable for one further development. This was the proposal for the formation of a World Council of Churches (WCC) to take forward both the 'Faith and Order' and the 'Life and Work' agendas from the conference. A draft constitution was offered as part of the conference report.¹³ Once it had taken shape after the war, the WCC became one of the Church bodies which most consistently drove the agendas of justice, human rights, and combating poverty. It is also true that, on these agendas, the Church of England was largely content for leadership and practical action to be taken mainly by ecumenical bodies.

The outbreak of war in 1939 did not for long deflect Temple from pursuing the issues of the Oxford Conference. His next conference, at Malvern in 1941, focused on the shape of a new political and economic settlement after the war. Malvern is often regarded as one of the formative influences on the Labour government of 1945 which introduced Britain's Welfare State, a term popularized by Temple, in contrast to the 'Power State'.¹⁴ But, partly perhaps

¹⁰ Oldham (ed.), *Churches Survey Their Task*, p. 185.

¹¹ Oldham (ed.), *Churches Survey Their Task*, p. 185.

¹² Oldham (ed.), *Churches Survey Their Task*, pp. 232–3.

¹³ Oldham (ed.), *Churches Survey Their Task*, pp. 279–82.

¹⁴ William Temple, *Citizen and Churchman* (London, 1941).

because the Malvern Declaration was considerably shorter than the report on the Oxford Conference, questions of international justice and order were not prominent. The moral certainties about the centrality of Christian faith to any future moral order were undiluted. In a section on religious teaching, it was urged that the syllabus should always include instruction 'about the expansion of the Church... in the last 150 years, and some appreciation of the transformation of social life which it has brought to those countries to which the gospel has been carried in that period'.¹⁵ But there was no hint of guilt for colonial exploitation.

Whilst reports of conferences are among the most significant textual evidence about attitudes and practices in the Church, they do not reflect the total activity. After the rise of Hitler, and throughout the Second World War, churchmen such as George Bell, bishop of Chichester, were active in offering practical assistance to Jewish people, either by facilitating their migration or by pressing their cause among politicians. Bell became famous (or notorious) for his condemnation of the Allied bombing campaign against Germany as a breach of the conditions for a just war. His concerns were essentially Europe-centred. Whilst his enthusiasm for both ecumenism and a reunited Europe would do much to shape attitudes within the Church of England after the war, his book *Christianity and World Order* (1940) had little to say about empire, inequality, or exploitation. The tone was more 'Edinburgh' than 'Oxford'.¹⁶ But Bell's Europeanism caught the post-war mood of reconstruction and played into the Church's continuing trust in the concept of Christendom. If this created a disposition within the Church of England for the wider European project, it later helped align the Church with the understanding of justice enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights, in 1950.

The end of the Second World War introduced a new moral question. The atom bombs dropped on Japan caused immediate and widespread alarm. On the day the raid on Hiroshima was made public, John Collins, then an Oxford don serving as a chaplain in the RAF, called Lambeth Palace to seek the archbishop of Canterbury's support in opposing any repetition of such destruction, but discovered that the archbishop 'had gone into hiding'. It was, declared Collins, the moment when he finally abandoned the concept of the just war.¹⁷ The pacifist strand of thinking within the Church of England, which was in tension with the just war theorists, whilst never dominant, was influential in Anglican responses to many global issues, and would have gained many recruits that night.

¹⁵ *The Malvern Declaration* (reprinted by the Industrial Christian Fellowship as *The Malvern Declaration of 1941* [London, 1991]), paragraph 26j.

¹⁶ Bell, *Christianity and World Order*.

¹⁷ Canon L. John Collins, *Faith Under Fire* (1966), pp. 98–9; quoted in David Kynaston, *Austerity Britain: 1945–51* (London, 2007), p. 84.

A WIDER, BUT DIVIDED, WORLD

The devastation across Europe prompted both religious and secular efforts to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe. The United States led the way with the creation in 1940 of the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief (PBFWR—from 2000, Episcopal Relief and Development), created initially for assisting European refugees but later extended to disaster relief and world-wide development. Both the model and the trajectory of activity were soon replicated. In the UK, the founding of Oxfam (the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief) in 1942—a non-confessional venture led by Quakers, Anglicans, and others—was initially driven by the situation in Greece where the Allied naval blockade risked major famine. Within a decade Oxfam had become a major international aid organization working for the relief of poverty world-wide, committed to addressing not only material needs but injustice and oppression.

1945 saw the creation of the UK Churches' own relief and development agency, Christian Reconstruction in Europe (from 1964, Christian Aid). Like the PBFWR and Oxfam, Christian Aid first aimed to alleviate the suffering of refugees in Europe, but by the 1950s it was addressing world-wide poverty. There is an interesting parallel between Save the Children after the First World War, and both Oxfam and Christian Aid after the Second. All began by addressing the aftermath of war in Europe but rapidly became global agencies for the relief of poverty, by the end of the century interpreting poverty not primarily in absolute terms but as the consequence of inequality. They explicitly included the so-called developed West in their global remit. Another UK-based organization with similar origins, although it became less a relief agency than a focus for political campaigning, was Christian Action, founded in 1946 by Canon John Collins to promote relief work in Germany but soon to focus on the injustices of apartheid in South Africa.

Whilst the PBFWR was always specifically Anglican, Christian Aid was, from the start, ecumenical. The formation of the World Council of Churches was accompanied by the national-level equivalent in the British Council of Churches. Christian Reconstruction (later Christian Aid) soon became the BCC's Department of Interchurch Aid and Refugee Service.¹⁸ Christian Aid Week was inaugurated in 1957, with local churches raising money through doorstep collections. The Church of England, as a member of the BCC, supported this venture strongly, the local fundraising model fitting well with the parochial structure; Christian Aid Week became a prominent feature in the life of innumerable Church of England parishes, often the best supported local ecumenical activity.

Christian Aid's insistence on prioritizing the relief of poverty and injustice regardless of the faith, or unbelief, of recipient communities was to become

¹⁸ Christian Aid website: <<http://www.christianaid.org.uk/aboutus/who/history/>>, accessed 5 Mar. 2014.

more controversial towards the end of the century. In the immediate post-war climate of reconstruction, this would have seemed uncontroversial, but it was a major shift away from a mission-oriented relationship. Christian Aid saw the relief of suffering as a basic Christian imperative: combining relief with proselytizing, openly or otherwise, mixed motives in ways which compromised effective delivery. This principle—a significant step beyond Mutual Church Aid—was never wholly accepted across the Church of England.

Charities such as this attracted strong support within the Church of England but were not specifically Anglican ventures. This might have reflected either confidence that Anglicans did not need to do everything themselves and that international work needed to be ecumenical and multilateral if it was to be effective, or a degree of institutional complacency that did not prioritize social needs elsewhere when rebuilding the Church at home was so pressing in a new age of scepticism. Clues as to which mindset was dominant can be found in the reports of successive post-war Lambeth Conferences—occasions when the Church of England's bishops took their place among the bishops of the whole Anglican Communion and where international concerns could not be ignored. How was thinking among the global Anglican leadership developing?

The Lambeth Conference of 1948 was attended by 349 bishops (compared with 749 in 1998). Ecumenism was celebrated, but only as the reunion of Churches rather than as practical working together. In a positive echo of Oxford 1937, one resolution affirmed that discrimination 'on the grounds of race alone' was incompatible with Christian faith. The driver for this was less colonialism itself than the Holocaust which, with the liberation of Belsen much in the public consciousness and Bishop Bell among the first British public figures to set foot in Auschwitz after the war, was not surprising. The conference also dismissed the ordination of women out of hand as inconsistent with Anglican order, despite the (irregular, but *in extremis*) ordination of Florence Li Tim-Oi in Hong Kong in 1944.

By 1958, however, the post-colonial agenda was perceptible. The shadow of nuclear warfare and the persistent threat of totalitarianism (this time in Communist guise) were seen as the causes of a deep insecurity in the West which encouraged materialism and short-term thinking. The conference contrasted this with the dynamism of the newly-independent former colonies driven, according to the bishops, by the overwhelming desire for political freedom and parity of status with their former colonial masters. Comparisons between the colonial powers and their former subjects largely favoured the latter, however. Similarly, the Church's responsibility to 'remedy justice and to halt oppression' was affirmed, but only in the sense of helping to 'create a climate of public opinion wherein constructive action becomes possible'.¹⁹

¹⁹ *The Lambeth Conference 1958* (London, 1958), p. 121.

Perhaps this lack of concrete proposals for Church action was a reflection of the optimism towards the United Nations and its international programmes. If so, it was another instance of the Church placing its faith in external agencies—a gradual accommodation with secularism which sat uneasily with the continuing rhetoric of the unique efficacy of the Christian faith in promoting good societies.

Lambeth 1958 did, however, demonstrate an awareness of growing international tensions which would continue to tax the Church's understanding of global justice. Conflict between Israel and the Arab world, tensions between Muslims and Hindus in India and Pakistan, the problems of emerging nations in the Far East, and racial tensions in Australia, America, and South Africa, were noted explicitly, as were a number of specific issues in West, East, and Central Africa.²⁰ But overall the call was for reconciliation between opposed groups, not for justice. Indeed, the question of apartheid was treated with a degree of even-handedness between black and white South Africans which suggests that the realities were not brought to the conference's attention.

By then Christian Action, driven by a more radical theology, was opposing apartheid more strenuously, exemplifying a growing gap between the official Church pronouncements and the prophetic actions of Christian individuals and groups, including senior clergy like Collins. In 1956, Christian Action raised many thousands of pounds to provide legal aid to anti-apartheid activists in South Africa on trial for treason. This was followed by a sustained programme of fundraising to support black South Africans taking up places in higher education in Britain. Much of Christian Action's work was, deliberately, below the radar in order to avoid generating political antagonism; the extent to which it was endorsed by the Church of England's hierarchy is uncertain. As awareness of the injustices of apartheid grew through the 1960s, Christian Action was working increasingly with the grain of Anglican opinion, nonetheless. Racism and apartheid would come to be more contentious issues as the years of political consensus in Britain came to a close.

Despite the committed work of Collins and others, the 1968 Lambeth Conference did not move the debate about racism much further from the position of ten years previously. After a familiar denunciation of racism, it affirmed that the 'major responsibility and final decision remains with the individual in the person to person relationship demanded by Christian discipleship'.²¹ Individualist approaches to sin, ethics, and responsibility still lay at the heart of official Anglican thinking. Nevertheless, twenty years' work by agencies like Christian Aid had begun to percolate episcopal imaginations. Lambeth 1968 was the first since 1945 to speak in tones of alarm about world poverty, noting that, with growing prosperity in the West, global inequality

²⁰ *The Lambeth Conference 1958*, pp. 128–35.

²¹ *The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports* (London, 1968), p. 79.

was widening. It articulated a theology of aid which reflected, for the first time, Christian Aid's prioritizing of need over considerations of strategy or power, and was alert to the spiritual consequences of dependency on outside aid. It placed great hope in the powers of the state, the bishops calling on Churches to pressurize the Western governments to commit 1 per cent of GNP to overseas aid with immediate effect, supported by the example of a levy on each diocese of a similar amount. They also recognized that the terms of trade favoured industrialized nations over developing ones. This theme would re-emerge strongly in later decades as the Fair Trade movement captured the imaginations of many in the Church and beyond.

The period between the Second World War and 1979 is often regarded as one of consensus in Britain, in domestic, social, and economic policies. But they were also years of considerable readjustment to Britain's post-war place in the world. The Cold War made the main political parties acutely conscious of geopolitical strategic issues which inevitably affected their approach to relations with former colonies and other nations when it came to matters of aid and development. Western Anglicans generally, exercised simultaneously by fear of Communism and by a long-standing desire to bring the whole world together within an expanded conception of Christendom, were not immune to the political climate of the period. There were inevitable tensions, especially between official statements and the practical work of Church-related organizations and groups that were detached (or semi-detached) from Anglicanism's organizational structures.

But the fragility of the post-war consensus was experienced differently in different parts of Western Anglicanism. In Australia and New Zealand, the broad support given by the Churches to military action in the Second World War shifted to greater equivocality over conflict in Vietnam when both countries became militarily involved. Pacifism, in the 1940s the preserve of a small minority of Anglicans, grew more confident, especially as the Cold War heightened awareness and, in New Zealand, Anglican voices in the anti-nuclear movement contributed to the passing of the New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone Act in 1987.

The age of consensus had been visibly fracturing through the 1970s. There was therefore some irony in the 1978 Lambeth Conference's call for a 'new economic order' to reverse the widening of material inequality, seek peaceful solutions to conflict and prevent the proliferation of nuclear weaponry, involve the poorest nations in addressing global issues, promote greater planning in the development of cities, and seek human fulfilment in ways other than economic work.²² In the following year, the election of Margaret Thatcher's first Conservative administration (soon followed in America by the

²² *The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978* (London, 1978).

presidency of Ronald Reagan) would turn most of those aspirations on their head in pursuit of a rather different new global economic order.

Whilst the Vietnam War had divided American Anglicans at least as sharply as it divided American society, it had had far less salience in Europe. But heightened tensions in the Cold War, leading to the escalation of nuclear weaponry, polarized Christian opinion on both sides of the Atlantic. The rift within the Churches over nuclear armaments, exacerbated by the fact that in the United States and Britain confrontation with Communism at a global level went hand in glove with socially confrontational economic and social policies at home, began to dissolve the glue which had formerly aligned the Churches' social ethics with political consensus and divided the Churches' members against each other in the image of the wider political polarization.

A NEW WORLD ORDER?

As Francis Wheen noted, 1979 was the year when the world changed for ever, on two counts.²³ First, the election of Margaret Thatcher heralded an economic order which abandoned trust in planning and the pursuit of equality, in favour of the free market and the reduction of state intervention. Her example was swiftly followed by the Reagan administration in the United States and became a new economic orthodoxy in which social welfare at home and development aid overseas were only tolerable if they could be shown to serve the national interest in economic or strategic terms. But second, this was also the year when militant Islam first came to the world's attention with the overthrow of the Shah of Iran by a radical Islamic movement headed by the Ayatollah Khomeini. The Church—indeed, the world at large—would be forced to think out its approach to questions of poverty and justice against a very unfamiliar political and cultural background in which post-colonial guilt gave way to a new kind of economic imperialism (spearheaded by the United States and supported by Britain), and inequality widened rapidly. Perhaps most significantly, tensions arose between what amounted to the old Christendom and Islam, seen as a primitive and aggressive faith incompatible with Western values. After 1979, the Church of England and Anglicans across most of the prosperous parts of the world—notwithstanding inevitable internal divisions—generally maintained a staunch internationalism, sought to enhance relations between faiths, and worked to sustain a sense of responsibility for combating poverty and enhancing the development of the poorest countries.

²³ Francis Wheen, *How Mumbo-Jumbo Conquered the World: A Short History of Modern Delusions* (London, 2004), pp. 9ff.

The Church had not completely won the argument over racism and apartheid, however, and in the Thatcher government it seemed to face a stalwart apologist for the South African regime. In part, Thatcher prioritized the anti-Communist agenda over racial justice, but among some members of her administration at least the white population was still identified with 'civilization', and black activists like Nelson Mandela condemned as 'terrorists'. Bodies such as Christian Action found themselves working increasingly out of the public eye and nervous of attention from the security services.²⁴ Criticisms of the Churches' anti-apartheid stance multiplied. Shortly before Thatcher's first election victory, the WCC was widely attacked for its stance on apartheid—a harbinger of the times to come.

The 1978 Lambeth Conference had noted the growing voice of the 'younger Churches' within the WCC, and their focus on the survival and freedom of their people, which had led to WCC programmes on relief, resettlement, education, the struggle for justice, and combating racism. This movement within the global Church meant, the conference report went on, that 'to many Western Christians, the WCC seems very radical, but what they fail to understand is that "the centre" has shifted dramatically with the influx of new Churches'.²⁵ There followed an apologia for the priorities of the WCC which did not fully reflect views within the Church of England, whose formal links with the WCC had progressively weakened since the 1960s.

Since 1970, the WCC's Programme to Combat Racism had made humanitarian grants to black liberation groups in Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and South Africa. In keeping with the WCC's anti-colonialist understanding of aid, deployment of these grants was left to the recipients. But in the context of the struggle for racial justice in Africa, the groups concerned were widely seen among white communities, in Africa, England, and elsewhere, as subversive or terrorist organizations. Complaints from Western Churches, including the Church of England, became more strident. The widely held conservative view that the Church should not meddle in politics meant that the more ideologically motivated critics of the WCC could count on substantial implicit, and often explicit, support.

For black Christians, the WCC's grant programme was a welcome sign of practical commitment to repeated assertions (not least at Lambeth Conferences) that racism was incompatible with Christian faith. Criticism from within predominantly white European Churches was interpreted as a sign that old paternalistic or colonial attitudes persisted, even to the point of condoning apartheid. The Church of England's official response to the controversy was to send a delegation to the WCC which concluded that the Church of England should support the WCC more strongly in order to rebuild

²⁴ Canon Eric James, Director of Christian Action, in conversation with the author, 1991.

²⁵ *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978*, pp. 104–5.

links with the international Church.²⁶ But much damage had been done. In Cambridge, Dr Edward Norman, dean of Peterhouse and a vocal public supporter of Mrs Thatcher, refused amid much publicity to allow WCC posters to appear in his chapel—a petty point, but a sign that the WCC was not forgiven by the Anglican right. In retrospect, the controversy over the Programme to Combat Racism was an early indication that the ecumenical movement was no longer a universally admired vehicle for the rebuilding of Christendom, now that churches from beyond Christendom's former boundaries had found their voice within it.

The struggle against apartheid in South Africa heightened awareness of issues of racial justice at home, most acutely in Australia and New Zealand where relations between the Church and indigenous peoples came under renewed scrutiny. In the nineteenth century, Anglican leaders in Australasia had adopted only the most muted voice in public affairs. This was partly attributable to national Church structures which emphasized the diocese, rather than the nation, as the primary unit of ecclesiastical organization; it was only in the 1970s that the Churches' engagement with national issues came to the fore, largely around the question of Aboriginal and Māori rights and conditions.²⁷ In the Anglican Church of Australia, it was conceded explicitly that the history of the Church's dealings with the Aboriginal population had grievously hindered its witness to racism and oppression elsewhere.²⁸

In the United States, the different histories of former slaves and the indigenous peoples in relation to the white population continued to shape the Episcopal Church's witness against racism. Nineteenth-century legacies could not be eradicated easily, according to one writer, since the Episcopal Church itself 'had been unwilling either to condemn slavery or to recognise the equality of all Americans, [and] most blacks knew they had been consistently victimised by the same denomination that was now making an effort to minister to them'.²⁹ Ethnic minorities made up less than 10 per cent of all American Episcopalians by the end of the twentieth century, and a similar under-representation was characteristic of all the Western Anglican Churches.

The shift of the ecumenical 'centre' from Europe and America to the developing countries impacted substantially on the shape and nature of the Anglican Communion. The legacy of British imperialism was ever-present, but the global 'reach' of the United States also created tensions within the Communion. The powerful and wealthy Episcopal Church in the United States bankrolled many of the Communion's activities, although conservative

²⁶ *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978*, pp. 280–1.

²⁷ <<http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/anglican-church>>, accessed 5 May 2015.

²⁸ <http://www.anglican.org.au/home/about/history/Pages/part_2_the_anglican_church_in_australia.aspx>, accessed 5 May 2015.

²⁹ Harold T. Lewis, *Christian Social Witness* (Boston, MA, 2001), p. 98.

Christians were suspicious of its liberal stance on many issues. On the one hand, the African Churches resented interference from the old colonial masters. On the other, they not only sought funding, mainly from the United States, but continued to look for leadership to the archbishop of Canterbury and thus, implicitly, to the Church of England, if only in the negative sense of not striking out in directions which African Christians would find hard to follow. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, these tensions were most acute around issues of human sexuality, calling into question how far Anglicanism could be viewed as a coherent world Church. The over-enthusiastic identification in the past between the imperialistic project and the growth of Christendom had left a legacy of dependency and resentment which continued to affect development policy and exploded the notion that 'justice' was identified by all Christians in the same terms.

The place of the United States within the Anglican Communion was also affected by this tension between dependency and resentment, but was made even more problematical by the strident culture wars within American society and between American Churches. The Episcopal Church (TEC) was widely identified (not always accurately) with liberal Christianity and Democrat politics. Attacks from US conservatives, including theological conservatives within TEC itself, seemed unrelenting. Enormous amounts of funding and voluntary labour flowed into Africa from conservative Pentecostal Churches which had a major stake in the culture wars between conservatives and liberals back in the United States, and aid often came tied to conservative solidarity on ethical matters. The potential for cultural and religious agendas to become confused was considerable. Again, the flashpoint for these conflicts by the end of the century was (homo)sexuality, to many a question of justice, but with diametrically opposed implications for liberals and conservatives. The bitterness of these arguments spilled over to affect the question of who would work with whom on other justice matters.

The divisions that opened up in the 1980s were both political, in the sense of left versus right, and ecclesiological, as the settlement between different parties within Anglicanism was challenged by new shifts of power. Whereas Anglo-Catholics had called the shots regarding the Church of England's participation in Edinburgh 1910, seventy years later their ecclesial power had waned. In the 1980s, liberal Anglicanism appeared to be in the ascendancy within the Church of England. However, an Evangelical revival was already underway which would see influence and funds move significantly towards that party as the decade progressed. One indication of the growing confidence of Evangelicals, and their increasing independence, was Tearfund, created in 1968 but growing in prominence and activity after the 1980s. Tearfund was not a uniquely Anglican venture; it was an initiative of the trans-denominational Evangelical Alliance, its title derived from 'The Evangelical Alliance Relief Fund'. It began, like many other agencies, as a system of relief for refugees, but

expanded to embrace longer-term development projects, disaster relief, and humanitarian aid in many parts of the world. Like Christian Aid, Tearfund's publicity focused on human need and rapid response. Both transcended denominational identity. But whereas Christian Aid acted in partnership with the most effective local agencies, secular or religious, Tearfund operated specifically through local churches, with a brief to build up the Christian community as a viable agent in the relief of poverty and disasters. It thus embodied a critique of Christian Aid, voiced by Evangelicals, which became more insistent around the turn of the millennium. The charge was that Christian Aid's approach to partnership contributed to the marginalization of the Churches in trouble-hit regions, and favoured non-Christian organizations. Whilst Tearfund itself did not seek confrontation with Christian Aid, and both organizations worked in partnership with the Church of England's central structures, the underlying ecclesiological questions remained contentious. Evangelical antagonism reached the point where the claim was made by some members of the Church's Mission and Public Affairs Council that Christian Aid used the 'Christian' tag fraudulently, persuading churches to raise money in the belief that it would be used for 'Christian' purposes when grants were actually being given to secular or Muslim organizations.³⁰ Christian Aid's riposte was that relief of poverty and the effects of disaster was a Christian imperative in itself, that it chose its partners for their effectiveness, and that in many regions the local church was ineffective or itself part of the problem.

What was at stake here was partly a reaction to the perception that the Churches, since the 1970s, had increasingly relied on secular reasoning to justify international action, and partly a regained confidence in the mission agenda which had, for most of the post-war period, lacked a persuasive post-colonial narrative. Where Christian Aid was anxious about proselytizing, Tearfund was less afraid to share the theology which informed Edinburgh, Oxford, and Malvern in which the expansion of Christendom was the key to good human relationships, peace between nations, and viable states. This reflected an intra-Anglican disagreement about the nature of the Church. In an increasingly secular Western context, where religious believers often felt the need to express their faith more visibly, the pressure to give substantive confessional content to anything that was labelled 'Christian' was considerable.

Increasing reliance on secular modes of thought was evident in the report of the 1988 Lambeth Conference, which introduced 'human rights' as a potentially universal language of justice. It also explored the imperative of a bias to the poor, the feminization of poverty, the threat to the environment, and the

³⁰ An unminuted claim made in a meeting between members of the MPA Council and representatives of Christian Aid in Dec. 2007.

AIDS crisis.³¹ But the focus on human rights was especially significant: they were becoming, effectively, a secular replacement for the confident Christendom theology which had been unquestioned before 1945, but which had faltered in the rebalancing of global power after then, and in the growing salience of other faith communities. Previously Anglicans had supported the League of Nations and, later, the United Nations, as means for world peace, but now the United Nations was regarded as simply a mechanism. Justice required a universal foundation: the adoption of human rights as the shared basis for justice was a greater philosophical concession to secularism than was probably recognized at the time. Those who held fast to the ideal of a shared ethic grounded on Christian theology had the harder task of making their case in a context where the concept of Christendom was challenged by militant Islam, secular conceptions of pluralism, and the growing rejection of faith among populations in the West itself.

If tentative words about the feminization of poverty showed Lambeth 1988 coming rather late in the day to an awareness of gender issues in contexts other than the Church's ministry, raising the profile of the environment as an issue of global justice suggested that the conference was more clearly keeping pace with wider Western opinion. Concerns were expressed about the environment at Lambeth Conferences in 1968 and 1978, but the 1980s brought a tone of urgency and priority. Reflecting the United Nations' designation of the 1990s as the Decade for the Repair of the Earth, the 1988 conference listed a string of related concerns: 'the permanent loss of non-renewable resources, the non-replacement of renewable resources, soil erosion, the pollution of air, sea and rivers, and the damage to the ozone layer. Taken together, these now pose a serious threat to the whole ecosystem.'³² By 1998, environmental concerns were expressed more explicitly as a matter of global justice. The report of the conference in that year noted that 'Industrialised countries, although comprising only 24 per cent of the total world population account for over 75 per cent of consumption of commercial energy, metal and mineral resources.'³³ It condemned the squandering of natural resources in the 'two thirds world', and linked the environmental issues to wider questions of inequality. The role of world faiths in creating a value-base to help prioritize the long-term sustainability of the planet was explicit, although it was recognized that this potential was far from being realized. This remained the case in the early twenty-first century as religious attempts to shift governmental and commercial approaches to the environment were energetic but often lacked effectiveness.

³¹ *The Truth Shall Make You Free: The Lambeth Conference 1988, The Reports, Resolutions and Pastoral Letters from the Bishops* (London, 1988).

³² *The Truth Shall Make You Free*, p. 173.

³³ *The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998* (London, 1999), p. 87.

THE TURN OF THE MILLENNIUM

By 2000, the impact of twenty years of resurgent free market economics, the end of the Cold War, and economic globalization left social and political institutions struggling to make sense of concepts like justice which seemed to have lost any shared meaning. The Churches were no exception. Widening inequality, both between nations and within them, and growing awareness of climate change as a potential threat to humanity, prompted a desire (not necessarily realized) to think more deeply and theologically.

In 2001, the Church of England's Board for Social Responsibility issued a collection of essays which took stock of the Church's position on global development.³⁴ Their unifying theme was globalization, around which there was a great deal of misunderstanding, obfuscation, and hype. 'Globalization' nevertheless encapsulated the radical expansion of market economics on the so-called 'Washington model' and the apparent supremacy of Western values. The essays acknowledged the danger that development programmes would entrench established power relationships to the West's advantage. One contribution noted that for more than a generation the Churches of the North had lacked confidence in their global responsibilities: 'There is good reason for critical self-examination about the nature of the North's religious and ideological, as well as political and economic, domination of the world.'³⁵ Lack of confidence remained, but the essays suggested a positive model for future engagement—the Jubilee 2000 campaign for the cancellation of unpaid debts owed by developing countries to the West. Once again, this was not a specifically Anglican project, but it captured the imaginations of many in the Anglican Churches. Drawing explicitly on the biblical concept of the Jubilee, the campaign perceived indebtedness as one of the greatest obstacles to development in the global South. By the early 1990s, the world's poorest nations owed some \$127 billion; the campaign sought to persuade Western governments to wipe off \$90 billion of this debt. Starting in Britain, it became international with over forty countries participating. Mobilizing large public demonstrations to coincide with meetings of the G7 in 1999, Jubilee 2000 attracted attention from key politicians, including Britain's Prime Minister Tony Blair, and a commitment from the United States to cancel 100 per cent of the debt which certain qualifying countries owed. It took, however, much further pressure from the campaign before Congress committed \$769 million to debt relief in 2000.³⁶ Jubilee 2000 may not have realized all its ambitions,

³⁴ Charles Reed (ed.), *Development Matters: Christian Perspectives on Globalization* (London, 2001).

³⁵ Ian Linden, 'Globalization and the Church: An Overview', in Reed (ed.), *Development Matters*, pp. 3–11 (p. 12).

³⁶ Jubilee 2000 website: <<http://www.jubileedebt.org.uk>>, accessed 5 Mar. 2014.

but its achievements were far from negligible. It showed substantial support in Britain for development issues, younger people in particular having joined the campaign in unexpected numbers. As Peter Selby, Anglican bishop of Worcester and author of an important book on the theology of debt, put it, 'There is no doubt that the Jubilee 2000 campaign, whatever it may or may not have achieved for the poorest nations of the earth... was an incredibly successful piece of biblical teaching.'³⁷

Whatever the Church of England's qualms, other Christian groups were less troubled by the legacy of colonialism. The attraction of Pentecostalism, in particular amongst poor communities, was impossible to ignore by the end of the 1990s. As Ward has put it, 'The great appeal of Pentecostalism (whatever its problems as an apparent agent of American culture and global capitalism) is that it provides struggling people with an incentive to work and create a community not of hopelessness but of aspiration.'³⁸ The parenthesis is important. Theologically, the Pentecostal focus on the individual's experience of the Holy Spirit, the association between flourishing and virtue, and the atmosphere of optimism, are congruent with the kind of behaviours that a capitalist economy requires—much more so than the sceptical moderation, alert to difference and nervous of appearing to wield power which, by 2000, characterized much of the Church of England's approach to global justice, and that of its Anglican near neighbours. However, as noted earlier, the balance of power within British Anglicanism was changing too.

Although the shift was not unconnected with the priorities of Evangelicals it was primarily a gradual reconciliation between the aims of development and the aims of mission, and the easing of the stand-off between Anglican mission agencies and ecumenical development agencies that had existed since at least the 1960s. Much of the impetus came from the mission agencies, struggling to find a narrative for their activities which would support them through difficult times, but it was also a return to their roots. As Mark Oxbrow of the Church Mission Society put it, 'For at least 150 years the Anglican mission societies were the most effective world development agents of the Church of England.'³⁹ The creation of Church development bodies like Christian Aid had not meant the transfer of development responsibilities away from the mission agencies altogether.

One of the great leaders of post-war British Evangelicalism was John Stott (1921–2001), whose combination of Evangelical orthodoxy, theological engagement, and commitment to the Church of England helped to provide

³⁷ P. Selby, 'The Silent World Still Speaks: Globalization and the Interpretation of Scripture', in Reed (ed.), *Development Matters*, pp. 97–105 (p. 101).

³⁸ Kevin Ward, 'The Role of the Church in Overseas Development', in Reed (ed.), *Development Matters*, pp. 12–20 (p. 14).

³⁹ Mark Oxbrow, 'The Role of British Mission Agencies and Dioceses in International Development', in Reed, *Development Matters*, pp. 125–34 (p. 125).

the springboard for the Evangelical revival in the late twentieth century. Unlike many Evangelicals, Stott did not regard Christian social action as tainted by the charge of 'salvation by works'. His commitment to Evangelicalism as a global movement made him sympathetic to the global South, in which Christianity was palpably growing. Stott's thought and writings helped Evangelicals to commit afresh to global development, formerly regarded much as a liberal Christian cause.

By the new millennium, two phrases dominated Anglican discussion about mission and development—'holistic mission', and 'mission as transformation'. As Oxbrow noted, the context of these concepts was the growing missiological influence of the global South, influenced perhaps by the perception that developing countries were growing gradually closer to the model of Western market economies.⁴⁰ The emphasis now was on North and South working together to find sustainable solutions to inequality and injustice. Whilst 'holistic mission' and 'mission as transformation' were sound enough principles, they had to be applied within a Church culture in which numerous other agendas, national and global, were in play. First there were questions of structure. The mission agencies were legally independent voluntary bodies which, nonetheless, as Church of England foundations worked with a variety of Anglican partners world-wide. They often found it hard to balance their desire for autonomy with the desire to be visibly 'owned' by the Church. Many of them were founded on Church 'party' principles, and whilst their churchmanship was perhaps less rigid than in 1910, they often had distinctive Church constituencies. Their inability to speak convincingly in each other's theological vernacular hindered their attempts to work together effectively, and to discover whether the nineteenth-century model of autonomous mission agency was still viable.

Second, the last two decades of the twentieth century, and the early twenty-first century, also saw a shift towards alternative modes of inter-Anglican partnership, especially through diocesan companion links. Often initiated when bishops met one another at Lambeth Conferences, most English dioceses, for example, were partnered with one or more dioceses elsewhere in the Communion. Some companion links were expertly developed and were of considerable mutual benefit. Others failed to rise much above polite exchanges. The growth of companion links went hand in hand with a widely observed trend in charitable giving, with people more inclined to give to projects in which they felt a personal stake: as a result resources were often diverted into the companion links which the mission agencies believed would otherwise have come to them, bypassing experience and expertise in favour of a more hit-and-miss process. Indeed, the trend towards local action continued

⁴⁰ Oxbrow, 'Role of British Mission Agencies and Dioceses', p. 128.

to the point where the unilateral initiatives of some large and financially well-endowed parishes produced a third tier of mission and development engagement with congregations abroad. As the activities of the Church of England devolved to the local in this way, the ideal of holistic, transformational mission and development became progressively harder to realize.

Third, the apparent rapprochement between mission and development was harder to translate into the theological framework within which some bodies like Christian Aid operated. The relief of poverty, and response to war and disaster, often required a rapidity of response regardless of faith commitment. If that approach was theologically valid in its own right, the potential for drawing Christian Aid into a holistic approach to transformative mission was limited. To its credit, after some years of reluctance to engage deeply with the question at all, by the early twenty-first century Christian Aid was taking fresh steps to examine the theological foundations of its *modus operandi*.

One initiative which went some way to resolving these tensions was the Anglican Alliance for Development, Relief and Advocacy, born out of the 2008 Lambeth Conference with a brief to 'establish a new way for Anglicans to work together globally'.⁴¹ Every province was involved in the consultation that led to the creation of the Alliance in 2009. Again, the terminology of holistic mission was strongly to the fore, whilst the Alliance's activities were described as encouraging best practice, coordinating communication, and building capacity. This, then, was not a development agency on the model of Christian Aid or Tearfund, but a move to bind the Anglican Communion together on agendas of mission and development. It also reflected the trend, noted earlier, towards distinctive 'ownership' of development work rather than remitting it to ecumenical organizations. The hope was that the Anglican Communion had sufficient salience to secure the commitment of Anglicans world-wide in ways more openly ecumenical ventures apparently could not.

CONCLUSION

Looking back over a century of work, the themes with which this survey began had taken different trajectories. Confidence in ecumenism as a mechanism for promoting justice and addressing global poverty had waned by the end of the twentieth century. The WCC, like many ecumenical structures, was accused of being bureaucratic, although the deeper problem perhaps was the impatience of many denominations with the compromises that ecumenical collaboration required. Christian Aid had struggled with a governance deficit as its

⁴¹ Privately circulated papers.

accountability to over forty member Churches, of widely differing sizes and ambitions, proved unwieldy. The cost of streamlining was the loss of connection with key denominations.

The colonial instincts which went largely unchallenged at Edinburgh did not survive into the post-1945 world order. The reaction against colonialism enabled Western Anglicans to realize that many more Anglicans were now in Africa rather than Britain, North America, and Australasia. But economic imperialisms had taken on new forms and remained potent. The Church did not yet have an agreed stance on the implications of modern forms of political and economic organization, although numbers of Anglicans mistrusted the prevailing economic order.

Alongside the abandonment of colonial assumptions, the concept of Christendom, so powerful in the Churches' thinking early in the century, had also taken on a new shape. As mission was reaffirmed as the foremost category through which Western Churches related to the rest of the world, an implicit theology of Christendom was evident again. But the centre of gravity in Christendom was no longer in Europe and the United States. The territorial understanding of Christendom underlying Edinburgh had proved inadequate to secularization and religious pluralism. Where once the Churches had seen the Christian faith as providing a common moral framework which would make peace and justice possible, the emergence of the human rights agenda prompted some to think that the Churches had abandoned God for a secular ethic. But that was to underestimate the fragility of the concept of human rights. As both Nicholas Wolterstorff and Rowan Williams implied, the idea of human rights without some theistic foundation may be insufficiently robust to bear the weight expected of it.⁴² But the ability of a rights-based discourse to relate to religious priorities which may not conform to Western, individualist, assumptions, was uncertain.

The attacks on New York and London by Islamic militants in 2001 and 2005 changed the way Western Anglicans looked at all religion, not just Islam. In Britain, getting a hearing for Christian arguments in the public square became, suddenly, much harder. The mission imperative became a domestic priority as well as an international one. For some, the vibrancy of African Christianity suggested that the missionary movement should now be from Africa to Britain and the West—an inversion of the Victorian approach. How African Anglicanism could translate into British culture was another question. But poverty and global injustice could be looked at from both ends of the telescope. As long as the poorest people of the world inhabited those regions most susceptible to natural disaster and armed conflict, the call for relief from

⁴² Nicholas Wolterstorff, *Justice: Rights and Wrongs* (Princeton, NJ, 2008); Rowan D. Williams, 'Do Human Rights Exist?' in Williams, *Faith in the Public Square* (London, 2012), ch. 12.

the prosperous West was likely to continue. Churches, as ever, would play a major role in such efforts, and Anglicans were, in practice, as likely to do so through 'secular' or non-aligned groups as through those with the Christian 'brand'. With religious difference fuelling armed conflict in a number of parts of the world, notably Nigeria, by the end of the period, and Christian communities in the Middle East under threat from violent Islamic militants, the world-wide solidarity of Christians became, itself, an imperative of justice.

In 1984, the Anglican Consultative Council adopted the 'Five Marks of Mission' as a simple way of articulating the richness and complexity of mission today. Put briefly, they were: proclamation of the Gospel; teaching, baptizing, and nurturing new believers; responding to human need through loving service; the pursuit of peace, justice, and reconciliation; and striving to protect the integrity of creation and to renew the life of the earth. Widely adopted—locally, regionally, nationally, and by other Churches—the Five Marks built development and justice issues into the range of activities that constituted mission. The third, fourth, and fifth marks addressed directly the issues of poverty and injustice that continued to disfigure the world.

Much good work had been done by the Anglican Churches on all these fronts in the twentieth century. It is impossible here to enumerate the sheer amount of transformative activity that Anglicans had undertaken. But the conceptual frameworks within which that work had taken place had adapted, on a long trajectory, to reflect a world which now presented itself as incorrigibly plural. To be sure, the Church remained confident that, if the whole world should turn to Christ, injustice would cease and the poor would be fed. But whereas Edinburgh 1910 could envisage that taking place within a generation, it was arguably more biblical and theological to see such a state of affairs as a mark of the kingdom in its realized fullness. The renewed focus on mission and development as integral to each other at least perhaps had the virtue of being clear about the Church's long-term intentions, but it also risked raising again a problematic ideology of religious domination.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, G. K. A., *Christianity and World Order* (Harmondsworth, 1940).
 Jacob, W. M., *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997).
 Lambeth Conference reports and publications:
 The Lambeth Conference 1958 (London, 1958).
 The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports (London, 1968).
 The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978 (London, 1978).
 The Truth Shall Make You Free: The Lambeth Conference 1988, The Reports, Resolutions and Pastoral Letters from the Bishops (London, 1988).
 The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998 (New York, 1999).

- Lewis, Harold T., *Christian Social Witness* (Boston, MA, 2001).
- Oldham, J. H. (ed.), *The Churches Survey Their Task* (London, 1937).
- Price, Janice, *World-Shaped Mission: Exploring New Frameworks for the Church of England in World Mission* (London, 2012).
- Reed, Charles (ed.), *Development Matters: Christian Perspectives on Globalization* (London, 2001).
- Samuel, Vinay and Chris Sugden (eds.), *Mission as Transformation: A Theology of the Whole Gospel* (Oxford, 1999).
- Stanley, Brian, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2009).
- Suggate, Alan M., *William Temple and Christian Social Ethics Today* (Edinburgh, 1987).
- Temple, William, *Citizen and Churchman* (London, 1941).
- Temple, William, *Christianity and Social Order* (Harmondsworth, 1942).
- Welsby, Paul, *A History of the Church of England 1945–1980* (Oxford, 1984).

Part II

Institutional Development

The Development of the Instruments of Communion

Colin Podmore

INTRODUCTION: ANGLICAN ECCLESIOLOGIES

This chapter examines the development of inter-Anglican structures up to 1979, when the constellation of Lambeth Conference, Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), and Primates Meeting as it remained into the twenty-first century was complete.¹ From 1987 the archbishop of Canterbury and these three bodies were all termed 'Instruments of Unity'; from 1997 they were called 'Instruments of Communion'. In 2005 the ACC approved the Windsor Report's suggestion that the three bodies be regarded as the Communion's 'Instruments of Communion' and the archbishop of Canterbury as its 'focus for unity'.²

To understand the Instruments one must understand the ecclesiologies of the Churches that the Communion comprises. The first Lambeth Conference marked what Gregory Cameron has called 'the self-conscious birth of the Anglican Communion', giving it structural expression and defining its name and its extent (including the Scottish and American Episcopal Churches but not the Church of Sweden).³ That the Communion was brought to birth by a

¹ An earlier version of some sections of this chapter was given as the House Lecture at St Stephen's House, Oxford on 12 May 2011.

² *Many Gifts, One Spirit. The Report of ACC-7: Singapore 1987* (London, 1987), p. 129; 'The Virginia Report: The Report of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission', in *The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998* (Harrisburg, PA, 1999), pp. 56–63; the Lambeth Commission on Communion, *The Windsor Report 2004* (London, 2004), pp. 57–8: para. 105; ACC 13, resolution 2: <<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/communion/acc/meetings/acc13/resolutions.cfm>>; cf. A. Goddard, 'Communion and Covenant: Continuity and Change', in B. M. Guyer (ed.), *Pro Communion: Theological Essays on the Anglican Covenant* (Eugene, OR, 2012), pp. 30–49 (p. 30).

³ G. K. Cameron, 'Locating the Anglican Communion in the History of Anglicanism', in I. S. Markham, J. B. Hawkins IV, J. Terry, and L. N. Steffensen (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion* (Chichester, 2013), pp. 3–14 (p. 3).

conference of bishops, on which its identity has continued to depend, is ecclesiologicaly significant.

The Communion brought together Churches with very different ecclesiologies. The Church of England and the Scottish Episcopal Church were governed by bishops. Though their synods included houses or chambers of clergy, these did not enjoy equal powers with the Upper Houses (England) or Episcopal Synod (Scotland). Not until 1970 and 1982 respectively did any body in either Church called a 'synod' include lay representatives. By contrast, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (PECUSA) had been constructed with what David Holmes has called 'a very American system of church government' that 'combined the ministry and liturgy of the English established church with the constitutional forms of American republicanism'.⁴ Paul Valliere has described the result as 'an unprecedented synthesis of episcopacy, presbyterianism, and republicanism'.⁵ Power was vested in 'conventions' (the term 'synod' was avoided), in which laity and clergy had equal representation. Diocesan conventions are unicameral, though the laity and clergy may vote separately (the bishop generally having a single vote in the clergy 'order'). In the General Convention the House of Deputies (laity and clergy, sometimes voting by 'orders'—called the 'senior house' because it is older) and House of Bishops have equal powers.

The proliferation of Anglican Churches increased ecclesiological diversity. The New Zealand constitution, adopted in 1857 under George Augustus Selwyn's leadership, was strongly influenced by the American model and indeed went beyond it: the bishops did not form a separate house in the General Synod (though binding decisions required a majority in each of three 'orders'—bishops, clergy, and laity). The Church of Ireland's 1870 constitution was novel in giving the laity twice as many General Synod representatives as the clergy. Other constitutions, while including the laity in synods, were closer ecclesiologicaly to the English tradition.

What came to be called 'provincial autonomy' featured from the outset, and in this Selwyn and two men who had been his closest friends at Eton played leading parts. As Permanent Secretary at the Colonial Office (1860–71), Frederic Rogers completed effective disestablishment of the colonial Churches, while as Prime Minister W. E. Gladstone disestablished the Irish Church. Disestablishment resulted in autonomy. Rowan Williams has pointed out that Selwyn did not pursue provincial autonomy for its own sake: 'The assertion of autonomy... was not so much an assertion of the

⁴ D. L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church* (Harrisburg, PA, 1993), p. 57.

⁵ P. Valliere, *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church* (Cambridge, 2012), p. 177.

dignity of the local church as an attempt to recover a catholicity increasingly stifled or frustrated by state control.⁶ As a Tractarian, Rogers's motivation was similarly to secure the Church's freedom from the state.

The (often unrecognized) diversity of ecclesiologies within the Communion has given rise to very different attitudes to the questions of what international structures (if any) it should have, with what composition and roles. Supporters of the English Church's subordination to Parliament and supporters of the American Church's independence have opposed anything that might challenge those realities. Those influenced by American ecclesiology have resisted giving authority to any purely episcopal body and have believed that the laity must be represented internationally by members of their own 'order'. By contrast, catholic-minded conciliarists have looked for international councils with morally if not legally binding authority, have believed that it is part of the episcopal office to represent 'each diocese to the whole Communion and the Communion to each diocese', and have held that resolutions of meetings of bishops 'carry a considerable moral authority by virtue of the office of oversight entrusted to those who gather to take counsel'.⁷

Valliere has called the Lambeth Conferences 'a monument to Anglican ambivalence about conciliarism': 'The gatherings at Lambeth look like episcopal councils, yet they are not. In fact they were purposely designed not to be councils. Their name encapsulates the point.'⁸ In 1867 conciliarist instincts were strong: on a motion by Selwyn, the conference resolved that 'Unity in Faith and Discipline will be best maintained among the several branches of the Anglican Communion by due and canonical subordination of the Synods of the several branches to the higher authority of a Synod or Synods above them', and appointed committees to report on this and on 'the constitution of a voluntary spiritual tribunal, to which questions of doctrine may be carried by appeal from the tribunals for the exercise of discipline in each Province of the Colonial Church' (Resolutions IV, V, IX). The reports were published, but no action was taken. Valliere comments that they 'marked the crest of conciliarism': 'The Pan-Anglican surge was effectively side-channelled by Longley and his associates... Anglican conciliarism never came as close to capturing the Lambeth Conference as it did in 1867.'⁹

⁶ R. D. Williams, 'Reflection on the Cambridge Conference to Mark the Bicentenary of the Birth of G. A. Selwyn, First Bishop of New Zealand', *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 9 (2011): 56–60 (p. 57).

⁷ 'The Virginia Report', p. 57; *Bishops in Communion. Collegiality in the Service of the Koinonia of the Church: An Occasional Paper of the House of Bishops of the Church of England* (GS Misc 580) (London, 2000), p. 31.

⁸ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, p. 186.

⁹ Valliere, *Conciliarism*, p. 191.

THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE, 1897–1908

For the history of the Consultative Body that met between Lambeth Conferences from 1908 to 1968 to be understood, its pre-history must be appreciated. The 1878 Conference rejected a pan-Anglican Synod, but the colonial and missionary Churches and dioceses increasingly felt the need for an external point of reference. The 1878 and 1888 conferences considered ‘voluntary boards of arbitration’ or a ‘council or councils of reference’, to which disputed questions or cases could be referred, but took no action.¹⁰ Things came to a head in 1897. Most English colonial and missionary bishops now wanted a ‘tribunal of reference’ to deal with doctrinal and even disciplinary questions, but there was very strong opposition from the Americans in particular. The relevant committee at the conference proposed a tribunal of reference with a remit limited to ‘any question submitted by Bishops of the Church of England, or by Colonial and Missionary Churches’—and therefore no role in relation to the Scottish, American, and Irish Churches—but even this was too much: after discussion, it was decided that the relevant motions should not be put. The conference did, however, ask the archbishop of Canterbury to create ‘a consultative body... to which resort may be had, if desired, by the National Churches, Provinces, and extra-Provincial Dioceses of the Anglican Communion either for information or for advice’.¹¹

Archbishop Temple issued a circular in July 1898, indicating that the Consultative Committee would meet each July and asking for agenda items by Easter 1899.¹² The archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Armagh, the Scottish primus, and the bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester would be *ex officio* members; the American Church was invited to appoint two bishops and the colonial Churches one each; the extra-provincial dioceses were asked to nominate candidates for election.

The American Church was determined not to take any official action in response to a Lambeth Conference resolution, as this might imply recognition that the conference had authority to act. A joint committee of the 1898 General Convention commented:

Insomuch as the need of such Consultative Body has been deeply felt by Bishops of the colonial and missionary dioceses of the Church of England, it would be ungracious in us not to recognize their need, even though we have no sense of it among ourselves... But inasmuch as the suggestion emanates from a voluntary conference of Bishops, which neither claims nor asks recognition as an organic representative of the Church, the Committee thinks that no action of this General

¹⁰ *The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867–1920* (London, 1929 edn.), pp. 83, 87–9, 113, 150–2.

¹¹ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 199–200, 204.

¹² The principal source for this section is Lambeth Palace Library (LPL), Papers of the Lambeth Conference Consultative Body: LCC 1 (Minutes and Papers, 1897–1924).

Convention should be taken in regard to it, feeling that, if the Bishops of this Church desire any of their number to be members of this Consultative Body, they will undoubtedly arrange among themselves some method of accepting the courteous invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury.¹³

The Consultative Committee did not meet until 9–10 July 1901. The archbishop of the West Indies attended. India and Australia were represented by former metropolitans now living in England (the Australian also representing New Zealand), the Chinese and Japanese dioceses by Bishop Jacob of Newcastle (whose four years as chaplain to the metropolitan of India in the 1870s had given him a lifelong interest in missionary work), and South Africa by Bishop Talbot of Rochester (that his brother-in-law and son were army officers serving in South Africa was probably coincidental). America and Canada had appointed no representatives, and the Irish archbishops and the primus did not attend. Thus only the Church of England and some colonial Churches were represented, and only one of the nine members was currently serving overseas. Advice was given in response to questions from the bishops of Rangoon, Korea, and Auckland, the archbishop of Sydney and the bishop in Tokyo.

An informal meeting on 8 August 1902 enabled two bishops from Japan to consult members of the Consultative Committee about proposals for consecrating a Japanese bishop which they had developed in response to advice from the 1901 meeting. Scotland, Ireland, America, and Canada were again unrepresented and the archbishop of the West Indies could not attend, but all of the English members were present. Temple died in December 1902, and the Consultative Committee did not meet again for five years.

Temple's successor, Randall Davidson, could not have been more closely involved in the development of the Lambeth Conferences. He had helped run the 1878 Conference (as Tait's chaplain), had been assistant secretary in 1888 and episcopal secretary in 1897, and had edited the conference reports. As Bishop of Winchester he had served on the Consultative Committee. Understanding the need to cultivate close ties of friendship with the American bishops, he accepted an invitation to the 1904 General Convention, becoming the first archbishop of Canterbury to visit North America. After ten days in Canada, Davidson, his wife and two chaplains spent a fortnight with the bishops of Albany and Massachusetts in their holiday homes, two weeks visiting Washington and New York, and a final week in Boston for the convention.

An important new role for the Consultative Committee began on 8 July 1907, when Davidson convened an informal meeting to discuss arrangements for the 1908 Lambeth Conference. In addition to the nine members resident in

¹³ LCC 1, fos. 13–14.

England, the archbishop of Armagh and the primus attended for the first time. The next day, six of the eleven, including the primus, returned for a formal meeting which confirmed the resolutions of the 1902 informal meeting and discussed with the bishops of South Tokyo and Kyushu further questions from the Japanese bishops. A further planning meeting in January 1908 was more sparsely attended.

A Pan-Anglican Congress preceded the Lambeth Conference. Held in London over eight days in June, it was attended by clerical and lay representatives from around the Communion. This was essentially an educational event, with 17,000 people each day attending meetings in the Albert Hall, Church House, and elsewhere. Papers were read and discussed, but no resolutions were passed.

THE 1908 CONFERENCE AND THE CENTRAL CONSULTATIVE BODY, 1908–1919

The 1908 Lambeth Conference largely followed the established pattern. It began in Canterbury on Saturday 4 July, with a luncheon in St Augustine's College, a Service of Reception in the Cathedral, during which Davidson addressed the bishops from St Augustine's Chair on the altar steps, and a garden party at the deanery. A further opening service in Westminster Abbey followed on the Sunday morning. The conference met in the Great Hall of Lambeth Palace from Monday to Saturday. Thereafter committees worked for a fortnight at Lambeth, Church House, and elsewhere, pausing for a garden party at Buckingham Palace (for the first time) and a devotional day at Fulham Palace with addresses by the metropolitan of India. The conference reconvened for ten days from Monday 27 July to receive the reports, pass resolutions, and adopt the Encyclical Letter. It closed with Holy Communion in St Paul's Cathedral on 6 August. That Davidson had invited the American presiding bishop to preach exemplified his recognition of the importance of paying public tribute to the American Church's significance. With regard to the perennial issue of the conference's authority, it is noticeable that, whereas in 1897 a large number of the sixty-three resolutions had included phrases such as 'in the opinion of this Conference', in 1908 many of the seventy-eight resolutions struck a more authoritative—sometimes even peremptory—tone.

A committee explained why the creation of a Tribunal of Reference was impossible:

To be effective, the jurisdiction of what may be regarded as a final court of appeal for the Anglican Communion would need to be accepted by all parts of the Communion. The exceptional position of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the

United States of America precludes any approach to a foreign court. And certain other churches by their present constitution exclude any appeal...to a court outside their own bodies.¹⁴

The American Church's position was clearly perceived as the main obstacle. By contrast, the South African Church had made the Consultative Body its ultimate court of appeal in matters of 'faith or doctrine'. The Encyclical Letter, while upholding the principle that was not yet called 'provincial autonomy', emphasized that it needed to be held in check and saw the Central Consultative Body (CCB) as the means of doing so: 'That freedom of local development which is a characteristic element in the inheritance which the Anglican Communion has received... must have its balance and check in opportunities for mutual consultation and advice. To this end we have recommended the reconstruction upon representative lines of the Central Consultative Body.' The archbishop of Canterbury would be the only *ex officio* member. Bishops would be appointed by provinces, Churches, and regional groupings as follows: United States: four; Canterbury: two; York, Ireland, Scotland, Canada, Australia and Tasmania, New Zealand, West Indies, South Africa, India and Ceylon, China, Korea and Japan: one each. The remaining extra-provincial bishops would elect one representative. (The second Canterbury place was ceded to the new Church in Wales in 1920.)¹⁵

The new CCB was still a predominantly English affair.¹⁶ Talbot (now at Winchester) and Jacob continued as representatives; Louis Mylne (a former bishop of Bombay now living in England) represented India. The archbishop of the West Indies, the bishop of Down and Connor, and the bishop of Gibraltar attended the first meeting on 19 July 1910, but Talbot, Mylne, the Canadian primate, and the Scottish primus did not. Australia and Tasmania, New Zealand, and the United States had yet to choose representatives. The agenda was slight: two matters arising from 1908 resolutions (Sunday schools and conversations with the Moravians) were discussed, outline responses to canonical queries from two Australian archbishops were agreed, and a South American issue was remitted to the West Indies and PECUSA jointly. The archbishop of Sydney and the bishop of Wellington (who was returning to England) were subsequently elected, but the Americans again declined to participate. Davidson feared the consequences of American isolationism, writing of a hostile article by the editor of *The Churchman*: 'He, if I understand him aright, would prefer that the American Bishops took no part in the Lambeth Conference. That would mean that before

¹⁴ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 418.

¹⁵ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 313; Resolution 54.

¹⁶ The principal sources for this section are LCC 1 and LCC 7 (Printed Minutes, 1910–1947).

a generation had passed there would be two Anglican Churches in the world instead of one.¹⁷

The second meeting (22–3 July 1913) was much more representative: five primates (Canterbury, York, Armagh, West Indies, Canada) and the Scottish primus were present, as were the recently retired metropolitan of India, the former bishop of Wellington, and the new bishop of Gibraltar. Only the archbishop of Sydney was absent. The CCB gave advice on issues arising in the Moravian conversations, suggested that the advice of scholars and historians be sought concerning unfermented communion wine, and agreed that the next Lambeth Conference should ('all being well') be summoned for July 1918.

It was with its four-day third meeting (27–31 July 1914) that the CCB came into its own. Bishop Frank Weston of Zanzibar having protested against the proposals of a missionary conference held at Kikuyu (Kenya) in 1913 for an ecumenical federation involving intercommunion, and at the admission of non-Anglicans to communion at the closing service, Davidson referred the issues to the CCB. After deliberating in his absence for two days, under Archbishop Lang's chairmanship, it advised that such proposals should not be adopted before the Lambeth Conference could discuss them. In particular, allowing ministers and members of other Churches respectively to preach and receive communion required 'the most anxious consideration', while receiving communion in other Churches was not 'consistent with the principles of the Church of England'. The CCB's conclusion about the joint communion service was wittily summarized as saying that 'the Service at Kikuyu was eminently pleasing to God, and must on no account be repeated'.¹⁸ Perhaps inevitably, Davidson's eventually published nuanced judgement pleased neither side. The CCB also ruled that the 1908 Lambeth Conference's conditions for Anglican participation in Moravian episcopal consecrations had not been met, and that the remaining points of difficulty would need to be considered by the next conference—as would marriage rules proposed in South Africa. It resolved that it should consider the conference agenda at least one year, if not two, in advance. Though the CCB was clear as to the limits of its authority and took no earth-shattering decisions, it is important to note that a formally established episcopal body (including the primates or presiding bishops of five of the Communion's nine formally constituted Churches and bishops chosen by three of the others) offered advice on canonical questions, set down limits with regard to Anglican ecumenical initiatives, and expected at least to be consulted about the timing and agenda of Lambeth Conferences.

¹⁷ Davidson to W. Lawrence, 15 Nov. 1910, LPL: Lambeth Conference papers (LC) 75, fo. 247; cf. Lawrence to Davidson, 27 Oct. 1910, LC 75, fo. 245.

¹⁸ Unattributed quotation in G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1952 edn.), p. 708.

The CCB met again on 13 July 1915 and 18 July 1916, though the war prevented the non-UK residents from attending. In 1915 Davidson was encouraged to stick to the plan of a 1918 Lambeth Conference and to circulate the metropolitans with a list of subjects already on the agenda, inviting them to suggest others, but in 1916, in the light of representations from overseas, he was advised to warn them of a possible change of date. In February 1917 he sought the concurrence of the CCB's UK-resident members before writing (in the light of further overseas responses) to postpone the conference.¹⁹ Five members met him informally on 20 February 1919, with two other English bishops, to discuss the agenda for the 1920 conference, but the CCB as such did not meet after 1916.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCES AND THE CENTRAL CONSULTATIVE BODY, 1920–1945

The 1920 Lambeth Conference again largely followed the established pattern. Of the 252 bishops (ten more than in 1908), seventy-two were from England (including twenty-nine suffragans, six former colonial bishops and four retired bishops), twenty-three from Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, fifty-two from the United States, and 103 from the rest of the world. Overseas bishops (with their wives) stayed either with families or in the King's College Hostel in Vincent Square, and were invited to Lambeth for at least two nights. The conference is best known for its 'Appeal to All Christian People'.

A committee recommended that the Consultative Body's position 'be strengthened', hoping that it would be regarded 'as a real living Body, to which any question of Faith and Order may be referred, as an authority of great moral weight... though possessing no power to enforce its decisions'.²⁰ However, unease about its role plainly continued in some quarters. The conference was at pains to stress that it was a 'purely advisory Body... a continuation Committee of the whole Conference' with no 'executive or administrative power', that 'offers advice only when advice is asked for' (Resolution 44). The Encyclical Letter made similar comments about the Lambeth Conference, but made clear that its limited role did not mean that individual Churches could do what they liked:

[The Conference] stands for the far more spiritual and more Christian principle of loyalty to the fellowship. The Churches represented in it are indeed independent, but independent with the Christian freedom which recognizes the restraints

¹⁹ LCC 4, fos. 254–5.

²⁰ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, Appendix, p. 80.

of truth and love. They are not free to deny the truth. They are not free to ignore the fellowship.

The CCB was declared to be 'one of the links which bind together our fellowship'—in modern terminology, an 'instrument of communion'.²¹

The CCB met in July in five of the next nine years (1922, 1924, 1927, 1928, and 1929)—for three days in 1922, and two thereafter. The archbishops of York, Armagh, and Wales, and the Scottish primus were elected by their provinces or Churches, but practical considerations led most of the overseas Churches and groupings to choose UK residents to represent them. The archbishop of Rupert's Land (who attended in 1924) and the bishops of Madras and Bombay (who attended in 1928 and 1929 respectively) were the only exceptions. The United States was again not represented. As an example, the 1929 meeting was attended by the archbishops of Canterbury and York and five other English diocesans, the archbishops of Armagh and Wales, the primus, Bishop Price (formerly bishop in Fuh-Kien), Bishop Tugwell (formerly bishop on the Niger), and the bishop of Bombay.

Very few issues indeed were submitted for consideration by the CCB, and in each case it either remitted them to the next Lambeth Conference (reinstatement of 'holy' in the Nicene Creed, Irish bishops consecrating bishops for Spain and Portugal) or simply declared them beyond its competence (permissibility of Benediction and other public eucharistic devotions). Overwhelmingly, the CCB functioned as a continuation and preparatory committee for the Lambeth Conferences. It reviewed progress in implementing resolutions and received reports on ecumenical dialogues and proposals for forming new provinces, giving a steer where necessary. Occasionally the archbishop of Canterbury asked it for advice on an issue that concerned him. At its 1929 meeting the CCB revised the agenda and committee structure for the 1930 conference in the light of comments from bishops around the world.

Davidson announced his resignation a week after the 1928 meeting. His successor Cosmo Gordon Lang had been archbishop of York for twenty years. Having attended both of Davidson's conferences and served on the reconstructed CCB from its inception, chairing both the CCB's most sensitive discussion (of Kikuyu) and the 1920 conference's most prominent committee (on ecumenical issues), Lang continued the tradition that had developed from 1878.

The 1930 Lambeth Conference followed the established pattern with only minor variations, but the attendance of 308 bishops made it 22 per cent larger than in 1920. The Chinese and Japanese Churches were recognized as 'constituent Churches of the Anglican Communion', bringing the number (including the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania, which was not

²¹ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, Appendix, pp. 13–14.

formally constituted until 1962) to thirteen. Contraception—in limited circumstances—was accepted (reversing a 1920 decision) by 193 votes to sixty-seven (the only voting figures recorded). That a positive response to the proposals for a united Church of South India was passed unanimously was attributable in significant measure to able chairmanship of the ecumenical committee by the new archbishop of York, William Temple.

For the first time, the conference offered a definition of the Anglican Communion that set out distinguishing characteristics of its member Churches beyond merely being in communion with the Church of England (perhaps at least partly in response to a renewed proposal to invite the Swedish bishops). Resolution 48 having set the context by affirming ‘that the true constitution of the Catholic Church involves the principle of the autonomy of particular churches based upon a common faith and order’, Resolution 49 stated:

The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common:

(a) they uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorised in their several Churches;

(b) they are particular or national Churches, and, as such, promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship; and

(c) they are bound together not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the Bishops in conference.

The conference was careful to add that it ‘makes this statement praying for and eagerly awaiting the time when the Churches of the present Anglican Communion will enter into communion with other parts of the Catholic Church not definable as Anglican in the above sense, as a step towards the ultimate reunion of all Christendom in one visibly united fellowship’. The committee on the Anglican Communion was more explicit, describing the Communion as ‘transitional’.²²

The autonomy affirmed here (in the first use of the term by a Lambeth Conference) was not unlimited, but bounded by ‘a common faith and order’ and ‘mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the Bishops in conference’. The Committee on the Anglican Communion, noting that autonomy ‘carries with it the risk of divergence to the point even of disruption’, observed that although ‘the Lambeth Conference as such could not take any

²² *The Lambeth Conference 1930: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with Resolutions and Reports* (London, n.d.), p. 153.

disciplinary action', its advice, sought before the constituent Churches took action, 'would carry very great moral weight'.²³ In saying that the Anglican Churches 'repudiate any idea of a central authority, other than Councils of Bishops', the Encyclical Letter again qualified autonomy by reference to the authority of bishops in council. By commenting that 'a larger federation of much less homogenous Churches... in some measure in communion with the See of Canterbury... would need some organ to express its unity' and that 'Councils of the Bishops were in antiquity, and will be again, the appropriate organ, by which the unity of distant Churches can find expression without any derogation from their rightful autonomy', it effectively added a fifth limb to the Lambeth Quadrilateral.²⁴

The CCB's role was redefined, giving priority to the functions it had actually exercised in the last decade, as a continuation and preparatory committee for the Lambeth Conferences, though it would continue to advise on matters referred to it by the archbishop of Canterbury or by 'any Bishop or group of Bishops, subject to any limitations on such references which may be imposed by the regulations of local or regional Churches'. Now seen as representing not their Churches but the conference, its members would not be elected by the Churches but 'appointed to represent the Lambeth Conference by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with due regard to regional requirements, after consultation with the Metropolitans and Presiding Bishops' (Resolution 50). A central Appellate Tribunal was again rejected as 'inconsistent with the Spirit of the Anglican Communion' (Resolution 51) and the Anglican Communion Committee rejected a secretariat as tending 'to the development of centralised authority'.²⁵

The changes to the CCB's character were made in order to facilitate American membership.²⁶ Doubtless, the fact that the new appointment mechanism required no decision by the American episcopate was also helpful. Among the members of the new CCB were, therefore, the American presiding bishop and three other American bishops. It had taken more than thirty years after an episcopal consultative body was established to function between Lambeth Conferences for American bishops to agree to participate in it. Two Canadian archbishops were also appointed, but when the CCB met in 1934 its membership was otherwise comparable with that in the 1920s: the archbishops of Canterbury, York, Armagh, and Wales, the Scottish primus, seven English diocesans, three former overseas bishops now resident in England, and Bishop Heaslett of South Tokyo.

The CCB did not meet in 1932 for lack of business, but otherwise followed the previous decade's pattern, meeting for two days in July in 1934, 1937, 1938,

²³ *The Lambeth Conference 1930*, p. 154.

²⁴ *The Lambeth Conference 1930*, p. 29.

²⁵ *The Lambeth Conference 1930*, p. 156.

²⁶ Lang to H. St G. Tucker, 22 Mar. 1938: LCC 5, fo. 250.

and 1939. The presiding bishop attended in 1934 and (with the bishop of California) in 1937, the bishop of Albany in 1938, and the bishop of Rhode Island in 1939. One Canadian archbishop attended in 1934 and the primate and another archbishop in 1937, but none in 1938 or 1939. The archbishop of the West Indies attended the last three meetings.

The 1934 meeting reviewed the follow-up to various 1930 resolutions, noted points for consideration at the next Lambeth Conference, and responded to questions regarding ecumenical matters (confirmed Roman Catholics should not be reconfirmed on becoming Anglicans, as they had been in Ottawa; formal ecumenical negotiations in East Africa should await the formation of a province there; bishops could allow other Churches to use Anglican church buildings where appropriate). In the last three years of the decade the focus was increasingly on preparation for the 1940 conference. In 1938 the CCB reviewed changes to the South India Scheme and warned that one of them might require reconsideration of the proposals by the 1940 conference. It also judged a proposal from the bishop of Central Tanganyika to establish a 'united ministry' by laying on of hands at the ordination of 'African clergy' belonging to the Moravian Church, and an interdenominational mission to be 'inadmissible'.²⁷

Lang was succeeded in 1942 by William Temple. As archbishop of York, he had played a key role at the 1930 conference and had attended five CCB meetings, so a strong measure of continuity again seemed likely. However, Temple died in October 1944, having presided only over a single one-day meeting of the CCB to respond to further questions about the South India Scheme from the metropolitan of India. The American and Canadian members and the archbishops of Perth, Armagh, and Wales were unable to attend this wartime meeting: only the primus travelled from outside England.

GEOFFREY FISHER AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION, 1945–1961

Geoffrey Fisher was enthroned as archbishop of Canterbury in April 1945. As Paul Richardson has observed, he 'more than anyone else was responsible for the creation of the Anglican Communion as we know it today'.²⁸ His appointment marked the end of the Davidson–Lang tradition which reached back to

²⁷ Cf. J. J. Willis to A. C. Don, 6 Apr. 1938: LCC 5, fo. 279.

²⁸ *Church of England Newspaper*, 8 Feb. 2008, p. 15.

1878. There had been no Lambeth Conference for fifteen years, and Fisher recalled:

My first contact with the Consultative Body was in 1946 or thereabouts when I summoned it, according to precedent, to consider the Agenda for the 1948 Lambeth Conference... There were at Lambeth few supporting papers of any substance, and no chaplain who had had any touch with previous conferences or any knowledge of their working. Bishop Bell, Bishop Haigh and others gave me of their great knowledge and experience with utmost generosity. But Lambeth had to work it all out afresh before the Consultative Body met.²⁹

The CCB met in July 1946 and July 1947. Of the bishops present, only Bishop Oldham of Albany (United States) and, in 1946, the Chinese presiding bishop did not live in Britain. Initially there was little American interest in another conference: there were unhappy memories of 1930, when the American bishops had felt they were 'onlookers rather than participants', and 'given scant opportunity to be heard'. Fisher feared the American Church might drift apart from the rest of the Communion and, remembering Davidson's example forty years earlier, 'saw clearly the one thing that I must do at all costs': he and Mrs Fisher visited the United States for the 1946 General Convention.³⁰ His 'charm offensive' worked: sixty-six American bishops attended the 1948 conference, five more than in 1930. During the conference 'the Primates' Committee' of primates, metropolitans, and presiding bishops met to advise the archbishop.

Overall, the conference was only slightly larger than in 1930 (329 bishops compared with 308) and it again followed the established pattern with only minor variations. But the post-war world was a changed world. Britain was on its knees; the United States was riding high. The 'British Commonwealth' had superseded the empire; in the light of Indian independence it would become the 'Commonwealth of Nations' in 1949. In response, under Fisher's guidance, the Communion similarly became less English-dominated. The opening words of the conference's Encyclical Letter signalled this shift. These had defined successive Lambeth Conferences—and hence the Anglican Communion—by reference to the Church of England, beginning, in the 1920/30 formulation, 'We, Archbishops and Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England' (the earlier version had included 'Bishops Metropolitan'). Now, the bishops' communion was said to be with the archbishop of Canterbury and each other: they were 'assembled... under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, with whom, as with

²⁹ G. F. Fisher, 'A Postscript', in S. F. Bayne, *An Anglican Turning Point: Documents and Interpretations* (Austin, TX, 1964), p. 21.

³⁰ W. Purcell, *Fisher of Lambeth: A Portrait from Life* (London, 1969), p. 176; H. K. Sherrill, *Among Friends* (Boston, 1962), p. 235.

one another, we are in full communion'. (In 1958 this was simplified to 'in communion with the See of Canterbury'.)³¹

Addressing the American General Convention, Fisher had commented:

The Anglican Communion embraces many national churches... The name Anglican is already a misnomer; it indicates their remote origin, but it does not at all describe their present condition. They are indigenous churches.³²

He repeated the point at the opening service of the Lambeth Conference in Canterbury Cathedral: 'Our Communion is not to be thought of as English or British or Anglo-Saxon... But it is still called the Anglican, the English, Communion.' Though the name was 'no longer altogether appropriate for this diverse family of autonomous Churches', it did point both to the Communion's origins and to the Anglican tradition, which 'first acquired its distinctive form here in this country'.³³

At the conference the most divisive issue was how to respond to the inauguration of the united Church of South India nine months earlier. A judicious resolution (54) stated as much as could be agreed unanimously and then simply recorded a difference of view between the majority, who thought the orders of clergy ordained in the new Church should be accepted, and a 'substantial minority' (41 per cent of those who voted) who thought it not yet possible to decide. A further resolution (56) sought to prevent the problem recurring: future unions should unite not just the Churches but also their ministry 'in a form satisfactory to all the bodies concerned, either at the inauguration of the union or as soon as possible thereafter'.

Crucial for Fisher's strategy of tying the American Church into the Anglican Communion by according appropriate recognition to its status and strength was the close friendship that developed between him and Henry Sherrill, a Broad Churchman who was elected presiding bishop in 1946. Since 1908 the American presiding bishop (in 1920 the President of the House of Bishops) had preached at the closing service of each conference, but in 1948 Fisher invited Sherrill to preach at the inaugural Holy Communion in St Paul's Cathedral—on 4 July. The distinction between America and England remained, however—symbolized at the closing service when the English bishops wore the scarlet chimeres they wore in Convocation, whereas their American counterparts wore the standard black.

³¹ *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, Appendix, p. 9; *The Lambeth Conference 1930*, p. 17; *The Lambeth Conference 1948: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops; together with Resolutions and Reports* (London, 1948), part I, p. 15; *The Lambeth Conference 1958: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports* (London, 1958), part I, p. 17.

³² E. F. Carpenter (ed.), *The Archbishop Speaks. Addresses and Speeches by the Archbishop of Canterbury, The Most Reverend Geoffrey Francis Fisher P.C., G.C.V.O., D.D* (London, 1958), p. 87.

³³ LC 188, fos. 46–7.

Growing American influence and the tendency to treat the Church of England as just one Anglican Church among many were reflected in the report of the conference's Anglican Communion Committee. Its members included Sherrill but none of the leading English bishops. Lkening the Communion to a river 'made up of streams, each of which passes through a different country', its report stressed that 'no one stream is superior to another'.³⁴ Its description of authority in the Anglican Communion as 'dispersed' rather than 'centralized' lacked the balance of the 1930 Conference's account of autonomy and its limits, was poorly argued, and was taken up neither in the encyclical nor in a resolution, but was to be much quoted.

Three of the committee's practical recommendations designed to strengthen the Communion's unity were endorsed by the conference (Resolutions 80, 86, and 87). An Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy (ACMS) would function alongside the CCB, considering issues relating to missionary strategy or arising from the formation of new provinces. Meeting at least every second year, it would consist of elected or appointed 'representatives'—two each from the United States and England, and one each from the other Churches. Whether these might be non-episcopal was not stated. Second, the American desire for international gatherings of clergy and laypeople as well as bishops was met by the decision (taking up a suggestion made at the 1946 CCB meeting by the bishop of Albany) that an Anglican Congress, consisting of 'representative bishops, priests, and lay persons of all dioceses or missionary districts' should be held. In a further move towards equality between the Churches, 'the Primate or Presiding Bishop of the Church of the country in which the Congress is held' should preside. Third, a 'Central College' should be established—ideally at St Augustine's in Canterbury. The college opened in 1952 but lack of funds forced its closure in 1967. Another of the committee's recommendations resulted in the Anglican Cycle of Prayer for the Communion's dioceses and their bishops.

After the conference, Fisher wrote to the 'Metropolitans' (actually the senior bishop of each Church) to begin the process of reconstituting the CCB and constituting the ACMS. Regarding the former, he proposed that 'every Primate, Metropolitan or Presiding Bishop' (by which he meant the archbishops of Canterbury and York and the senior bishop of each other Church) should be an *ex officio* member, but that the American presiding bishop should also appoint four other bishops, the archbishop of Canterbury and the Canadian and Australian primates two each, and the others one each. Furthermore, those outside the British Isles could, if they wished, appoint a bishop resident in Great Britain as an alternate. The extra-provincial dioceses would be represented by two bishops, with two alternates.³⁵ Fisher also asked the

³⁴ *The Lambeth Conference 1948*, part 2, p. 83.

³⁵ LPL, Fisher Papers 59, fos. 138–9.

'Metropolitans' to nominate representatives to the ACMS.³⁶ He appointed the secretary of the Church Assembly's Missionary Council, Canon John McLeod Campbell, as secretary of the ACMS, but he had neither a budget for this work nor staff to support him in this. Consequently, neither body met for six years.

An Anglican Congress was duly convened in Minneapolis from 4 to 13 August 1954 (prior to the World Council of Churches' Assembly at Evanston, Illinois). This first representative gathering of the Communion held outside England was attended by 657 delegates (201 bishops, 242 priests, and 214 laypeople, sixty-five of them women). The emblem designed for the Congress became that of the Communion: a compass rose, surmounted by a mitre, with St George's cross at its centre, surrounded by the text 'The truth shall make you free' in Greek. Sherrill was the Presiding Officer, but at the opening service Fisher walked with him at the rear of the procession and both gave an address. Though Fisher never took the chair, one English delegate observed that 'He sat in black coat and gaiters towards the back of the platform, and one sensed that he was the presiding genius.' The congress was an event, not a structure, and passed no resolutions, but it did build unity. Sherrill praised the contribution made by the Fishers in participating in the afternoon teas held in a tent outside the cathedral, where they 'mingled and talked with delegates from all over the world'.³⁷ Though much of Fisher's contribution to the creation of the modern Anglican Communion was structural, he understood the importance of establishing warm personal relations in deepening Church unity. In all he visited the United States four times (1946, 1952, 1954, 1957). As a result of his efforts, for a time at least, the American Episcopal Church (a distant Church with a very different ecclesiology) was integrated more closely into the family of Churches centred on the see of Canterbury.

The ACMS met on 4 August, the opening service following that evening. In summoning it, Fisher had said that each Church should be represented by its primate or a bishop appointed by him, at best by both, and they should be free to bring any priest or layperson with relevant knowledge and responsibility.³⁸ The CCB's members also met informally on the afternoon of 10 August. They discussed preparations for the 1958 conference, and in particular a possible limitation of numbers, but neither decisions nor minutes were taken.³⁹

The CCB met at Lambeth on 14–15 July 1956 to fix dates for the 1958 conference and discuss the agenda and programme. It agreed that invitations should in principle go only to 'Diocesan Bishops and those Bishops who share jurisdiction with their Diocesans', while leaving the archbishop of Canterbury discretion to invite other bishops with 'a special contribution to make', and that a further Anglican Congress should be held in 1963. The ACMS met on the following two days.⁴⁰

³⁶ Fisher Papers 59, fos. 85–7.

³⁷ Purcell, *Fisher of Lambeth*, p. 194.

³⁸ Fisher Papers 127, fo. 389.

³⁹ MS note (1956): Fisher Papers 175, fo. 163.

⁴⁰ Fisher Papers 175, fos. 168, 175.

Richard Chartres has commented that the Anglican Communion 'was invented in the 1950s by Geoffrey Fisher and B.O.A.C.'.⁴¹ Between 1950 and 1960, in addition to visiting North America, Fisher flew to Australia and New Zealand (1950), West Africa (1951), Central Africa (1955), India, Pakistan, Japan, Hong Kong, and Korea (1959), and Nigeria and East Africa (1960). In the past, the unity of the Communion's episcopate had largely flowed from a large proportion of the bishops having been educated at a relatively small number of British schools and universities, and overseas bishops visiting England from time to time. Now, international air travel having made it possible for the archbishop of Canterbury to travel not just across the Atlantic but also to Africa, Asia, and the Antipodes, he could foster unity by visiting the overseas Churches rather than simply receiving visits from their bishops.

With West and Central Africa added, fifteen Churches were represented at the 1958 conference—the first increase since 1908 (though from the Chinese Church only the bishop of Hong Kong was able to attend). Ethnic diversity was growing: there had been Japanese and Chinese bishops before (and one Indian and one African in 1948), but in 1958 there were three black diocesans (from Nigeria) and several black assistant bishops (principally from Nigeria and Uganda).

The conference was also less English. An editorial in the journal *Theology* (November 1948) had criticized the composition of the 1948 conference, at which one-third of the bishops represented England, the sixty-three English suffragan and assistant bishops (almost one-fifth of the total) outnumbered the Americans, and only 240 of the 326 bishops were diocesans. The CCB's decision reduced the number of suffragans, assistants, and coadjutors to forty, of whom only six served in England. Consequently, the attendance (310) was comparable with 1930 (308) and 1948 (329), despite the increased number of dioceses, and arrangements could again follow the traditional pattern. Committees met at Church House (which also served, as in 1948, as a social club) as well as at Lambeth. That the Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, gave a dinner for the archbishops and metropolitans at 10 Downing Street and the Lord Chancellor and Speaker a reception for bishops at the Palace of Westminster testifies to the significance that the Church still had in English life. Twice a week, groups of a dozen bishops stayed with Fisher at Lambeth for two nights, and at the weekends the Fishers entertained around twenty guests in the Old Palace at Canterbury.

As the Committee on Progress in the Anglican Communion observed, the Communion had entered a period of liturgical change, so the conference gave significant attention to the principles that should underlie liturgical revision. The report of the Committee on the Family in Contemporary Society, chaired

⁴¹ In conversation with the author, 19 Apr. 2012. The British Overseas Airways Corporation was the state-owned airline that served destinations beyond Europe.

by Bishop Stephen Bayne of Olympia (United States) with John Hines (Texas) and Frederick Willis (Delhi) as joint secretaries, has been widely praised. Adrian Hastings judged it 'among the ablest to come from any authoritative church body in the twentieth century'.⁴² It accorded a positive value to sexual intercourse in marriage and rejected the idea that it 'ought not to be engaged in except with the willing intention to procreate children'. A conference resolution advocated family planning.

During the conference Fisher convened three meetings of 'primates' and three of 'metropolitans' as a sort of steering committee.⁴³ Now that travel was easier, the conference amended the CCB's constitution (Resolution 61) to provide that it should consist of the archbishops of Canterbury and York and the primates or presiding bishops, together with members appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury to represent other dioceses under his jurisdiction. A member unable to attend could nominate a bishop to represent him. In addition to its role as a follow-up and preparatory committee for Lambeth Conferences, it was to 'advise on question of faith, order, polity, or administration' referred to it by bishops. The ACMS's membership was also changed. Instead of members chosen by each Church, it was to consist of the archbishop of Canterbury, one Church of England representative appointed by him, the primates and presiding bishops, the metropolitans of the other provinces, and representatives of the extra-provincial dioceses appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury. Members unable to attend could send representatives, who—crucially—could be clerical or lay: after ninety years, a Lambeth Conference for the first time specifically envisaged non-episcopal participation in meetings of an inter-Anglican body.⁴⁴ The most important innovation of all was that Resolution 60 required the archbishop of Canterbury to appoint, with its approval, a secretary of the CCB who, if the ACMS agreed, could also be its secretary. As Fisher put it, 'The Conference of 1958 gave the Council for the first time a Chief Officer and a staff'.⁴⁵

George Bell's membership of the conference (despite his retirement earlier in 1958) provided a strong link with its predecessors. As Davidson's biographer, he was steeped in the tradition going back to 1878; as his chaplain, he had been Junior Secretary in 1920; he was Episcopal Secretary in 1930, and chaired the Church Unity Committee in 1948. Bell praised the spirit of fellowship and a sense of the Anglican Communion as 'much deeper and stronger than at any previous Conference', a feeling he attributed in part to the 1954 Anglican Congress (quite a few participants were spending significant time together for the third time in ten years). But, he judged, there were 'too

⁴² A. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity, 1920–1985* (London, 1986), p. 449.

⁴³ Anglican Communion Office: ACC/LCB/1(a).

⁴⁴ *The Lambeth Conference 1958*, part 2, pp. 70–1; Resolution 60.

⁴⁵ Fisher, 'A Postscript', p. 23.

many subjects of importance in the time', 'few outstanding figures' (only Ramsey of York, Simms of Dublin, Mortimer of Exeter, Allison of Chelmsford, and Bayne), 'few weighty bishops', too little spirituality, and 'too little of theological approach anywhere'; the English bishops 'failed to give leadership'.⁴⁶ The latter point, as well as suggesting a lack of quality, could also reflect the English Church's diminishing role in the Communion.

At the end of the conference Sherrill presented Fisher with a gift on behalf of the bishops, as in 1948. His jocular reference to the archbishop's earlier life as a schoolmaster prompted a humorous defence of schoolmasters from Fisher, who continued the joke by announcing at the end: 'Class dismissed'.⁴⁷ Sherrill preached at the closing service in Westminster Abbey, then Fisher bade farewell to the bishops in the chapter house—leaving hurriedly, having burst into tears.

DEVELOPING STRUCTURES, 1960–1967

Fisher retired in May 1961. One of his most important legacies to the Anglican Communion was his appointment, as the first Anglican Executive Officer, of Bishop Stephen Bayne, whose organization of the Anglican Congress discussion groups and chairmanship of the 1958 conference's committee on the family had impressed many. Bayne arrived in London in February 1960 and after six months established his home and office in Belgravia, supported by an assistant and two secretaries. Thus began the Anglican Communion Office, which by 2016 employed twenty staff, with a budget of £2 million. *Anglican World* (initially a private initiative) was established as a periodical linking the Communion's Churches together.

Bayne quickly became one of London's best-known American residents, appearing on BBC radio and television in programmes such as *The Brains Trust*, but he spent up to two-thirds of his time abroad, visiting the Churches. In his first annual report he wrote, 'Of all our churches I am the least at home in England (in the sense of meeting any broad understanding of my job, and the inter-Anglican character of my ministry and our churches' life)': England had more significance for the Communion than the Communion had for England.⁴⁸

The climax of Bayne's five years was a series of meetings in Canada in July–August 1963. Out of a week-long conference of fifty 'missionary executives' (representing missionary societies, boards, and Churches) came a paper that was revised by the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy (5–8 August) and

⁴⁶ Quoted by R. C. D. Jasper, *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester* (London, 1967), p. 384.

⁴⁷ Sherrill, *Among Friends*, p. 269.

⁴⁸ Bayne, *An Anglican Turning Point*, p. 34.

presented, with the agreement of the Consultative Body (8–10 August) to an Anglican Congress in Toronto (13–23 August), under the title ‘Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ’ (MRI). Though not drafted by Bayne, its tone and key concepts owed much to what he had been saying. It sought increased financial contributions to mission projects and the appointment of ‘regional officers’, but its chief importance lay in its insistence that ‘It is now irrelevant to talk of “giving” and “receiving” churches. The keynotes of our time are equality, interdependence, mutual responsibility.’⁴⁹ Ian Douglas has suggested that this represented a challenge to the pre-eminence which the American Episcopal Church had gained through its generous giving.⁵⁰

The ACMS’s membership potentially comprised thirty-seven bishops: the senior bishop of each of the eighteen Churches, together with the other metropolitans (York, Dublin, and the non-primatial Canadian and Australian archbishops), the presidents of the American provinces, and bishops representing the South East Asia and South Pacific Councils of extra-provincial dioceses. No fewer than thirty-one bishops attended, together with twenty-three ‘staff advisers’ and the Executive Officer. A range of strategic, policy, and practical matters were discussed.⁵¹

The CCB was smaller, attended only by the senior bishop of each Church (Dublin representing Armagh), together with the archbishop of York, the South East Asian and South Pacific representatives, and the Executive Officer. It principally discussed ecumenical, constitutional, and ecclesiological questions. It decided that the Lambeth Conference should meet in 1968 (not the centenary year 1967). It expressed a wish for a meeting of primates and metropolitans at intervals of 18–24 months, beginning in Canterbury the following April. This would consist of the CCB plus one American bishop, one Canadian, and one Australian metropolitan, with consultants and staff advisers attending ‘general consultation’ but not decision-making sessions.

At the Anglican Congress Archbishop Ramsey said that what would come out of the MRI document was ‘a process involving a great many things’, the first being ‘a gathering of the primates and metropolitans in common council every two years’. He added: ‘You know that they are not prelatical gentlemen, but men who try to know their own churches and areas and who represent in

⁴⁹ ‘Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ: A Message from the Primates and Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion’, in E. R. Fairweather (ed.), *Anglican Congress 1963: Report of Proceedings* (Toronto, 1963), p. 118.

⁵⁰ I. T. Douglas, *Fling Out the Banner! The National Church Ideal and the Foreign Missions of the Episcopal Church* (New York, 1996), p. 253.

⁵¹ Principal sources for this section include CCB and ACMS minutes (1963–8), Anglican Communion Office, ACC/LCB/1(c), ACC/LCB/2, and papers relating to the Executive Officer’s Advisory Committee, ACC/LCB/1(e).

council something far deeper and wider than their own poor personalities.⁵² In Canada in 1963, the CCB finally embraced and fulfilled the long-held catholic conciliarist vision of it as a gathering in which the Churches took counsel together between Lambeth Conferences, each represented by its senior bishop. Just five years later, that vision would be supplanted by a very different one, embodied in the Anglican Consultative Council.

Meanwhile, the enlarged CCB met again in Canterbury from 17 to 20 April 1964, following an ecumenical meeting. The ecumenical, constitutional, and ecclesiological matters that had always been its main focus dominated the agenda, but more practical matters of cooperation (including the Inter-Anglican Budget) also featured. Bayne having announced that he would return to the United States in November 1964, it was agreed that the archbishop of Canterbury should appoint one of three named bishops to succeed him. He chose Ralph Dean, a Low Church Englishman who had been bishop of Cariboo in British Columbia since 1956 and chaired the Programme Committee for the 1963 Congress. Bayne's assistant was replaced by two Canadians: the Revd Dr Ernest Jackson (administrator of the 1963 Congress) as Deputy Executive Officer, and a secretary (who had serviced the Congress's Programme Committee). With two typists, the staff now numbered five.

The CCB met again in Jerusalem from 25 to 29 April 1966. A brief minute headed 'M.R.I.' noted approval of a proposal for 'the establishment, for two years on an experimental basis of a body, as representative as possible, of people who carry undoubted authority in the Anglican Communion to advise the Executive Officer on various aspects of planning, priorities and projects, the responsibility of which was considered too great for any one man', together with a list of people to be approached.⁵³ This Advisory Committee duly met in Nairobi from 4 to 7 July. The bishop of Calcutta (metropolitan of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon) chaired the meeting. The other members were the primate of Canada, the archbishop of East Africa, an Australian bishop, Bayne (now Director of the American Church's Overseas Department), Canon Douglas Webster (a mission theologian and former Church Missionary Society staff member who had once been Dean's colleague at the London College of Divinity), and Mr John W. Lawrence (also from England). The absence of a Church of England bishop from such a meeting would have been unthinkable in any previous decade.

One of sixteen points discussed was the future of the ACMS, on which Dean was asked to prepare a paper, which he did after consulting the Advisory Committee members by correspondence. The problems he discerned were that the Consultative Body and the ACMS had largely the same membership, that the distinction between their agendas was artificial, and that their mostly

⁵² Fairweather, *Anglican Congress 1963*, pp. 123–4.

⁵³ LCB minutes, 1966, ACC/LCB/1(c), p. 15.

ex officio membership did not guarantee sufficient relevant expertise. He also asked how the lack of any non-episcopal members could be 'justified in the present age when even the Church of England is contemplating synodical government'.⁵⁴ The solution (suggested by his deputy) which he proposed was to replace both bodies with a new 'Anglican Consultative Council', consisting of two bishops and two clerical or lay representatives from Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia, Africa, and India, and one bishop and one clerical or lay representative from each other province or region. The archbishop of Canterbury would be one of the two British bishops, but the council would elect its own chairman. Meeting in Ceylon from 12 to 16 June 1967, the Advisory Committee adopted a developed version of the staff proposal and agreed that it should be forwarded to the Lambeth Conference for approval.

THE 1968 LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND THE ANGLICAN CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL

As we have seen, in 1945 international power relationships had changed. Arguably, the 1968 Lambeth Conference met in a context of much more revolutionary changes in the Church and the world. The Second Vatican Council was resulting in dramatic change in the Roman Catholic Church. The decade's true 'annus mirabilis' was not 1963 (as Philip Larkin suggested) but 1968, which saw the Prague Spring, the assassination of Martin Luther King, violent student protests around the world, and Pope Paul's encyclical *Humanae Vitae* (published during the Lambeth Conference). Meeting in this revolutionary context, the 1968 Conference set the Anglican Communion on a new course, profoundly changing its international structures and the ecclesiology that they embodied. As W. M. Jacob has commented, in 1968 'a new phase was beginning in the Anglican Communion, which to do it justice, will require another book'.⁵⁵

The tenth Lambeth Conference differed from its predecessors in a number of respects. The Consultative Body had decided that all non-retired bishops should be invited, but in any case the diocesan episcopate had finally outgrown Lambeth Palace (375 of the 462 bishops present were diocesans). The conference therefore met not in the archbishop of Canterbury's home but in the Assembly Hall at Church House, Westminster—a 'parliamentary' debating chamber in the office of a bureaucracy. In addition to the bishops, there were—in the gallery—seventy-five (male) ecumenical observers and twenty-six

⁵⁴ 'Memorandum from the Executive Officer on the Future of the A.C.M.S. and Related Matters', ACC/LCB/1(e), p. 1.

⁵⁵ W. M. Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997), p. 285.

consultants (twenty-five men and one woman). In keeping with the move to a public venue, the conference voted to admit the press. The effect of these changes should not be underestimated. It was not only the first conference at which the bishops did not wear gaiters: John Macquarrie (one of the consultants) was 'astonished to find how many bishops were being swept along uncritically by the changing fashions and slogans of popular theology'.⁵⁶

The report subtly downplayed the conference's authority: the 'Encyclical Letter' became a mere 'Message', and the resolutions were preceded by this novel Note:

The function of the Conference being consultative and advisory, its findings are not to be interpreted as having legislative force throughout the Anglican Communion. No Resolution of the Lambeth Conference is binding upon any part of the Anglican Communion unless and until it has been adopted by the appropriate canonical authority.⁵⁷

Legally speaking, this was true, but previous conferences had assumed the pronouncements of 'bishops in council' to have a certain intrinsic moral authority that went beyond the merely 'consultative and advisory'. This entirely negative Note was unprecedented.

As recommended by the Executive Officer and his Advisory Committee, in Resolution 69 the conference replaced the CCB and the ACMS with a single Anglican Consultative Council (ACC). In addition to the archbishop of Canterbury, it would comprise three members (bishop, clergy, and lay) from each of the largest five Churches and two (bishop and clergy or lay) from the others (at the outset, eleven Churches, the Jerusalem archbishopric, and three regional groups of dioceses), plus up to six co-opted members (two of them female and two laypeople under the age of 28). As president, the archbishop of Canterbury would preside only at the inaugural session: the council would elect its own chairman and vice-chairman. They (but not the president) and seven other elected members would form the standing committee. The council would meet every two years, the standing committee annually. At the outset, only twenty-one of at least forty-six members would be bishops. These would not necessarily be the primates or presiding bishops: like the other members, they would be chosen as each Church or province determined. Though the bishops would be a minority, there was no provision for voting by houses or 'orders', as there is in most Anglican synods. Furthermore, though changes to the membership would need the assent of two-thirds of the metropolitans, otherwise the constitution and changes to it required ratification by the 'constitutional bodies' of two-thirds of the Churches. Therefore, unlike all

⁵⁶ J. Macquarrie, 'Whither Theology?' in C. Martin (ed.), *The Great Christian Centuries to Come: Essays in Honour of Michael Ramsey* (London and Oxford, 1974), p. 157.

⁵⁷ *The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports* (London, 1968), p. 28.

previous inter-Anglican bodies, the ACC would have an independent existence, deriving its authority not from the Lambeth Conference but directly from the Churches.

Furthermore, whereas the 'Anglican Executive Officer' had been appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury with the CCB's approval and served 'under the directions of the Archbishop', now the ACC would appoint 'a Secretary, who shall be known as the Secretary General of the Council', and the council would 'determine his duties'. He would have a 'staff, and office'. Whereas a Roman Catholic curia is under the court of the Pope or a diocesan bishop, this international Anglican 'curia' is not under the archbishop of Canterbury's direction. A bureaucracy accountable to bodies that meet only rarely is potentially far more powerful than an administration gathered around a bishop who directs it.

For the first century since the Anglican Communion took structured form in 1867, the only structural bonds linking its Churches together had been meetings of bishops. The 1930 Lambeth Conference had identified the role of bishops in binding the Churches together as an ecclesiological principle. From 1968, by contrast, there would be episcopal meetings only every ten years—if the Lambeth Conferences continued, about which there was considerable doubt. In the much more frequent ACC meetings the bishops could be outvoted, and the ACC's constitution was not under the Lambeth Conference's control.

All of this represented a profound shift in ecclesiology, yet the conference report offered no ecclesiological justification for the proposals. The introduction to the relevant section report said, 'Our perspective has...been changed by the new prominence of the laypeople of the Church who have a ministry and a voice with that of bishops and clergy', but why that should lead to the specific changes proposed was not explained. The report argued that 'a more integrated pattern [of meetings] is now necessary', but did not explain why that pattern should take this particular form.⁵⁸ The possibility of the bishops being outvoted might be unproblematic if the council's agenda were purely practical, and indeed the ACC's eight functions did not include offering advice on faith and order questions: the conference did not formally entrust that key responsibility of the CCB—one of the reasons for establishing and maintaining it—to the ACC or any other body.

However, in Resolutions 34–7 the conference did in practice give the ACC a role in determining an important issue of faith and order—the ordination of women to the priesthood. It did not endorse the belief that there are no theological objections but, affirming that 'the theological arguments at present presented for and against...are inconclusive', asked

⁵⁸ *The Lambeth Conference 1968*, pp. 120, 145.

'every national and regional Church or province' to study the question and report its findings to the ACC, which was to initiate consultations with other Churches and disseminate the information thus secured. Before any final decision, the ACC's advice should be 'sought and carefully considered'.

Such a request for advice soon came from Bishop Gilbert Baker of the extra-provincial diocese of Hong Kong and Macao, whose synod had approved ordaining women as priests. Only eight Churches (just over one-third of the twenty-two Churches or regional groupings represented on the ACC) had even begun to consider the issue. They had submitted no reports, and the views of other Churches had not been sought. Nonetheless, at its first meeting in 1971, the ACC resolved that if Bishop Baker, with the approval of his synod (or any other bishop with the approval of his province), ordained a woman to the priesthood that would be acceptable to the council, which would encourage the member Churches to remain in communion with the diocese or province concerned. Twenty-four members voted for the motion (moved and seconded by the American clergy and lay representatives); twenty-two (including the ACC's chairman and the archbishop of Canterbury, under whose metropolitan jurisdiction the diocese of Hong Kong and Macao came) voted against; five abstained.⁵⁹

This eleven-day meeting was attended by fifty-one members, eighteen consultants, observers, and preparatory committee members, and six staff—seventy-five people in all. It passed forty-four resolutions, which were published, with the reports of the four sections in which much of the work was done, in an eighty-page book entitled (significantly) *The Time is Now*. All of this made the ACC seem like a mini-conference—not a continuation committee of the Lambeth Conference, but a rival to it. That the report's preface was signed not by the ACC's president or chairman but by Bishop John Howe (who had become Executive Officer in 1969 and was appointed secretary-general by the ACC at this meeting) perhaps indicated where real power now lay. On the last day of the meeting, Ramsey told Howe that he had found it 'creative', but he later changed his mind, commenting 'I think that Lambeth 1968 erred in giving power to the Anglican Consultative Council' and 'I quickly came to think that it was not the right way to run the Anglican Communion and that it was a poor substitute for a meeting of archbishops.'⁶⁰ The ACC met again in 1973 and 1976.

⁵⁹ *The Time is Now: Anglican Consultative Council First Meeting*, Limuru, Kenya (London, 1971), pp. 34–5, 38–9; cf. W. O. Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey: A Life* (Oxford, 1990), p. 280; J. Howe, *Highways and Hedges: Anglicanism and the Universal Church* (London, 1985), p. 156.

⁶⁰ Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey*, pp. 277–8.

THE PRIMATES AND THE 1978
LAMBETH CONFERENCE

Abolition of the Consultative Body meant that there was now no forum which brought the senior bishops of each Church together between Lambeth Conferences.⁶¹ In January 1975 a conversation between John Allin (the American presiding bishop since 1974) and John Howe prompted the latter to propose an informal 'gathering of Anglican Primates'. 'The word "Primate" in this context', he explained, 'means the person who is the principal bishop in each Church of the Anglican Communion' (several of whom were not primates in the traditional sense of the bishop of the 'first see' of a nation or people). With the agreement of the new archbishop of Canterbury, Donald Coggan, the 'primates' met in Nairobi in November 1975, immediately before the World Council of Churches assembly. Howe stressed the gathering's informality: 'There will probably never be any sort of formal agenda. The aim is to pray together, converse and think together, and to get to know one another... as people.' The second of four full days would be a 'conducted Quiet Day'.⁶²

In 1976 the ACC decided—against the expectation of some, who had seen the ACC as replacing the Lambeth Conference—that there should be a Lambeth Conference in 1978. In September 1977 the primate of Canada, Edward Scott, wrote to Howe following a meeting of the Canadian bishops with Coggan. One of their suggestions was that the primates should meet during the conference as a steering committee. In a separate letter, following a conversation with Allin, Scott suggested a full Primates Meeting in association with the conference and the development of the primates as a network:

Bishop Allin maintains that the Primates have direct access to the decision making structures of their own churches which is not always the case of A.C.C. representatives and he is pushing for both/and not either/or. Here some of the tension between Marion [Kelleran]⁶³ and himself is no doubt being expressed but I do believe that most of the Bishops believe we need a variety of networks of contact between provinces—that A.C.C. alone is not enough.⁶⁴

The 1978 conference, which met at the University of Kent in Canterbury for three weeks, was the first to meet residentially. There was a London Day, comprising a Lambeth Palace reception, a Buckingham Palace garden party, and evensong at Westminster Abbey, and a separate Wives' Conference met at Christ Church College, Canterbury, during the last week. The 1978 conference was also the first whose membership was not entirely episcopal: in addition to

⁶¹ Principal sources for this section include papers relating to the Primates Meeting (1975–80), Anglican Communion Office, ACC/PM/1(a)–(c).

⁶² J. Howe to Primates, 27 Jan. 1975, 29 May 1975, ACC/PM/1(a).

⁶³ Kelleran was the American lay representative on the ACC and chaired it from 1973 to 1980.

⁶⁴ E. W. Scott to J. Howe, 2 Sept. 1977, ACC/PM/1(b).

the 406 bishops (370 of them diocesans—most suffragans were not invited), eight ACC Standing Committee members were present as non-voting ‘participants’—including Dr Kelleran, the only woman. In addition, there were twenty consultants (one of them female) and thirty-one (male) ecumenical observers. Otherwise, the most significant thing about the conference was the fact that it happened at all: its report was slim and its resolutions (thirty-seven—a deliberate reduction from the 131 of 1958 and sixty-nine of 1968) were unmemorable. For the first time, the report listed the Churches (now numbering twenty-four), and the diocesans within each, alphabetically rather than by seniority.

Day-to-day decisions were taken by a steering committee, chaired by Howe, comprising Archbishop Coggan and the section chairmen, vice-chairmen, and secretaries, but the ‘Primates Committee’ met four times to take ‘major decisions’ and discuss matters about which Coggan consulted them. ‘Aware of an opinion among its members, and in the Lambeth Conference and beyond, that from time to time there should be meetings of the Primates of the Anglican Communion’, the primates ‘authorised the Archbishop of Canterbury to initiate consideration in the future of a Committee of Primates’.⁶⁵

The relevant section of the conference report referred briefly to the possibility of the primates meeting between conferences and expressed the hope that ‘such meetings will be held more often, perhaps in connection with meetings of the ACC’.⁶⁶ Though the conference did not pass a resolution establishing a Primates Meeting, Resolution 41 assumed that such meetings would take place: the decision had already been taken by Coggan. He explained it in an address, printed in the conference report.⁶⁷ When quoted out of context, as it almost invariably is,⁶⁸ his statement that the primates should meet ‘for leisurely thought, prayer, and deep consultation’ might imply merely an international fellowship group for Church leaders. In fact, however, Coggan’s address was about ‘Authority in the Anglican Communion’ and began by asking where it should lie. Having rejected suggestions that it ‘ought to be centred in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury’ or that the Lambeth Conference would suffice, he went on: ‘Is the central authority of the Anglican Communion, then, to rest with the Anglican Consultative Council? Again I believe that the answer is no.’ Nor could a doctrinal commission be ‘the authoritative council of the Anglican Communion’. Instead, he proposed that the primates should meet ‘reasonably often, for leisurely thought, prayer, and deep consultation... perhaps as frequently as once in two years’. They

⁶⁵ Primates Committee 1978 minutes, ACC/PM/1(c), pp. 5–6.

⁶⁶ *The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978* (London, 1978), p. 103.

⁶⁷ *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978*, pp. 122–4.

⁶⁸ Cf. a document approved by the Primates themselves in Jan. 2011: ‘Towards an Understanding of the Purpose and Scope of the Primates’ Meeting’: <http://www.aco.org/communion/primates/resources/downloads/prim_scpurpose.pdf>, accessed 26 Apr. 2011.

would be 'channels through which the voice of the member Churches would be heard, and real interchange of heart could take place' and should 'be in the very closest and intimate contact with the Anglican Consultative Council'. Thus Coggan saw the Primates Meeting as central to solving the problem of authority in the Anglican Communion.

In Resolution 11 the conference explicitly envisaged that, far from meeting merely for the occasional spiritual retreat, the Primates Meeting would have a crucial role when Churches contemplated developments that might have consequences for the whole Communion:

The Conference advises member Churches not to take action regarding issues which are of concern to the whole Anglican Communion without consultation with a Lambeth Conference or with the episcopate through the Primates Committee, and requests the primates to initiate a study of the nature of authority within the Anglican Communion.

No mention was made of a role in such matters for the ACC: local developments that were likely to affect the whole Communion were to be discussed by bishops. (Nor did the resolution say what should happen if the primates' advice was ignored.) Resolution 12 asked the archbishop of Canterbury 'with all the primates of the Anglican Communion, within one year to initiate consideration of the way to relate together the international conferences, councils, and meetings within the Anglican Communion'. Again, the primates, led by the archbishop of Canterbury, were to act—not the ACC.

The Primates Meeting met for the first time at Ely from 26 November to 1 December 1979. Any lingering idea that a meeting of the leaders of the Communion's Churches could be merely social and spiritual will have been dispelled when the agenda (sixteen items, one of which covered no fewer than thirteen sub-items) was circulated. The minutes of the meeting filled nineteen pages, not including the appendices (another sixteen pages).

POSTSCRIPT, 1978–1998

The 1988 Lambeth Conference, again held in Canterbury, was the largest ever, attended by 518 bishops, thirty-three ACC members, twenty-six consultants, and twenty-nine ecumenical observers, and supported (with the simultaneous Wives' Conference) by 170 staff. The conference's 350-page report, a substantial document, justifiably claimed that it was also 'perhaps the best prepared'. The title of Archbishop Runcie's magisterial opening address, 'The Nature of the Unity We Seek' (which covered Anglican and ecumenical unity and

‘the unity of all creation’) points to the significant attention still given to ecumenism.⁶⁹

Between 1978 and 1998 the Anglican Consultative Council met seven times—in 1979, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1990, 1993, and 1996. A book-length report of each meeting was published, the series culminating with the 374-page report of the 1996 meeting, ambitiously titled *Being Anglican in the Third Millennium*. The Primates Meeting met eight times—in 1979, 1981, 1983, 1986, 1989, 1991, 1993, and 1997.

The 1998 Lambeth Conference was the third to be held in Canterbury. Resolution I.10 on human sexuality, the widely criticized process which led to it, and a failure to engage substantively with the Virginia Report of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission on ‘the meaning and nature of communion’ combined to make the conference one of the contributory causes of the crisis which engulfed the Communion in the next decade.

CONCLUSION

Though Howe commented in advance of the 1979 meeting that ‘from discussion with Primates themselves the wish for meetings does not appear to derive from a desire to revive the Lambeth Consultative Body’,⁷⁰ this is in fact what had happened. A formally constituted body consisting of the senior bishop of each of the Communion’s Churches had been abolished in 1968, but revived in 1978. Nonetheless, the revolution of 1968 had been so profound that the previous existence, for seventy years, of formally constituted structures for consultation, advice, and decision-making between Lambeth Conferences soon became completely forgotten. That is how, for example, Mark Chapman could claim that ‘The Lambeth Conference was born out of disputes on doctrine and the use of the Bible... It was not until the 1960s and ’70s that further structures were established with the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates’ Meeting.’⁷¹ A meeting of ‘primates’ came to be regarded by many as an un-Anglican novelty rather than reversion to a pre-1968 norm.⁷²

Discussion of the authority and roles of these bodies continued after 1979. In 1997 the Virginia Report commented positively on the ACC as including laypeople, but noted that its existence ‘raises questions’, whereas the Primates Meetings ‘have an inherent authority by virtue of the office which they hold as

⁶⁹ *The Truth Shall Make You Free: The Lambeth Conference 1988: The Reports, Resolutions & Pastoral Letters from the Bishops* (London, 1988), pp. 1, 11–24.

⁷⁰ J. Howe to Primates, 26 June 1979, ACC/PM/1(c).

⁷¹ M. D. Chapman, ‘Spatial Catholicity’, *The Living Church*, 8 Apr. 2012, p. 11.

⁷² Cf. Kevin Holdsworth on ‘the upstart Primates’ Meeting’ (*Church Times*, 12 Feb. 2016).

chief pastors'. It emphasized the bishop's representative role as 'one who represents the part to the whole and the whole to the part, the particularity of each diocese to the whole Communion and the Communion to each diocese'.⁷³ Ten years later, the Windsor Continuation Group noted that the ACC was 'particularly valued by those who emphasize the contribution of the whole people of God in the life, mission and the governance of the Church', but observed that 'Not all believe that a representative body is the best way to express the contribution of the whole people of God at a worldwide level.'⁷⁴

The differences in approach between those who saw the primates as the natural international representatives of their Churches and those who (in the American tradition) were uncomfortable with ceding authority to any forum in which the clergy and laity were not represented by members of their own 'Orders' were displayed in successive drafts of the Anglican Communion Covenant from 2006 on, which gave the role of determination in the case of disputes first to the primates, then to the ACC, and finally to the two bodies' joint standing committee, acting on behalf of both. The difficulty in agreeing where ultimate responsibility should lie reflected differences in the understanding of the role of bishops in Church government that stemmed from the formation in 1867 of an Anglican Communion that brought together Churches with very different ecclesiologies.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayne, S. F., *An Anglican Turning Point: Documents and Interpretations* (Austin, TX, 1964).
- Bell, G. K. A., *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1952 edn.).
- Booty, J., *An American Apostle: The Life of Stephen Fielding Bayne, Jr.* (Valley Forge, PA, 1997).
- Carpenter, E., *Archbishop Fisher: His Life and Times* (Norwich, 1991).
- Clarke, H. L., *Constitutional Church Government in the Dominions Beyond the Seas and in Other Parts of the Anglican Communion* (London, 1924).
- Coleman, R. (ed.), *Resolutions of the Twelve Lambeth Conferences 1867–1988* (Toronto, 1992).
- Dawley, P. M. (ed.), *Report of the Anglican Congress 1954* (London, 1955).
- Fairweather, E. R. (ed.), *Anglican Congress 1964: Report of Proceedings* (Toronto, 1963).
- Jacob, W. M., *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997).

⁷³ 'The Virginia Report', pp. 57, 60–1.

⁷⁴ Windsor Continuation Group, 'Preliminary Observations: A Presentation at the Lambeth Conference', p. [4]: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/windsor_continuation/docs/WCG%20Observations%20080724.pdf>, accessed 24 Oct. 2008.

Lambeth Conference reports and publications:

The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867–1920 (London, 1929 edn.).

The Lambeth Conference 1930: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with Resolutions and Reports (London, n.d.).

The Lambeth Conference 1948: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops; together with Resolutions and Reports (London, 1948).

The Lambeth Conference 1958: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with Resolutions and Reports (London, 1958).

The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports (London, 1968).

The Report of the Lambeth Conference 1978 (London, 1978).

The Truth Shall Make You Free: The Lambeth Conference 1988: The Reports, Resolutions & Pastoral Letters from the Bishops (London, 1988).

The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998 (Harrisburg, PA, 1999).

Podmore, C. J., *Aspects of Anglican Identity* (London, 2005).

Podmore, C. J., 'A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of the Episcopal Church and the Church of England Compared', *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church*, 8 (2008): 124–54.

Podmore, C. J., *The Governance of the Church of England and the Anglican Communion* (GS Misc 910) (London, 2009).

Podmore, C. J., 'Re-telling the Tale', *Theology*, 114 (2011): 13–22.

Podmore, C. J., 'Two Streams Mingling: The American Episcopal Church in the Anglican Communion', *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 9 (2011): 12–37.

Simpson, J. B. and E. M. Story, *The Long Shadows of Lambeth X: A Critical Eye-Witness Account of the Tenth Decennial Conference of 462 Bishops of the Anglican Communion* (New York, 1969).

Stephenson, A. M. G., *Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences* (London, 1978).

The Anglican Communion and Anglicanism

Ephraim Radner

What does the phrase ‘Anglican Communion’ refer to? As a concept, it is a contested one. As a social entity, its definition is blurred and perhaps no longer even identifiable. The ecclesial and cultural conflicts among Anglicans in the early twenty-first century led to the realignment of local and national Churches in a way that could only connote rival structures and, behind them, rival understandings of what ecclesial, and in particular Anglican, communion might be.

This was, however, a novel situation. By the late twentieth century, there were administrative structures and procedures in place that provided official and recognized definitions of communion. In particular, the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), which was formed in 1969, had a constitution and set of bylaws that regulated which Churches were its members, and how membership could be altered. An initial ‘schedule of membership’ was provided by the 1968 resolution, but with the understanding that this schedule could and would change, as it has, according to the decisions of the council itself. More fundamentally, the Lambeth Conference of 1930 had given a clear definition of the Anglican Communion in the following terms:

The Anglican Communion is a fellowship, within the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, of those duly constituted dioceses, provinces or regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, which have the following characteristics in common:

- (a) they uphold and propagate the Catholic and Apostolic faith and order as they are generally set forth in the Book of Common Prayer as authorised in their several Churches;
- (b) they are particular or national Churches, and, as such, promote within each of their territories a national expression of Christian faith, life and worship; and

(c) they are bound together not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the bishops in conference.¹

The fact that the rest of this resolution also spoke of the hope of eventually entering into ‘communion with other parts of the Catholic Church not definable as Anglican in the above sense’ points to the fact that ‘communion’ itself was a broader term than its application to Anglicanism in particular, a matter we shall observe in the following, but also a matter of some theological perplexity. Before 1930, the notion and organization of ‘communion’ had, since the late nineteenth century, been an informal, though nonetheless relatively consistently ordered set of experienced and identifiable realities.

To be sure, the ACC was not the Communion itself. As a council, it was only one gathering among several where the Anglican Communion’s Churches were represented. And the Lambeth Conference itself was always clear that its own decisions were not ‘legislative’, and thus its definitions carried no legal weight unless, as in some cases, the 1930 definition was itself incorporated into the constitutions of individual Churches. Nonetheless, these piecemeal claims enjoyed an almost universal stability of acceptance among those who participated in the various gatherings, networks, and widening interchange among Anglicans that characterized the life of an increasingly globalized set of Churches from the early nineteenth century on. Churches that had separated from these participating members—e.g. the Reformed Episcopal Church, the Church of England in South Africa, and later, various catholic-oriented groups who left after later twentieth-century changes the over Prayer Book or over women’s ordination—rarely questioned the shape of the Communion in which they were no longer officially represented.

All this changed in 2000, with the formation of the Anglican Mission in America (AMiA), a group of US clergy and churches who left The (US) Episcopal Church (TEC) and ordered themselves under existing Anglican provinces elsewhere in the world (Rwanda and, initially, South East Asia). These sponsoring provinces, in turn, not only chose to be in communion with the AMiA, but deliberately claimed that this communion *replaced* the communion they had held with TEC.² We could call this practice one of ‘communion replacement’, where one Anglican Church recognized another Church literally within the geographical space of a previously recognized Church. And the practice among certain Churches expanded with further separations in the United States, then Canada, and (much less extensively) Britain, and with the formation of rival Anglican Churches in those places

¹ 1930 Lambeth Conference, Resolution 49.

² Cf. Neela Banerjee, ‘U.S. Bishop, Making It Official, throws in Lot With African Churchman’, *New York Times*, 6 May 2007.

now recognized by some Communion provinces in the place of TEC or the Anglican Church of Canada, or the Church of England. By the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century some Communion Churches were *out* of communion with other Anglican Communion Churches, but were *in* communion with Churches who were rivals to and were viewed as legitimate replacements of these Anglican Communion Churches, yet were not recognized as members of the ACC, nor were their leaders invited to long-standing Anglican gatherings like the Lambeth Conference.

Was this simply a contingent anomaly of the Communion, to be sorted out by existing procedures? It appears not. For along with this practice of 'communion replacement' went the rejection of some of the major organs of the Anglican Communion's self-defining life that had previously articulated the Communion's own existing contours. Hence, by 2008, around 200 bishops, almost a quarter of the total invited, mostly from those provinces recognizing the replacement Anglicans of the United States and Canada, chose not to attend that decade's Lambeth Conference. Similarly, several bishops and primates dropped out of attendance at the ACC and Primates Meeting. At this stage, one could plausibly speak of at best an obscured Communion, or of a dissolving Communion, or perhaps of multiple Communions, some of which were in fact overlapping. But one could also speak of the enactment of different ideas of communion, already long at work over time, whose crystallization or stabilization had not yet occurred and were thus still evolving. Any attempt, therefore, to say that there was 'an Anglican Communion' that was *other* than an evolving *set* of ecclesiological claims held by Churches gathered by blurred parameters would be false. I would prefer this last option of definition, and will now try to trace something of these diverse ideas and claims historically.

THE SEMANTIC ORIGIN OF COMMUNION

The use of the term 'communion' to couple with Anglican Churches follows a fairly straightforward historical, although theologically obscure, path. The word's reference to eucharistic sharing—the 'Holy Communion' of the Book of Common Prayer—in the sixteenth century led quickly to its application to whatever group in fact shared the eucharist. In the early seventeenth century, this communion in which members of the Church of England shared was a more comprehensively 'Protestant' or 'Reformed' communion, and hence had a wide reach that also engaged a number of only broadly defined theological and ecclesiastical elements of teaching and order. By the end of the century, this Reformed communion was increasingly qualified also as 'Catholic' in a general sense. William Sherlock, later archbishop of Canterbury, for example,

wrote a *Discourse Concerning the Nature, Unity, and Communion of the Catholick Church* (1688). But there was no notion of an 'Anglican communion' that existed as a subset of this larger Protestant grouping, the adjective 'Anglican' being a rarely used loan word from the Latin for 'English'.

Within the American colonies, this notion of communion as a kind of ecclesial membership, contrasted with alternative memberships, was tightened by the more narrowly competing groups of mostly Protestant Churches that had grown up there. Church of England members in America found their own identities more clearly marked over and against other often more numerous Protestant Churches. Within this context, a peculiar Anglican 'communion' took on a focused definition. Samuel Johnson, the eighteenth-century American 'apostate' from the Congregationalism of Yale University, who then went on to build up local Connecticut Anglican congregations and later became founding president of King's College in New York, argued for the 'communion' of the American Church of England in terms that were bound to theological and liturgical forms, rather than national interests. Like the Scottish Episcopalians, William White, later to become the first presiding bishop of the new American Episcopalians, could speak of 'our communion' after the Revolution as a specific Church, that somehow spanned the Atlantic in its boundaries, yet which was contrasted with other Churches in the new states. The new Book of Common Prayer of the American Church spoke to the commonalities in its preface (1789) with respect to a relationship with the Church of England that saw no interruption between the two Churches in terms of 'any essential point of doctrine, discipline, and worship'.

At this point, eucharistic fellowship was no longer the key boundary-marker for communion. Rather, a more encompassing identity seemed to be at work. There was something historical, as well as something genetic, in the sense of a dynamism of origins and geographical movement that informed White's ideas: the American Church derived *from* the same body as the Church of England, and thereby shared a common doctrinal and liturgical culture and set of commitments. White's apology for a new 'Episcopal' Church in the young republic, shorn of its juridical ties to the Church of England, was argued on the basis of culture and taste: former members of the Church of England had 'preferences' and 'attachments' to certain forms of worship and order, born of their 'education' and sense of 'agreeableness'. Ethos became an important element here, and would flourish as a principle of Anglicanism in the twentieth century. In practice, it would take several decades for the ordained ministries of Episcopalian priests to be legitimated within the Church of England. But when this took place officially by Act of Parliament in 1840 for both Scottish and American Episcopalians it marked a key transition in the notion and usage of the term 'communion'.

For one thing, it was now the case that the eucharistically centred character of the term had expanded across national ecclesial boundaries. By the

mid-nineteenth century the notion of an 'Anglican' set of Churches existing in some kind of 'communion' with one another—in this case, the United Church of England and Ireland, Scotland, and the United States—began to gain currency. With the legal recognition by Britain of Episcopalian ministries, however, this 'communion' now embraced these Churches, just as theirs embraced England and Ireland's. And within this, the term 'Anglican' began as well to migrate to this larger set of Churches. There was a clear theological payoff to this evolution as well. As one writer of the time enthused, with respect to the 1840 Act, the 'Anglican Church' had now '[taken] up a position becoming her towards her daughter or sister Churches; exhibiting herself as not merely a national, but a truly Catholic Church', in the sense of 'communicat[ing] in all good offices with those who are really one with her in doctrine, discipline, and forms of worship'; another writer in the same journal, referring to 2 Corinthians 1:11, spoke of the Act's repercussions in terms of the pneumatic power of common prayer and 'Church communion'.³ By 1846, William Palmer, celebrated for his promotion of a 'branch theory' of Catholicism, could speak of non-British 'parts' of the 'Anglican Communion' or of the American Episcopal Church as 'the American branch of the Anglican Communion'.⁴

'Anglicanism' entered the English vocabulary, it seems, in the late 1820s, encouraged perhaps by the use of this term on the part of French and German travellers and commentators, attuned, as the period was wont to be, to the peculiarities of national character and attitude.⁵ It was taken up in the later 1830s by English churchmen like John Henry Newman for theological purposes, in arguing for a particular ecclesiology. But joined to 'communion', as the 1840s sense permitted, something new was potentially conjured—a 'way' or 'ethos' that crossed oceans and joined peoples and disparate locales through just such a common character. It might well have been a more traditional theological or political aspect—'reformed' and 'episcopal', 'catholic'. But the phrase would increasingly become the container for a multiplying leaven of meanings.

Perhaps the most consistent and powerful meaning, to which I will return, would end up fastening upon the missionary purpose of the Anglican Communion. It is certainly with this content that the phrase reached its stable meaning by the early 1850s, when a kind of final international sense was given to it through the discussions surrounding the third Jubilee celebrations of the

³ *The Christian Remembrancer, or, The Churchman's Biblical Ecclesiastical, & Literary Miscellany*, 22 (1840), pp. 624 and 625.

⁴ *A Harmony of Anglican doctrine with the doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East* (Aberdeen, 1846), pp. xi, 249.

⁵ Cf. the popular travel volume of Joseph Jean-Baptiste Marie Charles Amédée Pichot, whose English version simply transliterated the French 'anglicanisme': *Historical and Literary Tour of a Foreigner in England and Scotland* (London, 1825), vol. 1, p. x.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) in London in the summer of 1850. American bishops, along with Scottish and colonial bishops were present, and talk of a 'catholic' 'Anglican Communion' was now official.⁶ In the course of the 1860s, the existence of an international 'Anglican Church' and 'Anglican Communion' was unquestioned. This Communion was one that emerged from and gave form to the missionary impulse of Christians out of the Church England. The outward flowing dynamic of this particular communion character—historically tethered and geographically expansive—ordered the coming century's more formal structures.

Behind the gradual congealing of these terms and their meanings lay a range of social realities. Their interaction was too complex and little understood to unravel, so I will simply arrange their description according to certain categories.

First to be considered are *doctrinal and liturgical pressures*. As mentioned earlier, the notion of a 'communion' that is tied to England—is 'Anglican', in other words—originally derived from the post-Reformation debates between English Protestants and the Church of Rome. King James and other seventeenth-century English Protestant apologists understood there to exist a common set of Christian convictions and practices that tied them both to the apostolic Church of Scripture and the first centuries, and to other contemporary faithful Christians. These convictions and practices went beyond England, and their 'Protestant' character was central. What historians call the 'confessionalization' of Europe during this century, however, constricted this communion increasingly to national boundaries. Already, by 1600 in fact, it seemed unlikely that 'communion' could move beyond such frontiers, even though until 1662 the possibility, for instance, of recognizing a communion with continental Reformed and Lutheran Churches was concretized in terms of occasional recognition of orders within the Church of England. Certainly, the deep suspicions and antagonisms towards Rome were not mitigated until the later eighteenth century. In the face of intra-Protestant conflict and civil war within England, positions on episcopacy and liturgy hardened within the Church of England, as it steadily withdrew canonical recognition of other continental Protestant Churches, not to mention English non-Episcopalians. 'Communion' became, from a polity perspective, a national affair, even with a Lutheran monarch like George I sitting on the throne. Many of these arguments and tensions continued to be expressed well into the nineteenth century.

Yet there was a considerable press *against* this constrictive dynamic as well, one that emerged from the search for something beyond division that could engage theological and missionary elements of the faith on a less political

⁶ Robert Semple Boshier, 'The American Church and the Formation of the Anglican Communion, 1823–1853', Lecture at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1962, reproduced at Project Canterbury, <<http://anglicanhistory.org>>.

basis. In the eighteenth century, there had been a curious reversion to a sentiment of Protestant communion, as Lutheran missionaries in India were officially employed as missionaries by the Church Missionary Society (CMS) and others. Although they were given a *pro forma* 'reordination', it was a canonical requirement that was acknowledged by almost all involved as being little more than window-dressing, for better or worse.

In turn, this missionary imperative became the main underlying dynamic of the Anglican Communion's stabilization as a conceptual and ecclesial entity. Before the eighteenth century, Church of England members moved outside of England as emigrant settlers or for commercial reasons, especially to Ireland and North America. Although Christian ministry, lay and ordained, followed, the impetus for a self-conscious missionary identity did not gain force until Thomas Bray's organizational leadership at the end of the seventeenth century provided both a society of missionaries and a theology of mission. Bray's notion of 'Apostolic charity' as a peculiarly British Christian calling, given by God at a providential moment of global access, proved seminal.⁷ In a manner clearly reminiscent of the Great Commandment of Matthew 28, Bray called upon English 'communities of faith' (contrasted especially with Romanists) to bring 'the Nations' into their midst, where proper formation in 'righteousness' could be received. The late seventeenth-century emergence of the religious and charity society movement in Britain constituted a profound cultural shift, wherein religiously and morally enlivened individuals could come together with a goal of contributing to a robustly reconceived public or 'common' good. The geographical extension of the English Church moved quickly, first within Britain's 'Atlantic' matrix of Britain, West Indies, and North America—and later in south-west Africa and Australasia. Palmer's nineteenth-century 'branch' ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion was still imbued with this missionary outlook, as he continued to view the creedal mark of the 'British Churches' holiness', bound to a traditional Anglican interest in moral rejuvenation, in terms mainly of mission (he mentioned America and India). Mission was, he wrote, the supreme mark of 'charity' especially, as it moved to martyrdom.⁸ We see this view, in various forms, expressed over and over in key publications like the *Colonial Church Chronicle*. Its terminus in the linking of an Anglican Communion to a missionary society's celebrated efforts in 1852 was fitting.

Third, the missionary impetus moved in a less direct fashion for American Episcopalians. The non-established character of their Church, and its location

⁷ Thomas Bray, *Apostolic Charity: A Sermon at the Ordination of some Missionaries* (London, 1700); cf. also R. Strong, 'Continuity and Change in Anglican Missionary Theology: Dr Thomas Bray and the 1910 World Missionary Conference', *Journal of Postcolonial Theory and Theology*, 2 (2011): 1–32: <<http://postcolonialjournal.com/Resources/Strong%20JPTT.pdf>>.

⁸ William Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of Christ* (London, 1838), vol. 1, pp. 231–7.

after the Revolution in a highly competitive denominationalist context, muted the providentialist expansionism that the British could easily link to ecclesial existence. In America, persuasive differentiation was an enforced given, and simply moved in a direction opposed to the politically integralist presuppositions of the High Church missionary ties to England, despite the predilections of some Catholic-minded American Anglicans like Johnson, Samuel Seabury, and later John Henry Hobart. White's founding vision for the American Episcopal Church was an ecclesiology of savour, one in which 'taste' and personal desires for a given form of worship and polity deserved democratic space. If the Episcopal Church had some special purchase on the truth of the gospel, it was one that could only be presented in terms of an inclusive American-styled virtue, better represented here than in other denominations. And so, as the nineteenth century wore on, American Episcopalians began to recast their communion as the quintessentially *democratic* Catholic Church, building on the truth of the gospel, while maintaining democracy's supposed openness to choice and individual discrimination. The Episcopal Church would be the 'comprehensive' Church of the nation. This was ordered to a new version of missionary expansionism, which the Church carried to the western United States with a message of popular doctrinal compromise and generous embrace. It was not, however, without its own coercive edge.

Fourth, the nineteenth century thus saw the rise and confluence of two missionary streams that finally gave rise to what became the British–American axis of communion—that is, the Church of England through its colonial Churches, and the Episcopal Church in the United States through its own national expansion, had provided an inclusive set of boundaries that were, in their mutual relation, to define the character of the Anglican Communion. But each brought to this reality differing outlooks and self-conceptions.

Several factors encouraged the practical confluence. Travel by British churchmen to America, and to some extent vice versa, simply enlarged the acquaintance of each Church's life, and as this acquaintance sowed friendships and was publicized in the press, most notably by the American Episcopalian priest and later incumbent in the Church of England, Henry Caswell, in his *America and the American Church* (1839), the political boundaries between Britain and the young United States became less formidable in their ecclesial implications. Another element at work was the specifically Tractarian interest in the character of a non-established Anglican Church, free from the corrupting influence of cultural politics; and the Episcopal Church provided a test case that several High Church and Tractarian leaders like J. H. Newman and Samuel Wilberforce engaged, if often with a sense of anxiety over its inherent fragility. Finally, the enlivening of British missionary endeavour, already long critical in the establishment of the American Church in the eighteenth century, and continuing in Canada, India, and Australasia, now turned with attention and some inspiration to

American Episcopalian church work in the rapidly westward moving frontier of the United States.

The American Church provided an example of functioning synodical life that many Anglicans elsewhere viewed as empowering of missionary expansion, and it proved an important element in the rise of colonial Church independence, in some tension with attempts at synodical and legislative reform in England. Further, the American experience of missionary bishops, and of seeing the Church as a whole as a single 'missionary society', remained a provocative model of mission that continued into the twentieth century to prod international Anglican discussions, ones that were constantly trying to balance the interests of 'national' mission with the energies of individual missionary societies. But concerns over American doctrinal dilution, self-conscious nationalism, and democratic anti-Catholic tendencies dogged British evaluations of the Episcopal Church's growing influence—worries already expressed by Newman and Wilberforce, despite their attraction to the American Church.

Anglicanism's identity as an 'imperial Christianity' thus developed in two directions. The British form, which linked Anglican mission with the expansion of 'Greater Britain', was something that nonetheless stood in a critical relationship with the needs of the state, despite its general linkage of Christianity with the Christian goods of British civilization. There was, underlying this outlook, a hope that the missionary outcome would be both local and national Churches around the world whose self-ordering energies and central stability would be given in their gospel commitments and episcopal apostolicity. Indeed, the bonds viewed as connecting ecclesially separate national episcopacies became the primary lens through which to view communion as a whole, in this British model, and it reframed the idea of a Christian empire in a new way, one that was based on cooperation and finally on an ordered 'confederation'. This was a political understanding of communion that self-consciously mirrored the civil hopes of apologists for Greater Britain like the historian John Seeley, who saw the natural and just evolution of empire as giving way to a universal cooperative grouping of liberal Christian nations.⁹ Seeley's ideas played a formative role in the late-nineteenth century Anglican congresses. They were mirrored by more directly engaged thinkers like Alfred Barry, later bishop of Sydney, who was one of the first synthetic theorists of the Anglican Communion as a body, upholding Seeley's notion of a kind of federated set of independent Churches, capable of doing local evangelism on their own terms.¹⁰

⁹ Cf. D. S. Bell, 'Unity and Difference: John Robert Seeley and the Political Theology of International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, 31 (2005): 559–79.

¹⁰ Cf. E. D. Daw, 'Electing a Primate: Alfred Barry and the Diocese of Sydney, 1882–1883', *Royal Australian Historical Society Journal and Proceedings*, 66 (1980–1): 237–57.

While Evangelical and Catholic Anglicans would, of course, gauge the emphases differently, in practice episcopal essentialism predominated, given the way that resources were allocated to mission, especially with the founding of the Colonial Bishops Fund in 1841, whose support of episcopal ministries around the world remained shaped by High Church concerns. This episcopal essentialism remained in place throughout the twentieth century, even within Evangelical areas of the Communion. But it also upheld the cooperative vision that finally took the concrete form of the Lambeth Conferences, beginning in 1867.

American imperial Christianity was perhaps less significant than its British counterpart in the formation of the Anglican Communion. Deriving from the experience of a minority Church, whose original ecclesiology of savour fastened its self-justification in the realm of sentiment, it drew its energies from identifying itself with a 'spirit' rather than with political forms. This spirit was variously interpreted, but finally congealed around the conviction that the Episcopal Church was the most expressive vehicle for American democratic virtues. The goal of the Episcopal Church's expansion, which moved then beyond the United States to Latin America and then the Philippines and Asia by the early twentieth century, followed an emancipatory narrative tied to American freedoms, in which the Church properly reflected this story rather than politically reshaping it. The astounding address of Bishop McCoskry of Michigan at the 1852 SPG Jubilee was an extreme, though hardly idiosyncratic, version of this. After describing the Church of England's imperial destiny as putting all 'the islands of the sea . . . under our control' (that is, the control of English-speaking Anglicans) for the sake of a single Church of Christ, McCoskry spoke of America's part in this pincer movement:

Of late our territorial possessions have been greatly enlarged. California, New Mexico, and Oregon have been added . . . and thus responsibilities greatly increased. Sooner or later Mexico and south America must come under Saxon control . . . even the walls of that old spiritual Jericho, Rome, will fall flat.¹¹

TWO COMMUNIONS IN SINGLE MISSION

Several factors maintained the coherence of this confluence of missionary visions throughout the mid-twentieth century. It is the dissolution of these realities that significantly explained the Communion's uncertain reordering in the early twenty-first century.

¹¹ Quoted in H. G. G. Herklots, *The Church of England and the American Episcopal Church: From the First Voyages of Discovery to the First Lambeth Conference* (London, 1966), pp. 157–8.

From about 1850 to 1970 various formal and informal ecclesial structures arose, through relative ad hoc decisions and procedures that continued and furthered the missionary confluence. First, as we have mentioned, the SPG Jubilee celebrations of 1852 marked the first formal gathering of the Anglo-American missionary nexus to which the term 'Anglican Communion' was given. The closer networks of communication that were associated with this movement, and which made use of the possibilities of easier and more rapid travel, enabled concerns over local ecclesial tensions to be shared around the world. Hence, when disputes in South Africa and worries over Evangelical-Catholic balances of influence in Canada and elsewhere arose, the desire for common resolutions that crossed these boundaries emerged with even greater force. The calling of a conference of world Anglican bishops to Lambeth, in 1867, represented the most famous and lasting response, in the form of what became the decennial Lambeth Conferences. From the beginning, there were disagreements and tensions over the very meaning of such a gathering, and its implications for further Anglican cooperation, with some favouring a movement towards a full-scale 'pan-Anglican synod', and others decidedly drawing away from it. Without question, the Lambeth Conferences, and the resolutions and sometimes common letters that came out of them, came to define the profile of the Anglican Communion to the larger public, both popularly and more formally in ecumenical terms. The 1920 Lambeth Conference's Encyclical Letter as well as its Resolution 9, known as the 'Appeal to All Christian People' for the reunion of Christendom, came to stand as the unsurpassed expression of fundamental Anglican 'communion ecclesiology', before the phrase became popular. The Anglican Communion's world-wide reality, now spoken of as a 'Church', was compared in its challenges to those facing 'the unity of the Catholic Church' itself, and thus the Christian burdens of the Communion's life were viewed as similarly inescapable and solemn. The discussions and decisions emanating from these conferences had, if not legislative sanction for represented Churches, at least 'moral influence' in how Churches came to see the Anglican culture in which they operated. Hence, resolutions dissolving the essential place of the Articles of Religion for communion, and related Prayer Book revision, or those dealing with divorce and contraception were to be seen as key determinants in shifting Anglican commitments.

But, as events in the latter part of the twentieth century demonstrated, especially with respect to women's ordination and sexuality, Lambeth resolutions had limited formative power in many circumstances, and the gathering's status as an invited conference, in the exclusive hands of the archbishop of Canterbury, meant that its status as a definer of Anglican Communion was literally idiosyncratic. Just as important as Lambeth, if not more so, were the many conferences and networks that flourished from the later nineteenth century that drew together representatives, ordained and lay, who shared

more directly the peculiar dynamics of communion that were embodied and unleashed by the SPG Jubilee—that is to say, missionary conferences and then ‘pan-Anglican’ conferences. Arguably, these ultimately had greater influence on the shapes of communion that arose in the later twentieth century.

‘Communion’ concerns were discussed in missionary journals more than elsewhere, and bishops did their work together around ‘communion’ issues mostly at missionary meetings. While Lambeth Conferences dealt with a variety of issues, many of them specifically missionary in nature, they delegated their consultative executive groups to missionary gatherings in particular. The 1894 Missionary Conference in London was an episcopally led affair. From then on, in tandem both with Lambeth and with larger missionary conferences, like Edinburgh in 1910, Jerusalem in 1928, and Tamburam in 1938, the lines between wider missionary concern and Anglican Communion matters were not only blurred, but deliberately merged. All three Anglican Congresses—London in 1908, Minneapolis in 1954, and finally Toronto in 1963—were the products of these missionary orientations, the first organized by the Mission Boards of York and Canterbury, and the subsequent ones coming out of Lambeth’s stated missionary concerns. It was clear that ‘Anglican Communion’ meant ‘mission’, quite simply, and with all the breadth of the complex religious and moral-political meaning that the Christian gospel in Anglican form had come to bear. The celebrated document on ‘Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence’ (MRI) that was promulgated from the Toronto Congress, finally, was the product of the representatives of Anglican missionary groups, the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy of Lambeth, and the Lambeth Consultative Body, Primates and Metropolitans whose gathering, relatively infrequent, for several decades, formed the basis of both the later ACC and the Primates Meeting.

All of these missionary gatherings and groups, and others before them, since the founding of the Colonial Bishops’ Fund after 1841 at Bishop Blomfield’s instigation, shared a range of concerns consistent up to 1963 at least. The fault-lines of attitude were expressed early on, emerging as conflictual only later in the twentieth century. Some of the common threads of discussion were as follows. What forms should mission take?—societies versus dioceses versus national Churches? What questions of funding were there? Should there be unity of teaching among all Anglican Churches in the world, or what kind of diversity makes sense? How should the need for and raising up of native clergy and leaders be addressed? How should engagement with diverse cultures and religious outlooks take place, and how should it be done faithfully? What about the uniformity and diversity of liturgical outlooks? What about nationalism versus catholicity? What were the challenges of poverty and, increasingly by the early twentieth century, of war and global disarray? The first public calls for a ‘pan-Anglican’ synod, which had already been mentioned forty years before at the time of the SPG Jubilee, came at the

Missionary Conference of 1894, where questions of the nature of ecclesial relationship among Anglican Churches were repeatedly discussed, with missionary hopes generally pressing in the direction of conciliar and centralized forms of organization. Lambeth, of course, would speak of similar matters, but that was only because the wider missionary dynamics of the Anglican Churches of the world were the bedrock of all gatherings.

Many of these concerns derived from some of the differing Anglo-American conceptions of *imperium*, even as they were both held together and themselves transformed by certain common missionary features. Hence, the so-called 'political' framework of imperial Britain, often charged with a Church of England-centric and culturally arrogant power over Anglican Communion developments, was actually transformed by this more central missionary focus, into a 'federalizing' hope (strongly understood) that came to characterize Anglican thinking into the twenty-first century: it was the power of *evangelism*—what the Minneapolis Pan-Anglican Congress of 1954 still called 'zeal for souls'—that had carried the gospel to the world, and that now permitted the Church to reflect a true 'communion of nations', capable of 'gathering' as equals before the sight of God and the world, in the words of Bishop Foss Westcott at the 1894 Missionary Conference.¹² Though it may have tended, theologically, to a more Catholic conception, this Evangelical-political vision was carried through and given more weight after the First World War, especially as Lambeth shaped Communion self-identity in terms of reconciling unity for the sake of the world (especially the 1920 conference). Meanwhile, the American imperial vision of communion was tempered by the less nationalistic character of 'world evangelism', even while its own democratic and liberal chauvinism was granted a larger stage for commendation that tended to press in a more diverse and 'nationalist' direction. On the whole, though, worries over Anglican Communion identity and structure were but the logical outcome to the still-pressing and deeper interest in the world-transformative fruit of the evangelistic vocation.

It is important to stress this point: many of the practical and structural concerns that had percolated, often quite evidently, among Anglican Churches during the one hundred years or so of the formal Communion's acknowledged existence enlivened rather than subverted contacts and shared ministry, largely because of the sustaining breadth of missionary vision that leaders maintained. It was only as this commonly held missionary vision fragmented that the concerns themselves became destabilizing.

¹² 'Christ calls us to a rekindled zeal for souls', as a central part of the Congress's Final Report puts it; cf. Powel Mills Dawley (ed.), *Report of The Anglican Congress 1954* (Greenwich, CT, 1954), p. 199; B. F. Westcott's Inaugural Sermon to the 1894 Conference is found on pp. 1–9 of the *Official Report of the Missionary Conference of the Anglican Communion* (London, 1894).

MID-CENTURY CROSSROADS

One key emerging force for fragmentation in the twentieth century was the breakup of a unified Anglican leadership which, for a century, had basically shared a general commitment to a common moral and catholic episcopal order that provided the vehicle for the more basic apostolic and evangelistic thrust of Communion life. The Anglican episcopate around the world had been extremely cohesive sociologically, a reality that seems to have overshadowed, even while encouraging in an often unaware fashion, the possibilities of a fruitful 'nationalism' that would later prove a challenge to Anglican unity. Until the late twentieth century almost all non-American Anglican bishops, including missionary bishops, attended a small range of British public schools and Oxbridge, following generally a classical degree and reading theology only peripherally. Even the rise of separate seminaries in the latter half of the nineteenth century had changed little when it came to bishops. Whether in India or Africa, whether Evangelical, High Church, or Broad, missionary bishops around the world came from the same backgrounds, studied at the same institutions, and had little foundational theology apart from the Bible and formularies, and whatever private reading they may have found congenial.

Two things can be said from this. First, the theological 'default' (although substantive) for the modern Anglican Communion until recently, apart from the United States and Scotland (and even there, once there was common engagement), was the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Second, the self-conscious ecclesiological engine informing the Communion's life was not derived from theological conceptions of this or that school of thought, but from the more general evangelistic outlook, adorned by certain shared moral assumptions, whose force lay in their episcopal propagation. Indeed, moral and political concerns, whatever their differences, were functionally epiphenomenal to these commonalities of classical education, Prayer Book religion, and evangelistic impetus. To be sure, sometimes these elements acted as major prods, often obstacles and scandals, but they were almost always secondary.

But by the mid-twentieth century, commitments that had been held consistently among High and Low churchmen now required ways of being addressed that could no longer rely on informal organizational continuities. Not only were bishops increasingly educated, along with their clergy, in a variety of ways, but obviously as the indigenous episcopacy increased, so did the variety of their educational and cultural backgrounds. Thus, although the issues of national and cultural difference among Anglican Churches were emerging as important topics from the late nineteenth century, they did not become problematic to Communion life until after the mid-twentieth century. At the 1948 Lambeth Conference, this point was already recognized. The Report on the Anglican Communion, chaired by the bishop of Quebec, Philip

Carrington, was a landmark discussion here.¹³ The long list of consistently examined issues I have already noted were discussed here. But there was now a note of urgency over the need for better ways of engaging diversity and national independence. The world, after the conflagrations of the previous decade, was seen as beset by fragmentation and conflict again, and the Churches were called to a vocation of reconciliation that explicitly harked back to the 1920 Appeal.

The character of the Communion, and hence the meaning of communion itself as a Christian ecclesial reality, was laid bare here in the struggling tensions that would break apart in the coming years, the dynamics of Christian cultural diversity pressing over against the pull towards coordinated and coherent witness. The Carrington Report pointed to a range of elements which the Anglican Communion depended upon: consultation, simple and fundamental doctrinal commonalities, the *consensus fidelium*, and so on, using the term 'interdependence' to characterize all this.¹⁴ The Communion was, at this time, being offered a specific missionary 'character' of mutuality, termed 'giving and receiving' in the build-up to the Lambeth Conference.¹⁵ But it also noted a worry over the 'internal disruptions' caused by too much Prayer Book variation, acknowledged the tensions between British and American administrative models, and finally commended and called for the opening of a common Anglican centre for theological education for the Communion at St Augustine's College at Canterbury, a school that had functioned for a century as a missionary college, but had been destroyed in the war. Carrington himself pressed these same elements more pointedly in his 1954 address at the Minneapolis Congress. Each of these concerns, finally, found its place in the now celebrated document that emerged from the 1963 Toronto Pan-Anglican Congress, known as MRI (Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence).¹⁶ More than any other Anglican conference, the gathering at Toronto was coloured by a sense of world political and social crisis—war and dislocation, Communism, revolution, growing non-Christian religions, and spiritually depleting secularism—and a tottering Anglican missionary response weakened by pinched resources and lack of vision.

The MRI document was itself only a few pages long. It spoke generally and unremarkably of mission, unity, obedience, and the need for Anglican Churches around the world to help one another. The bulk of the document,

¹³ The 'Report on the Anglican Communion' (IV) in *The Lambeth Conferences (1867–1948): The Reports of the 1920, 1930, and 1948 Conferences, with Selected Resolutions from the Conferences of 1867, 1878, 1888, 1897, and 1908* (London, 1948), pp. 81–94.

¹⁴ 'Report on the Anglican Communion', p. 86.

¹⁵ Cf. E. R. Morgan and Roger Lloyd (eds.), *The Mission of the Anglican Communion* (London, 1948), pt. II, pp. 133–209.

¹⁶ 'Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ', in Eugene R. Fairweather (ed.), *Anglican Congress 1963: Report of Proceedings* (Toronto, 1963), p. 118.

however, was devoted to outlining concrete areas where such partnership was called for: a US\$15 million fund for training, church construction, and new dioceses; a call for new vocations, or 'manpower', to carry out the Church's work around the world; pressure for new inter-Church 'consultation', and a few general suggestions for institutionalizing this; an exhortation for each Church of the Communion to order its priorities according to missionary partnership; and finally, a general demand for 'mature' and 'non-sentimental' rethinking of the 'nature of the Anglican Communion' as a 'united' missionary 'body': 'Mission is not the kindness of the lucky to the unlucky; it is mutual, united obedience to the one God whose mission it is. The form of the Church must reflect that.'¹⁷

But several things had changed by 1963. First, the movement for structural response to the Communion's diversification had already begun in 1948, with the constitution of the Lambeth Consultative Body/Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy. The 1958 Conference had called for a Communion 'Executive Officer' to coordinate activities and consultations among the Churches; this was to be Stephen Bayne, an episcopal bishop and indefatigable traveller.¹⁸ The members of these committees, along with the missionary societies, and led by Bayne, were the people who articulated MRI and presented it to the Toronto Congress. The articulation itself, however, went along with a now concrete embodiment of all the hopes and claims of diversity. At Lambeth 1867, seventy-six Anglo-American bishops were in attendance; by Lambeth 1948, among the 349 bishops in attendance, there were nine non-Western bishops, and only one African. At the Minneapolis Pan-Anglican Congress in 1954, there were twelve native bishops, and now Islam was discussed with some concern. In Toronto, even though American attendance was more than double Church of England representation—over 300—there were over twenty-five non-Western indigenous bishops, and over 161 non-Western delegates. It was a striking shift that was well etched in the public's perceptions. Their voices were heard, and some, like Bishop John Sadiq, of Nagpur, India, took prominent roles in the conference itself.

The reality of national diversity, founded on the rapid passing over of the Anglican Churches around the world to indigenous leadership after the Second World War, was ineluctable. But it was also confusing, and its later reformulation as a challenge in terms of 'globalization' in practice barely advanced understanding. Bayne himself, for instance, was well aware of the range of social, political, and cultural elements that were evolving in diverse directions among Anglican Churches, and whose moral challenges demanded cooperative study and response. But his vision never went beyond the need

¹⁷ Fairweather (ed.), *Anglican Congress 1963*, p. 121.

¹⁸ Cf. J. Zink, 'Changing World, Changing Church: Stephen Bayne and "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence"', *Anglican Theological Review*, 93 (2011): 243–62.

itself, and when it came to the ecclesial character of the Communion in the face of such need, he had little to say except to go beyond the Carrington Report and now simply state as a fact that the 1662 Prayer Book was no longer a means of unity among Anglicans.¹⁹ Instead, some other spirit was necessary. It was a stunning admission, in the light of past assumptions, and its truth was joined to the multiplying forms of theological education that had been emerging around the Communion by the second half of the twentieth century. For a set of Churches for whom theological education had always been a secondary concern, given the strong underlying bonds of the Prayer Book as understood by a classically trained common episcopate, this development, only vaguely grasped in 1963, proved significant: national diversification, once it spread its wings, had little to build on with respect to theological formation. And in fact local churches subsequently drifted between unfocused mediocrity in formation, or towards particular political concerns and cultural inventions unassimilable within the larger Communion's shared theological grammar.

CONTESTED MISSION, CONTESTED COMMUNION(S)

After the 1963 congress, two other unexpected elements emerged that undermined the hoped-for usefulness that Bayne wanted for the new Communion structures. The first was the unstable and quickly waning US domination of ecclesial life in the Communion. In the 1950s and 1960s, all the talk was of how the American Church was now taking over the leadership mantle of the Communion from the British. There was good reason to speculate about this: the earlier part of the century had seen a tremendous growth in Episcopal Church mission outside its boundaries, and already before that Anglicans around the world looked with envy at the growth of TEC within America itself, seeing that Church as a truly 'missionary' body. With America's political profile exponentially enhanced after the Second World War, her leadership was unquestioned in Church circles. But it proved a passing moment, despite the money TEC dispersed. Who could have predicted The Episcopal Church's precipitous decline in membership and energies in the past few decades of the twentieth century? The reasons for the decline itself—paralleled in Canada and yet more strikingly in Britain—are complex and debated.

Joined to this, the evangelistic thrust of the Anglican Communion as a formal body (as opposed to its individual member Churches from, for example, Africa and Asia) impelling both British and American contributions to the Communion's development also declined drastically and quickly in

¹⁹ Bayne's statement is given in Fairweather (ed.), *Anglican Congress 1963*, p. 184.

energy. Part of this decline was tied to important rethinking of the character of Christian mission itself, both in its former imperial modes, and in its theological foundations. The story is complex, and is tied to a range of political, scholarly, and theological developments that touched far more than Anglicanism. But, apart from the specific congregations and smaller groups that identified themselves as 'Evangelical', the wider elements of Anglo-American Anglicanism not only lost interest in evangelism as a central task of the Church, but in many cases actually repudiated it. The tensions were evident in the 1998 Lambeth Report on mission entitled *Called to Live and Proclaim the Good News* (Section Two), where evangelization, dialogue and presence, and economic justice jostle among the driving foci of the material. A glance at the 'resources' shows a divide between practical material for evangelism drawn from non-Western sources, and more academic economic and social discussions oriented to Britain and North America.²⁰ The ongoing centralization of the Communion's official bureaucratic functions within the hands of Anglo-Americans (discussed further in the following) meant that official Communion-wide orientations generally followed this turn away from evangelism. The so-called 'Decade of Evangelism' that was called for by Lambeth 1988, and that unfolded to great fanfare and then disappointment in the 1990s, in fact exposed a deep divide between numerically declining older and vibrant younger Churches in the Communion. The recognition of this divide on the part of the latter was probably a significant element in awakening their distrust of the Communion's leadership more broadly.

For evangelistic mission had remained central to what some called the 'Majority Communion'—those Anglican Churches in Africa and Asia especially, whose origins and ecclesial culture often lay more in an Evangelical outlook, and whose numbers, by the 1980s, had grown enough to surpass significantly their Western counterparts. According to the World Christian Database, in 2008 African Anglicans alone made up well over half of the world's estimated 80 million Anglicans.²¹ Hope for positively engaging post-colonial diversity within the Communion remained widely held, but it was a great disappointment that the still loose organization of the Anglican Communion, in the face of pressing Christian diversity, was translated by Western Anglicans into a change in *missionary* commitment that had, in the past, been the main motor of the Communion's life. Majority-world Anglicans, already successful in their own local evangelistic efforts in ways that surprised many, increasingly saw the need to forge their own networks of mutual support apart from Western Anglicans. Gatherings like the South-South Encounters begun in 1994 (in Kenya) turned into movements that, finally, fragmented the

²⁰ Cf. the Report at: <<http://www.aco.org/ministry/mission/resources/documents/1998lambethsection2.pdf>>, accessed Sept. 2015.

²¹ At: <<http://www.worldchristianDATABASE.org/wcd/>>, accessed Sept. 2015.

Communion's previous lines of recognition and cooperation. Other gatherings and councils served to forge identities outside of the older Churches, including the Council of Anglican Provinces in Africa (CAPA), the Global South Steering Committee, and the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON), which first met in 2008 in Jerusalem, issuing a still-fundamental organizing Declaration, as a kind of alternative to the Lambeth Conference that year, and attracted many of the bishops who boycotted the Lambeth Conference of that year, along with leaders of the North American Anglicans who had left TEC and the Anglican Church of Canada. Perhaps more than anything, this missionary divergence underlay the weakening and reconsideration of Communion structures. Given that the Anglican Communion's own genetic character was bound to such evangelistic mission, these structures, by the 1980s, were already pressing to escape the improvisatory bonds that Bayne had left.

Much attention had been spent on these structures since the 1960s. Following the Toronto Congress, and under Bayne's leadership, the institution of the Communion's 'Executive Officer', which Bayne pioneered with enormous energy, hope, and savvy, was now supplemented with a staff and office. In the place of the Lambeth Consultative Council, the Anglican Consultative Council was formed, with episcopal, clergy, and lay representation; and Bayne's Executive Officer was changed to the post of the Council's Secretary-General. Soon, Lambeth's Missionary Strategy group was retooled as the Primates Meeting. These instruments were meant to be more representative of the Communion's diversity, and more reflective of its mutual interdependence. Programmes like 'Partners in Mission', or PIM, were put together, including consultations and companion dioceses—reflecting the new emphasis on 'partnership', rather than one-way and top-down mission.

Many of these and subsequent efforts were criticized as both maintaining the power of Western Churches in the distribution of resources and decision-making, and as taken over by 'shopping-list' relationships—poorer Churches asking for money for this and that, richer Churches giving it, but exercising control and patronage. To be sure, none of the structures that emerged after the Toronto Congress were more than provisional attempts to respond to the great demands that MRI represented. Bayne called them 'improvisations'; they had little theological or ecclesiological weight.²² The challenge, however, was that these improvisations themselves began to encourage the entrenchment of interests and power by this or that group. The Communion Office in London became the centre of specific organizational authority, appointing, organizing, and setting the agenda for representative functions, commissions, and Communion-wide meetings, in ways that were, by the very nature of the

²² Fairweather (ed.), *Anglican Congress 1963*, pp. 193–4.

case, narrowly controlled. As a result, whatever their intentions, the office and its functions became less and less integrated with the diversifying growth outside of the Western Churches. Still, until the Virginia and Windsor Reports of the late twentieth century, which deliberately addressed the ecclesiological issues of the Anglican Communion, and the Covenant process, which practically sought to put in place some of the suggestions these reports had offered, no serious ecclesiological attempt to get *beyond* improvisation was made.

But the attempt was in fact desperately needed. For, despite the compelling character of something like MRI, certain common threads in the Communion had already begun to unravel, and continued to do so into the early twenty-first century. As we have seen, by 1963, no longer did world bishops necessarily share a common educational, let alone social background. The hope that was St Augustine's College in Canterbury—a place for common Anglican Communion formation—dissolved when the school was closed in 1967, with somewhat bitter recriminations by its last warden, Kenneth Cragg, directed towards Archbishop Ramsey's neglect, even dismissal of the institution.²³ Ongoing resentments over relationships of patronization and Western bureaucratic dominance increased, rather than decreased, as non-Western Churches began to look to one another as potential partners, and the growth of a South–South axis of Churches began to emerge. Diversity and engagement with it was both inevitable and valued by most. But issues touching on 'nations' as political cultures which Anglican Churches are somehow expressive of—the remnants of the British, and to a far lesser extent American, notions of an imperial federalism among a multiplied set of new Christian countries—became simply unwieldy from both a political and ecclesial perspective, so that the hope of 'post-colonialism' as a constructive category for Communion discourse proved illusory. Indeed, the Anglican Communion in fact followed almost the exact path of political internationalism, as a mirror of such political relations over the past fifty years. Although such internationalism was perhaps a given, it was also an impossibly resolved given, in that it was inevitably conflictual. In the face of realities like human rights, genocide, and climate change, the notion of national autonomies that twentieth-century Anglicanism tried to balance seemed increasingly wrongly stated.

This was generally ignored throughout the 1970s. The Anglican Communion was something that could be formally represented in ecumenical organizations and dialogues, through individuals chosen either by the Communion Office, or the archbishop of Canterbury, by means of often opaque nominating processes that were rarely public. International organizations like the World Council of Churches had by this time begun to lose traction in the moral imaginations of Church leaders, and with this decline of interest went the

²³ Kenneth Cragg, 'The Central College of the Anglican Communion 1952–1967', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 59 (June, 1990): 224–42.

diminishment of the initiating role Anglicans had played on the ecumenical scene since the early twentieth century. Nonetheless, certain theologically significant bilateral dialogues, notably the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC), gave rise to conceptualizations of ecclesial communion more generally that were to deeply influence Anglican discussions about their own structural challenges, for better or worse.²⁴ That is, when Communion-wide efforts began, in the 1980s, to consider the necessary adjustments in the organization of international Anglicanism, they turned to these ecumenical categories for help.

Three key documents on this score followed in sequence. In 1996, the Virginia Report was published. It was written in response to a request by the 1988 Lambeth Conference that theological reflection be done on the meaning of 'communion', in the wake of division over women's ordination and the likely consecration of a woman bishop. The report was the final product of consultations by a group appointed by the archbishop of Canterbury, eventually known as the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission. It engaged especially the more juridical questions of order and oversight within the Communion, and pressed for bolstering the authority of current groups like the Primates Meeting.

The 1998 Lambeth Conference issued, among other things, a contentious resolution asserting the incompatibility of homosexual partnerships with scriptural teaching and ecclesial practice, and this topic quickly took the place of women's ordination as an occasion for ecclesial debate. This was largely because of the rapidly multiplying divisions on the ground that immediately followed; as gay advocacy groups, including clergy and bishops, organized for change in opposition to the Lambeth resolution, other groups simply left to form alternative Anglican Churches and jurisdictions, supported by the coordinated involvement of some global South bishops. In 2008, a gathering of several until then separate groupings of Churches that had departed the Episcopal and Canadian Churches, including several entire dioceses in the United States, was formed, known as the Anglican Church in North America (ACNA), under the leadership of Archbishop Robert Duncan, former bishop of Pittsburgh in TEC. After the 2003 consecration of Gene Robinson, a partnered gay priest, as bishop of New Hampshire, another group appointed by Canterbury, at the request of the Communion's primates, consulted and produced the Windsor Report. Published in 2004, it took up a number of themes from the Virginia Report, but explored them with an applicative focus on the current divisions over Robinson's consecration and developing splits in North America, now involving other Communion

²⁴ Cf. ARCIC II, *The Church As Communion* (1991).

Churches.²⁵ The report concretized further the structural recommendations of Virginia, and suggested specific actions with respect to the current crisis.

One of these suggestions called for the articulation and adoption of a Communion-wide ‘covenant’, that might lay out the basis and limits for common life among Anglican Churches. Rowan Williams, then archbishop of Canterbury, favoured this approach, and appointed a Covenant Design Group to draft such a document. The group met from 2007 through to 2009. The draft it produced attempted to distil doctrinal, missional, and structural fundamentals that all Anglican Churches could accept as definitive of their communion relationship, should they wish to retain it.²⁶ It also outlined processes for dispute resolution among Anglican Churches and related issues.

What all three documents had in common was a primary commitment to what had become a consistent ecumenical understanding of the Church as ‘Communion’, growing out of discussions between Anglicans and Roman Catholics especially. They drew as well on Anglican–Orthodox agreed statements and a wider ecumenical consensus, whose origins, arguably, were tied to the conceptions offered by Anglican ecumenical leadership in the 1920s. This understanding of communion tended to be episcopally focused and it valued visible structures of unity; it was also ordered towards a mutually accountable diversity of character among Churches. The chasm between ecumenical experts’ interests and the growing missionary divide, however, meant that these quite serious and theologically substantive offerings were met with general lack of interest. Attention of leaders in response to these documents focused almost exclusively, for instance, on the issues of ‘where’ Communion decision-making should happen—should it be the primates, or the ACC, or some other committee?—and on seemingly stark arguments over local autonomy. These issues were driven less by theology than by deeply divergent practices of ministry whose perpetuation by respective proponents was the chief strategic concern driving decisions. While some theologians struggled with the meaning of ‘communion’ in a way that might imply structural reform, many lay and clerical leaders, in Anglo-America especially, pressed for a status quo ante understanding, as they saw it, of the Communion’s Churches pre-1998, which they understood in terms of unencumbered ‘bonds of affection’ without structural constraints on local ecclesial life and teaching.

It was clear, however, when over a quarter of the Communion’s bishops, mostly from the global South, boycotted the 2008 Lambeth Conference, that something deeply problematic had taken place. The 2009 ACC ended in anger and recriminations, with the Covenant text the council had been asked to commend sent back for further revision, while resignations from the council’s

²⁵ The Lambeth Commission on Communion, *The Windsor Report* (London, 2004).

²⁶ *The Anglican Communion Covenant*, at: <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/99905/The_Anglican_Covenant.pdf>.

working group followed. After that, the spectre of 'alternative structures' hung over the Communion as a whole, led primarily by the Global Anglican Future Conference, a large group of mostly global South Evangelicals, along with North Americans who had left TEC, and ACoC and Sydney Anglicans. Communion replacement, as noted at the beginning of this essay, was now established as a legitimate practice recognized by many. Openly expressing their sense that the four current 'Instruments of Unity' (or 'Communion') for the Communion had lost their effectiveness, the Gafcon leadership pressed for reordering the Communion on the basis of a confessional document, bound to Reformation principles, known as the Jerusalem Declaration.²⁷ Parallel to this, the global South primates took on the task, if asked, of overseeing churches that decided to depart from their current provincial affiliations.²⁸ All this placed the halting theological enquiries on the nature of Anglicanism's communion back to square one, as definitions of ecclesial existence and common life, not to mention the particular characteristics of 'Anglicanism', were seemingly tossed back into a pot of reinvention. The contraction of Western Churches and their resources, including, perhaps most importantly, the fragile integrity of the Church of England as a unified Church, meant that the structures themselves that were left in 1963 or led up to them, were now in serious doubt as both morally compelling and financially viable.

CONCLUSION

The Anglican Communion, in the early twenty-first century, was not simply a contested entity; it was in the process of changing its actual meaning. But that was because the Anglican Communion, as a concept, was the product of Churches whose relationships and self-identities were themselves fluid. It is best to see the phrase as pointing to an evolving *set* of ecclesiological claims held by Churches gathered together within *blurred parameters*. That did not mean that there was nothing identifiably Anglican about them; if nothing else, each Anglican Church shared with others a common set of legal principles of order that provided a pragmatically distinct family resemblance.²⁹ These principles even oriented each Church to something called the Anglican Communion.³⁰ But the actual referent of this Communion was unevenly specified

²⁷ The full text of the Declaration can be found at: <<http://fca.net/resources/the-complete-jerusalem-statement>>.

²⁸ Global South Communiqué of Feb. 2014.

²⁹ Cf. Norman Doe's notion of an 'emergent *ius commune*' among Anglican Churches, in *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* (London, 2008), p. 110.

³⁰ Cf. Doe, *Principles*, pp. 25–7.

in the actual canons of Communion Churches, and rarely granted a defined theological explication. This allowed for a definitional and indeed practical fluidity with respect to Communion life that was subject to identifiable directions of change. The outline of this evolution could be summarized in the following way.

By the end of the seventeenth century, communion was seen by Church of England thinkers in terms of a general Protestant ‘communion’ of mutual recognition among bounded national Churches. During the eighteenth century, this notion narrowed to one centred more specifically on the Church of England and her related Churches (for example in Ireland, Scotland, and the colonies in America): communion referred to a shared liturgy and perhaps doctrinal and moral ethos. Beginning in the eighteenth century, however, another understanding of communion began to develop, one that grew in prominence and articulation in the nineteenth century—communion as a missionary movement, whose engagement gave rise to an expanding family of Churches. The inner meaning of this communion took on an increasingly diverse character, while its explicated forms and consequences would vary among leaders in their soteriological, moral, political, and sometimes explicitly imperial, emphases. Nonetheless, by the 1840s, a group of Churches concretely identified as ‘the Anglican Communion’ had been defined, and that definition was bound to the missionary dynamic of the Church of England and her related sister Churches. By the twentieth century, this missionary character had become deeply embedded in Communion thinking, but it was joined to a developing understanding of communion as an ecumenical icon and instrument. It was one, however, whose articulation within self-conscious apprehensions of ecclesial and cultural diversity tracked with changes in the political shape of an internationalizing global context. The missionary character of the Anglican Communion remained vital in many parts of the world, but by the end of the twentieth century, tensions and finally open conflict arose between it and the centrifugal forces of local diversity that were loosening previously unquestioned ties of common life and that had begun fuelling the more inward-looking concerns of the older Anglo-American Churches. The pluralistic global setting in which this conflict was being played out remained uncertain and theologically clouded.

The ‘Anglican Communion’ was left as something unsettled and in motion. Gerald Bray, a conservative Evangelical Anglican scholar, noted, with commendation, the way that debates over sexuality were engaged among Anglicans by then: the openness, freedom, and honesty of these contests were something, he argued, that was unique to Anglicanism itself.³¹ Perhaps at this

³¹ Gerald Bray, ‘Why I Am an Evangelical and an Anglican’, in Anthony L. Chute, Christopher W. Morgan, and Robert A. Peterson (eds.), *Why We Belong: Evangelical Unity and Denominational Diversity* (Wheaton, IL, 2013), p. 91.

time, the Anglican Communion was thus a form or even a period of intra-Christian debate, that is, a Christian way of debating that was specific to this evolved and now highly pluralistic context. If so, this conclusion represented a particular claim, rather than simply an observation, about the character both of 'Anglicanism' and 'communion', that derived from the nature of those evolving aspects of each. This is what it looked like for Christians to order their Church within a world whose own ordering was deeply contested.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC), 'The Church as Communion' (1990). <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/105242/ARCIC_II_The_Church_as_Communion.pdf>.
- Barney Hawkins IV, J., Ian S. Markham, Leslie Nunez Steffensen, and Justyn Terry (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion* (Chichester, 2013).
- Barry, Alfred, *Ecclesiastical Expansion of England in the Growth of the Anglican Communion (Hulsean Lectures for 1894–95)* (London, 1895).
- Bayne, Jr, Stephen Fielding, *An Anglican Turning Point: Documents and Interpretations* (Austin, TX, 1964).
- Bosher, Robert, *The American Church and the Formation of the Anglican Communion, 1823–1853*, Johnson Memorial Lecture (Evanston, IL, 1962).
- Carey, Hilary M., *God's Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c.1801–1908* (Cambridge, 2011).
- Caswell, Henry, *America and the American Church* (London, 1839).
- Doe, Norman, *The Principles of Canon Law Common to the Churches of the Anglican Communion* (London, 2008).
- Fairweather, E. R. (ed.), *Anglican Congress 1963: Report of Proceedings* (Toronto and London, 1963).
- Hassett, Miranda, *Anglican Communion Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and Their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ, 2009).
- Herklots, H. G. G., *The Church of England and the American Episcopal Church: From the First Voyages of Discovery to the First Lambeth Conference* (London, 1966).
- Jacob, W. M., *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide* (London, 1997).
- The Lambeth Conferences (1867–1948): The Reports of the 1920, 1930, and 1948 Conferences, with Selected Resolutions from the Conferences of 1867, 1878, 1888, 1897, and 1908* (London, 1948).
- Morgan, E. R. and Roger Lloyd (eds.), *The Mission of the Anglican Communion* (London, 1948).
- Podmore, Colin, 'The Anglican Communion: Idea, Name and Identity', in Podmore, *Aspects of Anglican Identity* (London, 2005), pp. 26–42.
- Russell, John Fuller, *The Judgment of the Anglican Church (Posterior to the Reformation) on the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture, and the Authority of the Holy Catholic Church in Matters of Faith* (London, 1838).
- Strong, Rowan, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c.1700–1850* (Oxford, 2007).

Valentine, Gill, Robert M. Vanderbeck, Joanna Sadgrove, Johan Andersson, and Kevin Ward, 'Transnational Religious Networks: Sexuality and the Changing Power Geometries of the Anglican Communion', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 38 (2013): 50–64.

Warren, Max, *Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion* (London, 1957).

Yates, T. E., *Venn and Victorian Bishops Abroad* (Uppsala and London, 1978).

Part III

Regional Survey

Anglicanism in Australia and New Zealand

Ian Breward

In 1914, Australian and New Zealand Anglicans were the largest denomination in their respective countries. Neither was established by statute, but aspects of that heritage survived, such as the place of the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-Nine Articles. Many of the clergy and most of the bishops were English-born and educated. They shared popular antipathy to Roman Catholics. In Australia they assumed that the recognition they received in Britain would also be theirs in the Antipodes, despite the federal constitution. In both countries relationships with colonial elites were close and they were expected to offer leadership in their community beyond their religious obligations. Women, despite their enfranchisement for state and national elections, had no role in Church governance, unless they were principals or teachers in Anglican schools. They shared in religious education and in organizing women's groups, but had to rest content with giving, cleaning, and flower arrangement as their share in Sunday worship and parish life.

Both countries had free, compulsory, and secular primary education, but most secondary schools were provided by the Churches until the 1950s. Anglican residential colleges in universities gave future leaders an introduction to the possibilities of cooperation between state and Church. Loyalty to the British Empire was strong, for it was seen as a bastion of international righteousness. Both countries were thereby enabled to share in the regional development of that ethos through dioceses and general synods and the missionary work they sponsored.

Their indigenous people were treated very differently. The Māori in New Zealand had four elected members of the House of Representatives. Dr Peter Buck and Sir Apirana Ngata had served as cabinet ministers. Most children attended native primary schools, but only a minority attended Anglican or government secondary schools and entered the professions. Most Aborigines did not attend school, though many Torres Strait Islanders did. The Australian constitution excluded Aborigines from citizenship and the majority in

northern Australia had little or no contact with white Australians. Melanesians in Papua and the Islands were in a similar political situation, though some were serving as clergy in their linguistic community, helping to ground Christianity in their culture.

The Anglican Board of Missions funded mainly by High Church and Anglo-Catholic dioceses, and the Church Missionary Society (CMS) supported by Evangelicals, sent missionaries to the Pacific Islands, Papua, China, India, and East Africa. Other Evangelical Anglicans served with faith missions. Work amongst Aborigines was started in 1908 by the CMS. Isolated families in the outback were served by the Bush Church Aid Society (Evangelical) and the Bush Brotherhoods (Anglo-Catholics), some of whom served in areas larger than England. Liturgical, theological, and practical divisions largely corresponded to those found in the United Church of England and Ireland, of which the Australian Church was legally a part. New Zealand Anglicans were legally independent, but shared the same ethos.

THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND AFTER

Both countries loyally joined their homeland in war with Germany in 1914. There was a deep sense of unity with Britain, politically and religiously, whereas 'Kaiserism' was seen as anti-Christian. Several Australian bishops had joined the imperially centred Round Table in Australia, so as better to understand the European situation and the rise of militarism.¹ German victory in the South Pacific would have had serious consequences. Young men volunteered, expecting often that the war would be brief. Its scope far exceeded their expectations. The horrific casualties at Gallipoli created a strong, shared Australasian memory of sacrifice, later commemorated by Anzac Day on 25 April every year, a commemoration begun by an Anglican priest, David Garland, in Brisbane in 1916.² The honour boards in churches large and small underlined the impact of war. Numbers of Anglican institutions erected war memorial chapels, often prominent and substantial, including free-standing crucifixes as well as stained-glass windows, and more traditional plaques.³ Clergy were active in recruiting, but also had the unenviable task of notifying families when members were killed. Though some troops after

¹ John A. Moses, 'Australian Anglican Leaders and the Great War, 1914–1918: The "Prussian Menace", Conscriptio, and National Solidarity', *Journal of Religious History*, 25 (2001): 306–23 (p. 310).

² Ruth Frappell, 'Imperial Fervour and Anglican Loyalty', in Bruce Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia: A History* (Melbourne, 2002), pp. 76–99 (p. 78).

³ Colin Holden, 'Anglicanism, Visual Arts and Architecture', in Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia*, pp. 247–69 (pp. 256–8).

Gallipoli stayed in the Middle East and helped to defeat the Ottoman Empire, many went on to fight in France. Attempts to boost Australian numbers there by conscription failed when two referendums in 1916 and 1917 were lost. Some Roman Catholics were very public in their opposition, which was to leave divisive sectarian memories for many years in Australia. Some fifty-one Anglican clergy and eighty theological students served in the ranks as volunteers, but 175 served as chaplains, a higher proportion than from any other denomination. The Australian chaplain-general was Archbishop C. O. L. Riley of Perth. Women from both countries served as nurses and ambulance drivers, as well as contributing comforts generously to the troops in camps and on the front lines. Casualties were horrific. New Zealand sent 100,000 men, of whom 58,000 were killed or wounded; and 59,000 Australians were killed.

Neither General Synod made significant contributions to answering the difficult theological and moral questions raised by the war, apart from underlining that the Church of England was the Church of all the English-speaking peoples. That failure to deal with pressing questions disillusioned many troops, who dropped out of the Anglican Church when they returned home, though others returned with strengthened faith and enriched their parishes. The racist White Australia Policy was supported by many Anglican leaders, who believed that it sustained British identity, as well as by trade unionists who wished to safeguard their wages and working conditions. Both Australians and New Zealanders had been upset by the competition from Chinese migrants who had stayed after the gold rushes of the nineteenth century. Only Bishop G. White of Carpentaria questioned the racial bias of the legislation, but his concerns had little support.⁴ Strikes and lockouts were a reminder of the differences between capital and labour. They also contributed to the growing strength of the Labour movement and the language of class war. Anglicans were becoming local in their priorities, but remained loyal to their British inheritance on both sides of the Tasman. Apart from bishops in the metropolitan dioceses, leadership was increasingly local.

Keeping Australia predominantly white would, many Australians believed, ensure the British ethos remained dominant. Migration from Britain was substantially increased, especially in Western Australia, so that Australia could not be seen as easily as an empty continent. Unfortunately, many migrants were placed in the bush with minimal facilities and little pastoral care, without the capital or experience to break-in farms. Because they could not make a living, many migrated to urban centres, increasing the number of urban Anglicans and making the largely rural dioceses more marginal. Another Anglican response was to build memorial hostels and nursing homes for the growing numbers of aged people as thanksgiving to God for victory, but

⁴ Brian H. Fletcher, 'Anglicanism and Nationalism in Australia, 1901–1962', *Journal of Religious History*, 23 (1999): 215–33 (p. 224).

indigenous troops were given no help to remake their lives. They did not receive an Australian pension, because they were not citizens. That neglect could also be seen in Aboriginal settlements on the edges of towns and in the exploitation of workers on stations. Māori ex-servicemen had some of the same problems.

Many Australians believed that their country had a decisive role to play in their region and beyond by upholding the values of the empire, such as the rule of law, democratic government, and willingness to foster the Christian mission. Australia's federal structure was reflected by the Anglican Church. The dioceses there were determined that General Synod should not have national and wide-ranging authority, which marginalized dioceses' ability to order their own affairs.

In New Zealand, a lively discussion took place on the primacy and the nature of the leadership which it provided. Given that the Church was not established, primate leadership could only be advisory and appeal to the Anglican values which were shared by the nation. Bishop Churchill Julius of Christchurch, and first archbishop of New Zealand, wanted primacy based in the capital, Wellington, and brought in a bill to this effect at the 1919 General Synod. It was referred to the dioceses. Dunedin and Auckland were opposed to the suggestion and the 1922 General Synod rejected the proposal. Nomination for the primate was given to the bishops, with the houses of clergy and laity voting on the nomination. Julius was elected, but held the position for only three years until his retirement. It was another sign that a stronger Anglican provincial ethos was emerging, though in a different way than in Australia where dioceses were more autonomous and fiercely guarded their independence.

THE INTER-WAR YEARS

Churches in both nations met the challenges of increased post-war population by setting up new congregations in rapidly growing city suburbs, building halls, churches, and vicarages. Raising money for this expansion was a constant challenge. Thirteen new Anglican schools were built in Australia by 1930. A smaller number began in New Zealand, attracting paying pupils from middle-class families. Assemblies in state schools could also open with prayer and Bible reading, led by school staff. Though this did something to spread Christian knowledge, it did not have the same scope as the system of religious education which had been set up in New South Wales and Queensland. Victorian and South Australian schools remained without any religious instruction until after the Second World War.

Bishops and clergy varied in the effectiveness with which they communicated their faith to wider society by preaching and writing. Kenneth Henderson, a notable priest and educator, wrote a provocative series on 'Christianity and Class War' in *The Church Standard* in 1920 and 1921. More Anglicans were interested in the Hickson Healing missions in 1923 and 1927: an Australian layman, J. M. Hickson had a rare gift for sharing the gospel. When hospital fees and doctors were expensive, his work inspired many on both sides of the Tasman. It was an important reminder that healing was part of the contemporary witness to the gospel, though it had a mixed reception from the medical profession and some clergy. Nor did it sustain a prominent place in Anglican life. In New Zealand, Wiremu Ratana had a similar impact earlier, after a vision in 1918 and the healing of one of his sons. By 1925, he had formed a separate Church with some 11,000 followers. Many healings were claimed. Anglican leaders, initially supportive, felt that his movement was moving into heresy, and in 1925 in a pastoral letter they threatened to excommunicate any Anglicans who joined his Church, to little effect.⁵ Ratana's link with the Labour Party led all the Māori parliamentary seats to be won by his followers by 1943. His movement fostered tribal unity and Māori social priorities and weakened the role of the *tohunga*, or traditional healers.

New Zealand Anglicans made one important change to the role played by Māori. Apirana Ngata, the leading Māori lawyer and politician, argued that insufficient recognition was given to their place in the Anglican Church and that a separate diocese was needed. The archbishop of Canterbury was very uneasy about the proposal, but said he would reluctantly accept it if the Church went ahead.⁶ After much discussion, it was agreed to appoint a bishop within the diocese of Waiapu, which had a large Māori population. He would not be a General Synod member, would have to obtain episcopal permission to visit other dioceses, and would be elected by the North Island bishops. The Revd F. A. Bennett, a leading Māori, was selected in 1928 and exercised a notable ministry. Bennett's work was seriously limited by the Great Depression, however: his stipend was more than halved, as was that of many Māori clergy. A board for the diocese was set up, but it was unable to deal with the wide-ranging problems, such as the best place for ministerial education. Te Rau College was closed, but St John's College was too academic and unrelated to ministry to the Māori community. In addition, its buildings were in a bad way. A new warden's house and student rooms were opened in 1922, but it was many years before the necessary loans could be repaid. Its Anglo-Catholic ethos led to the bishops of Christchurch and Nelson refusing to send their

⁵ Allan Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa: A History of Church and Society in New Zealand* (2nd edn., Auckland, 1997), pp. 128–30.

⁶ W. P. Morrell, *The Anglican Church in New Zealand: A History* (Dunedin, 1973), pp. 176–7.

students there. There was also provincial disagreement about what education was required before candidates were ordained deacon.

The 1928 New Zealand General Synod also resolved issues about changing the Church's constitution, by persuading Parliament to pass the Church of England Empowering Act that year. A complex process was laid down to ensure that the Prayer Book and Thirty-Nine Articles could not be easily undermined, thereby weakening the Anglican Church's identity. The civil courts were given authority to prohibit whatever was not a *bona fide* exercise of the powers given by the Act. There were concerns about the revised Prayer Book of 1928 and the influence of theological scholars who wanted to restate Anglican theology. One of the most notable was H. D. A. Major of Ripon, a leading modernist, who had been born in Katikati in the Bay of Plenty and educated at Auckland University College. A visit to New Zealand in 1929 showed that his views had little support there. He remained influential in England through his teaching of ordinands and as editor of *The Modern Churchman*.⁷

Another important change was the creation of the Waikato diocese in 1925, centred in Hamilton. Some of Auckland's endowment was given to assist the new diocese, but not enough. A further sum was given in 1955. The first bishop, A. C. Cherrington, was an authoritarian Anglo-Catholic and abrasive at times. Two deans were deprived on dubious grounds. But in other areas, such as education, he gave fine leadership and placed the diocese on a firm foundation, aided by the steady growth of the dairy industry.

Though missionary work had already begun, there was no national oversight and coordination. In 1922, the New Zealand General Synod set up a Provincial Board of Missions, chaired by Bishop W. C. Sadlier of Nelson who was already very committed to overseas missionary work. New Zealand CMS missionaries were already working in Sind, China, and East Africa. The nurses who worked in China during the civil war and the Japanese invasion served heroically, Kathleen Hall in particular. She stayed in her hospital with the Chinese staff when most of the population elsewhere in the region fled the Japanese.⁸

These years were also a time of important developments in Melanesia and Polynesia. In the 1920s the Melanesian Mission in the islands had strong English financial support and employed some twenty staff, many of whom came from Britain. An increasing number of Melanesian clergy were beginning to offer pastoral leadership, but it would be claiming too much to argue that Christianity had become indigenous. Nevertheless there were signs of progress in that direction. Under the leadership of Bishop J. M. Steward, consecrated in 1919, a cathedral was begun at Siota and the number of schools

⁷ Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa*, pp. 111–12, 113.

⁸ Morrell, *Anglican Church in New Zealand*, p. 194.

increased. He looked forward to a separate province. The foundation of the Melanesian Brotherhood in 1926 by Ini Kopuria was a major step towards a more indigenous proclamation of the gospel, outside the village churches. The brothers were mobile and self-supporting, travelling in pairs. Vows were taken yearly and they met regularly in households. The Revd C. Fox, a New Zealander, assumed a mentoring role for the brothers from 1932, along with the other important contributions he made to the work of the mission. Though the mission had constant financial problems, it was taking deeper root. Australian priorities were sometimes different from those of their New Zealand partners in the mission, but both contributed to develop a Church with strong presence when the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu became independent from Britain.

Leadership by Bishop W. H. Baddeley in Melanesia, from 1932, was most important after the terrible destruction caused by the Japanese invasion. He travelled widely through the diocese, successfully creating a vision for the future of the Church, despite the distractions of the powerful nationalist movement Marching Rule and their opposition to British governance. The people had been loyal to Britain and by the time that Bishop Baddeley returned to England in 1947 there were eighty-one Islander priests and deacons.⁹ In Papua a mission from Australia began in 1891 and grew steadily. By 1939, an impressive cathedral had been consecrated at Dogura, numbers of local men had begun to offer for priesthood, and many villages had been transformed by missionary leadership. Incorporating Christianity into their culture had been very successful.

When war broke out, Bishop Phillip Strong asked his workers to stay with their people. Most did and several were martyred. Their feast day began in 1946 and is now celebrated in the Australian Prayer Book. That sacrifice enhanced the spiritual authority of the mission. There was a further tragedy in 1951, when Mount Lamington erupted. The mission buildings were destroyed, along with the mission staff, many Papuan clergy, teachers, and evangelists, and over 4,000 laity. That the diocese recovered was a tribute to the foundations laid by generations of missionaries and its new leadership. By the end of the century its episcopate was Papuan and the wider Church impressively indigenous. English Papuan bishops often retired to Australia and gave invaluable leadership, especially in Queensland.

Polynesia became a small missionary diocese in 1925 and was added to the New Zealand province in the same year. Bishop L. S. Kempthorne, a former Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) missionary, gave sacrificial leadership from 1923 till his death in 1963, building up the work in Tonga, as well as amongst Indians, Chinese, and Pacific Islanders living in Fiji. His

⁹ David Hilliard, *God's Gentlemen: A History of the Melanesian Mission 1849–1942* (St Lucia, Queensland, 1978), p. 273.

financial skills, patience, and willingness to help out pastorally whenever necessary were crucial for the diocese. By 1929 there were ten clergy, twelve congregations, and a number of primary schools for Melanesians, Chinese, and Indians. The indenture system for Indian sugar workers ended by 1920 by which time there was still little provision made for the education of their children. A girls' school was opened in 1929 and a dispensary in 1926. Few Indians became Christian, though that began to change with more Indian ministry.

Another school was begun in Nukualofa and a Willis Memorial Church opened in 1930. A chaplaincy was begun in Samoa in 1932. The bishop visited his scattered islands regularly. Depression affected diocesan income badly, until the bishop was able to visit England and gain £10,000 in grants towards a foundation from the SPG, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the Colonial Bishops' Fund. In 1935, Lord Nuffield gave £5,000, which made planning for a cathedral possible. In 1937, a Fijian Indian priest returned from study in India. Though missionary turnover was high, there was a core of priests who stayed and helped the diocese to develop an identity.

Natural disasters as ever provided a challenge to the New Zealand Church. A major earthquake occurred in Napier-Hastings—256 people were killed and many more injured on 3 February 1931.¹⁰ The cathedral was lifted two feet off the ground and totally collapsed. Schools, businesses, and parishes were hard hit, and insurance was inadequate. Many parishes and people found the task of rebuilding very stressful, and the cathedral was not rebuilt till 1960. Much later, the Christchurch earthquake in 2011 severely damaged the cathedral, and destroyed many buildings, churches, and homes. Bishop Victoria Matthews, who had come from Canada, came in for much criticism for being unwilling to rebuild the cathedral unchanged.

In Australia, the inter-war years brought no solution to the vexed question of the Australian Church's legal ties to the Church of England. The matter came up regularly at General Synod, but theological disagreements between Sydney Evangelicals and growing numbers of Anglo-Catholics in other dioceses prevented any solution. Anglo-Catholics wanted an episcopal majority on the Appellate Tribunal; Evangelicals wanted a lay majority, believing that Anglo-Catholics wanted to set aside the Reformation heritage by altering the liturgy and canon law in a Catholic direction. The 1916 General Synod set up a thirty-three member body to report in 1921, but its proposals were voted down by the house of laity. The existing constitution meant that no theological or liturgical changes could be made, for Australian Anglicans were legally part of the Church of England, but had no representation in English convocations, courts, or Parliament. Another proposal was discussed in 1926 at an

¹⁰ Michael King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand* (Auckland, 2003), pp. 352–3.

inter-diocesan convention, but agreement was not possible. In this context, the death of Bishop George Merric Long of Newcastle in 1930 was a tragedy, for he had the confidence of differing parties and might have been able to broker a solution. Achieving a central constitution and deeper unity was apparently unrealizable—what was acceptable to Brisbane was not agreeable to Sydney. That was apparent in 1935 at a further meeting of the continuation committee. Another proposal in 1939 also failed, because of the wide-ranging disagreements between dioceses.

A number of able new bishops were elected in Australia in the 1920s and 1930s. They included Francis de Witt Batty, Ernest Burgmann, Frederick Waldegrave Head, Howard Mowll, John Stoward Moyes, and John William Charles Wand. They did not set out any solutions of lasting importance for the problems of the period, but gave valuable leadership in their dioceses. Some new perspectives on social witness were opened up at Morpeth Theological College, near Newcastle, by staff such as Ernest Burgmann, A. P. Elkin, and S. Lee. The problems of the Depression were partly met by notable clergy setting up bodies which provided practical solutions. In 1932, G. K. Tucker began the Brotherhood of St Laurence in Newcastle, but moved to Fitzroy in Melbourne the following year, following an invitation from Father Maynard at the inner-city Anglo-Catholic parish of St Peter's, Eastern Hill.¹¹ Their combination of careful analysis and practical help led to steady growth, and the brotherhood became one of the most influential Anglican agencies dealing with poverty.

A more personal approach in Melbourne was taken by Brother Bill in Fitzroy, using radio to set out usable options for the needy. In Sydney, R. B. S. Hammond, the notable rector of St Barnabas, Broadway, had a remarkable ministry to unemployed men, providing meals and accommodation, clothing, and advice on employment, as well as never ceasing to press the benefits of personal faith.¹² Nor was he content with helping individuals. Hammond experimented with low-cost housing for families in what became Hammondville. Modest though the houses were, their low rent or purchase price gave many a new start from the depressing slums of inner Sydney and underlined the importance of giving opportunities for better family life.

State and federal governments were unable to meet the many needs of the unemployed. The dole was inadequate and often meant working far from home. Combating the appeal of Fascism and Communism to the victims of the Depression was an intellectual challenge few churchmen were able to meet. Personal charity by Church members was also important as a complement to

¹¹ Colin Holden, *From Tories at Prayer to Socialists at Mass: A History of St Peter's, Eastern Hill* (Melbourne, 1996), pp. 211–16.

¹² Tom Frame, 'Local Differences, Social and National Identity 1930–1966', in Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia*, pp. 100–23 (p. 102).

other forms of help. When Archbishop Henry Frewen Le Fanu of Perth argued that banks needed to be more accountable to society, he was accused of socialism, a heinous lapse for a bishop. Several bishops wanted the dole replaced by a wage for work, but did not go much beyond generalities when they addressed Depression issues.¹³ Clergy were vulnerable to economic decline and parish views. They did not have parsons' freehold as did their English counterparts, but could expect large attendances at Easter and Christmas, or when a notable visitor preached. Morning Prayer at 11 a.m. was being replaced by earlier Holy Communion services. Considerable liturgical and theological variety existed in the cities and sermons by leading preachers were still published in the metropolitan dailies.

In Sydney, Evangelical leaders argued that Jesus had not advised his followers on how to improve society. Repentance and personal faith were the foundations of the renewal needed to counter the impact of Depression. Less attention was paid to practical issues. Archbishop Howard Mowll's stress on evangelism built on an existing tradition and gave Sydney a unique ethos in the whole Anglican Communion. In New Zealand, Nelson drew on Sydney for clergy and bishops to sustain its less sharply defined Evangelical tradition. The breakaway Church of England in South Africa was also supported by finance and personnel from Sydney, much to the chagrin of the major Anglican Church in the country.¹⁴

Depression underlined the financial weakness of New Zealand Anglicanism. Dunedin was the diocese worst hit—Bishop William Fitchett stayed in a parish, other clergy had combined roles, and some rural parishes were united. One school was closed in Invercargill. Christchurch lost half its endowment income. City Missions were indispensable, for they provided food, clothing, and help with housing, as well as pastoral advice. The Church Army helped those affected by the closure of public works in isolated places. Its work was so appreciated that a national branch was set up in Auckland in 1935, with Archbishop Alfred Averill as president. General Synod set up a central social council in 1934, chaired by Bishop Campbell West-Watson of Christchurch.

The roles of women were slowly widened. In 1919, the Australian General Synod approved a canon which permitted anyone entitled to vote at a parish meeting also to serve as a churchwarden or on the vestry. In New Zealand the first woman was elected to a synod in 1952, when Mrs C. H. Symons was elected to the Wellington synod. The visit of the English Christian feminist Maude Royden, and her ability as a preacher, inspired some women to believe that they could have a wider leadership role, perhaps even to share in the

¹³ Rowan Strong, 'An Antipodean Establishment: Anglicanism in Australian Society 1788–c.1934', *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 1 (2003): 61–90 (pp. 88–9).

¹⁴ Stephen Judd and Kenneth Cable, *Sydney Anglicans: A History of the Diocese* (Sydney, 1987), pp. 220–2.

distribution of the elements in Holy Communion.¹⁵ For Anglo-Catholics that was impossible, for they believed that only men could preside at the eucharist and minister in the sanctuary. Matters were more flexible in the mission fields. There, women shared in governance and worship in ways unthinkable in their home Churches. In parishes, in addition to being homemakers, cleaners, and flower arrangers, women were also encouraged to serve in church community organizations, but not to question their role, or discern whether male convictions about their role were adequate. The Mothers' Union was still very important nationally. Not only did it shape views on women's wider role, it came to include women from a number of Māori congregations. By 1939 there were fifty-eight Pākehā and thirty-three Māori branches. Organizations like the Girls' Friendly Society provided opportunities for discipleship amongst young women.

Churches in both countries studied social questions. General Synod in Australia appointed a committee which drew up an agenda for a major conference in 1934 and published a report entitled *Christian Revolution and Social Reform*. The erosion of human rights in Germany, Italy, the USSR, and Spain was noted as a result of totalitarian regimes. Antipodean Christians were warned by their leaders to be alert to the beginnings of such changes in their nations. Though the League of Nations had some Antipodean Anglican support, the British Empire was still seen as a more important defender of international righteousness, along with opportunities for discussions at Lambeth Conferences. Governments in both countries went along with British foreign policy, for that gave them diplomatic access to many countries where the expense of consulates could not be justified. The Italian invasion of Abyssinia, the Spanish civil war, and the betrayal of Czechoslovakia seemed too remote to cause serious concern, but Nazi militarism soon left no choice but war to Britain. Australia and New Zealand again supported the mother country without question in 1939.

Labour parties on both sides of the Tasman discussed a wide range of social reforms, which caused some anxiety about erosion of political fundamentals, because many Anglicans were more identified with conservative parties. In New Zealand, the Labour government introduced a number of reforms which greatly helped those on low incomes and pensions. Bishops and leading clergy gradually came to see that this created a more stable community and enhanced their own teaching about the nature of a Christian society. Instead of undermining the place of capitalism, such reforms placed it on a firmer foundation.

¹⁵ Anne O'Brien, 'Anglicanism and Gender Issues', in Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia*, pp. 270–92 (pp. 282, 284).

THE SECOND WORLD AND THE 'LONG' 1950S

State Labor governments in Australia observed the New Zealand situation under a Labour government and introduced similar reforms. Though the outbreak of war in 1939 limited change, the accession of a federal Labor government brought some important developments, not least the conviction that there needed to be a major alteration in migration policy after the war ended. The moral issues of war were sensitively dealt with by the Bishops Temple and Bell in England. The latter's criticisms of blanket bombing of cities were unwelcome to Sir Winston Churchill, but enabled some Australian Anglicans to see that patriotism did not need to be uncritical. While Jewish refugees were not settled in great numbers, some Anglicans, such as Bishop Charles Venn Pilcher in Sydney, were emphatic about the importance of treating them generously.¹⁶ A proposed settlement in Western Australia came to nothing.

The Japanese invasion of the Pacific and the bombing of northern parts of Australia reminded Anglicans of the costs of war, but did not shake their commitment to the Allied cause. The arrival of huge numbers of American troops in both countries diminished the risk of a Japanese invasion. The mission in Papua was faced with the choice of withdrawing or staying with their people. CMS workers in the Northern Territory were also evacuated, along with half-caste children from Roper Island, which was very open to invasion if Port Moresby fell. The son of Archbishop C. O. L. Riley, Bishop Charles Riley of Bendigo, was Australian chaplain-general. In New Zealand, Bishop George Vincent Gerard of Waiapu served the forces in a similar capacity and eventually resigned his see so that he could focus on chaplaincy. Both bishops travelled widely and Riley was for a time a prisoner of war until his release was aided by the Vatican. Anglican clergy formed a majority of forces' chaplains from both countries.

In New Zealand, Archbishop Averill retired in 1940 as primate and bishop of Auckland. He was a fine pastor, but not always a decisive and persuasive leader. West-Watson succeeded him as primate, but did not deal with a number of the unresolved problems facing the province. They included clergy pensions, the Māori churches, and the provincial theological college. These matters were left until after the war ended. During the war, the work amongst troops was paid for by the Church, until the National Patriotic Fund Board was established and provided the needed funds.

Chaplains were often frustrated by the way in which parades were called at times arranged for services, indicating that some officers did not place the work of chaplains high on their list of priorities. By 1942, New Zealand

¹⁶ Judd and Cable, *Sydney Anglicans*, p. 229.

Anglican chaplains numbered sixty-four out of 468 clergy. The Church Army also provided forty-six full-time staff and some 500 women volunteers. Almost a quarter of Australian Anglican clergy served as chaplains. In addition, hundreds of other women in both countries provided comforts for those in camps at home, as well as for those at the front. In St John's, Camberwell, in Melbourne, the League of Soldiers' Friends had over 140 members. They sent clothing to troops and sailors, as well as helping in the recreation hut in the cathedral grounds. Others elsewhere served in administrative roles, as well as nurses and ambulance drivers. Several New Zealand chaplains were decorated. Those who stayed in their parishes had a heavy pastoral load to carry, which was not always appreciated if they were of enlistment age.

Planning for the post-war world began early in the war, though the Churches were often not consulted by governments. Bishop West-Watson of Christchurch played a major part in the formation of the National Council of Churches in 1940. This was a notable piece of Protestant ecumenism with long-term results for the remainder of the century. Its most immediate result was the foundation of the Campaign for Christian Order in 1942, which played an important part in New Zealand's reconstruction after the war, bringing Anglicans and others into mutually acceptable decisions about what kind of society should be sought. Anglicans also shared in the work of CORSO (Council of Organizations for Relief Service Overseas), formed in 1944, which worked constructively in the rebuilding of war-damaged societies overseas.

The nurture of suburban family life was one of the primary roles of Anglican parishes after the war. Growing prosperity brought a parish building boom that was often supported by the fundraising Wells campaigns which, in Australia, began at St Andrews, Brighton, Victoria, in 1954 and increased giving dramatically.¹⁷ Anglicans thus kept up with population growth and urban sprawl in the 1950s and 1960s, but their contribution to thinking about priorities for the public sphere declined.

Population increase by birth and migration was roughly half and half between 1947 and 1961, but British identity was still very significant to many Australians and New Zealanders. Non-British migration steadily increased in Australia, but Anglicans did little to foster changes attractive to new arrivals. The monarchy was still important, as the royal visit in 1954 made clear. Yet settling the complications of legal ties to the Church of England was unavoidable, even urgent. Denominational allegiance was in decline, as was parochial participation and addressing contentious national issues. That was masked by the growth of the Anglican population and the importance of an increasing middle class. Its leaders were unwilling to leave behind some of

¹⁷ Frame, 'Local Differences', p. 115.

their English heritage, increasingly weakened by major social and cultural changes from television and focus on family life. Social ethics and public duty were eroded by secularity and individualism, making the national viability of Anglicanism problematic on both sides of the Tasman.

Both Australian and New Zealand Anglicans were attendees at the ecumenical international meetings between the wars that led to the formation of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam during 1948. Following that, the Australian Council of Churches was set up. The Revd D. Taylor, a Christchurch Anglican, was one of its first secretaries, testifying to the importance of trans-Tasman partnership. Though Evangelicals were often not active in the ecumenical movement, Archbishop Mowll's participation was vital in Australia, not least because he was also concerned to rebuild ties with Christians in China, where he had worked before coming to Sydney.

Relations with the Church of South India, formed in 1947, were complicated by the refusal of many Australian Anglo-Catholics to recognize the validity of its ministry until all its clergy were episcopally ordained. Anglo-Catholics wanted to develop ecumenical relationships with the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, not just with Protestant bodies. Evangelicals showed in 1948 that they were prepared to stand for their convictions, even to going to court with Sydney support, as Bishop Arnold Wylde of Bathurst was to discover in 1942 when he introduced liturgical changes of a Catholic nature in the so-called Red Book, a diocesan publication.¹⁸ The court ruled against his contention that property trusts were unaffected. He accepted their decision and did not pursue an appeal to the Privy Council.

Important contexts for discussion of national issues were the numerous congresses held mostly in Australia, but occasionally in New Zealand. They were often based on a particular theme, addressed by a number of well-qualified speakers. Several hundred usually attended, giving both clergy and laity opportunity to widen their horizons and also to ask questions. The centenary of Christ Church St Laurence in Sydney during 1940 was marked by a conference which explored social issues from an Anglo-Catholic perspective. The *Church Standard* published a series of editorials on social issues, designed to clarify where Christians stood on matters likely to arise when the war was over. Bishop Burgmann of Canberra-Goulburn, one of the leading publicly concerned Anglicans, deplored the way in which the nation was destroying its natural resources and neglecting the Aborigines.¹⁹ Many of the original 500 Aboriginal languages had already died out and numbers of others were in serious decline, spoken only by older tribal elders and missionaries focused on the teaching of English. It was rare for worship to be

¹⁸ Ruth Teale, 'The "Red Book" Case', *Journal of Religious History*, 12 (1982): 74–89.

¹⁹ Peter Hempenstall, *The Meddlesome Priest: A Life of Ernest Burgmann* (St Leonards, NSW, 1993), pp. 277–8.

conducted in an Aboriginal language, or for serious attention to be given to translation of the Scriptures. The issue was complicated by the small numbers speaking so many languages, which made publication very costly.

Similar problems existed in New Zealand, where only some 9 per cent of adult Māori spoke their own language. There was as yet no provision for tertiary teaching of the language, or serious academic interest in the extensive oral traditions which still survived, for the importance of Māori to a bicultural nation was still seen by only a minority. However, the importance of a new translation of the Bible in everyday language was recognized and completed after the war by a joint team of Pākehā and Māori.

The surrender of Japan after the atomic bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima in 1945 marked a major change in the history of warfare. Few Anglicans commented on the importance of this change. Some New Zealand Anglicans, such as Dr G. Armstrong, from St John's Theological College, later played an active part in protests against nuclear weapons and their testing in French Polynesia, despite the disapproval of Bishop Eric Gowing. The government was also concerned and refused to permit nuclear-powered vessels to even dock in New Zealand harbours.

Dr Herbert Vere Evatt, a notable Anglican lawyer from Sydney, was a decisive leader in the formation of the United Nations and its role in international peace-making, though his Church appears to have had little impact on the formation of his views. Both Anglican Churches supported the United Nations Organization as their countries began to develop independent foreign policies. England was moving into European connections and placing much less emphasis on the Commonwealth. Though many Britons migrated to the Antipodes, by the late 1950s and 1960s the cultural connections were weakening, as was the influence of the Anglican Church. The Anglican percentage of the population was in steady decline. It was also placing more weight on local religious priorities, though the influence of the monarchy and the popularity of Queen Elizabeth were still very important, both for politicians and people.

The massive post-war Australian government-sponsored migration included many from Southern and Central Europe, and decisively altered the Australian ethos. Few migrants were Protestant and they greatly strengthened the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches. In addition, much later, thousands of Chinese students were permitted to stay after the violent events that occurred in Tiananmen Square in Beijing in 1976. Vietnamese boat people added yet another Asian dimension, and made the continuation of the White Australia Policy even less attractive to the federal government, despite still substantial support in the community, especially in trade unions which feared downward pressure on wages.

New Zealand also had substantial British and Dutch migration, but the move of Māori to the cities and the rapid growth of migrants from the Cook Islands and Samoa created a different set of challenges from those being

experienced in Australia. Few Islanders were Anglicans and the Anglican Māori members and clergy were in decline. Increasing numbers were challenging the limitations of biculturalism and asking for extended recognition and educational opportunities for Māori.

In both countries, suburban parishes grew rapidly. Large Sunday schools and youth groups reflected a dramatic increase in birth rates. Recruitment of clergy did not initially keep up with population growth, and raising money to cope with expansion was a constant problem, until the Wells Organization from the United States put giving on a more realistic level. Compton Associates in Queensland complemented the work of Wells, as did the emergence of stewardship programmes. Stipends had to keep pace with wage increases, especially among poorly paid Māori clergy who were often receiving about half of the Anglican stipend in Pākehā parishes. St John's College modified its curriculum to take account of the needs of Māori and Melanesian candidates, but their enrolments remained low. The appointment of Paul Reeves, an outstanding part-Māori from Taranaki and Wellington to teach Church history was another sign of cultural change. He was later to become bishop of Waiapu and of Auckland, then governor-general, and a leader in the Anglican Communion.

Aboriginal and Islander clergy were also poorly paid, because their community had such low income levels. Their education was improved by the foundation in 1974 of ecumenical education at Nungalinga College in Darwin, and then Wontulp bi baya in North Queensland in 1985. Lay training was also provided, often undertaken by women who gave invaluable leadership in their communities when they returned from study. Some church buildings in Aboriginal communities were starting to incorporate cultural features, though missionary unease about possible pagan origins often meant that such decoration was not permitted. Clergy vestments also began to include Aboriginal features, as Nungalinga graduates celebrated cultural origins at their ordination.

By the late 1950s liturgical changes were beginning to spread in Anglican congregations with Anglo-Saxon members. These changes included extempore prayer, lay preaching, contemporary songs, more lay sharing in the distribution of the eucharist, and more options for women in parish life. Sydney clergy began wearing everyday clothes for services instead of clerical vestments. Others began to celebrate from the westward position. New church buildings in current styles provided for congregations to worship in the round, as at Ridley College, Melbourne. Some dioceses had official architects and plans, which brought distinctive features to modern buildings. Louis Williams was a notable church architect in Victoria. In Sydney, Leslie Wilkinson, the first professor of architecture from 1921, helped to create a strong regulatory policy for new church buildings.²⁰

²⁰ Holden, 'Anglicanism, Visual Arts and Architecture', pp. 255, 262–3.

In Dunedin's cathedral a modern chancel was added to the neo-Gothic nave: it was a very happy blend. Similarly in Auckland's Holy Trinity Cathedral, the historic wooden building was creatively combined with a modern one. Current proposals for further additions to the building underlined how effectively Christian space and public space for city occasions could be combined. Wellington and Waiapu also built new cathedrals in the latter part of the twentieth century. Brisbane completed its grand neo-Gothic building, which had been started by Bishop William Webber in 1901. In Darwin, within the diocese of Carpentaria, a much simpler cathedral was consecrated, with a picture of an Aboriginal Mary.

Some New Zealand churches used clear windows to give congregations a sense of sharing the landscape and worship. That was made very obvious in a church at Lake Tekapo. In Australia, some churches had features which took local climate seriously, such as verandas, hipped roofs, and attempts to reduce the brightness of exterior light. Though much stained-glass still came from Britain, some local artists were emerging, such as Christian and Napier Waller, who often incorporated recognizably Australian people and landscapes. In 1965, the latter portrayed a variety of races in the windows of Holy Trinity Williamstown, Victoria. Miller Studios in Dunedin produced some notable windows which broke away from traditional compositions. A window in Holy Trinity, Hobart, representing the crucified Christ included recognizably Australian wounded, dying soldiers, and stretcher-bearers. Modern altars replaced the neo-medieval ones which were fashionable in nineteenth-century interiors. While bishops' faculties kept a degree of decorative unity, there were buildings which were not so closely under their jurisdiction which took initiatives that moved in varied directions. In 1951, Bishop Felix Arnott was one of the founders of the Blake Prize, which has been an important incentive for the creation of Australian religious art.

Women embroiderers, such as Morna Sturrock of Melbourne, produced altar frontals, kneelers, bible markers, and pew cushions which were lovingly decorative. Ethel Barton, whose son served in the First World War, produced a panel of a wounded soldier with AIF insignia. Papuan martyrs were commemorated in a number of churches. Later, Renis Zusters portrayed troops in Vietnam for Newcastle diocese. Statues were popular additions to interiors in the twentieth century. In St John's Wodonga, a Christus Rex was placed above the high altar.

In the major cities, many of the cathedrals developed an impressive choral tradition, with local content. Organists, such as Dr A. Floyd in Melbourne, frequently influenced the wider musical life of their city. A few composed, but none matched the many hymns composed by Melbourne's Elizabeth Smith, a gifted Melbourne parish priest. They combined attention to the present, as well as debt to the traditional heritage. The Revd K. Ihaka, a leading Māori priest in Auckland, edited *Himene* in 1953, which included some of his own

compositions, in addition to the classical hymns which had been translated into Māori and given Māori tunes. Pacific Islanders and Torres Strait Islanders also sang a blend of translations and local compositions, which sustained their cultural distinctiveness. New Zealand Anglicans contributed to the Indigenous Supplement added to the Australian Hymn Book. *Together In Song* had a much wider selection of Aboriginal hymns. Getting Anglicans of European origin to sing hymns in other languages remained an unmet challenge.

The task of achieving distinctive governance for the Australian Anglican Church had reached a stalemate by 1939. Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury found this most unsatisfactory when he visited Australia in 1950 and visited sixteen out of the twenty-five dioceses.²¹ He wanted the Anglican Communion to be freed from colonial influences, so that it could have shared relationships based on constitutional equality. While travelling home he produced a significantly altered draft constitution for Australian synods to consider. There were changes in identity which helped his case. Influential Sydney Evangelicals, such as Archbishop Mowll and Principal T. C. Hammond of Moore College noted that they could no longer hope that the Church of England would remain, legally, liturgically, or theologically unchanged.²² For them Fisher's proposal offered a way ahead which would safeguard their concerns, but also channel limited change through procedures which ensured thorough discussion. Though there was a group who rejected this approach, they did not carry General Synod with them. Some Anglo-Catholic dioceses were uneasy about the proposals, especially the possibility of a lay majority on the Appellate Tribunal, but enough were willing to compromise for the constitution to be passed by General Synod and come into force in 1962. Adelaide approved at the last minute.

This decision transcended the growing rift between liberals and conservatives which reflected the questioning of heritage and a culture of protest, symbolized in the Anglican divisions over involvement in the Vietnam War. Influential theological changes were gathering force, though many rejected both radicalism and supernaturalism. The constitution made possible an expansion of General Synod's role, by appointment of a number of commissions. Proposals for a central office in Canberra came to nothing. A small office in Sydney gave space for a general secretary. John Denton, the first appointee, had been a missionary in East Africa and he had great ability to build rapport with the parties in General Synod. His gifts led to his becoming chair of the Anglican Consultative Council. Leaders in both countries dealt with a wide range of national and regional issues, without always resting them on biblical and theological foundations. One of the most contentious was

²¹ Stuart Piggin, 'Australian Anglicanism in a World-Wide Context', in Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia*, pp. 200–22 (pp. 210–11).

²² Judd and Cable, *Sydney Anglicans*, pp. 225–66.

remarriage after divorce, which was finally settled by a canon in 1981 which stipulated that remarriage could only take place with the bishop's consent.

CHANGE AND THE 'OPEN SOCIETY'

By the end of the 'long' 1950s change was definitely in the air liturgically, as well as otherwise. There was world-wide liturgical revision during the 1960s, aiming to energize the congregations and enable them better to share the gospel. Draft services were circulated widely and tested in some parishes in Australia. Laity were admitted to share in administering the chalice, intercessory prayers were led by members of the congregation, and modern hymns were increasingly used. Congregations learned to give the peace to one another. Dean John Hazlewood in St George's Cathedral, Perth, celebrated rock masses, which drew huge crowds of young people for a time.²³ An Australian Prayer Book was approved by General Synod in 1977, but parishes which so desired could retain the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. In Sydney, the archbishop's approval was needed for the new book to replace the Book of Common Prayer. Though the Australian Prayer Book did not have the bicultural indigenous emphases of the New Zealand one, its approval was a major achievement which helped weaken some of the party spirit which had flourished under the previous constitution. Children of church-going families were admitted to Holy Communion without confirmation.

Attempts to develop support for the 1662 Prayer Book were unsuccessful. In contrast, Evangelicals, especially in Sydney, moved away from liturgically ordered services, dropping vestments for clergy and choirs. Music groups to accompany new music replaced organs. Taizé chants became used widely. Dedication of buildings to saints was sometimes dropped, and laity were often invited to speak about their faith and how it connected with their daily work and community life. Later, inclusive language became widely used, especially in the 1995 Prayer Book, which aimed to give resources to congregations rather lay down particular forms of worship. In this changing context, some argued that laypeople could preside at communion. Anglo-Catholics disliked the new book and Sydney had many who felt that it was too influenced by liberal theology. Once again episcopal permission was needed for its use. Overall Anglican worship had become more participatory, varied, and musically different. The 1981 General Synod agreed to change its name from The Church of England in Australia to the Australian Anglican Church to underline its growing Australian identity.

²³ John Tonkin, *Cathedral and Community: A History of St George's Cathedral, Perth* (Nedlands, Western Australia, 2001), pp. 155–9.

The new respect for varied views made it possible to discuss the ordination of women, after a request from Lambeth in 1968, even though there was strong opposition from many Anglo-Catholic dioceses. The Australian General Synod doctrine commission agreed that there was no theological case against such ordination, which did not please some Anglo-Catholics or Sydney Evangelicals who felt that their theological convictions about the maleness of priesthood and ministry had not been given due weight. The influential Dr Broughton Knox from Sydney had been a dissenting member of the commission. Melbourne Evangelicals were mostly in favour. Nevertheless, the 1977 General Synod approved the report and its recommendations that women be admitted to the diaconate and the priesthood. Women in favour of the change formed the Movement for the Ordination of Women (MOW) in 1983 and vigorously explored the implications in practical ways. Some left the Church because it was too patriarchal. Others wrote and held conferences about the issues. Anglo-Catholics insisted that such a change was totally opposed to Catholic order, as practised though the centuries. The National Association for Apostolic Ministry was established in 1989, but did not win wide support for its defence of historic Anglicanism.²⁴

In 1986 the first ordinations of women to the diaconate occurred, but the 1987 special session of General Synod rejected the proposed canon for women's ordination to the priesthood. It lost by four votes in the house of clergy. MOW members were disappointed, but not surprised. After extensive synod discussions, which did not resolve the disputed issues as the required support was not forthcoming, Bishop Owen Dowling of Canberra-Goulburn decided to ordain eleven women to the priesthood in early 1992. That was opposed by a legal injunction on 22 April 1992 from opponents in Sydney and elsewhere.

The New South Wales Supreme Court refused to rule over the issue on 3 July, on the grounds that it was a Church matter and that its constitution was not a legally enforceable contract. Meanwhile, Archbishop Peter Carnley of Perth maintained that there were no legal barriers to women's ordination in Western Australia, and went ahead with his ordinations in March 1992, after an injunction against them failed. Canberra-Goulburn performed its ordinations later that year. These ordinations were not recognized by opposing dioceses, but the actions pushed the General Synod, later in the year, to pass a clarifying canon which permitted dioceses to ordain women. Archbishop Keith Rayner of Melbourne played a key role. That meant that, by the end of 1992 ten dioceses had ordained eighty women as priests. Opposition feeling still ran high. In Melbourne, the service had to be delayed because of a bomb threat. Ballarat, Armidale, North West Australia, Sydney, and The Murray rejected the change and would not even permit ordained women

²⁴ O'Brien, 'Anglicanism and Gender Issues', pp. 288–9.

who visited their dioceses to exercise their ministry. Armidale changed its position in 2013.²⁵

By the end of the century there were over 480 Australian women priests. A small number of opponents became Roman Catholics, and others became members of the Anglican Catholic Church, based in the United States, but which subsequently split. Some Sydney Anglicans proposed that the diocese withdraw from General Synod. That did not occur, but they did cut off their grant to the fund which fostered ecumenical activities. A group of Anglo-Catholics formed Forward in Faith and demanded oversight from bishops who had not ordained women, if female bishops were to be appointed.

The process had been much simpler in New Zealand where there were no dioceses opposed to the ordination of women, or high-profile opponents who could have gathered sufficient numbers to defeat the proposal in General Synod. The first women were ordained in 1977. By the end of the 1970s every diocese had female clergy. A further barrier was broken in 1992, when Dunedin, with significant Anglo-Catholic sympathies, elected Dr Penelope Jamieson as their bishop. She had been an academic and a respected priest in the Wellington diocese, was possessed of a keen intellect, and was skilled at relating with the wider community. For many Māori, it was difficult to accept a woman having authority over male clergy, even though they were not personally affected. Bishop Whakahuihui Vercoe of Aotearoa refused to attend her consecration, in order to make plain Māori opposition to this innovation.²⁶

Jamieson was the first female diocesan bishop in the Anglican Communion. At times her role was lonely, for she was well aware that precedents would be created which might make difficulties for other women elected to the episcopate. She gave very competent leadership for a decade and served on national and international bodies. Dr Victoria Matthews was consecrated in Christchurch during 2008, after serving significant time as a bishop in Canada. In 2013, Dr Helen-Ann Hartley was elected to the see of Waikato. She had strong British academic qualifications and had been on the staff of St John's College. Though sexist attitudes persisted at the end of the century, they had been substantially weakened by the notable contribution made to ministry by women priests.

The appointment of women bishops in Australia took much longer because of constitutional difficulties and the unyielding opposition of Sydney, Ballarat, and their satellites. The Revds Kay Goldsworthy and Canon Barbara Darling were appointed as assistant bishops in 2008 in Perth and Melbourne respectively. Again some Australian opponents of women bishops joined the

²⁵ David Hilliard, 'Pluralism and New Alignments in Society and Church: 1967 to the Present', in Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia*, pp. 124–48 (pp. 133–7).

²⁶ Kevin Ward, *A History of Global Anglicanism* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 295.

'continuing' Anglican Catholic Church: three were admitted to its episcopate, including David Robarts, an earlier opponent of women's ordination in Perth and Melbourne, but ultimately few separated from the Australian Anglican Church. Nor did opposing dioceses dissociate themselves from General Synod or national episcopal meetings attended by female bishops.

Population growth and changes led to some new dioceses being created in Australia and others being amalgamated, because they were too small to survive. Kalgoorlie, with only six parishes, rejoined Perth in 1973. Carpentaria merged with North Queensland in 1995, but retained an indigenous bishop in the Torres Strait Islands. A diocese of the Northern Territory was founded out of Carpentaria as early as 1968, to take account of population growth there.

One of the most important issues facing the Churches in the later twentieth century was the nature of Christian unity and whether it demanded serious attention to reunion. Australian Anglicans were not directly involved in formal union discussions. Their leaders had rejected an invitation from Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian leaders involved in the negotiations which led to the formation of the Uniting Church in Australia. While there were theological conversations with other Churches, they impinged little on Anglican life. Initially, Anglicans were not even willing to approve inter-communion with other Churches.

Involvement with Councils of Churches also had little impact on parish life; nor did the meeting of the World Council of Churches in Canberra during 1990. The Week of Prayer for Christian Unity that began in 1955 was a gradual climate changer, as was the Church and Life Movement at local level, which started in 1966. Most important, however, was the effect of the Second Vatican Council on ecumenism, and the practical actions it inspired. Even in Sydney there were modest changes, though Archbishop Marcus Loane refused to meet the Pope when he visited Sydney in 1970 and attended an ecumenical service. Some regarded such action as disgraceful.²⁷ They did not understand the seriousness with which Loane took doctrinal differences with Roman Catholics.

In Melbourne, however, Archbishop Frank Woods attended several World Council Assemblies and served on the central committee from 1968–75. He presided over the Australian Council of Churches in 1966 and was active in the first meeting of the Anglican–Roman Catholic Dialogue Group the following year. He created a climate for deeper relations with Roman Catholics in events such as the 1973 Melbourne Eucharistic Congress. Archbishop Keith Rayner of Melbourne (formerly of Adelaide) from 1990–9 was also primate from 1991 and active in the Christian Conference of Asia. He was important in the founding of Anglicare in 1997. It brought together a variety of Anglican

²⁷ Hilliard, 'Pluralism', p. 138.

agencies and made possible the development of a national Anglican policy on social issues.

The situation was very different in New Zealand where the Anglicans were deeply involved with Churches of Christ, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in negotiations for a united Church. Congregationalists mostly joined the Presbyterian Church in 1969, apart from some Pacific Islander congregations who wished to retain links with their home Churches. A Basis of Union had been produced, and patterns of governance were being developed which involved some modification of episcopal authority as understood by Anglicans. An Act of Commitment was held in 1967; but in 1974 and again in 1976, the Auckland synod rejected the Plan for Union. Other issues included how to combine infant and believers' baptism, convictions about essentials of ministry, definition of Holy Communion and its participants, and relationships with other Churches, especially the Roman Catholic Church, which was engaged in serious conversations with the National Council of Churches. Anglicans opposed to the direction of the negotiations formed the Selwyn Society, which published a series of concise critiques.²⁸ In Auckland diocese some 20 per cent of the clergy were members. Anti-unionists also had a formidable advocate in Dr H. Miller, editor of *Church Scene*, the national Anglican paper and librarian at Victoria University. When a General Synod vote was finally taken in 1974, it failed by two votes in the house of clergy to gain the requisite two-thirds majority.²⁹ Attempts to find another way to unite were failures. Many of the union parishes began to find their reporting requirements onerous, and some were exploring dissociation by the end of the century, not wanting to form effectively another denomination.

Theological education, however, remained significantly ecumenical. Anglicans and Methodists educated their ministers at St John's College and the University of Auckland. Some Anglican candidates from Nelson and Christchurch, however, were educated in Christchurch at Christchurch College and Latimer House. Post-graduate theological study at the University of Otago did not have denominational boundaries, attracting a wide range of students. Melbourne College of Divinity (later the University of Divinity in 2013) later opened up wider partnership in theological education at every level, and included faculty in Adelaide and Sydney. The Anglican-based Australian College of Theology had degree-granting status, as did the Evangelical stronghold of Moore College, Sydney. The general hostility of universities in Australia towards theology, based in part on suspicions from the nineteenth century about sectarianism, began to be eroded when in 1974 the Perth College of Divinity integrated into Murdoch University in Perth as a faculty of Theology.

²⁸ Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa*, pp. 125–6.

²⁹ Ian Breward, *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (Oxford, 2001), p. 367.

The Anglican Church provided little ministry to Aborigines and was often silent about their exclusion from mainstream Australian society by governments, which believed that, even if Aborigines did not die out, their assimilation was the best policy. In local churches they were rarely welcome. Little was done to recognize Aboriginal leadership and its potential for fostering interaction between Christianity and Aboriginal culture. One of the few examples was James Noble who was made a deacon in 1925, but never priested. Fifty years elapsed before any other Aborigines were ordained. Two Torres Strait Islanders were made deacons in 1919 and priested in 1925. By the 1960s there were eighteen Torres Strait priests. Bishops in dioceses with Aboriginal populations expected Aboriginal candidates for ministry to undertake the same studies as white Anglican clergy, despite the fact that there were no secondary schools for tribal people to attend. Unsurprisingly, there were almost no candidates.

Removal of children from their families was often destructive. Anglican homes for such children evoked mixed memories. Aboriginal activists like William Ferguson and David Unaipon were few, though the missionary societies gave them a limited hearing, for almost no white Anglicans believed that Aborigines had a future—it was expected that they would die out. But by the 1940s not only were Aborigines surviving, but they were increasing in numbers. Federal and state government policy was assimilation for those of mixed race. By the 1950s assimilation was also applied to Aborigines. Some contrast was to be found within the Churches, though they generally accepted government policy. One missionary couple worked at translation of the local language, but the first official Bible translation of an Aboriginal language was not begun until 1967, by the CMS.³⁰

The introduction of self-determination by the Whitlam Labor government (1972–5) changed relations between Aborigines and missions. Fostering Aboriginal leadership was essential. Michael Gumbuli became the first Aboriginal priest on 4 November 1973. Arthur Malcolm was ordained in North Queensland during 1979 and consecrated as a bishop in 1985. A revival began in Arnhem Land during the late 1970s. It spread across Australia. By the 1980s Aboriginal leadership was spreading widely. In 1997, there was a schism in the Torres Strait Islands leading to rival bishops and Churches.

Reconciliation at government level began in the 1990s. The Anglican Church had already apologized to its Aboriginal members in 1988 in St Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney. *Bringing Them Home*, a government report published in 1997, underlined the tragedy of the 'stolen children', the government policy of forcible removal of half-caste children. In 1998, General Synod at last admitted Aboriginal and Torres Strait members as of right. Much

³⁰ John Harris, 'Anglicanism and Indigenous Peoples', in Kaye (ed.), *Anglicanism in Australia*, pp. 223–46 (pp. 240–1).

remained to be done, for many Aboriginal churches were inadequately resourced and uncertain how to deal with the social breakdown caused by abuse of alcohol and unemployment. Until such issues were fully shared, the Anglican Church would remain a prisoner of its colonial past.

Anglicans became concerned about alcohol use, which was changing. Six o'clock closing of hotels was increasingly seen as a dated solution to excess consumption of alcohol. Influential Anglican leaders encouraged their followers to vote for change when a referendum was held. The vote against six o'clock was clear. Closing time could thus move to 10 p.m. or even later. But the growth of heavy female drinking and underage excess continued to create major social problems. Many Aborigines and Māori continued to overuse alcohol. Some Aboriginal townships became dry, without entirely solving alcohol abuse by individuals. Drink-driving remained an intractable problem, killing and maiming thousands every year. A related issue of chemical dependence on a variety of drugs created further problems, not least because of the involvement of criminals in the supply and sale of marijuana, heroin, and other drugs of dependence. Gambling was also a growing challenge, as clubs, casinos, and international betting companies sought to provide opportunities for people and their money to be parted. Another Anglican concern, shared with other Churches, was sexual immorality. The number of children born out of wedlock accounted for almost half the births in Australia; New Zealand was little different. Though prostitution was no longer a crime in either country, the numbers of women involved had grown, for it was a highly profitable industry. Anglicans were as divided as other denominations on these and other issues. Gay and lesbian Church membership had come to be accepted widely, but there was no agreement on same-sex marriage, or on whether people in such committed partnerships should be ordained. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the matter of gay or lesbian bishops—a fractious issue in the Anglican Communion world-wide—had not yet arisen in a divisive way in Australasia, though one bishop of Bendigo was gay, without any hostile reactions from his clergy or people.

In both countries there were major discussions about native land title and its implications. Successive New Zealand governments recognized that substantial areas of Māori land were unjustly confiscated. Substantial compensation of over NZ\$600 million was paid and the Waitangi Tribunal was important in determining such title issues.³¹ In Australia there was a major case which reached the High Court in 1992. Eddie Mabo, an Anglican Torres Strait Islander, sought a ruling that native title on his island of Meriam had not been extinguished, despite the Queensland government's claim to the contrary. His claim was upheld by the High Court. Reaction among white

³¹ Ranginui J. Walker, 'Maori People since 1950', in Geoffrey W. Rice (ed.), *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (2nd edn., Auckland, 1992), ch. 19 (pp. 511, 516–19).

Australians was intense. The judgement was very carefully drawn. In particular, it underlined the importance of pastoral leases coexisting with Aboriginal and Islander title. That had been disregarded by generations of pastoralists and miners. Mining companies were thus forced to negotiate with tribal owners about access to minerals, adequate royalty payments, and offering employment. That had major consequences for many Aboriginal communities. They needed to employ lawyers to ensure that agreements were fair and comprehensive and to set up tribal negotiation teams. Anglican missions in the Northern Territory, Western Australia, and Queensland also had to develop new relations with their communities, especially after the Whitlam government reformed land laws and encouraged Aborigines to take control of their own affairs, instead of relying on white advisers. The development of such Aboriginal leadership ultimately encouraged more men and women to apply for entry to Anglican ministry, especially in the diocese of Carpentaria.³²

SYDNEY EXCEPTIONALISM

In all this, the conservative Evangelicalism of the diocese of Sydney made it strikingly different in culture and spirit, apart from the tide of change elsewhere, and its wealth enabled that difference to be supported and propagated. Though some Sydney Anglicans had from time to time floated the idea of separating from the Anglican Church of Australia, they had never won the support of their archbishop, or the synod. The Sydney synod sometimes refused to pay some of the dues of General Synod, rejected some canons, and was critical of the Appellate Tribunal over some decisions which went against Sydney positions, though it did not withdraw, as it was later to do in 2008, from the Lambeth Conference. It was, however, prominent in GAFCON. Dr Peter Jensen, archbishop of Sydney, became the secretary of GAFCON, which had the support of many bishops in Africa and Asia, as well as substantial financial support from Sydney (though the global financial crisis from 2008 attenuated support).

Another Sydney strategy had been for some clergy to plant their Evangelical congregations in other dioceses. Some of these congregations related to the local synod, but others affiliated with Sydney, creating new complications in diocesan relationships. By 2012, there were eight such affiliates.³³ Though Sydney rejected women priests, it employed a number of women in parishes. They mostly worked as deacons, having been ordained since 2004, after the

³² Harris, 'Anglicanism and Indigenous Peoples', p. 244.

³³ Muriel Porter, *Sydney Anglicans and the Threat to World Anglicanism: The Sydney Experiment* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 4–5.

same ministerial education as men at Moore College, but with many more restrictions on their ministry than male deacons, including being unable to preach from the pulpit, or share in the distribution of Holy Communion. In frustration, some migrated to other dioceses, so that they could be ordained as priests.

A further Sydney concern was for lay presidency of Holy Communion. Many Sydney Anglicans believed this had more biblical justification than the ordination of women as priests, but they did not convince other dioceses or General Synod, which discussed the issues in 1995. The Sydney archbishops did not press the matter nationally, but it was unlikely to disappear, related as it was to ideas on male headship held widely in Sydney. Moore College was at the centre of these developments, preparing candidates for ministry in the diocese. Its staff were highly qualified academically, published widely, and had close connections with Evangelicals elsewhere in the Anglican Communion. Drs Marcus Loane and Donald Robinson both became archbishop, after serving on its staff. T. C. Hammond, who had been formed in the Church of Ireland, and D. B. Knox had done much to create this particular Evangelical tradition, supported by other staff, which powerfully influenced generations of students. At its centre lay an emphasis on personal faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour, awakened by powerful preaching of the gospel as revealed in the Scriptures.³⁴ The authority of the Bible, the importance of justifying faith, substitutionary atonement, and the work of the Holy Spirit were all linked with an understanding of the local church as the embodiment of New Testament language on the Church and an anticipation of Jesus's return.

Knox's students were given a tightly defined doctrinal system, which rejected more liberal Anglican understanding of mission, expressed in Perth by Archbishops Geoffrey Sambell and Peter Carnley. Sydney Anglicans' views on divine headship not only affected views on women, but also led to a distinctive view of the Trinity, set out in a 1999 Report.³⁵ Its authors argued that there was an appropriate subordination in the Trinity, as well as in human relationships, notably in marriage. That was rejected elsewhere in the Australian Anglican Church.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century the influence of the Anglican Church League, a bastion of Sydney Evangelicalism in the diocese, continued. It dominated the nomination of synod committee members and ensured that they were elected. Again and again, Sydney bishops discovered that their authority was often limited by the league. There was tension between the central priorities and the need for parishes and agencies to follow their vision. In Sydney the Anglican Church League did something to bring unity between

³⁴ Judd and Cable, *Sydney Anglicans*, pp. 286–95.

³⁵ Cf. Kevin Giles, *The Trinity and Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate* (Downers Grove, IL, 2002), pp. 122–37.

the differing entities in the synod, though its influence was not always welcomed. Worship had moved from near-universal acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer and clergy leadership to a much freer style with lay leadership, contemporary music, and a determination to attract outsiders. Knox's views on the priority of the local congregation as the Church gained ground and made it difficult for attempts to provide centralized priorities. Though the income of the diocese grew dramatically in the 1970s, it was difficult to reach agreement about how best to spend income from trusts and endowments. Under Archbishop Robinson attempts to regionalize failed. He refused to remarry the divorced and did not espouse any radical change.

Parties emerged, for there was no agreement about which form of Evangelicalism was most suitable for leadership. The election of a new archbishop was strongly contested, before Henry 'Harry' Goodhew was elected in 1993. Building an effective episcopal team was a continued problem, for division of the diocese had been rejected. Though Goodhew managed to set up a Professional Standards Authority, founded regions, and resolved the issue of remarriage, divisive issues remained during the Peter Jensen years from 2001–13. Initially, Jensen's vision of a diocesan mission which would add 400,000 to Church membership inspired many of the clergy and the laity. Twenty per cent of all Anglicans lived in Sydney and 12 per cent in Melbourne. The numbers of those who had no association with the Church was growing steadily. That included 30,000 Māori in Sydney by the end of the 1980s.

However, in the late 2000s the finances of the diocese suffered dramatically as a result of the global financial crisis. Income fell by over half. Membership grew only by some 5,000, and a fire-sale of assets did little to repay the A\$160 million debt created by unwise borrowing and poor administration. The situation in 2010 was even worse. It was clear that the central leadership had been less than adequate. Good governance and risk management needed to be developed. That demanded a major change in the leadership provided by the new archbishop, Glenn Davies.

INTO THE NEW MILLENNIUM

Anglicans needed to be well informed about their identity if they were to respond adequately to the increasingly marginal position of all Churches in Australia and New Zealand. Secularism was an increasing challenge, as was the decline of theistic beliefs. A culturally compliant and ageing Church would not be able to respond in ways that brought commitment from the missing social cohorts. Anglicans in Australia in the 2011 census were just under 20 per cent of the population, and in New Zealand there were in the 2013 census just

under 500,000 adherents in a population of some four million.³⁶ The aged were a majority in many parishes and found it difficult to change in ways that would be effective in missionary terms. Church schools appeared to be failing in communicating the gospel, and few of their former students felt any need to be identified with their local parish and its organizations. Anglican intellectual life had vitality, but it was not always noticed. Magazines, such as *St Mark's Review* in Australia and *Anglican Taonga* in New Zealand demonstrated that national and international issues were still widely discussed, but governments and the public too rarely responded.

New Zealand Anglicanism did gain a measure of recognition throughout the Communion for the New Zealand Prayer Book. Its multi-cultural character, the variety of resources offered, and the freshness of some of its translations ensured that. Jewish leaders protested at the way some of the Psalms were translated, but that did not prevent the book selling many more copies in the United States than it did at home. Regular revisions kept the liturgy in touch with cultural changes and the continuing development of New Zealand idiom.

Though the proportion of Anglican schools was smaller in New Zealand than in Australia, careful attention was paid to providing resources for religious education in its forty-five schools. Sunday school rolls shrank, but the Joint Board for Religious Education continued to provide quality resources for their pupils. Theological education changed, with less emphasis on attendance at St John's College and more education for ministry being provided locally by the dioceses. That was especially important for ministers in Māori dioceses. St John's library was a vital resource for the Church and its Methodist partners, and all ordinands were required to have the ability to lead worship in Māori in marae and other Māori settings, though this was not always monitored adequately. Both Churches covenanted to share ministry. Anglicans were also in fruitful conversations with local Lutherans on eucharistic hospitality, and with Roman Catholics, as well as dealing with relationships with other world religions present in New Zealand. Governance of St John's was brought into closer relationship with diocesan synods, following a comprehensive report by Sir Paul Reeves and Dr K. M. Beck. Even more important were the constitutional changes introduced in 1992, which had been under development since 1986. General Synod approved a draft constitution in 1990. It was sent to dioceses for study and comment, and finally approved in May 1992. It provided three *Tikanga*, one for Pākehā, one for Māori, and one for Pacific Islanders. Each had to agree to any legislation at General Synod before it could become canonical. Māori were delighted at the opportunity thus given to deal

³⁶ Australian Bureau of Statistics, 'Australian Social Trends, November 2013', <<http://abs.gov.au>>, accessed 5 Apr. 2016; Statistics New Zealand, '2013 Census QuickStats about Culture and Identity', <<http://stats.govt.nz>>, accessed 5 Apr. 2016.

with their own priorities, using their own cultural procedures, without having to gain Pākehā approval as had been the case in the past. Pacific Islanders found it difficult to keep to the time schedules imposed and asked for the process to be slowed, as well as finding discussion of some issues, such as sexuality, culturally difficult. Despite teething problems, there was general agreement that the new framework had many advantages, as well as addressing the colonialist attitudes of many Pākehā towards Māori and Islanders and their ignorance about Polynesian cultural priorities and variety.

CONCLUSION

Mutual respect, reasoned reflection which honours Scripture, creeds, and canon law, and commitment to mission were essential to an Anglican future. Spaces for serious theological discussion needed to be created, so that renewal could have sustainable foundations, while undertaking to take seriously the new developments in national identity. Attitudes in Australia and New Zealand to race, ethnicity, and gender were changing by the early twenty-first century. The Anglican Church in both nations needed to take cognizance of that, if it was to remain both inclusive and yet faithful to its imperial heritage, without being imprisoned by it. Nor could secularist views be simply accepted. They needed to be challenged and restated in ways which underlined Anglican commitment to be emphatically Christian, despite being less widely accepted by its host society. Its ecumenical context also needed to be given due importance, as did its relation to the Anglican Communion. General Synods and the bishops helped with that, but the wider membership also was taking more responsibility for mission and service. While the Church in both countries had retained significant authority and had developed new ways of fulfilling its tasks, it no longer possessed the same place in society as it had at the beginning of the period, and faced significant challenges ahead.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, Brian, *Australian Gothic: The Gothic Revival in Australian Architecture from the 1840s to the 1950s* (Melbourne, 2001).
- Baynton, John R., *Cross over Carpentaria* (Brisbane, 1965).
- Breward, Ian, *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (Oxford, 2001).
- Cadwallader, Alan and David Richardson (eds.), *Episcopacy: Views from the Antipodes* (Adelaide, 1994).
- Chittleborough, Anne, *Anglicans in Papua New Guinea* (Sydney, 1996).

- Cole, Keith, *From Mission to Church: The CMS Mission to the Aborigines of Arnhem Land, 1908–1985* (Cole, 1985).
- Davidson, Allan K. (ed.), *Living Legacy: A History of the Anglican Diocese of Auckland* (Auckland, 2011).
- Dickey, Brian, *Australian Dictionary of Evangelical Biography* (Sydney, 1994).
- Fletcher, Brian, *The Place of Anglicanism in Australia: Church, Society and Nation* (Melbourne, 2008).
- Frame, Tom, *A Church for a Nation* (Sydney, 2000).
- Frame, Tom, *Church and State: Australia's Imaginary Wall* (Sydney, 2006).
- Frame, Tom and Geoffrey Treloar (eds.), *Agendas for Australian Anglicans* (Adelaide, 2006).
- Harris, John, *One Blood: 200 Years of Aboriginal Encounter with Christianity, a Story of Hope* (Sydney, 1990).
- Judd, Stephen and Kenneth Cable, *Sydney Anglicans: A History of the Diocese* (Sydney, 1987).
- Kaye, Bruce, *Anglicanism in Australia: A History* (Melbourne, 2002).
- Kaye, Bruce, *Reinventing Anglicanism: A Vision of Confidence, Community and Engagement in Anglican Christianity* (Adelaide, 2003).
- Monaghan, H. W., *From Age to Age: The Story of the Church of England in the Diocese of Wellington, 1858–1958* (Wellington, 1957).
- Peters, Bosco, *The Anglican Eucharist in New Zealand, 1814–1989* (Bramcote, 1992).
- Piggin, Stuart, *Evangelical Christianity in Australia: Spirit, Word and World* (Melbourne, 1996).
- Porter, Muriel, *Sydney Anglicans and the Threat to World Anglicanism: The Sydney Experiment* (Farnham, 2011).
- Stephens, Geoffrey, *The Anglican Church in Tasmania* (Hobart, 1991).
- Wand, John W. C., *White of Carpentaria* (London, 1949).

North American Anglicanism

Competing Factions, Creative Tensions, and the Liberal–Conservative Impasse

Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook

For over three decades mainline Christian Churches in North America towards the end of the twentieth century faced declining numbers, amid challenges about the ability of leadership to respond to post-modern culture, as well as questions about the relevancy of organized religion in the twenty-first century. The media referred to these questions as part of a ‘Church crisis’ which at the very least called into question the validity of Church organizations in the modern age, and in some cases predicted their demise. What were the root causes of the crisis, as well as the historical patterns which contributed to it? What were the sources of ‘conservative’, ‘traditional’, ‘liberal’, or ‘progressive’ arguments and how did they address the implied crisis? How could historical analysis of twentieth-century North American Anglicanism help inform the development of Anglican identity in the twenty-first century?

One of the major themes within Anglicanism in North America in the twentieth century that continued into the post-millennial era was the reality of growing diversity, also known as pluralism, along with subsequent struggles to discern the mission of the Church within a society increasingly individualistic and segmented. This trend did not affect Anglican Churches alone, but rather was characteristic of the crises surfacing in mainline denominations and local churches, including Roman Catholicism. In each case there was an apparent liberal–conservative impasse, characterized by threats of schism, and deeply polarized. The liberal side was assumed to be most hospitable to pluralism, yet at the same time suspected of including such a broad range of theological opinions that it espoused a religious relativism that dangerously compromised Christian identity. In tension with this perspective was the conservative side, which led with a narrower interpretation of the gospel along with a passionate

commitment to Christian identity, but which was considered by some to be judgemental, divisive, and lacking in compassion. Consequently, the Churches were viewed as composed of competing factions rather than creative tensions, deep commitment, or Anglican comprehensiveness.¹

The one hundred years between the close of the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference and the first decade of the twenty-first century witnessed significant developments in North American Anglicanism, as well as in all Christian Churches in the region. The region was 96.6 per cent Christian in 1910 (96.4 per cent in the United States and 98.4 per cent in Canada); these percentages fell to an average of 81.2 per cent Christian overall in 2010 (81.2 per cent in the United States and 75.8 per cent in Canada).² During that period the number of Anglicans in North America rose slightly overall, from 2,536,000 in 1910 to 2,864,000 in 2010. These numbers included 1,852,000 in the Episcopal Church and 669,000 in the Anglican Church of Canada in 1910, and 2,250,000 in the Episcopal Church and 614,000 in the Anglican Church of Canada in 2010.³

Two main trends were responsible for the decline in Christians in general in the region over the century. First, the impact of the increasing secularization of North American societies led to a decline in Church membership. The overall number of agnostics in North America increased from just over 1 million in 1910 to 41 million in 2010. Canada experienced the more profound statistical change with its Christian population dropping over 20 percentage points during the century. While Roman Catholic and independent Christians (those unaffiliated with institutional or denominational Churches) gained in numbers in North America over the century, Anglicans and mainline Protestants decreased. Second, due to the impact of immigration, particularly in the second half of the century, North America grew more religiously pluralistic, including over 5 million Muslims, 3.7 million Buddhists, and 1.8 million Hindus by 2000. At the same time, the majority of immigrants to North America by the end of the century were Christians from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.⁴

In the United States, the decline in membership of older, mainline denominations like the Episcopal Church began in the 1930s and was accelerated after the 1960s as growth rates lagged behind the population rate. In the early twentieth century, Canada was a religiously divided country, apportioned largely between Roman Catholics (many of whom were French-speaking) and Protestants, including Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Methodists (who

¹ W. Paul Jones, *Worlds Within a Congregation: Dealing with Theological Diversity* (Nashville, TN, 2000), pp. 13, 26–8.

² Mark A. Noll, 'Christianity in Northern America, 1910–2010', in Todd M. Johnson and Kenneth R. Ross (eds.), *Atlas of Global Christianity* (Edinburgh, 2009), pp. 192–3.

³ Johnson and Ross (eds.), *Atlas of Global Christianity*, pp. 73, 192–3.

⁴ Noll, 'Christianity in Northern America', pp. 192–3.

were largely English-speaking), with few points of connection. Among English-speaking Canadians the Church adherence rates were above those of the United States: into the 1960s, at least six out of every ten Canadians attended church.⁵ The religious loyalties of the Québécois, one of the most observant Roman Catholic populations in the world, and the Protestant English-speaking loyalism to the British crown in the rest of the population, combined to form a closer cooperation between Church and state than in the United States. Liberalism in Canada was balanced by religiously supported visions of the left and the right. For instance, denominational colleges remained part of Canadian universities throughout the century, and there was government support for primary and secondary Church-related schools in all provinces. From the 1960s on, however, the impact of religion on public life in Canada was in decline. In the Charter of Rights and Liberties (1982), the principles of multi-culturalism and individuals were more pronounced than the rights of religion. In contrast to the United States, where secularization coexisted with vigorous Churches (raising questions about whether the term was applicable at all), in Canada secularization proceeded through the traditional structures of society.⁶

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The early years of the twentieth century were a time of growth and affluence for the Episcopal Church in the United States, despite two World Wars and the Great Depression.⁷ After the Allied victory in the First World War the mainline denominations in the United States collaborated in an unprecedented way through ecumenical organizations such as the Federal Council of Churches (1908) and the Interchurch World Movement (1919), brought together to support the cause of Christian unity. The Episcopal Church entered the 1920s in a spirit of optimism and growth. Between 1880 and 1920 the Church doubled the number of its parishes (from 4,151 to 8,365) and tripled its overall membership (245,433 to 1,075,820).⁸ The General Convention of 1919 witnessed the most organizational changes for the Church since 1789, including the creation of an elected presiding bishop, a twenty-four member National Council to

⁵ D. Posterski, 'Affirming the Truth of the Gospel: Anglicans in Pluralist Canada', in George Egerton (ed.), *Anglican Essentials: Reclaiming Faith within the Anglican Church of Canada* (Toronto, Ontario, 1995), p. 34.

⁶ Noll, 'Christianity in Northern America', p. 191.

⁷ Jason S. Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity: The Past and Future of America's Majority Faith* (New York, 2012), p. 50.

⁸ David Hein and Gardner H. Shattuck, Jr, *The Episcopalians* (Westport, CT, 2004), pp. 111–12.

coordinate the work of the Church between triennial conventions, and large-scale fundraising efforts to support mission.

Originally, the Episcopalian leadership was reluctant to participate in the Federal Council of Churches, believing the Episcopal Church had a unique role as a bridge between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Still, Charles Henry Brent, bishop of the Philippines and a participant in the 1910 Edinburgh Missionary Conference, became a major ecumenical figure on the world stage and successfully proposed to the General Convention the need for another ecumenical 'Faith and Order' conference. Although the war in Europe, along with the lack of support from the Roman Catholic Church and some conservative Protestant Churches, threatened the nascent ecumenical movement, some 400 Christians gathered in Lausanne in 1927 for the first World Conference on Faith and Order. Episcopalians left Lausanne with a renewed commitment to ecumenical relationships, and to participation in international conferences on social policy (Life and Work), joining with the Church of England to establish full communion with the Old Catholic Church in 1931. In 1948, amid the devastation of yet another world war, the Episcopal Church pledged its support as a founding member of the World Council of Churches.⁹

Though the Social Gospel remained vigorous throughout the Church before the First World War, interest declined in the 1920s, as American society grew increasingly secular. The coming of the Great Depression in 1929 was a shock to Church and society alike. The House of Bishops in a pastoral letter dated November 1933 urged Christians to work towards a new social order with a more equitable distribution of wealth. As Episcopalians faced the possibility of another world war, many Church leaders pledged neutrality, though by 1941, with the increasing threat from Nazi Germany against Britain, the Church grew more supportive of the war effort. Though the Episcopal Church's leadership could do little to stop the injustices perpetrated against persons of Japanese ancestry sent to internment camps by the United States government, they did insist on continuing ministry to members of the Church's nine Japanese-American congregations.¹⁰

Church membership grew steadily in the 1950s, though some Episcopalians agreed that the contemporary religious scene had grown more insular, and less concerned with the traditional Anglican emphasis on the Social Gospel. As middle-class white families moved out of downtown areas, Episcopal leaders began to re-emphasize the need to minister in the city. In addition to the creation of urban ministries, the Episcopal Church created a nationwide racial ministry, as its institutions gradually became desegregated. The 1952 General

⁹ Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 113–14.

¹⁰ Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 115–19.

Convention passed a resolution openly condemning any school or college that denied admission based on race.¹¹

The first half of the twentieth century also brought changes in the role of women, as the status of women in the Episcopal Church was impacted by changes in society, particularly after the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment giving women the vote in 1919. In that same year the General Convention began to deliberate on the first resolutions which, though initially defeated, would allow women the right to vote in Church assemblies. The first women to take seats on the National Council were elected in 1935. Though the number of women missionaries and deaconesses began to recede in the 1920s, the hiring of women as professional Church workers grew in popularity and women became increasingly visible as leaders in many areas of Church life by the 1950s.¹²

Growing Polarization

From the later 1950s, there was a growing polarization between those who saw the mission of the Church in terms of social activism, and those who were primarily concerned with spirituality and nurture. Conflicts precipitated by the liberation movements of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, including civil rights, feminism, and the ordination of women to the diaconate, priesthood, and episcopate, as well as the ordination of gay and lesbian persons, and the liturgical changes of the 1979 Book of Common Prayer, shook the post-war consensus and contributed to a growing impasse between liberal and conservative opinion in the Church. At the end of the century, these polarities were still in place, with the additional perspectives of traditionalists who were unsure of their place in a Church of rapid change, as well as those progressives who wanted a more inclusive Church.

The civil rights movement was the first social issue that shook mainline Christians in the United States, including Episcopalians, after the post-war consensus. Calling for 'unity in Christ', Episcopal Church leaders and the bureaucracy in New York began to dismantle its segregationist policies during the 1940s. The denomination created the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity (ESCRU) for those who wanted to combat prejudice, and many lay Episcopalians supported the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).¹³ Given the history of the United States, conflict became inevitable once the Episcopal Church began to stress the need to desegregate. Between 1947 and 1949 most Southern dioceses granted equality

¹¹ Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 122–6.

¹² Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 126–8.

¹³ Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity*, p. 51.

to African American laypeople and parishes, though it was not until 1952 that black and white participants were seated together for a meal at an annual convention. A year earlier, in 1951, the provincial synod discussed the closing of the Bishop Payne Divinity School for African Americans, and decided that rather than opening another segregated seminary, existing seminaries in the South should be open to students of all races.

In June 1952 the Board of Regents of the University of the South decided not to admit African American students to the seminary. It concluded that to admit African American students would not only create a contentious atmosphere for both races, but that the move violated state segregation laws. Trustees also believed that further study of the effects of desegregation on the university was needed before the matter could be settled.¹⁴ The decision was a bitter disappointment to many students and teaching staff at the School of Theology; the majority of the teaching staff and over half of the student body decided not to return the following school year. The theology faculty charged that the trustees' position was 'untenable in the light of Christian ethics and of the teaching of the Anglican Communion'.¹⁵ At the same time the larger community of Sewanee (the site of the University of the South) was shocked that the theology faculty made segregation a public issue; 80 per cent of the undergraduates signed a statement in support of the chancellor and trustees, and affirming the traditions of the school. Some feared that the admission of African Americans would destroy 'the Sewanee ideal' for the sake of a few applicants. In June 1953, after a year of delays, the largest group of trustees to gather in the school's history met in special session and reversed the 1952 decision. Eighteen out of twenty diocesan bishops present supported desegregation; fourteen committed to keeping their students out of the school if it remained segregated. As one historian wrote, 'In this instance the Anglican position on race relations overcame other legal, cultural, and conservative preferences.'¹⁶ It was a powerful example of the Episcopal Church's ability to influence societal change.

Episcopalians became more involved in the civil rights movement as the century progressed. While the North had contributed to the abolitionist movement, like the South it was also home to racism and entrenched ideas about the ability of people of different races to live within the same community. As the movement progressed, the issues divided laity and clergy. More clergy than laity spoke out against racial discrimination, and while 79 per cent of Episcopalians supported the ending of segregation only 29 per cent agreed that whites and blacks should live in the same neighbourhoods. The division

¹⁴ Gardner H. Shattuck, Jr, *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Louisville, KY, 2000), pp. 45–50.

¹⁵ Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race*, quoted on p. 45.

¹⁶ Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race*, pp. 47–50.

eventually caused friction throughout the denomination. Liberal clergy and members of the Church bureaucracy were freer to attend the Freedom Rides and often returned transformed and committed to activism. So many clergy headed south that denominational offices and bishops' offices began receiving complaints from parishioners around the country about absentee clergy.¹⁷

As race riots escalated throughout the nation, the presiding bishop, John Hines, at the General Convention in Seattle in 1967, devised a plan endorsed by ESCRU to give \$3 million through an initiative named the General Convention Special Program (GCSP) to empower the black community, including community and grass-roots organizations outside the denomination. Although most Episcopalians, especially clergy, thought that the Church should be doing more to support the civil rights movement, others grew concerned that the Black Power movement was threatening to the country and to the Church itself. These fears escalated when James Forman, international affairs director of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), demanded reparations through the Black Manifesto from Churches and synagogues to pay for their part in the nation's racist history. National black Church groups supported the manifesto. The GCSP represented an enormous shift in the Church's response to racism, and grew to embrace Native American and Hispanic organizations as well. Hines called for a Special Convention in 1969 on the progress of the GCSP, and committed himself to including additional delegates to ensure that youth, women, and minority groups were represented. Recognizing an opportunity to influence power relationships and representation, the women of the Church, through the United Thank Offering, were the earliest to respond favourably to Hines's expanded concept of the Church's mission and leadership.¹⁸

Although Hines was optimistic about the GCSP as a compromise made in response to the Black Manifesto's call for reparations, the programme was a source of controversy among members of the Executive Council and other Church leaders from the beginning. Council members were opposed in principle to any grants programme that would approve sending funds into a diocese without the consent of the diocesan bishop. On a deeper level, beyond the polity concerns, there was genuine fear that the Church was funding black separatist organizations, some of which were involved in violence, rather than organizations focused on racial reconciliation and cooperation. In addition to the civil rights struggle, a growing divide in the Church about the escalating war in Vietnam exacerbated the friction between clergy involved in the anti-war movement and conservative-led congregations which passed resolutions against draft dodging. Eventually Hines and his administration were challenged to find ways, other than reparations, to address injustice, and other

¹⁷ Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity*, pp. 51–2.

¹⁸ Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race*, pp. 208–11; Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity*, pp. 54–6.

Church leaders were caught between two polarized positions—those who believed the Church should be concerned primarily with spiritual matters, and those who saw the Church in the forefront of the social revolution of the day. By the end of the GCSP the Episcopal Church had donated \$7 million to grass-roots social justice organizations. But the conservative backlash on the local level was severe and the precipitous drop in giving forced Hines into an early resignation. He was replaced in 1973 by the conservative John Maury Allin, who stopped the GCSP soon after taking office, transforming it into the Commission on Community Action and Human Development, ending its specific projects, and merging all minority programmes under the one funding operation.¹⁹

Internal Conflicts

Perhaps even more than national issues, it was the internal conflicts caused by the movement for the ordination of women and the liturgical reforms leading to the 1979 Book of Common Prayer which most greatly exacerbated the liberal-conservative impasse in the Episcopal Church in the mid-twentieth century. Although Julia Chester Emery declared the twentieth century 'The Woman's Century', the General Convention of 1919 denied women the right to serve as delegates and in most Church offices.²⁰ At the same time, the Woman's Auxiliary, founded by Emery and her sisters, continued to recruit, train, and support lay women for ministry on every level of the Episcopal Church. Although Episcopal women excelled in their separate sphere of the Woman's Auxiliary, in sisterhoods, as deaconesses, and later in the twentieth century as religious educators and certified women workers, they did not serve on vestries until the 1950s, and were not eligible to be voted deputies to the General Convention until 1970. Although the order of deaconess was officially recognized by the Church in 1889, it was not until a new canon was adopted in 1964 that women were recognized as 'ordered' rather than 'set apart'. In an effort to recognize women as deacons and members of the clergy, James Pike, then bishop of the diocese of California, announced his intention to recognize deaconess Phyllis Edwards as a deacon in his diocese. Pike's actions pushed a reconsideration of the 1964 canon, and a new canon was passed at the General Convention in 1970 that eliminated distinctions between male and female deacons and allowed women to seek diaconal ordination officially.²¹

¹⁹ Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity*, pp. 56–9.

²⁰ Pamela W. Darling, *New Wine: The Story of Women Transforming Leadership and Power in the Episcopal Church* (Cambridge, MA, 1994), p. 110.

²¹ Darling, *New Wine*, pp. 110–11.

Although the House of Bishops voted in 1972 to allow the ordination of women to the priesthood 'in principle', the measure failed to pass the House of Deputies at the General Convention in 1973. After this bitter disappointment, proponents of women's ordination to the priesthood began to develop a strategy for gaining ordination without the consent of the General Convention. Initial attempts to secure the support of pro-ordination bishops failed, though in July 1974 three retired bishops agreed to ordain eleven women deacons to the priesthood. The ordination of the 'Philadelphia 11' was held on 29 July 1974, the Feast of Saints Mary and Martha of Bethany, at the Church of the Advocate in Philadelphia, the parish where Paul Washington, the civil rights advocate, was rector.²²

The ordination of the Philadelphia 11 caused a severe crisis throughout the Episcopal Church. John Maury Allin, the presiding bishop, implored members of the Episcopal Church to refuse to recognize the validity of the women's orders until the next General Convention could determine their status. At the same time, other notable Episcopalians, including seminary deans, publicly supported the ordinations and ignored attempts to suppress the new priests. To complicate matters, four more women were ordained to the priesthood in the diocese of Washington in September 1975. As fifteen women actively ministered in the Church as priests, the General Convention of 1976 debated their status, eventually voting to recognize the eligibility of women to serve in all three orders of ordained ministry. At the same time, the Church also passed the 'Conscience Clause', which allowed individual bishops to decide whether or not to ordain women in their dioceses, but this proved to be a short-lived compromise. Those who disagreed most strongly left the Episcopal Church. Many who stayed accepted the change, even if initially the idea of women priests made them uncomfortable. To have the Episcopal Church ordain women to the priesthood gave the movement respectability. By 1979, almost 300 women, serving in seventy-two of the Episcopal Church's ninety-three dioceses, had been ordained to the priesthood.²³

Sociologists and theological educators have suggested that women's entry into the ordained ministry represented the most significant transformation in pastoral leadership in the twentieth century, if not since the Reformation.²⁴ By the end of the twentieth century, there were nine Episcopal women bishops and approximately 2,000 women clergy, comprising 14 per cent of all clergy in the Episcopal Church, numbers which continued to climb into the twenty-first century. While women clergy were visible throughout most of the Episcopal Church, especially since the election of the first female presiding bishop,

²² Darling, *New Wine*, pp. 120–32.

²³ Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, p. 142; Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity*, pp. 60–1.

²⁴ Joy McDougall, 'Weaving Garments of Grace: En-gendering a Theology of the Call to Ordained Ministry for Women Today', *Theological Education*, 39 (2003): 149–65 (p. 150).

Katherine Jefferts Schori, many ordained women encountered considerable challenges to living out their vocations. A report issued by the Church Pension Fund in 2006 reported a consistent compensation gap between full-time male and female clergy, with women earning on average 17.5 per cent less than men.²⁵ As Barbara C. Harris, the first woman bishop in the Anglican Communion, stated in a speech to the Episcopal Women's Caucus in 2000, the Church was a 'strange land' where despite so-called progress, people of colour, women, and lesbian and gay people continued to struggle to claim a place.²⁶

The movement to ordain women into the priesthood led directly into other liberal and conservative conflicts in the Episcopal Church. One of the first women ordained to the priesthood in the diocese of New York, Ellen Barrett, was a lesbian. Barrett's bishop knew about her sexual identity when he ordained her to the diaconate, but did not believe it was a reason to bar her from ordination. However, when Barrett became the first co-president of Integrity, a recently (1975) formed organization for gay and lesbian Episcopalians, discontent over her ordination became more public and widespread. Although she was ordained in 1977 over protests not only from the diocese of New York, but also from other dioceses across the Church, the conflicts over Barrett forced the Church to speak in more concrete terms on the status of gay and lesbian Episcopalians by the time of the next General Convention in 1979.²⁷

As the realities of pluralism became more evident in the Episcopal Church because of the ordination of women to the priesthood and the status of gay and lesbian people, controversies regarding Prayer Book revision ensued. One scholar has commented that '[w]hen amplified by female ordination, calls for a new hymnal, and the changing role of baptism... the theological crises produced by Prayer Book revision constituted not only a change in liturgy but a threat to the way many envisioned their denomination should function'.²⁸ Prayer Book revision in the Episcopal Church was part of a much broader liturgical movement which influenced many branches of the Christian Church in the mid-twentieth century. Although the revision process began years before in the 1960s, it was not until the 1970s that Church members began to provide feedback on trial liturgies. When the 1979 Book of Common Prayer passed the General Convention, the occasion was equally one of elation and doom among Episcopalians. Some of the most extreme reactions were from members from the Society for the Preservation of the Book of Common Prayer, already discontented with the Church due to women's ordination

²⁵ Church Pension Group Research, *The State of the Clergy, 2006* (New York, 2006), p. 10.

²⁶ Quoted in Fredrica Harris Thompson, 'Women in the American Episcopal Church', in Rosemary S. Keller and Rosemary V. Ruether (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Women and Religion in North America* (Bloomington, IN, 2005), pp. 269–78 (p. 278).

²⁷ Hein and Shattuck, *The Episcopalians*, pp. 143–4.

²⁸ Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity*, p. 61.

and controversies over human sexuality. A year after the book's approval, eighteen congregations voted to withhold funds, ten had declined episcopal visitations, and another thirteen had voted to leave the Episcopal Church altogether. The total number of people who left the Church due to Prayer Book revision was estimated at about 3,000 out of 2.9 million.²⁹

The Browning Years, 1985–1997

At the time of his election as presiding bishop in 1985, Edmond Lee Browning inherited not only the controversial issues of at least two of his immediate predecessors, but also the polarized identities of 'conservative' and 'liberal' Episcopalians, as well as a large constituency who did not feel that they fitted in either camp. Throughout the course of the Browning administration there were two primary issues that tended to polarize the House of Bishops, and that remained major sources of controversy throughout the Church. The first was human sexuality, most specifically homosexuality, the ordination of gay and lesbian people, and same-sex blessings. The second was the ordination of women to the episcopate, and the mandatory acceptance of the ordination of women in all dioceses. There were certainly other major differences of opinion on other issues, such as scriptural interpretation, AIDS/HIV, Prayer Book revision, abortion, euthanasia, marriage, and divorce, yet the bulk of the press coverage tended to focus on homosexuality and women's ordination.

National media were quick to pick up on Browning's election as a move to the left on the part of the Episcopal Church's leadership. A *Time* magazine article, 'Opting for the Browning Version', dated within two weeks of the election, cited the presiding bishop-elect's support of women's ordination and inclusive language. The article also highlighted Browning's role in 1979 as one of the twenty bishops who filed a fervent dissent against the position that it is inappropriate for the Church to ordain practising homosexuals. 'I would hope', Browning told *Time* at the time of his election, 'we are not frozen in any kind of set belief about homosexuality'.³⁰

At the same time, *Time* quoted a 1985 Gallup poll of Episcopalians which suggested that among laity, 78 per cent did not believe it was the role of the Church 'to be an agent of political change in the United States', and 76 per cent stated that the Church should focus more on 'worship and spiritual matters' than on political issues. Undeterred by data uncovered by pollsters, Browning stated his belief that it is the responsibility of the Church to exercise moral leadership in society. 'Peace and justice concerns will be a high part of my

²⁹ William Sydnor, *The Prayer Book Through the Ages* (Ridgefield, CT, 1978), p. 124.

³⁰ R. N. Ostling, 'Opting for the Browning Version', *Time*, 23 Sept. 1985.

agenda', he said.³¹ In another statement, the presiding bishop-elect indicated that he intended to be supportive of many groups in the Church, and hoped that as his term ended 'we will have reflected an openness and will have tried to value all persons, will have tried to be loving without being legalistic and will have been deeply concerned about some of the issues demeaning persons'.³²

Voices from within the Episcopal Church felt strongly that the Church should stay out of politics, and return effectively to the way it was perceived before the 1960s, or at least stay away from controversies. For instance, Smith Hempstone, from Charleston, South Carolina, argued:

Those of us who do not think the Church should become an ecclesiastical version of Common Cause, who are unsure about the ordination of women and have reservations about the ordination of practicing homosexuals, who love the 1928 *Book of Common Prayer*, have been branded racists, sexists and reactionaries. We are none of these things. We are traditionalists who cherish our heritage, love our traditions and honor our past. We will accept progress, but we will oppose change for the sake of change.³³

Hempstone's analysis significantly positioned the origins of the intense friction between conservative and liberal Episcopalians in the years of the Hines administration, specifically between 1967 and 1970, the years of the controversial GCSP. While issues such as Prayer Book revision, the ordination of women, and the ordination of gays and lesbians certainly exacerbated the tension, Hempstone and other traditionalist commentators had not forgotten the GCSP initiative which had aimed to make available millions of dollars in grant money from the Church's budget to non-Church organizations aimed at the eradication of poverty and social injustice. They argued that while the presiding bishop appeared unconcerned about the money involved, local church people felt differently: 'But it did bother the man in the pew, who closed his wallet and found another church (or none) with more congenial practices.'³⁴ Hempstone's appraisal of Allin fell into the latter camp, judging him 'a good man but an indecisive one. So the drift toward secular liberalism continued with the adoption of the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer*'.³⁵

The initial optimism of the Browning administration about the ability of the Episcopal Church to bring together its many constituencies was evident in conferences held early in his term. The first was known as the Presiding Bishop's Vision Conference and was held in New Jersey. The second was a

³¹ Ostling, 'Opting for the Browning Version'.

³² Anne Harphan, 'Browning to lead Episcopalians with "ministry of servanthood"', *The Honolulu Advertiser*, 11 Sept. 1985.

³³ Smith Hempstone, 'An Episcopalian's Plea—Give Me Back My Church!', *The Evening Post*, Charleston, SC, 12 Jan. 1986, p. 17-A.

³⁴ Hempstone, 'An Episcopalian's Plea'.

³⁵ Hempstone, 'An Episcopalian's Plea'.

larger gathering in St Louis called 'Under One Roof'. Other than the times when the Church gathered at the General Convention, seldom had such diverse groups of Episcopalians come together. The guiding concept was to bring together the leadership of as many Episcopal organizations as possible to worship together and to contribute their ideas to the future policies of the Church. At 'Under One Roof', the presiding bishop urged participants to a renewal of the spirit of Pentecost: 'I believe you and I have been gathered in this place to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit which will empower and restore us, so that our lives can be renewed and that we can speak with clarity across the barriers that have been created by a sinful world.'³⁶ Through such gatherings, Browning sensed that his role was to serve as a 'bridge' between diverse cultures and factions within the Church, and to encourage unity by challenging Episcopalians everywhere to become more involved in the mission of the Church. 'The way to unity is found in the scriptures', he said: 'We must come to a greater realization that the ministry to which we are all called . . . is to serve in the ministry of Christ.' Although participants in the gatherings welcomed the opportunity to meet with other leaders and explain the work they were doing, some wondered how genuine the dialogue between groups was, given the deep differences that existed.³⁷

A Gallup poll commissioned by the Episcopal Church in 1990 at the onset of the Decade of Evangelism found that, like other mainline denominations, the Episcopal Church had seen declining membership since the 1960s. The poll indicated that the decline in membership was more about societal factors which affected all Churches, rather than denominational issues such as Prayer Book revision, the ordination of women, inclusive language, or same-sex relationships. George Gallup, Jr, a self-identified Evangelical Episcopal layman, wrote in his introduction to the poll that the Episcopal Church was 'substantially orthodox' and had 'a fairly clear sense of direction and mission'. One of the major challenges for Episcopalians, the poll suggested, was the gap between belief and practice. Thus, the suggestion was not only to encourage evangelism, but also to provide more opportunities through the use of small groups for people to share their spiritual journeys, study Scripture together, and deepen their prayer lives. Browning found much to celebrate in the poll, and hoped that Church leaders and parishes would use it to promote spiritual health.³⁸ He also implemented the use of small groups to deepen the spirituality of Church life, not only within the House of Bishops, but also in other gatherings throughout the Church, such as Executive Council meetings, the

³⁶ Edmond Lee Browning, 'Under One Roof', 11 June 1987, notes from Jim Solheim Archives.

³⁷ Roann Bishop, 'Bishop sees New Vitality in Church', *Times-News*, Hendersonville, NC, 11 July 1987.

³⁸ 'Gallup Poll Says Episcopal Church has a "Clear Sense of Direction and Mission" Despite Gaps Between Belief and Practice', *Episcopal News Service*, 14 Mar. 1990.

General Convention, and 'In-House' meetings at the Episcopal Church Center in New York.

Beginning in 1991, some dioceses either threatened or actually voted to withhold funds from the national Church, giving parishes the choice of whether or not to redirect funds they would normally send as their assessment. 'The agenda of local churches and the agenda of the national Church staff have been on parallel paths for many years with very little communication between them', said John MacNaughton, bishop of West Texas.³⁹ Some of the members of his diocese believed that the national Church's focus on social controversy made it ineffective when it came to Christian ministry. It should be noted that most dioceses, in fact, gave sacrificially during years of financial hardship, yet the fact that a few dioceses would even consider not meeting their financial obligation to the Church signalled a switch in the understanding of Anglican polity as it relates to the relationship between dioceses, the national Church offices, and the Episcopal Church as a whole.⁴⁰ These shifts within the Episcopal Church were concurrent with the decentralization and the down-sizing of the national offices of other mainline denominations, some of which made the decision to move out of New York City for economic reasons. Also, the trend of the times was the belief that large denominational bureaucracies built during the 1950s and 1960s were no longer good investments. The perception was that money sent away to fund national (and international) mission might be better spent locally, and that local leaders were more in touch with the needs of the person in the pew.

Institutional Racism

Despite the gains of the civil rights movement, the reality of institutional racism continued throughout the Church. 'The whole issue of racism in our country is more serious today than it was during the Civil Rights era' of the 1960s, said Browning. 'Before we talk about bringing down apartheid, we must look at ourselves. Racism in this country is an evil that needs to be addressed.'⁴¹ During Easter Week in 1989 the black Episcopal bishops drafted a special pastoral letter to the African Americans within the Episcopal Church, in an effort to address the struggles of the people in the pews who sought ways to live out their faith in a predominantly white denomination. The pastoral letter was designed to provide an opportunity for black Episcopalians to take

³⁹ J. Michael Parker, 'National Staff Draws Frowns from Episcopalians', *Express-News*, San Antonio, TX, Browning Collection, n.d. [c.1991].

⁴⁰ 'Episcopal Church in 1991: Many Divisions, Budget Cuts Pose Challenges', *The Living Church*, 5 Jan. 1992.

⁴¹ Roxanne Evans, 'Episcopal Leader Hails Diversity: Bishop Urges Church to Fight U.S. Racism', *American-Statesman*, Austin, TX, Browning Collection, n.d. [c.1986].

stock of what had been accomplished, as well as to 'shape the vision for the next stages of their journey'.⁴² The pastoral letter was designed to encourage the African American Episcopal community to move forward in recognition of their many contributions to American culture.

The 'Pastoral Letter on the Sin of Racism', adopted by the House of Bishops in the spring of 1994, was a lasting contribution towards the eradication of racism. The first teaching on the subject of racism addressed to Episcopalians in the United States, and framed within the context of the Baptismal Covenant (a mini catechism used at baptisms), the pastoral letter did not attempt to touch on all aspects of racism, but rather aimed at stimulating discussion. 'Escalating violence in America illustrates the complexity of racism', it asserted:

At the heart of the matter is fear. We fear those who are different from ourselves, and that fear translates into violence, which in turn creates more fear. Institutionalized preference, primarily for white persons, is deeply ingrained in the American way of life in areas such as employment, the availability of insurance and credit ratings, in education, law enforcement, courts of law and the military.⁴³

The pastoral letter was used as a tool for dialogue throughout the Church, asserting that 'We will teach and preach the gospel in ways that sustain a vision of justice and peace among all people.'⁴⁴ Further, the bishops committed themselves to the creation of a standing committee on racism within the House of Bishops to monitor and implement the covenant.

Like the Anglican Church of Canada to the north, the Episcopal Church also built significant relationships with American Indians and other indigenous Anglicans. In 1990 the Episcopal Council on Indian Ministries (ECIM) began the first of several visits to Māori Anglicans of Aotearoa/New Zealand, leading to the development of a new network, the Anglican Indigenous Network (AIN), which included not only Māori and indigenous peoples in the United States, but native peoples in Canada, Native Hawaiians, and the Aboriginal people of Australia. Network founders included Paul Reeves, the former primate of New Zealand, himself partially of Māori descent. The network expanded into the southern hemisphere when an international delegation of Anglican Indians participated in the Anglican Encounter in Brazil in 1992.⁴⁵

On All Saints Day, 1997, in Jamestown, Virginia, the site of the first permanent English settlement—and during one of the last major events of

⁴² *But We See Jesus: A Pastoral Letter from the Black Episcopal Bishops to the Black Clergy and Laity in the Episcopal Church* (New York: Office of Black Ministries), 25 June 1990.

⁴³ 'The Sin of Racism: A Pastoral Letter from the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church', Mar. 1994.

⁴⁴ 'The Sin of Racism'.

⁴⁵ Owanah Anderson, *400 Years: Anglican/Episcopal Mission among American Indians* (Cincinnati, OH, 1997), pp. 330–1.

his administration—Browning led the Episcopal Church to join in a ‘new covenant of faith’ with the indigenous people of the United States. The Jamestown Covenant committed Episcopalians to strive for justice in reconciling the painful history of colonization, to work with indigenous people in finding solutions to political and social challenges, and to stand together to honour and protect the earth. ‘James and his advisers would never in a million years have guessed that their descendants would be led by the gospel to pursue the radical equality of the human family’, said Browning.⁴⁶

Women and the Episcopate

At the 1978 Lambeth Conference the bishops of the Anglican Communion approved a resolution which recognized that a member Church of the Communion might elect a woman to the episcopate, and accepted the fact that this event could be in accordance with the constitution of the Church concerned. However, the resolution also stated that no decision to consecrate a woman should be made without consultation with all the primates of the Communion, and that there should be a clear mandate for the election, lest the office of bishop become a symbol of disunity. At the 1985 General Convention the House of Bishops voted 112:31 that they would not withhold consent to the election of a bishop on the basis of gender, and asked Presiding Bishop Browning to convey this information to the Anglican primates. Although the Episcopal Church was clear about its desire to consult with the primates to discuss the impact of such an action on the Anglican Communion, it was also clear that the Episcopal Church was not asking for permission; the canonical and theological justifications were already decided when women were ordained to the priesthood. Other Churches in the Anglican Communion—Canada, New Zealand, Kenya, Uganda, and Cuba—added their names to a growing list of Churches where the ordination of women to the episcopate was not far from a reality.⁴⁷

Robert Runcie, then archbishop of Canterbury, was concerned that the election of a woman to the episcopate would produce a bishop not in communion with other bishops, cause a serious rift within the world-wide episcopate, and thus create yet another obstacle to women in Churches where ordination to the priesthood was not yet a reality. With the archbishop of York, he appointed a commission to study the issues of women and the episcopate, yet that group was not to report until the Lambeth Conference

⁴⁶ ‘Covenant With Indigenous People Signed at All Saints’ Day Service’, *The Living Church*, 30 Nov. 1997.

⁴⁷ ‘Question of Women Bishops Requires Primates’ Attention’, *Canadian Churchman*, Mar. 1986.

in 1988. Yet within the Episcopal Church, there was a distinct possibility that a woman would be elected before 1988. The *Canadian Churchman* argued that 'the primates should accept the likelihood that such actions will probably happen before Lambeth and devise steps by which they would deal with such an eventuality'.⁴⁸

In September 1988, Barbara C. Harris, director of the Episcopal Church Publishing Company and assistant at the Church of the Advocate in Philadelphia, was elected suffragan bishop of the diocese of Massachusetts. 'I have been elected a bishop of the Church, not a symbol or token', she said.⁴⁹ In response to this historic event, Browning called all members of the Episcopal Church to prayer, and with pastoral concern sought to minister to those on all sides of the issue, while upholding the historic significance of the event: 'Our Church, in a prophetic manner, has made that witness and continues to do so around the issues of women in the episcopacy—it's a witness I earnestly believe will be a contribution of real significance to other parts of Christendom.'⁵⁰

After receiving the required canonical consents, Browning ordained Barbara C. Harris as the first woman bishop in the Anglican Communion on 11 February 1989. Harris said she was initially 'floored by the presiding bishop's enthusiasm for her election. He tried to be pastoral in every way', she said. Aware of the joy of the event for many, as well as the anguish it caused others, the presiding bishop said, 'This consecration will be both a momentous and solemn occasion, and a time of great joy and celebration . . . I (have) asked the Church to be sensitive to the convictions and feelings of others. I have felt that sensitivity being expressed by the majority of the Church.'⁵¹

In June 1989, Browning, Harris, and other ordained women from the Episcopal Church met with the archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Communion and Women in the Episcopate (the Eames Commission) in Long Island, New York. Significantly, it was the first meeting of the commission after Harris's consecration as bishop. Women priests from Canada and the United States, as well as representatives of the Evangelical and Catholic Mission, joined Harris at the commission meeting. The Eames Commission had been charged with creating pastoral guidelines for opponents across the Communion to 'respect' each other's views on women's ordination.⁵² Browning was encouraged by the Eames Report, and believed that its work significantly improved the relationship between the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion. Like many of the primates, he was also concerned by

⁴⁸ 'Question of Women Bishops Requires Primates' Attention'.

⁴⁹ 'Massachusetts Election: Comments', *The Living Church*, 23 Oct. 1988.

⁵⁰ Edmond Lee Browning, 'Remarks to the House of Bishops', San Antonio, 22 Sept. 1986.

⁵¹ 'Historic Consecration', *The Living Church*, 26 Feb. 1989.

⁵² 'Eames Commission Report', *The Living Church*, 28 May 1989.

'the great divide in consciousness' in the Anglican Communion that surfaced on a variety of issues such as the ordination of women, human sexuality, and the nature of authority. Browning explained this divide in consciousness as between those who tend to see tradition as an evolving, dynamic reality, with the capacity for continuing revelation, and those for whom tradition was a more fixed reality. Despite these two perspectives on tradition, or maybe because of them, Browning repeatedly maintained 'that we need each other for the integrity of the *whole* Church's unity, witness, and mission'.⁵³

As presiding bishop, Browning's support of ordained women was very public, yet the ordination of women remained a subject of debate in the Church during his entire administration and for many years after the General Convention approved it. After Barbara C. Harris, the next two women elected to the episcopacy in the Episcopal Church were Jane Homes Dixon, as suffragan bishop of Washington in 1992, and Mary Adelia McLeod as bishop of Vermont in 1993, the first woman diocesan bishop in the Episcopal Church.

The intense debate on the ordination of women at the General Convention in 1994 was focused on the implementation of the eighteen-year-old canon on women's ordination. The House of Deputies voted that it was time to guarantee access to ordination for both women and men and that the time had come for the canon to be implemented, not 'addressed' as proposed by the House of Bishops. After two days of discussion going back and forth between both houses the General Convention passed a resolution directing both supporters and opponents of women's ordination to engage in dialogue, and for the first time officially recognized both theological positions. The convention 'managed to keep the peace', yet supporters of women's ordination were embittered that the House of Bishops was unable to affirm that the three orders of ministry, bishops, priests, and deacons were equally open to women and men.⁵⁴ At the General Convention in 1997 in Philadelphia, Browning's last as presiding bishop, two resolutions were passed making women's ordination mandatory in every diocese, and at the same time respecting the theological views of those who oppose it.⁵⁵

Human Sexuality

From the 1970s some of the most heated debates between conservative and liberal Episcopalians centred on human sexuality. The 1976 General

⁵³ Edmond Lee Browning, Address to the Executive Council, 13 June 1989.

⁵⁴ Michael Barwell, James Solheim, and Jeffrey Penn, 'Urging Continued Dialogue on Thorny Issues, General Convention Ends in a Fragile Peace', *Episcopal News Service*, 4 Sept. 1994; 'Women's Victories in both Houses', *The Witness*, Oct. 1994, p. 22.

⁵⁵ Jan Nunley, 'Women's Ordination Mandatory, but Opponents' Right Respected', *Episcopal News Service*, 6 Aug. 1997.

Convention, while remembered primarily for its approval of the ordination of women to all orders of ministry, was also the occasion when it was first affirmed by the Episcopal Church that homosexual persons had civil rights and were 'children of God'. Three years later, at the 1979 General Convention, a minority of bishops drafted a statement of conscience and objected to the convention's adoption of a resolution declaring it inappropriate to ordain a 'practising homosexual'. While the Episcopal Church voted publicly to uphold the civil rights of gays and lesbians in 1976, controversy regarding the ordination of 'practising' homosexuals was very much alive during the Browning administration, as was the topic of the blessing of same-sex unions. During an era when several well-publicized accounts of sexual misconduct involving Episcopal bishops were in the news, Browning worked to clarify the expectations of the Church in terms of clergy contact, and to separate the issue of sexual misconduct from discussion of sexual identity. It was his belief that the partnership between the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies facilitated the dialogue on difficult issues:

I did not choose these issues...Nor did you. They are the challenge of this generation given to us through the God of history. I believe with all my heart that for the most part, we are responding to them out of the gospel: not some literalist gospel, or a liberal gospel or a conservative gospel, but the gospel of Jesus Christ, whom we know and love.⁵⁶

A pivotal event in the dialogue on human sexuality during the Browning administration occurred when the diocese of Newark ordained a non-celibate gay man, Robert Williams, to the priesthood in December 1989. Browning and his Council of Advice disassociated themselves from the ordination, stating that 'We believe that good order is not served when bishops, dioceses or parishes act unilaterally.'⁵⁷ In this instance their main concern was 'collegiality', given the breach of an agreement made in the House of Bishops in a resolution from 1979 that stated it was not appropriate to ordain practising homosexuals or any person engaging in heterosexual relations outside of marriage, rather than a negative response as such to the issue of ordaining gay men and lesbians. No matter how strongly he felt about justice for gay and lesbian people, Browning was humble enough to know that the issue would have to work itself out through the House of Bishops and the General Convention. David Collins, the president of the House of Deputies at the time, presided over the discussion, and observed that there was 'a wide variance' and fundamental differences among Executive Council members on the subject of human sexuality. 'It is an issue we're going to have to deal with in this Church', said Collins. 'I wish we didn't have to, but we do.'⁵⁸

⁵⁶ 'A Continuing Struggle to Reach Consensus', *Episcopal News Service*, 21 Apr. 1988.

⁵⁷ '1990: New Beginnings and More Controversy', *The Living Church*, 6 Jan. 1991.

⁵⁸ 'Executive Council Meets', *The Living Church*, 1 Apr. 1990.

John Shelby Spong, bishop of Newark, denied that any member of the diocese of Newark acted inappropriately in ordaining Robert Williams, and expressed shock at the condemnation that emanated from parts of the Church. At the request of the presiding bishop, Spong delayed the ordination to the diaconate of another non-celibate gay man, Barry Stopfel, in an effort to keep the dialogue open for the good of the Church. Stopfel later wrote that he did not present himself for ordination out of deference to Browning's request, and with the knowledge that the presiding bishop pledged his support to the ordination of gay and lesbian persons. Stopfel was eventually ordained in September 1990 by Walter Righter, assisting bishop of Newark. On the same day, Ronald Haines, bishop of Washington, ordained Elizabeth Karl, a lesbian living in a committed relationship. Browning's efforts at rebuilding relationships and restructuring the meetings of the House of Bishops held that body together so that consensus could gradually emerge and historic decisions could be made down the road. Accomplished largely behind the scenes, and with implications beyond his term of office, Browning's work with the House of Bishops was a major structural accomplishment of his administration.

During the 1991 General Convention in Phoenix the House of Bishops met in an unprecedented six closed sessions to repair their collegiality. After that convention the House of Bishops decided to hold an extra 'retreat' meeting each year, in addition to the annual business meeting, to nurture collegial relationships and to foster more constructive dialogue. Browning said:

During our meeting in Phoenix, I came to the realization that we could not go on in this fashion any longer, I thought that we were cheating ourselves and the Church by not claiming the shared leadership, the *episcopate*. I did not want to go through the next six years of my time as presiding bishop trying to argue disputes and keeping order.⁵⁹

One response of the House of Bishops to the issue of human sexuality was to make preparations for a pastoral letter on the subject for the General Convention in 1994. The process tested the level of collegiality within the House of Bishops since its collapse in Phoenix in 1991. Called 'Continuing the Dialogue: A Pastoral Study of the House of Bishops to the Church as the Church Considers Issues of Human Sexuality', the document traced the history of the Church's views on human sexuality, reviewed scriptural interpretations, discussed the discontinuities between official teaching and the experience of the Church's members, and offered guidelines for further dialogue. Weeks before the document's release date on the first day of the General Convention, the traditionalist organization Episcopalians United leaked the two final drafts, an action which Browning found reprehensible, and one that further

⁵⁹ 'Episcopal Bishops Journey Toward a More Collegial Style of Leadership', *Episcopal News Service*, 16 Sept. 1992.

fuelled controversy. The pastoral teaching eventually was downgraded to a 'study', and was joined by two other competing documents: 'An Affirmation', prepared by some bishops that upheld the traditional teachings on marriage; and 'Koinonia', a statement presented by John Shelby Spong that asserted sexual identity was 'morally neutral' and upheld the ordination of non-celibate homosexuals. By the end of the convention, 106 bishops had signed 'An Affirmation', and fifty-five had signed 'Koinonia'. The House of Bishops decided to send out 'Continuing the Dialogue' without either additional statement attached.⁶⁰

In contrast to the dynamics of 1991 in Phoenix, the debates around human sexuality and the pastoral study at the General Convention in 1994 were surprisingly civil. One area of contention was a guideline that committed bishops to ordain 'only persons [they] believe to be a wholesome example to their people according to the standards and norms established by the Church'.⁶¹ The question of just who was considered a 'wholesome example' was the subject of much debate, including a suggestion that the decision to ordain a non-celibate homosexual was not a 'local option'. Meanwhile, members of the House of Deputies appreciated the bishops' call for further dialogue, concerned that the pastoral study should not be used to sidestep other resolutions on human sexuality. Although approval by the House of Deputies was not needed to release the bishops' pastoral study, they did urge the Church to study it and created a twelve-member Committee on Dialogue on Human Sexuality, comprising bishops and deputies. After failed attempts in previous conventions, both houses agreed to change the Church canons to ensure that no one be barred from access to the ordination process because of 'race, color, ethnic origin, sex, national origin, marital status, sexual orientation, disabilities or age', except as otherwise specified in the canons. At the same convention, the House of Bishops voted down, after two days of debate, a resolution to develop rites for same-sex blessings, instead opting for a substitute resolution calling for study of the theological and pastoral considerations in developing 'rites honoring love and commitment between persons of the same sex'. A resolution calling for materials to understand and accept children's sexuality was approved, although bishops and deputies did not agree to distribute a report from the Standing Commission on Human Affairs on 'at risk' youth, including those who are gay and lesbian.⁶²

Towards the end of his term as presiding bishop Browning grew more proactive in his support of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT)

⁶⁰ David Kalvelage, 'It was a Typically Anglican Year', *The Living Church*, 1 Jan. 1995.

⁶¹ <http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/ENS/ENSpress_release.pl?pr_number=94135>, accessed Nov. 2015.

⁶² Barwell et al., 'Urging Continued Dialogue on Thorny Issues, General Convention Ends in Fragile Peace'.

community. In June 1996 conservative Church members took out an advertisement in the *Washington Times* rejecting Browning's statement that gays and lesbians in committed relationships can serve as wholesome examples. In the same year Browning insisted that the World Council of Churches engage in dialogue about human sexuality, despite protests from the Orthodox Churches.⁶³

In the same year, ten traditionalist bishops brought a presentment against Walter Righter, the suffragan bishop of the diocese of Newark, who had ordained Barry Stopfel in 1990. At the time, Browning implored the bishops not to put forward a formal presentment, and instead to remain in dialogue over controversial issues regarding human sexuality, but to no avail. The presentment stated that Righter had violated the doctrine of the Church and his ordination vows, and was supported by nearly a quarter of the Episcopal Church's 300 bishops. The charges were later dismissed in court, in a judgement stating that the Episcopal Church had no doctrine prohibiting the ordination of homosexuals. The ten bishops who brought the presentment charges against Walter Righter found the decision 'deeply flawed and erroneous' and issued a strongly worded statement after the court dismissed the charges. 'In a single pronouncement', the statement said, '[the court] has swept away two millennia of Christian teaching regarding God's purposes in creation, the nature and meaning of marriage and family, the discipleship in relation to sexuality to which we are called as followers of Jesus, the paradigm of the Church as bride and Christ as bridegroom'.⁶⁴ There was no appeal, although the bishops who issued the presentment stated their intention of bringing a canon to the 1997 General Convention which would require all clergy to abstain from sexual relations outside of marriage. Other groups, such as the Episcopal Women's Caucus, applauded the court's decision as positive: 'We especially rejoice with our lesbian sisters and gay brothers in this affirmation of the gift of their ministries in our Church.'⁶⁵

The 1997 General Convention was the last of the Browning administration and continued to focus on legislation related to issues pertaining to gay and lesbian Church members, extending health benefits for domestic partners, but rejecting pension benefits for surviving partners of gay and lesbian clergy. At the same convention, a resolution calling for the development of same-sex blessings was rejected by one vote in each of the clergy and lay orders of the House of Deputies. Despite the lack of consensus in the Church concerning homosexuality, the convention issued an apology to lesbians and gay men for 'years of rejection and maltreatment by the Church', at the same time

⁶³ Brian Grieves (ed.), *No Outcasts: The Public Witness of Edmond L. Browning, the XXIVth Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church* (Cincinnati, OH, 1997), pp. 88–90.

⁶⁴ 'Presenter Bishops Respond to Trial Court Vote', *The Living Church*, 9 June 1996.

⁶⁵ 'Presenter Bishops Respond to Trial Court Vote'.

acknowledging 'the diversity of opinion ... on the morality of gay and lesbian relationships'. Advocates of the measure, such as Louie Crew, a deputy from Newark and founder of *Integrity*, a newsletter in support of the LGBT community, signed the resolution, 'not because lesbians and gays need this apology, but because the Church needs to apologize'.⁶⁶

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH OF CANADA

According to Alan L. Hayes, 'The character of Anglican Christianity is to be sought not in the changing policies of Church judicatories but in the historical disagreements of Anglicans, which have continued into the present.'⁶⁷ It was 1893 when Anglicans gathered in Toronto to create the national General Synod and to pledge their ongoing commitment liturgically and theologically to the Church of England. The Church organization grew slowly. A missionary society was established in 1905, followed by organizations for Sunday schools and social service. A Church headquarters was established in Toronto in 1920. Most of the funding for the Indian residential schools founded by the Canadian Church came from the government. Many Canadian Anglicans were attracted to the Social Gospel movement, and participated in social reform movements focused on building a more just society. Unfortunately, many also believed that building a more just society meant the cultural assimilation of First Nations peoples, immigration restrictions, and the sterilization of impoverished women. After the Second World War, the Church, like other Canadian institutions, began to develop a more independent national identity. It began to see itself as a Canadian Church of Anglican heritage, rather than an English colonial Church. The name Anglican Church of Canada was adopted in 1955—the first use of the title 'Anglican' of any Church in the Communion.⁶⁸

Throughout the twentieth century, Canadian Anglicanism was a changing reality. The new Church organization, initially without a budget, grew slowly as a national structure. By 1905 the Church had organized its first national missionary society, followed by a Sunday School Commission and a Council for Social Services. Still, Church funding was limited, and mostly provided by the government in support of the First Nations residential schools. Hayes argues that throughout its history, the Anglican Church of Canada always

⁶⁶ 'Presenter Bishops Respond to Trial Court Vote'.

⁶⁷ Alan L. Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada: Controversies and Identity in Historical Perspective* (Urbana, IL, 2004), p. 46.

⁶⁸ Alan L. Hayes, 'The Anglican Church of Canada', in Ian S. Markham, J. Barney Hawkins IV, Justyn Terry, and Leslie N. Steffenson (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 475–88 (p. 484).

considered itself part of the global Church, and believed that mission was vital, but at the same time disagreed internally on exactly how it should be done. For instance, in 1910 there were voices strongly in support of the residential schools for the First Nations, yet there were also sharp debates against the same schools which resonated with the voices of Anglicans at the end of the century.⁶⁹

In regard to Anglican style and identity, the twentieth century in the Anglican Church of Canada also brought with it debates about the role of the Church in the modern world. On one hand, some Anglicans chose to embrace modernity as the means to realize the kingdom of God on earth. Those who repudiated it did so based on arguments which suggested that modernity raised social issues above the 'infinite worth of the individual human soul'.⁷⁰ Throughout the social and cultural changes of the twentieth century, despite cultural change, questions about the relationship between Christ and culture remained consistent. As Hayes has asserted, some preferred to 'preserve the beliefs and practices they have received, often unaware that these have been shaped in other historical cultures no more intrinsically Christian than their own', whereas others preferred to 'reshape their beliefs and practices according to new knowledge, often not fully acknowledging that the new knowledge comes without guarantees and is itself a passing chapter in human history'.⁷¹

By the early twentieth century, frictions over ritual were superseded by debates pertaining to the relationship between religion and modern science. Though a few liberal clergy in the early years of the century were disciplined for their views on modernizing doctrine, by the First World War the dominant theology affirmed both modernity and religion, and attempted to avoid religious conflicts pertaining to doctrine and Anglican identity through to the 1950s. In the 1920s and 1930s modernists in both the Anglican Church of Canada and the Episcopal Church sought to incorporate educational advances and academic standards into theological education. In 1918 they created the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges, renamed the American Association of Theological Schools in 1936. Similarly, methods from medical education influenced the creation of new organizations and training programmes, such as the Council for the Clinical Training of Theological Students (1930) and the New England Theological Schools Committee on Clinical Training (1933).⁷² Many Anglicans in Canada were attracted to the Social Gospel movement, and believed in the power of the Church to build a more just social order. For instance, an Anglican National Commission working in 1931

⁶⁹ Hayes, 'The Anglican Church of Canada', pp. 485–6.

⁷⁰ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, p. 159.

⁷¹ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, p. 162.

⁷² Robert W. Pritchard, *A History of the Episcopal Church* (3rd rev. edn., New York, 2014), pp. 260–1.

made many recommendations about the need of the Church to become more relevant to modern society. In a similar way the Church proposed welfare legislation in the 1940s.⁷³

Some historians have interpreted the First World War as a crisis of Church and culture in Canada because social evangelism was powerless to explain the evil and carnage witnessed by so many of those who experienced trench warfare. A few military chaplains, such as Robert Shires, who witnessed the slaughter of the battle of the Somme, renounced his orders because he was unable to reconcile Christian teachings with the realities of the war. As some historians also note, there were also conflicts between the elite officer chaplains, and the largely working-class men in the infantry.⁷⁴ Other historians note that while the war changed Canada forever, the intensity of the experience also forged a new national identity. As shown in their sermons and memorial services, wartime Anglicans in Canada, through the Book of Common Prayer, contributed to a strengthened identity as Christians and as Canadians.⁷⁵

Though the experience of the First World War reinforced social Christianity among Canadian Anglicans, particularly those who served as war chaplains in the conflict, it is also noteworthy that they were on different sides of major issues. Many supported receiving Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany, and some (above all missionaries for the Women's Auxiliary) ministered to Japanese-Canadians in relocation camps. What characterized Anglicanism 'was not a set of positions on the issues of the day, changing from time to time, but ongoing debates about how the Gospel should be applied to the life of the world'.⁷⁶

After the Second World War, during the 1940s and 1950s in Canada the religious culture was amongst the strongest in the Western world, surpassing that of Britain and the United States. A 1945 Gallup poll found that 65 per cent of adults (aged over twenty-one) attended a service three weeks after Easter Sunday, as compared to 58 per cent in the United States.⁷⁷

The second half of the twentieth century was a period of self-examination in the Anglican Church of Canada, as it struggled to come to terms with pluralism. A collection of essays, *Anglican Essentials: Reclaiming Faith within the Anglican Church of Canada* (1995), edited by George Egerton, a professor of history at the University of British Columbia, focused on whether or not the

⁷³ Hayes, 'The Anglican Church of Canada', p. 484.

⁷⁴ Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, *Christian Churches and Their Peoples, 1840–1965* (Toronto, 2010), p. 152.

⁷⁵ Melissa Davidson, 'The Anglican Church and the Great War', in G. L. Heath (ed.), *Canadian Churches and the First World War* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 116–67.

⁷⁶ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, pp. 72–3.

⁷⁷ Callum G. Brown, *Religion and the Demographic Revolution: Women and Secularisation in Canada, Ireland, UK and USA since the 1960s* (Woodbridge, 2012), p. 51.

pluralism of post-modern culture was hospitable or hostile to the Christian faith. Egerton himself argued that there was little comfort for the Churches in 'the confused moral compass of postmodernism... In any event, [they] will likely have little control over the cultural matrix in which they will exist in the foreseeable future; they can and must, however, guard the authenticity of their own faith and witness.'⁷⁸ In the same volume, Dan Posterski of World Vision Canada made a poignant plea for the need for a 're-nourished and re-created Church' in the midst of post-Christian Canada: 'Effective leaders in the future will increasingly contextualize the vision and function of their Churches. They will understand and address the prevailing *culture*.'⁷⁹

The Anglican Church of Canada in the second half of the twentieth century developed a liberal strategy of embracing pluralism and progressive values and practices, while at the same time others in the Church criticized what was seen as the abandonment or revision of traditional doctrines for the sake of relevance. In a period of secularization throughout Canadian institutions, social justice became a way to make the Church more relevant. Beginning in the 1960s, as Canada became an increasingly multi-cultural society, the Church was marked by intense ferment around a variety of issues, including doctrine, mission, gender roles, education, and liturgy. Like the Episcopal Church to the south, the Anglican Church of Canada grew more centralized and bureaucratized in the first half of the twentieth century. But by the 1960s many Canadian Anglicans began to call for structural changes:

The bureaucratic Church worked well for skilled bishops operating on a common wave length with skilled staffs, especially if the bishops also built rapport with wider constituencies. It worked poorly for bishops who failed to cultivate their staffs, lost touch with their clergy and people, lacked political savvy, or failed to maneuver lightly around the relics of ecclesiastical constitutionalism, notably synods.⁸⁰

The third and last Anglican World Congress which met in Toronto (1963) signalled the coming of age of the Anglican Church of Canada, and stimulated critical thinking and theological discourse about the role of the Church in the modern world. In 1965 the Anglican Church in Canada commissioned what was considered a controversial Lenten book, *A Comfortable Pew*, written by Pierre Benton, an atheist, and intended to challenge the relevancy of the Church. Canadian Anglicans found themselves at times deeply divided over questions of ecclesiology, specifically what it meant to be the Church, and what constituted proper Anglican worship and discipline. Even those not involved in other issues of the day could become embroiled in conflicts

⁷⁸ George Egerton, 'Hearing the Truth in Christ', in Egerton (ed.), *Anglican Essentials*, p. 11.

⁷⁹ Posterski, 'Affirming the Truth of the Gospel', p. 51.

⁸⁰ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, p. 111.

associated with churchmanship in the nineteenth century, specifically described in terms of polarities as the 'Church party' and the 'Evangelical party'. By the twentieth century these groups were replaced with other diverse expressions of Anglicans, all supporting their own agendas, organizations, and liturgical styles, and assuming the correctness of their expression of the Christian faith. These groups included conservative and liberal Anglican Catholics, exponents of the Liturgical Movement, the Prayer Book Society of Canada, social activists, Evangelical groups, Charismatic groups, Feminist groups, and others.

During the last thirty years of the twentieth century, the Anglican Church of Canada was served by two liberal primates, Ted Scott (1971–86), and Michael Peers (1986–2004). Increasing theological and political engagement in peace and justice issues was characteristic of these years, including building relationships with native peoples. Scott was a widely respected moderator of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, actively campaigning for the dismantling of apartheid in South Africa, as well as promoting justice for Third World peoples. During his primacy the Anglican Church in Canada also approved the ordination of women to the priesthood (1977), democratized Church polity, enhanced the role of the laity in synodical government, and participated in liturgical renewal, not without controversy after the introduction of the Book of Alternative Services (1985), which was formally introduced after Peers was installed in office.

Although women were always active as laity in the Anglican Church of Canada, they were excluded from formal governance until the 1960s. The exceptions to this rule were participation in the Women's Auxiliary (to the Missionary Society of the Anglican Church in Canada), where women participated in missionary and social ministries, religious orders, and as deaconesses. Discussions on the role of women in the Church paralleled the history of women in society at large. As women gained the right to vote in Canadian decision-making bodies in the 1910s and 1920s, so too did women gain roles in local churches. Women were first ordained to the diaconate in 1969. Between the years 1968 and 1976 a plan to ordain women to the priesthood was discussed and implemented. The first woman bishop, Victoria Matthews, was ordained in 1994.⁸¹ Opponents of women's ordination, as well as proponents, cited Scripture and tradition. Also after 1960, discussions about gender included debate about homosexuality, an issue which created polarization and conflict.⁸² Hayes points out that in Canadian Anglicanism historic conflicts have rarely been settled; rather, the more important emphasis has been to involve all sides in conversations on matters of importance to

⁸¹ Hayes, 'The Anglican Church of Canada', p. 479.

⁸² Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, pp. 196–7.

Anglican identity, valuing 'comprehensiveness' over authoritative statements on the 'boundaries of doctrine and practice'.⁸³

Not all adherents of the Anglican Church of Canada were equally supportive of the developments under the leadership of Scott and Peers. During these years, opposition emerged to liberal theology and what were seen as heretical teachings and radical innovations. The Prayer Book Society of Canada rigorously defended the traditional liturgy. Conservative theological renewal centred on Wycliff and Regent colleges. Anglican Evangelicals, Charismatics, and Catholics built coalitions and called for spiritual renewal.⁸⁴

During the 1970s and 1980s the Anglican Church of Canada was active in a variety of social causes, often in collaboration with other mainline denominations, and including anti-apartheid advocacy, social responsibility in investments, environmental causes, and supporting a fair resolution of First Nations peoples' land claims disputes. Like the Episcopal Church, the Anglican Church in Canada was embroiled in controversies for much of the 1990s, including many lawsuits resulting from clergy misconduct and the abuses against Indian children perpetrated by the residential schools. Although a settlement was reached in 2003 it was not backed by the Anglican Council of Indigenous People, nor was it entirely beneficial to the survivors. Revised in 2006, the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement was the largest class action suit in Canadian history, with the government incurring most of the liability for restoration and reconciliation.⁸⁵

During Michael Peers's primacy the Anglican Church of Canada achieved full communion, with interchangeability of ministries, with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada, and developed much closer ties with the Episcopal Church. It was under Peers's leadership that the Church had first issued a formal apology to First Nations people for the abuses they had endured in the residential schools. Towards the end of his term of office, Peers stood in support of the claims of northern Canadians dependent on seal hunting in opposition of animal rights lobbyists. Peers was also an active supporter of the ordination of gay and lesbian clergy. Debates over the ordination of gay and lesbian persons and the blessing of same-sex unions (after 2005 same-sex marriages) began in the 1970s, and were a regular topic of discussion at national and provincial meetings through the 1990s. These discussions were further complicated because 'disagreements on sexuality frequently camouflaged other, perhaps deeper disagreements on religious identity and authority, theological method, culture, styles of leadership and personality', according to Alan Hayes.⁸⁶

⁸³ Hayes, *Anglicans in Canada*, p. 204.

⁸⁴ George Egerton, 'Canadian Anglicans at the End of the Twentieth Century', in Egerton (ed.), *Anglican Essentials*, p. 15.

⁸⁵ Hayes, 'The Anglican Church of Canada', p. 486.

⁸⁶ Hayes, 'The Anglican Church of Canada', p. 486.

In 2003, when the diocese of New Westminster authorized the blessing of same-sex unions, the divisions in the Church escalated; fifty parish churches were later to leave the Anglican Church of Canada, dissatisfied with the liberal stance of the Church and its views on human sexuality. Questions remained about the relationship between the Anglican Church in Canada and the Anglican Communion. It has been argued that the divisions in the Canadian Church exposed

numerous fault lines running through the ACC and across the Anglican Communion: between maintaining Anglican traditions and moving out ecumenically; between British-American dominance and Third World equality; between top-down ecclesiologies and bottom-up ecclesiologies; between liturgical tradition and liturgical updating; and between the two missionary visions of changing the world and changing the individual.⁸⁷

GLOBAL RELATIONSHIPS AND REALITIES

In August 1963 the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy and the Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conference met in London, Ontario, immediately before the Anglican Congress. The focus of the talks was on the changing world and the Anglican Communion. Conceived by missionary leaders and endorsed by the primates under the title 'Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ' (MRI), the focus shifted from thinking of some Churches as 'mother' Churches and others as 'dependent' or 'younger' Churches. Touted as 'the rebirth of the Anglican Communion', MRI suggested a new reality among the Churches in the Anglican Communion where all were considered equal in responsibility, serving God and humanity in one missionary task. 'The Church that lives to itself will die by itself', said the archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsey.⁸⁸ Steven F. Bayne, executive officer of the Anglican Communion, and eventually bishop of the diocese of Olympia in the Episcopal Church, was instrumental in the consultation and in the drafting of the MRI report. Key to Bayne's thought was the idea that mutual responsibility and interdependence were what should drive Anglican mission, and that through this spirit the whole world would be transformed. No longer should Churches be locked into individual issues, but rather, Bayne reasoned, Anglicans needed to embrace the world with a larger vision.

It is now irrelevant to talk of 'giving' and 'receiving' Churches. The keynotes of our time are equality, interdependence, mutual responsibility. Three central

⁸⁷ Hayes, 'The Anglican Church of Canada', pp. 486–7.

⁸⁸ R. David Cox, 'One Body', *Episcopal News Service*, 9 July 2000.

truths at the heart of our faith command us in this: the Church's mission is response to the living God who in his love creates, reveals, judges, redeems, fulfils. It is he who moves through our history to teach and to save, who calls us to receive his love, to learn, to obey and follow. Our unity in Christ, expressed in our full communion, is the most profound bond among us, in all our political and racial and cultural diversity. The time has fully come when this unity and interdependence must find a completely new level of expression and corporate obedience.⁸⁹

Throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s, the Episcopal Church developed mission strategies for overseas relationships that stressed a basic commitment to the liberation of all humankind. In these years the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief began to consider as one of its primary tasks the support of development programmes that would enable people to deal creatively with their problems. Likewise, the United Thank Offering began to offer financial support for training programmes that supported human development and global justice. Integral to overseas development during these years was the belief in the need for Churches to develop indigenous leadership related to and part of the culture in which they lived, rather than as a reflection of the American tradition in a foreign context. It was one step towards the Episcopal Church recognizing its paternalistic history of dealing with overseas jurisdictions. As Bayne wrote, 'The national Church has had to face the question of whether it was seeking to *enable* these jurisdictions in their process of developing a mature life, or was it indeed, through various ways, treating them as adolescents—or even worse acting as a parent not willing to trust or let go.'⁹⁰

Under the oversight of the Overseas Review Committee and the Joint Commission on World Mission, policy changes moved overseas jurisdictions towards self-government, self-support, and self-propagation. Some of these policy changes included the right of overseas dioceses to elect their own bishops, the transfer of property held by the national Church to the overseas dioceses, and the formation of a coalition of overseas bishops to foster interdependence and group decision-making. At the time there was a growing desire among overseas jurisdictions—those churches of the Episcopal Church founded to cater to American congregations outside the United States—to seek autonomy. In actuality, some of the dioceses wished to leave the American Church not to be 'independent' so much as to be 'interdependent', or to meet with the Episcopal Church as equal partners rather than as a child coming to a parent. For instance, in 1965 the province of Brazil was formed from dioceses that were once part of the Episcopal Church. In 1971 the diocese of Okinawa, also once part of the Episcopal Church, became the eleventh diocese of

⁸⁹ Steven F. Bayne, Jr, *Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ* (New York, 1963), p. 18.

⁹⁰ Bayne, *Mutual Responsibility*, p. 18.

the Nippon Sei Ko Kai. In a similar manner, the diocese of Liberia petitioned the General Convention to become an associated diocese of the province of West Africa. Similarly, the diocese of Costa Rica was doing the same kind of planning.

In 1973 the Episcopal Church initiated the implementation of the Partners-in-Mission Consultation process developed at the second meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in Dublin in 1973, also known as 'MRI-Phase II'. This process called for every province or council within the Anglican Communion to host a consultation to which they invited other parts of the Communion to join them as partners in mission. Within the process of the consultation, the host province, and individual dioceses therein, were asked to state their mission goals. The partners then shared something of their own mission, as well as questioning, challenging, and affirming the host province. Lastly, the group together determined collectively how they as partners could support the mission of the host province. During the early 1970s, the Episcopal Church participated as a partner in over fourteen consultations. Not only did the consultations give the Episcopal Church a much broader picture of mission possibilities and its relationship to those possibilities within global Anglicanism, but the emphasis on joint cooperation served to share resources much more widely than in the past. The consultative process not only allowed both the host and partners to give and receive from each other with integrity, but the sharing of resources that was kept very parochial in the past was more widely recognized. Supporters believed that the Partners-in-Mission process directly enriched the mission of the Episcopal Church. As Browning asserted, 'We shall discover resources available to us from our partner Churches, giving us the opportunity to experience what it means to receive. We shall, by acknowledging our overall goals interdependently, be able to unify this Church in its one mission.'⁹¹

Towards the end of the century, primary evangelism and social outreach in the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada was transformed from a reliance on missionaries from older Anglican Churches to a post-colonial model of provincial partnership.⁹² During the 1990s the balance of power throughout the Anglican Communion began to shift away from the Churches of the industrialized West and increasingly towards the global South where Churches continued to grow in numbers at a steady rate. For example, by the time of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, the number of bishops from Africa (224) and Asia (95) outnumbered bishops from the United States and Canada (316).⁹³ The impact of globalization, or the tension between local and

⁹¹ Edmond Lee Browning, 'Our World Mission' (unpub., 1978), p. 15.

⁹² Ian T. Douglas and James Tengatenga, 'Anglicans, 1910–2010', in Johnson and Ross (eds.), *Atlas of Global Christianity*, p. 72.

⁹³ Pritchard, *A History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 401.

global realities that needed to be negotiated, was one of the prevailing challenges within the Anglican Communion. Although much of the rancour within the Episcopal Church, the Anglican Church of Canada, and other Churches in the Anglican Communion appeared on the surface to be about human sexuality, deeper questions about the ability of a pluralistic and global family of national and regional Churches with diverse contextualities and expressions of the gospel to embrace each other were at the heart of the debates.

The early years of the twenty-first century witnessed significant gains in the rights of homosexual persons world-wide as Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Canada moved to legalize gay marriage. The election and consecration in 2003 of V. Gene Robinson, a gay man living in a committed relationship, as the bishop of the diocese of New Hampshire in the Episcopal Church, as well as the development of rites for the blessing of same-sex unions in the diocese of New Westminster in the Anglican Church of Canada, caused considerable debate throughout global Anglicanism. While the membership of both dioceses maintained that their actions were the result of faithful deliberation on the needs of their own unique contexts, the actions raised questions globally about what are the allowable limits of pluralism within the diversity of the Anglican Communion. Archbishop Rowan Williams called a special meeting of the primates in October 2003. After a closed session, the primates issued a statement suggesting that the actions of the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada threatened the unity of the Anglican Communion and relationships with other Christian Churches. While the primates also recognized the juridical autonomy of the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada, the primates argued that due to the interdependent nature of the Anglican Communion, no Church had the authority to substitute an alternative teaching.⁹⁴

Following the Primates Meeting in 2003, Williams established a Lambeth Commission on Communion to explore the decisions on sexuality made by the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church in Canada. The subsequent Windsor Report criticized the lack of consultation by the North American Churches in regard to issues concerning sexuality, as well as the incursions from bishops in the global South into North American dioceses.⁹⁵ Subsequently, one of the recommendations of the Windsor Report resulted in the draft Anglican Covenant. Discussion of the Anglican Covenant focused around the need, on one hand, for a more centralized authority, or on the other, a more diverse and plural Anglican Communion.

Although both positions were present in the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada, neither Church approved the Anglican Covenant. In July 2012 the General Convention of the Episcopal Church affirmed

⁹⁴ Pritchard, *A History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 405.

⁹⁵ Pritchard, *A History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 406.

their commitment to building relationships across the Anglican Communion, especially through the continuing Indaba process—a process of mutual discussion between different views established in 2005 as part of the preparation for the Lambeth Conference in 2008—and declined to take a position on the Anglican Covenant itself. Also without a clear consensus, the Anglican Church of Canada's triennial General Synod in the summer of 2013 approved a motion that urged the continuation of conversations on the proposed Anglican Covenant and delayed a final decision on whether to accept or reject it until 2016.

Opposition to the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church in Canada, symbolized by the full inclusion of lesbians and gays, was a primary force behind conservative alliances such as the Anglican Church in North America (ACNA), the Global Anglican Futures Conference (GAFCON), and the Global Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans (GFCA). The zeal for these alliances sprang from conservatives' feelings of disempowerment and their desire to unite with like-minded Anglicans in other parts of the world. Both liberals and conservatives accused the other of imperialism and colonial insensitivity: 'Within the Anglican world there are now two different camps. Only time will tell whether this is a true schism or whether a new rapprochement will lead toward reconciliation.'⁹⁶ At the same time, it is important to note that the increasing tendency to see the Anglican Communion exclusively in terms of binary oppositions, such as liberal-conservative, or North-South, did not adequately describe the challenges and opportunities of world-wide Anglican Christianity.⁹⁷

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH OF MEXICO

Anglicanism in Latin America included several Churches with ties to the Episcopal Church and the Church of England. The Missionary District of Mexico was founded in 1904 under the auspices of the Episcopal Church to minister to the expatriate English-speaking community. In addition, the Episcopal Church had, earlier, formed ties with the Church of Jesus, Iglesia de Jesús, a liberal religious group interested in establishing an indigenous Catholic Church in Mexico, in ceasing the alleged abuses of Roman Catholicism, and in reforming Christianity in the country. The Episcopal Church was cautious about its relationship with the Church of Jesus amid concerns that the group

⁹⁶ Caroline J. Addington Hall, *A Thorn in the Flesh: How Gay Sexuality is Changing the Episcopal Church* (Lanham, MD, 2013), p. 235.

⁹⁷ Miranda K. Hassett, *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ, 2007), pp. 256–9.

was not yet sufficiently close in faith, order, and practice to the Anglican Churches, to the extent that a major opportunity to establish a strong indigenous Anglican presence in Mexico was lost.⁹⁸

With the coming of the Mexican revolution in 1910, many foreigners left the country and Church property was seized. Strict laws which prohibited foreign missionaries or ecclesiastical leaders led to the election of the first Spanish-speaking bishop in the Anglican Communion in 1931, Efraín Salinas Velasco. The measures also curtailed foreign control over the life of the Mexican Church. Throughout the twentieth century, the connection between political reform and the Protestant Churches in Mexico remained strong. In 1958, under the leadership of the first Mexican bishop to be consecrated in Mexico, José G. Saucedo, the Church grew and developed a diocesan structure in the 1970s and 1980s. Bishop Saucedo's goal was to lead the Church to become an autonomous member of the Anglican Communion. Under his leadership a Spanish Prayer Book and hymnal were adopted, and the first woman was ordained. A relaxing of the restrictions placed on religious groups in 1992 allowed the Church to expand its mission. At the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1994, the Mexican dioceses were granted autonomy from the Episcopal Church, and an *Iglesia Anglicana de México* was formed. A few years later, scandal broke out when bishops of two of the dioceses misappropriated Church funds. By the beginning of the new century, the Anglican Church of Mexico was an active participant in the Anglican Communion, particularly in the Indaba listening process, or the international Anglican conversations on human sexuality begun in 2005. The province found that it was not yet time for them to begin blessing same-sex unions, yet they affirmed their identity as an 'open, welcome, and inclusive Church which takes its Baptismal Covenant seriously'.⁹⁹

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carrington, Philip, *The Anglican Church in Canada* (Toronto, 1963).
 Darling, Pamela W., *New Wine: The Story of Women Transforming Leadership and Power in the Episcopal Church* (Cambridge, MA, 1994).
 Egerton, George (ed.), *Anglican Essentials: Reclaiming Faith within the Anglican Church of Canada* (Toronto, 1995).
 Garrett, Greg, *My Church is Not Dying: Episcopalians in the 21st Century* (New York, 2015).

⁹⁸ J. A. MacDonald, 'The Anglican Church of Mexico (La Iglesia Anglicana de México)', in Markham et al. (eds.), *Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion*, pp. 500–7 (pp. 500–3).

⁹⁹ MacDonald, 'The Anglican Church of Mexico', pp. 504–5.

- Hall, Caroline J. Addington, *A Thorn in the Flesh: How Gay Sexuality is Changing the Episcopal Church* (Lanham, MD, 2013).
- Hassett, Miranda K., *Anglican Communion in Crisis: How Episcopal Dissidents and Their African Allies are Reshaping Anglicanism* (Princeton, NJ, 2007).
- Hayes, Alan L., *Anglicans in Canada: Controversies and Identity in Historical Perspective* (Urbana, IL, 2004).
- Hein, David and Gardiner H. Shattuck, Jr, *The Episcopalians* (Westport, CT, 2004).
- Holmes, David L., *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church* (Harrisburg, PA, 1993).
- Hood, Robert E., *Social Teachings in the Episcopal Church: A Source Book* (Harrisburg, PA, 1990).
- Ingham, Michael (ed.), *More Than I Can Say: Michael Peers—A Memoir* (Toronto, 2014).
- Johnson, Todd M. and Kenneth R. Ross (eds.), *Atlas of Global Christianity* (Edinburgh, 2009).
- Jones, W. Paul, *Worlds Within a Congregation: Dealing with Theological Diversity* (Nashville, TN, 2000).
- Kujawa-Holbrook, Sheryl A., *The Heart of a Pastor: A life of Edmond Lee Browning* (Cincinnati, OH, 2010).
- Lantzer, Jason S., *Mainline Christianity: The Past and Future of America's Majority Faith* (New York, 2012).
- McCullum, Hugh, *Radical Compassion: The Life & Times of Archbishop Ted Scott* (Toronto, 2004).
- Markham, Ian S., J. Barney Hawkins IV, Justyn Terry, and Leslie N. Steffenson (eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion* (Oxford, 2013).
- Prelinger, Catherine M. (ed.), *Episcopal Women: Gender, Spirituality and Commitment in a Mainline Denomination* (New York, 1992).
- Pritchard, Robert A., *A History of the Episcopal Church: Complete through the 78th General Convention* (New York, 2014).
- Shattuck, Jr, Gardiner H., *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington, KY, 2000).
- Sumner, David E., *The Episcopal Church's History, 1945–1985* (Wilton, CT, 1987).
- Sydnor, William, *The Prayer Book Through the Ages* (Ridgefield, CT, 1978).
- Thompson, Fredrica Harris and Sheryl Kujawa-Holbrook (eds.), *Deeper Joy: Lay Women and Vocation in the 20th Century Episcopal Church* (New York, 2005).

Anglicanism in Britain and Ireland

Jeremy Morris

Despite the remarkable changes Anglicanism in the British Isles underwent in the twentieth century, popular impressions throughout remained curiously in harmony with images from a bygone era. They were signalled above all by the numerical and historic dominance of the Church of England, and in turn by the persisting image of the parish church as emblem both of a pastoral ideal, and of a traditional social standing and appeal which came, at mid-century, to be labelled as quintessentially ‘establishment’ (‘the whole matrix of official and social relations within which power is exercised’), following the famous *Spectator* article by Henry Fairlie.¹ Visually, this was epitomized in the soft-toned art of Brian Cook, and especially his book covers for the Batsford guides such as A. K. Wickham’s *Villages of England* (1932), which placed the parish church at the very centre of the scene. Much of this pastoral idyll persisted to the very end of the century, despite the intervention of world wars, mass immigration, and Church decline. Architectural and topographical guides—Arthur Mee, Pevsner, Shell—routinely placed the historic parish churches in the foreground of their commentary. At the end of the century a best-selling guide to *England’s Thousand Best Churches* (2000) covered almost exclusively Anglican churches. The sheer number of historic churches belonging to the Anglican Churches of England, Wales, and Ireland (in Scotland they had passed to the Church of Scotland)—nearly 20,000 of them, mostly located in the countryside—naturally supported such a view. But it was reinforced by the common perception that if, by the early twentieth century, the population was overwhelmingly urban, British Anglicanism’s ‘clerical deployment and pastoral vision was still fundamentally rural’.²

If popular images of Anglicanism were largely resistant to change, an abiding strand of Anglican self-understanding was similarly rooted in a

¹ H. Fairlie, ‘Political Commentary’, *The Spectator*, 23 Sept. 1955.

² A. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920–1985* (London, 1986), p. 65.

conviction that the Church changed too slowly for its own good. This was fuelled by a consistent preoccupation with Church decline. As we shall see, the statistics on church-going across the century present a more complex picture than simple perceptions of decline might suggest. But it is undeniably true that by almost every conceivable yardstick, British Anglicanism was numerically and financially weaker, and socially and culturally more marginal, at the end of the twentieth century than it was at the beginning. Here, perhaps, perception mattered even more than measurable practice. Like many of their late nineteenth-century forebears, British Anglicans commonly expressed frustration with the complexity and cumbersomeness of Church structures, and with the apparent indifference of the wider population to their attempts to reach out to them. One of the more eloquent statements of clerical disillusionment came from a South London clergyman in the 1960s, who summed up his experience of ministry in a memoir called, simply, *Who Cares?* (1971).³ Many years later Nick Stacey could only note how little had changed, 'in spite of the fact that in the intervening 30 years things have got steadily worse'.⁴ Pessimism about trends went hand in hand with criticism of institutional sloth. Reformers of all shades of opinion were tempted to place ecclesiastical structures in fatal contrast to the seeming rapidity of change around them. One canon of Westminster Abbey, looking back over some fifty years since Edward Carpenter had gone to the abbey as a canon in 1951, asserted that 'The changes that have taken place since then have been enormous—perhaps greater than at any time since the sixteenth century, when the Abbey ceased to be a Benedictine monastery.'⁵ This was a pardonable exaggeration, but it was an exaggeration all the same.

Yet comments such as this masked a deeper complexity. The rural, nostalgic, established, 'classic' or privileged notion of Anglicanism which resurfaced frequently in arguments about the Church of England's relationship with the state and the monarchy, and which invariably carried connotations of irrelevance, captured neither the multi-faceted experience of Anglicanism throughout the British Isles, nor the extent to which British Anglicanism adapted and changed over the period. If the analytical lens is widened to encompass all the countries of the British and Irish Isles, a variety of different contexts and experiences come to the fore. These include the surprising tenacity of a disestablished Welsh Church which, early in the century, had looked as if it would be swept away by Nonconformity; a small, minority Scottish Church which protected its own 'dissenting' status jealously; and a disestablished Irish Church facing contrasting political and religious pressures north and south of what came to be, in 1922, the border of the Irish Free State. This is to say nothing of the experience of Anglicanism in the inner cities, and in the new

³ N. Stacey, *Who Cares?* (London, 1971).

⁴ Letter in the *Church Times*, 1 Nov. 1996.

⁵ T. Beeson, *Window on Westminster: A Canon's Diary 1976–1987* (London, 1998), p. 283.

suburban estates and new towns which sprang up between the World Wars, and the very different context of economic and social change from the 1960s on. As Matthew Grimley has pointed out, the image of the parish church was a pervasive expression of English national culture between the wars, for 'an imaginative identification between Englishness and a tolerant, undemonstrative form of Protestantism remained strong in the first half of the twentieth century'.⁶ And yet the seemingly invincible equation of English identity and Anglicanism was complicated and even contradicted in the very different national cultures of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland—increasingly so as the century wore on.

However attractive the notion of a certain timelessness might have been for British Anglicans in the twentieth century, then, in fact their history was every bit as subject to diversity, internal conflict, and organizational and theological change as it had been in the previous century. No account of that history can be adequate which does not reckon with regional complexity and class differentiation, with organizational and institutional reform, and with theological evolution, against a background of growing awareness of the pressures bearing down on organized religion in modern Britain. Writing towards the end of the century, one sociologist described the relationship of religion, politics, and society in the United Kingdom as a 'mixed but resilient fabric', founded as it was on a religious pluralism that impeded the development of political parties based on particular confessional identities, and helped condition a culture in which arguably a 'polite indifference or apathy towards religious issues' was much more widespread than anti-religious sentiment.⁷ In the emergence of this 'polite indifference' English Anglicanism undoubtedly had a central role, but it is a description that does not comfortably fit the experience of all British and Irish Anglicans in the period. Here, in this necessarily compact survey, the sheer numerical scale of the Church of England, and its historic importance in the development of Anglicanism as a religious tradition, will seem to occupy the foreground at many points, but the narrative presented will also complicate and colour this description with a wider national and regional perspective.

REGIONAL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The statistical analysis of British Churches, pioneered in the nineteenth century and encapsulated in the unique experiment of the 1851 census of

⁶ M. Grimley, 'The Religion of Englishness: Puritanism, Providentialism, and "National Character," 1918–1945', *Journal of British Studies*, 46 (2007): 884–906 (p. 885).

⁷ J. A. Beckford, 'Politics and Religion in England and Wales', *Daedalus*, 120 (1991): 179–201 (pp. 179, 180).

church attendance and in a variety of local (mostly urban) church censuses, effectively established the abiding impression of Anglicanism as a predominantly middle- and upper-middle-class religion, stronger in the south of England than in the north and the 'Celtic' nations, and weaker in the city than in the countryside. The general tenor of this impression is hard to deny, as is evident from the overwhelmingly 'Anglican' ethos of Oxford and Cambridge, most of the public schools, the armed forces, and the learned professions, on the eve of the First World War. Yet it masked a great deal of variation and complexity. Surprisingly perhaps, the social composition, geographical distribution, and demographic profile of Anglicanism in the British and Irish Isles in the twentieth century are significantly under-researched, in contrast to the extensive research on Roman Catholicism undertaken by Michael Hornsby-Smith.⁸ This has facilitated the promotion or survival of prejudices and misleading generalizations about Anglican strengths and weaknesses.

In the case of England, the unnuanced assumption that Anglicanism was essentially southern, middle-class, and rural hid the simple fact that in almost all social and geographical contexts the Church of England was far and away the largest denomination, and based its claim to be the national Church not merely on attendance, but on its preponderance in the celebration of the great 'moments' of birth, marriage, and death, a claim severely attenuated only towards the end of the century. As late as 1967 the social commentator Geoffrey Gorer could argue, on the basis of the marketing practice of dividing England into five regions (Midlands, south, west, north-west and north-east), that the 'nominal creed' of the north-east, 'apart from the Church of England', was Methodism, whereas in the north-west, 'after the Church of England', it was Roman Catholicism.⁹ But the qualification in both instances is crucial. It illustrated very well how the notion of a default Anglicanism could easily be side-tracked by a more exotic alternative, and implicitly downplayed. Stated more forcefully, it indicated powerful Anglican resilience amongst the population at large. Like so many writing in the mid-twentieth century, Gorer simply assumed the truth of the secularization meta-narrative, asserting that active practice 'of any variant of Christianity' was low and diminishing amongst most English people, and that only a minority held orthodox Christian beliefs, despite their adherence to the traditional Christian understanding of marriage.¹⁰

⁸ Cf. M. Hornsby-Smith, *Roman Catholics in England: Studies in Social Structure since the Second World War* (Cambridge, 1987).

⁹ G. Gorer, 'English Character in the Twentieth Century', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 370 (1967): 74–81 (p. 76).

¹⁰ Gorer, 'English Character', p. 78.

Regional variation in English Anglicanism broadly followed a pattern mapped out by the religious geographer John Gay in 1970, who described a band of Anglican strength from the mid-nineteenth century crossing the country from the south-west, running eastwards through the Midlands and encompassing the south-east and eastern counties. North of this, on upland and moorland, the historical machinery of the parish system was stretched wider and had proved harder to adapt at first to rapidly changing population patterns, and in those contexts Nonconformity and Roman Catholicism had tended to prosper.¹¹ Yet everywhere, even in the industrial cities of the Midlands and the north, Anglicanism remained a significant presence for much of the century. This was true even in the north-west, where by the end of the twentieth century the Church of England had clearly ceded ground to Roman Catholicism: just before the First World War, a local census of church-going in Liverpool showed Anglicanism as still the largest single denomination, despite the rising strength of Roman Catholicism; by the end of the century, Roman Catholic attendances easily outpaced Anglican attendances across Merseyside.¹² Birmingham was a city in which church-going at the beginning of the century was somewhat stronger than it was in many other industrial cities, and whilst Anglicanism was weaker there than in many other English dioceses, it was nonetheless the largest single denomination, though outnumbered overall by the Free Churches combined.¹³ Another example tracked through the first half of the century was York: here Anglican church attendance, clearly well ahead of all Free Church attendances in 1901 at 44 per cent of attendances to 39 per cent, by 1948 had just nudged under all Free Church attendances, but remained the largest church overall at 33 per cent.¹⁴ Yet again, even though all contexts showed significant decline overall through the century—both Anglicanism specifically, and the mainstream Churches generally—there were pockets of resilience. A study of rural residents in five English dioceses in the early 1990s disclosed surprisingly high rates of affiliation to the Church of England, with only 12 per cent disclaiming any religious affiliation at all, and 70 per cent of those with one claiming to ‘belong’ (and the question was put in a strong form) to the Church of England.¹⁵ The sense of belonging did not translate directly into weekly church attendance,

¹¹ J. D. Gay, *The Geography of Religion in England* (London, 1971), ch. 4, ‘The Church of England’, pp. 64–80.

¹² *The Manchester Guardian*, 14 Dec. 1912; P. Brierley, ‘Christian’ England: *What the English Church Census Reveals* (London, 1991), p. 71.

¹³ I. Jones, *The Local Church and Generational Change in Birmingham 1945–2000* (Woodbridge, 2012), pp. 26–7.

¹⁴ S. Rowntree, *English Life and Leisure: A Social Study* (London, 1951), p. 343.

¹⁵ M. Winter and C. Short, ‘Believing and Belonging: Religion in Rural England’, *British Journal of Sociology*, 44 (1993): 635–51 (p. 641).

though some 23 per cent claimed to attend at least three times a year, a figure which, late in the twentieth century, looked unexpectedly high.

In Scotland, for much of the century the myth persisted that the Episcopal Church was the 'English' Church, a myth fuelled by the influx of English Anglicans into Scotland. But the Episcopal Church, whilst predominantly middle-class and very much a minority Church, in fact had deep native Scottish roots, not least through its revival in the previous century, and was widely scattered across urban and rural areas in Scotland. Through its 'Home Mission' campaigns it founded new congregations in all of the major cities in the middle of the century, and in sundry rural areas, both in the Highlands and in the Lowlands and Borders.¹⁶ It continued to found new churches in the post-1945 new towns such as East Kilbride and Cumbernauld, but by then these new congregations were not offsetting the pace of closure of small and struggling causes elsewhere: by 1975 over seventy had closed in just twenty-five years.¹⁷ Its weekly communicant numbers climbed to over 50,000 in 1906, and thereafter fluctuated, though they reached an all-time high at 62,375 in 1938, sinking back in the 1960s.¹⁸ Membership peaked at over 140,000 in the 1920s, but slumped to some 54,000 by the mid-1990s, a decline that again was marked by local variations: decline was particularly evident in urban areas.¹⁹

Wales, by contrast, showed Anglicanism as a surprisingly resilient minority. It was notorious that the growth of Protestant Nonconformity—the 'chapel' culture—had outpaced Anglicanism everywhere in the nineteenth century, as much in the Welsh-speaking areas of north, west, and central, as in the increasingly monoglot, industrialized, south Welsh valleys and towns. In south Wales, on the eve of the First World War, church-going was probably higher than almost anywhere else in Europe. Yet even there, when 'chapel'-goers might constitute as much as 75 per cent of attendances, frequently the Church in Wales remained the single largest denomination. Anglicans were treated as a kind of pariah people, like 'black sheep', according to one reminiscencer, and yet once again the parish system ensured that congregations nonetheless were widely spread.²⁰ Disestablishment in 1920—whether directly or indirectly, no one can be sure—acted like a hinge in the divergent fortunes of Welsh Anglicanism and Welsh Nonconformity: starved of their

¹⁶ F. Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland* (2nd edn., Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 126–7.

¹⁷ Goldie, *Short History of the Episcopal Church*, pp. 143–4.

¹⁸ R. Currie, A. Gilbert, and L. Horsley, *Churches and Churchgoers: Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles since 1700* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 128–9.

¹⁹ E. Luscombe, *The Scottish Episcopal Church in the Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh, 1996), p. 150.

²⁰ N. Williams, 'My Childhood in the Valleys', in C. White and S. R. Williams (eds.), *Struggle or Starve: Women's Lives in the South Wales Valleys between the Two World Wars* (Dinas Powys, 1998), p. 40.

single most unifying political cause, the chapels began a steep and prolonged decline, whereas Anglicanism wobbled, found its feet, and thrived. By the 1970s, the Church in Wales was still the single largest Welsh denomination, with approximately 137,600 communicants in its six dioceses, and although outstripped in total still by the Free Churches combined, the gap had narrowed considerably; Roman Catholicism continued to increase in numbers, almost certainly overtaking Anglicanism in terms of communicants before the end of the century.²¹

In the case of Ireland, the most significant 'hinge' moment was not, of course, disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, which had happened back in 1869, but rather the partition of Ireland in 1922, after civil war, into the Irish Free State, and Northern Ireland. Since this division directly reflected religious differences, it is hardly surprising that the destinies of twentieth-century Anglicanism varied so sharply north and south of the border. After Roman Catholicism (except in parts of Ulster), Anglicanism was the single largest denomination in most parts of Ireland at the beginning of the century, with just over half of Irish Protestants being Anglican.²² Irish Anglicanism was numerically strongest in the north, but disproportionately influential in the south, with its pre-eminent see, and many of its national, educational, and social organizations based in Dublin. Depopulation for a time actually favoured Anglicanism in the south, as Anglican congregations declined less sharply than Roman Catholic; but as the Irish political crisis deepened, and up to and after partition, the shrinkage of Anglicanism in the south accelerated sharply; by the 1960s the Anglican population (or 'membership') of the Republic of Ireland had fallen by 36 per cent in thirty-five years to just 3.7 per cent of the total population of the republic.²³

For all the diversity displayed by Anglicanism across Britain and Ireland, there were significant common threads. One was the changing status and opportunities of women in the course of the twentieth century. As with almost all major Christian denominations in the British Isles, women were a clear majority of attenders in Anglican churches at the beginning of the century. In London, for example, in 1902–3 in Anglican churches across all greater London boroughs women outnumbered men by a ratio of roughly 3:2.²⁴ There is little evidence to suggest that that proportion changed significantly over time. But in a context of decline, even a consistent proportion is expressive of something. Brown again has argued that it was the withdrawal particularly of women from the embedded 'salvation economy' of the

²¹ D. D. Morgan, *The Span of the Cross: Christian Religion and Society in Wales 1914–2000* (Cardiff, 1999), pp. 264–5.

²² A. Megahey, *The Irish Protestant Churches in the Twentieth Century* (Basingstoke, 2000), p. 7.

²³ R. B. McDowell, *The Church of Ireland 1869–1969* (London, 1975), p. 123.

²⁴ R. Mudie Smith, *The Religious Life of London* (London, 1904), p. 442.

mid-century that underlay the contraction of church-going in the 1960s and 1970s.²⁵ One of his group of female interviewees, for example, had become converted to Anglican Evangelicalism around the age of 20, married a Presbyterian minister, and as her marriage broke up, found her faith unsettled too: 'I mean, I had all these sort of marital personal problems . . . and I think I was just realising that religion didn't have any answer.'²⁶ For Brown, the conclusion is that women were particularly affected by the rapid changes in the nature of the family, and in gender roles, from the 1960s on, and that rapid secularization became a process of 'the chain of memory being severed—neither believing nor belonging'.²⁷ And yet the strong claim implicit in this argument—that women were *more* likely to disengage than men—does not seem borne out by the rapidly changing context of gender opportunity at the end of the century. As Field has pointed out, the point might be substantiated by the decline of the 'churching' of women after childbirth—a ceremony that almost exclusively involved Anglican parish churches—but that was a trend that began long before the 1960s, early in the twentieth century.²⁸ Several decades of growing support for the ordination of women to the threefold order of ministry—achieved for all four national Churches by the end of the century for the diaconate and priesthood—may have marked a momentous shift away from a gendered understanding of Church leadership, but the trend merely served to underline the existing Anglican gender imbalance.

The impact of social class on patterns of denominational allegiance, and therefore on Anglican allegiance specifically, was a second common element. That is not to deny, nonetheless, some variation again. Royalty and aristocracy across Britain were almost exclusively Anglican, with the exception of some few 'great' Roman Catholic families such as the Norfolks. But the aristocracy were to a large extent a homogeneous, national elite, whose political influence by the early twentieth century was rapidly in decline, but who continued to command some lingering social prestige and influence. Anglicanism also dominated the ranks of the gentry and upper-middle classes. The great private schools, with some significant exceptions—especially the Catholic schools—were suffused with an Anglican ethos, maintaining chapels with Anglican chaplains, and regular public worship. A regional exception was Scotland, where the Church of Scotland instead largely dominated the major private schools, and where an urban elite was correspondingly affiliated to

²⁵ C. G. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800–2000* (2nd edn., London, 2009), pp. 9–10.

²⁶ C. G. Brown, 'Unfettering Religion: Women and the Family Chain in the Late Twentieth Century', in J. Doran, C. Methuen, and A. Walsham (eds.), *Religion and the Household: Studies in Church History*, 50 (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 469–91 (p. 475).

²⁷ Brown, 'Unfettering Religion', p. 491.

²⁸ C. D. Field, *Britain's Last Religious Revival: Quantifying Belonging, Behaving, and Believing in the Long 1950s* (Basingstoke, 2015), p. 109.

Presbyterianism. The regional diffusion of Anglicanism was more complex further down the social scale. In almost all areas, even taking into account the regional variations alluded to earlier, regularly attending Anglicans were mostly middle class. But their demographic density varied considerably—stronger in the south and in rural areas, but weaker in Wales, in Scotland, and in parts of Ireland where other Christian traditions rivalled them. Amongst the working class, Catholic and Nonconformist loyalties were strong in some areas even when actual church attendance was relatively low, though again it has to be said that Anglicanism for much of England and parts of Wales remained a significant ‘default’ for the rites of passage, occasional attendance, and charitable aid in the early part of the century. Nevertheless, by the mid-twentieth century for many working-class families the Churches were all but irrelevant. The future Home Secretary, Alan Johnson, growing up in Kensal Town, in the west of London, in the 1950s, could say of his mother’s strong belief in God that it was ‘informal and unevangelical. She told us that He was everywhere but seemed to have greater faith in astrology and spiritualism than in the established Church.’²⁹

Gender and class were powerful shapers of the realities of Anglican existence, but over the experience of British Anglicanism in the twentieth century above all hung the third and perhaps most obvious theme, namely that of decline. Despite pockets of resilience, or at least of slower rates of contraction (such as parts of Wales, and of southern Ireland, at least in the first half of the century), the experience of British and Irish Anglicanism in the twentieth century was coloured profoundly by the sense of cultural dislocation and increasing marginalization that gathered pace as the century wore on. Decline was not a continuous, regular, and even process, however. The kind of case presented by the British sociologist Bryan Wilson in the 1960s, which assumed an inexorable trajectory of secularization in association with the onward march of modernization, by the end of the century was increasingly being called into question. Anglican church attendance proved surprisingly durable in the first half of the century, rising even into the 1920s, before falling back gradually into the 1950s. There were some grounds for regarding the 1950s as a period of stability, though again a broader range of statistics, including rites of passage, confirmations, and opinion polls suggests a more mixed picture.³⁰ But decline steepened dramatically in the mid-1960s. According to Callum Brown, using a range of indices, between 1956 and 1995 the rate of decline in Church of England Easter communicant figures was 1.3 per cent per annum, in contrast to just 0.26 per cent loss per annum in the previous eighty-one years.³¹ Arguments have raged about the reliability of such data. Whilst the

²⁹ A. Johnson, *This Boy* (London, 2014 edn.).

³⁰ Cf. Field, *Britain’s Last Religious Revival*.

³¹ Brown, *Death of Christian Britain*, p. 163.

newspapers were fond of trumpeting stories of Church decline, there were some signs that, by the early twenty-first century, decline had at least 'bottomed out', and that the worst of the contraction experienced in the 1980s and 1990s was over, with the average weekly attendance at around 2 per cent of the population of England.³² By then, the gap between 'nominal' theistic belief—some 76 per cent of 'Christian' adults professed to believe in God in the early 1990s—and actual church-going had widened enormously, and it was reckoned that less than 15 per cent of the adult population of the United Kingdom were active members (not even necessarily weekly attenders) of Churches of all denominations.³³ Weekly attendance for all churches was probably around 5 per cent of the whole population.

The Church of England's status as the 'national' Church suffered particularly from this contraction, especially in the light of its loosening hold on the rites of passage. At mid-century, almost two-thirds of the population of England and Wales were baptized according to an Anglican rite, and some two-thirds of couples so married when a religious rite had been used for marriage (somewhere around 70 per cent of all wedding ceremonies were religious); an even higher proportion of funerals were conducted by Anglican clergy.³⁴ All of these indices were markedly on the slide by the 1970s and 1980s, a trend that continued into the early twenty-first century. Weddings in particular were subject to rapid, liberalizing changes in legislation, with far-reaching implications for the parish system, against a background in a general fall in the number of weddings, and an increase in couples cohabiting. A sequence of measures beginning with the Marriage Act of 1994, and culminating in the Church of England Marriage (Amendment) Measure passed in 2012, enabled the licensing of secular buildings for civil marriages, encouraged the celebration of weddings outside the religious setting, and broke the necessary link between residency and marriage in the local church: although the intention was to free parishes to provide for whoever wanted a wedding in church, in practice decline continued as couples increasingly chose to marry in civil ceremonies in specially licensed venues such as hotels, country houses, or even football clubs. By 2013 the total number of weddings conducted by the Church of England had fallen to around 50,000 a year, from a figure more than three times higher just forty years before.³⁵ The downward trajectory was no less relentless in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales.

³² Cf. figures summarized by Christian Research at <<http://www.christian-research.org/religious-trends/uk-church-overview/church-attendance-overview/>>, accessed Mar. 2016.

³³ Beckford, 'Politics and Religion in England and Wales', p. 182.

³⁴ Field, *Britain's Last Religious Revival*, pp. 62–3.

³⁵ <<https://www.churchofengland.org/media/2112070/2013statisticsformission.pdf>>, accessed 8 Mar. 2016; Currie et al., *Churches and Churchgoers*, p. 224.

The slide was, inevitably, patterned regionally and socially. In the early twentieth century, the attention of commentators was inexorably fixed on the inner city, where practices of religion were often tenuously related to clerical ideas of what proper church-going should entail. In the inter-war years, the rapid growth of large-scale housing estates on the fringe of towns and cities—part of a trend towards consolidated, ‘developer-led’ estate development that stood in contrast to the small-scale, entrepreneurial building typical of the nineteenth century—seemed to contemporaries to call into question the central position of the Church in local society. One historian argued, of the new suburbs, that they ‘wouldn’t be organised, and the Church’s ancient parochial system was ill adapted to deal with these novel districts and types of mind’.³⁶ Lloyd’s view appeared to be an extension of the disparagement of the suburbs common amongst the professional upper-middle classes and the literati at the beginning of the century, but hard evidence to support it is difficult to come by. On the contrary, close study of the new suburban estates has yielded good evidence of the continuing vitality of Church life, and of the determination of diocesan authorities to provide new churches for these expanding ‘commuter’ settlements. By the end of the century, time and again it was in these suburban communities that the largest and most active congregations—frequently Evangelical—were to be found. Furthermore, both the suburbs and patches of inner-city communities were revitalized by a fresh ‘infusion’ of church-goers from successive waves of immigration from the 1960s on, so that the ‘typical’ urban congregation—supposing such a thing possible—by the end of the century was likely to be a diverse ethnic and cultural mix.

Charismatic renewal, together with the impact of these new migrant communities, and a determined emphasis on the exploration of new missionary strategies by diocesan authorities, helped to stem the tide of decline in some areas. By the beginning of the next century, there were signs of vitality dotted around the country, with growing churches recorded in cities such as London, York, Birmingham, and Cardiff, many of them Anglican. They may have mitigated the overall pattern of decline, but they did not reverse it. Advocates of the ‘secularization’ thesis were confident of the irreversibility of the trends: ‘Given that for much of [the century] church leaders have been quite well aware of what was happening and have tried very hard, without success, to reverse those trends, it is very difficult to suppose that next year will be different.’³⁷ And yet every sinew of Anglican effort, across all four countries, was strained to demonstrate that it would be.

³⁶ R. Lloyd, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*, vol. 1 (London, 1946), p. 44.

³⁷ S. Bruce, ‘Secularization and Church Growth in the United Kingdom’, *Journal of Religion in Europe*, 6 (2013): 273–96 (pp. 286–7).

CHURCH ORGANIZATION AND PASTORAL MINISTRY

The basic unit of local Anglican organization in Britain remained the parish throughout the twentieth century, but it was subject to pressure from a variety of sources. In England, Wales, and Ireland the Reformation heritage rested on the historic parish system, inherited from the early medieval period, with in most cases a single parish church at the heart of its territory. The parish was a legal, conceptual, and cultural entity as well as a spatial and religious one. Within it, particular responsibilities for pastoral oversight and for important moments of transition in life were entrusted to the parish priest, or 'incumbent'. Though English canon law conceived of the diocesan bishop as the 'chief pastor' of all 'within his realm [diocese]', and therefore there was a case for regarding the diocese as the primary ecclesial form of the local church, in practice local communities rarely identified closely with their see, but tended to view themselves as locally and religiously defined by their parish and its church building. This parish culture constituted an abiding core element of what 'Anglicanism' meant to many people. Only in Scotland was there a formal, constitutional difference, since the historic parish system there belonged to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland; in the Episcopal Church, much more so than elsewhere, the characteristic *modus vivendi* was more akin to chaplaincy to a particular community of belief within a larger local community. In Wales and Ireland, it is true, the sense in which localism could be said to be popularly associated with Anglicanism was attenuated by the strength of other religious traditions. Nonetheless, that the Anglican clergy identified themselves as pastors *for* the whole local area was a widely accepted convention, promoting a view of pastoral character that remained attractive despite the many senses in which it was not much more than an aspiration. Lloyd, in mid-century, called the parish priest the 'hero' of Anglican history, and asserted his (for at that time of course they were all 'he') absolute centrality to all that could be achieved for good or ill in Anglican policy:

No movement in the Church has the ghost of a chance of success unless and until it wins the sympathy and commands the enthusiasm of the average parish priest... He, with his workers, wields, in an absolute of freedom such as can hardly be seen anywhere else in the modern world, a power which is collectively overwhelming. If he is not interested in the missionary cause, it goes by default in that parish... The level of the whole Church can never rise higher than the level of its parish clergy.³⁸

This was of course a romanticized view, but it was accurate as to the practical autonomy of the local parish priest. Where it diverged from the fast-changing realities of the twentieth century was in its assumption of one parish, one

³⁸ Lloyd, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*, p. 7.

priest. No two neighbouring parishes were ever exactly alike, but in essence two contrasting patterns of development affected the emergent shape of Anglican parish ministry. In expanding towns and cities, new churches continued to be built, albeit at a slower rate than in the nineteenth century, and historic parishes had to be subdivided or their boundaries altered in order to accommodate them. Yet urban density undermined parish localism, particularly given the doctrinal and liturgical breadth of Anglicanism. Churches with a distinct identity—Anglo-Catholic, or conservative Evangelical, or charismatic Evangelical, for example—might draw a congregation from far and wide, ignoring parish boundaries. Here, then, despite the legal polity of Anglicanism, Church identity was essentially congregational and associational, bringing together like-minded believers. If this trend was already well established by the mid-nineteenth century, as the distinct Church ‘parties’ pulled apart nationally as well as locally, it was increasingly embedded in British Anglicanism in the twentieth century, as successive controversies over liturgical reform, charismatic worship, women’s ministry, and human sexuality divided and polarized Anglicans.

In the countryside, Anglican congregations were much more likely to be characterized by local loyalty, and Church ‘party’ distinctions, though by no means absent, were usually less marked. Here, however, the greater pressure was simply one of survival, as dwindling congregations—accompanied often by the decline of rural employment and by continuing migration to the towns—left clergy and laity struggling to support ancient buildings. Moreover, the long and slow decline in recruitment to the clergy, which began in the late 1880s and continued for much of the twentieth century, drained rural parishes of ordained leadership. One solution, almost universal by the end of the century, was the amassing of parishes into large ‘teams’. The best-known early experiment was in the diocese of Lincoln, where the incumbent Arthur Smith clustered fifteen parishes, covering a population of around a thousand people, into what become known as the ‘South Ormsby Group’; a radical innovation in the 1940s and 1950s, this was, by the 1990s, as Hastings averred, ‘fairly commonplace’.³⁹ Such multi-parish benefices, as they were called, may have been practical necessities, but they made a nonsense of the Anglican pastoral ideal, as dwindling numbers of clergy sped around the countryside in their cars trying to sustain a mixed pattern of services at scattered and diverse churches. A study of the Church in Wales at the end of the twentieth century concluded that in the four predominantly rural dioceses of St Asaph, Bangor, St David’s, and Swansea and Brecon over half of all benefices were in clusters of this kind.⁴⁰ Needless to say, it was typical of much of Ireland too.

³⁹ Hastings, *History of English Christianity*, p. 439.

⁴⁰ C. Harris and R. Startup, *The Church in Wales: The Sociology of a Traditional Institution* (Cardiff, 1999), p. 53.

The urban equivalent was perhaps more drastic, inevitably: Victorian or early twentieth-century churches, no longer needed in such numbers by shifting urban populations, or by the dwindling numbers of core attenders, were easier to close—some 1,795 by the beginning of the twenty-first century in England alone—and even to demolish.⁴¹ But it was in the towns too, for the most part, that more radical experiments in mission and in church formation were attempted, particularly into the twenty-first century. Many of these were a direct product of the Evangelicalism—whether in its charismatic or more traditional form—that increasingly dominated local Anglican life. Innovation as such was nothing new: the nineteenth century had seen initiatives such as urban mission centres, missions to particular occupational groups, new forms of ministry such as district visitors and lay readers, street preaching, new religious orders, and the Church Army. Most of these innovations remained active in the twentieth century, becoming a regular or routine addition to the Anglican Churches' usual pastoral provision. But by the 1970s, the decline in church-going had stimulated renewed attempts to find novel ways of persuading people to become active Christians. One widely practised technique was called 'church planting', by which a large congregation would opt to subdivide and send part of its number to join, and refresh, a failing congregation elsewhere, or in some cases to found an altogether new congregation. But even 'church plants' could look relatively conservative. More radical innovations were highlighted towards the end of the century, under various umbrella terms such as 'emergent Church' or, more commonly in Anglicanism, 'fresh expressions of Church': communities of Christians might be formed in places such as cafés and pubs, or for particular subgroups defined by age, lifestyle, or occupation. An influential Church of England report, *Mission-Shaped Church* (2004), marked the institutional recognition of these and other attempts to broaden local mission into more creative channels, drawing on the by-then widespread conviction that the conditions of 'modernity' (the industrial era) that had proved so difficult for organized religion under the theorizing of secularization had given way to a more fluid, open, and undetermined 'post-modernity'. By 2010, in England alone there were reckoned to be over 1,000 Anglican 'fresh expressions of Church', though accurate analysis was difficult in the nature of the case.⁴²

It would be a mistake to assume that such initiatives were only true of the urban context. But they were much more common there. They were indicative of the energy with which Churches across the British Isles were attempting to address the challenges of mission in a context in which most indices of

⁴¹ English Heritage, *Churches and Closure in the Church of England: A Summary Report*, at <<http://www.theheritagealliance.org.uk/hrba/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/churches-and-closure-in-cofe-mar-2010.pdf>>, accessed Apr. 2016.

⁴² <<https://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/news/cofestats2010>>, accessed Apr. 2016.

church-going and Christian identity seemed to be on the slide. Evaluating exactly how successful these initiatives—which were very diverse—really were is very difficult. None of the four Anglican Churches of the British Isles were unaware of, or unconcerned about, the challenges they faced in the twentieth century. In mid-century, it is true, the downward pressures perhaps seemed modest. In Scotland the Home Mission Crusade, begun in 1944, aimed to raise money for new churches and additional clergy in areas of need; there were similar initiatives in Wales and Ireland. In England, the 1945 report *Towards the Conversion of England* carried (for its time) an unusually explicit Evangelical tone and highlighted the need for confident evangelism and the proclamation of Reformation principles. But all this assumed in good measure the continuation of the parish system and existing patterns of ministry. That assumption was sorely tested by decline from the 1960s on, and it was in the last few decades of the century that more radical experiments were adopted. Yet, as we have seen, the results in numeric terms were somewhat mixed. A sociological study of the impact of episcopal churchmanship—that is, the doctrinal convictions of the bishop—in the Church of England during the 1990s ‘Decade of Evangelism’ proclaimed by the 1988 Lambeth Conference concluded that, with the exception of the diocese of London, all the dioceses effectively had shrunk, losing as much as a quarter of their ‘usual Sunday attenders’ in some cases.⁴³ The variations between dioceses were wide, but not so wide as to prevent some generalizations about regional patterns of growth and decline from being made. Episcopal churchmanship, incidentally, was of no significance in determining differential diocesan rates, but that can be no surprise, when almost all dioceses included a mix of parishes of different ecclesiastical opinion. The more salient conclusion was the obvious one: renewed effort may, for all anyone knows, have slowed down decline, but it did not fundamentally reverse it.

Alongside experiment in church organization and pastoral provision ran, necessarily, innovation in forms of ministry. Again, there were continuities with the nineteenth century, an era in which the ministry of women had begun to be explored, and in which new forms of lay ministry were also developed. Both of these trends continued through the twentieth century. Numbers of deaconesses, for example, were never very large, but by the 1920s there was growing recognition that their functions could include some—such as officiating at morning and evening prayer, and baptizing—formerly the preserve of male clergy. The full inclusion of women into the threefold order of ministry in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries is described elsewhere in this volume, but it is worth noting here its significance in helping to offset

⁴³ L. J. Francis and C. Roberts, ‘Growth or Decline in the Church of England during the Decade of Evangelism: Did the Churchmanship of the Bishop Matter?’, *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 24 (2009): 67–81 (p. 75).

partially the decline in male clerical recruitment. By 2012 it was reckoned that some 23 per cent of full-time parish clergy in the Church of England were female, a rapid advance on the 16 per cent recorded just six years earlier—a sign perhaps not only of the growing numbers of women ordinands, but also of the impact of retirement of men ordained in the 1960s and 1970s.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, measured against the yardstick of full gender equality widely accepted by most Anglicans by then, such figures were no cause for complacency: a debate was raised in the governing body of the Church in Wales in 2015, for example, as to why, after nearly thirty-five years of women's ordination, the proportion of women in full-time ministry varied from only 30 per cent in one diocese to 10 per cent in another.⁴⁵

If the ordination of women was the most noteworthy 'innovation' in ministry in the British and Irish Anglican Churches, equally significant in terms of their impact on pastoral provision 'on the ground' were the appearance and expansion of non-stipendiary (sometimes, disparagingly, called 'part-time') ministry, and of various forms of lay ministry. Summary is difficult here, because dioceses and provinces adopted different practices at different times. Non-stipendiary ministry in various forms was essentially a post-war development, widely adopted by the 1970s, and reflecting a tendency towards the recruitment of ordinands beyond university leaving age, and from a wider range of social backgrounds, than common hitherto. The 'Paul Report' of 1964 on *The Deployment and Pay of the Clergy* predicted a 'steady state' in clerical recruitment in the Church of England, but almost immediately numbers fell, and that stimulated argument that had already begun about the development of alternative forms of ministry. One form, the 'worker priest', influenced in part by the French and Belgian Catholic experiment of the 1940s, proved too radical for the Church of England, according to the historian of the movement.⁴⁶ But others, such as 'ordained local ministry', were more durable, if again varying widely in shape from diocese to diocese. By 2010, the proportion of non-stipendiary ordained parish clergy in the Church of England had risen to almost a third of the total.⁴⁷ Lay readers and pastoral visitors were also a widely accepted feature of many parishes. To accommodate these forms of ministry, new training schemes had to be developed. This inevitably implied—partly because of the sheer cost of full-time theological education—an expansion in provision for part-time training. As numbers of ordinands declined, the Church of England closed theological colleges—just eleven survived by the end of the century, from the twenty-seven in existence thirty years before—and opened regional and local 'courses', as they were called, for

⁴⁴ Archbishops' Council, *Statistics for Mission 2012: Ministry* (London, 2013), p. 10.

⁴⁵ *Church Times*, 24 Apr. 2015.

⁴⁶ J. Mantle, *Britain's First Worker-Priests* (London, 2000), p. 275.

⁴⁷ Archbishops' Council, *Statistics for Mission 2012*, p. 6.

non-residential, part-time study. The Episcopal Church took perhaps the most radical step of all here when, in 1994, it closed its one theological college, Coates Hall in Edinburgh, and moved over completely to a part-time, dispersed mode of training.

Accompanying change and innovation at the local level ran organizational change at diocesan and national or provincial level. Here again the twentieth century saw significant development of a pattern essentially laid down in the nineteenth. At its core was what, by the late twentieth century, was commonly called the 'synodical' system. Theologians and Church leaders liked to recall the language and influence of the Patristic model, echoed in the bishops' synods of the Roman Catholic Church. But equally important was the democratic ethos of representative government, both local and national. It was probably impossible, once the voice of the laity had been given some scope in Victorian diocesan and deanery 'conferences', and in the voluntary church councils which became ever more common, particularly in urban parishes, late in the nineteenth century, to prevent its evolution into a vital partner in the process of synodical government. Certainly the exclusion of women from voting for, and standing on, the Representative Church Council (RCC) formed in 1903, the forerunner to the Church Assembly and later General Synod, was overturned in 1919 in the wake of the Representation of the People Act of the previous year, which first extended the parliamentary franchise to some women and entitled women to stand for Parliament, leaving the Church of England, as one historian has said, temporarily in 'an anomalous position'.⁴⁸ The Episcopal Church also had a Representative Church Council, formed much earlier, in 1876, as well as a Provincial Synod, and the newly disestablished Church of Ireland a General Synod from 1871, a sign that the Church-state link arguably impeded in England the full development of a synodical system along the lines of sister Anglican Churches in Scotland and Ireland. Wales acquired a Governing Body in 1917, under the terms of disestablishment there. All of these 'Celtic' Anglican churches, therefore, achieved a measure of representative government with significant, autonomous powers—in effect as voluntary bodies—ahead of the far larger Church in England.

There, the crucial development occurred just after the First World War, though plans were being hatched by Archbishop Randall Davidson before and during the war. Davidson intended to put forward plans for reorganization of the RCC into a fully integrated assembly incorporating three separate houses of bishops, clergy, and laity, and to apply through Parliament for significantly enhanced powers of self-government for the Church of England, something necessitated by the increasing difficulty Church business experienced in getting a proper hearing in the legislature ('One body blocked all business, and

⁴⁸ S. Gill, *Women and the Church of England: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (London, 1994), p. 209.

made swift and decisive action impossible').⁴⁹ But he was cautious about pressing too hard for change during the war, and was outflanked briefly by a campaigning group, 'Life and Liberty', led by the charismatic and energetic William Temple, by Dick Sheppard of St Martin-in-the-Fields, and by others. Launched with the characteristically British *élan* of a letter to the *Times*, and then a large meeting of supporters at Queen's Hall, London, 'Life and Liberty' has acquired a wholly misplaced reputation as the harbinger of self-government for the Church of England, for all it did was to draw public attention to the plans Davidson had already hatched and had in his pocket awaiting peace. In the event, parliamentary legislation was required anyway, and the Enabling Act of 1919 achieved almost all that Davidson had envisaged: the RCC mutated into a Church Assembly, with the power to formulate Church measures, with the three houses of bishops, clergy, and laity, and with a hierarchy of representative bodies below it, stretching down through dioceses and deaneries to the parishes, where new, mandatory parish church councils came into being. The enthusiasm unleashed by self-government did not last, however. Temple's vision of a mass democratic Church (he strongly supported the much wider baptismal franchise for church elections than the confirmation franchise supported by High Churchmen), with significant working-class participation, quickly dissipated into the domination of church councils and synods by the professional middle class that lasted all the way up to the twenty-first century.

Disillusionment even on the issue of self-government for the Church of England was swift to follow, when considered plans for a revision of the Book of Common Prayer were, as it seemed, brutally rejected by Parliament in two successive sessions in 1927–8. The notoriously rebarbative bishop of Durham, Hensley Henson, was enraged by Parliament's action and called for disestablishment. But he was a relatively isolated voice, not least because the revised Prayer Book was quietly and informally introduced into widespread use from 1929 on, and so the Church of England was caught in a kind of legal limbo, able to act in practice on its own initiative in many areas, but at the same time having a questionable legal basis for some of these actions. Eventually, as a result of a commission into Church–state relations established by the archbishops of York and Canterbury and chaired by the historian Owen Chadwick, the Church Assembly was replaced, in 1970, by a General Synod with recognized authority in matters of doctrine and liturgy, effectively achieved by the abrogation of parliamentary control in that field. This did not mean that all four Anglican Churches of the British Isles even then had near-identical systems of governance, and in England Parliament retained some power of scrutiny. In Scotland in particular both Provincial Synod and RCC remained

⁴⁹ F. A. Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1948), p. 222.

essentially unintegrated, a position if anything complicated early in the twentieth century by the creation of a further body, a Consultative Council on Church Legislation. Growing pressure through the 1970s and 1980s to integrate these bodies into one, a General Synod, arose because of predictable tensions between the different bodies over particular policies, including the introduction of compulsory retirement, leading to the eventual creation of a General Synod for the Episcopal Church in 1982.

Organizational reform at the centre of each Church was by no means a matter only of the elaboration and refinement of a representative system, however. It was also a question of growing central bureaucracy. In part this was a parallel process—the adoption of more professional, specialized methods and structures to address particular problems—and in part a consequence of representative Church government. For centuries the Churches had functioned largely without a ‘civil service’, with little or no capacity to research and produce a defined Church position on one or other set of issues, but reliant almost entirely on individual bishops and archbishops making interventions through visitation, through the issuing of charges, or through more occasional writing and speeches. It was not possible, then, to say what was the ‘mind’ of the Church of England, or of any of its ‘sister’ Churches, on a wide range of subjects, as there was simply no mechanism by which such a thing could be achieved. When the Church of England responded to the papal declaration in 1896 that Anglican orders were ‘absolutely null and utterly void’, it was by a letter issued by the two English archbishops, *Saepius Officio*. When the archbishop of Canterbury sought to address doctrinal division, against the background of attempts at liturgical revision, in the early 1920s, he had to establish a special commission to do so; the report, *Doctrine in the Church of England*, finally issued in 1938 under the chairmanship of William Temple, rapidly sank without trace as its conclusions appeared unremarkable, but its very appearance was itself remarkable and unprecedented, as the first comprehensive attempt at stating an official, Church-wide doctrinal position for the Church of England since the sixteenth century.

The development of a professional Church bureaucracy was complicated and intricate, and there is no space to pursue it in detail here. By the end of the century, all four Anglican Churches in the British and Irish Isles nonetheless had acquired both a nucleus of paid officers, many of whom were not themselves ordained, and a network of standing committees across the range of Church activity, undertaking work as requested by bishops and by representative bodies, and in turn reporting to them. In each case, too, the management of financial resources was in the hands of a specialist body. Though the broad development was similar, inevitably the scale of the Church of England required a much more elaborate central bureaucracy, spread across Church House and the Church Commissioners in Westminster, and the archbishop’s staff at Lambeth. There were, as there always are, difficulties in

the way the various bodies related to each other. Towards the end of the twentieth century, at the beginning of the 1990s, financial crisis and high interest rates exposed the investments of the Church of England to a temporary property crash, with seemingly disastrous implications for the commissioners' support for parish stipends and for pensions. Steered by a report entitled, tellingly, *Working as one Body* (1995), the archbishops of Canterbury and York pushed through the creation of a new executive body, the Archbishop's Council, to oversee and coordinate all the Church of England's central activity, including the work of General Synod.

Critics were apt to point out that the growth of Church bureaucracies, like growth in the numbers of senior clergy, was a costly and cumbersome development that impeded the freedom of the gospel.⁵⁰ But this was surely a fantasy. Unquestionably savings could be made, with rational reform, the amalgamation of some positions, and the acceptance that Churches with dwindling resources could not do all that they wanted to do. But without central offices and professional staff, the efficient harnessing of resources would not be possible at all, nor would the various arrangements of cross-subsidy and financial levy (what was called, in the Church of England, the 'parish share') that underpinned, by the end of the century, the payment of uniform stipends and pensions. Disgruntled Church members might complain about the cost of bishops' staff. Others, perhaps with more justice, might bewail the obsession with managerialism and 'leadership' courses that seemed to be sweeping through the Churches early in the twenty-first century. But on a long perspective, the various organizational changes in the Anglican Churches of Britain and Ireland both continued the reforming vein of developments in nineteenth-century Anglicanism, and also helped Churches to adapt and survive in the face of a challenging secular context.

CHURCH PARTIES

By the late nineteenth century doctrinal division within Anglicanism had opened up to such an extent that it was possible—indeed routine—to speak of three distinct 'parties' within it, namely High Church or Anglo-Catholic, Liberal or 'Broad' Church, and Low Church or Evangelical. The terminology of Church party in fact was never so neat and tidy as to support this categorization comfortably, and as many exceptions, or rather in-between figures, could be found as those who sat fairly and squarely within one or other 'party'. Nonetheless, these three broad categories remained surprisingly

⁵⁰ Cf. Theo Hobson, 'If bishops were no more, would we miss them?', *The Times*, 17 July 2008.

resilient not only at the beginning of the twentieth century, but throughout the period, despite a great deal of change and complication. They were defined in part by religious practice, and in part by doctrinal conviction, but they were reinforced by the existence of a network of devotional and educational associations, journals, and newspapers—for Anglo-Catholics, societies such as the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Society of the Holy Cross, and the Additional Curates Society; for Evangelicals the Church Association and the Church Pastoral Aid Society; and for Liberals the Churchmen's Union (from 1928 the Modern Churchmen's Union). Styles of worship varied from group to group, though by the beginning of the twentieth century much of the most intense period of conflict over Ritualism was dying away, and more and more 'central' and even moderate Evangelical parishes were adopting practices such as lighted candles on the altar and surpliced choirs which just two generations before had been typical of the more 'advanced' Anglo-Catholics.

This gradual spread of some 'High' Church practices was generally taken as a sign that, even if the most extreme ritual practices were never all that common in Anglicanism in the British and Irish Isles, nonetheless by the 1920s Anglo-Catholicism was sufficiently strong for people subsequently to talk about its 'apogee' in the inter-war years. Much of the energetic leadership of the Church of England in these years was High Church; this could even at a stretch include William Temple, though in other ways he would be more comfortably considered a 'central' or even 'Liberal' Churchman. A series of Anglo-Catholic congresses in these years attracted huge numbers—nearly 20,000 people, for example, attended that in London in 1923. In these years Anglo-Catholics could feel that theirs was the more dynamic, radical wing of Anglicanism. In most areas except Northern Ireland popular anti-Catholicism was largely a thing of the past; with its fading had also passed away the objection that Anglo-Catholic ritual was 'un-English' and 'unmanly'. The revived religious orders continued to thrive in these years, producing scholars and theologians of the first rank, such as the liturgical theologian Gabriel Hebert of the Society of Sacred Mission, and the liturgical historian Gregory Dix, an Anglican Benedictine. Many of the churches built in the new suburbs of the great cities in these years were moderately Anglo-Catholic—churches such as John Keble Church, Mill Hill, in London, which routinely attracted large congregations, and gained the approval even of the *Daily Mirror* in 1932 for its conviction that 'religion is not gloomy but a gay, attractive, living thing'.⁵¹

Yet this was not quite the triumphant era it subsequently came to seem. Anglo-Catholic ritual may have become more widely accepted, but not everything went in favour of High Church opinion. Two particular defeats were fraught with significance for its future. One concerned the basis of the

⁵¹ R. Walford, *The Growth of 'New London' in Suburban Middlesex (1918–1945) and the Response of the Church of England* (Lampeter, 2007), p. 171.

franchise adopted in 1919 for the new parochial church councils in England under the Enabling Act. Anglo-Catholics, led by Charles Gore, bishop of Oxford, pressed for a confirmation franchise, which was certainly consistent with what had usually been the basis of voting for various informal or voluntary church councils in the nineteenth century. But, led by William Temple, a coalition of Evangelicals, Liberals, and some moderate High Churchmen succeeded in achieving instead a baptismal franchise, arguing that that would ensure a much wider popular base for church elections. To Gore, this was 'treating the spiritual obligations of Church membership with something like contempt'.⁵² Eight years later came the first defeat of the revised Prayer Book in Parliament, followed within nine months by a second rebuff. Since the revised Prayer Book was essentially the end product of a long process of liturgical revision which had begun with the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906 that the law of public worship ought to be relaxed to accommodate some Anglo-Catholic sensitivities, this was perceived as particularly damaging for Anglo-Catholics. It would perhaps be stretching the point to claim that these defeats marked out a double limit for Anglo-Catholicism, constitutionally and liturgically. But they were nonetheless a sign that Anglo-Catholics could not have things all their own way, and that the identity of the Church of England in particular was not going to be captured entirely by their point of view. But Anglo-Catholics were also internally divided, in any case. Although there were relatively few parishes which definitely sought to align themselves with Roman Catholic liturgical practices and norms, there were some nonetheless, and they remained a colourful and at times discordant element of Anglo-Catholicism. More common were the 'English' Anglo-Catholics, typified by the liturgical and ceremonial style advocated by the priest and popular writer Percy Dearmer, whose *Parson's Handbook*, published at the end of the nineteenth century, had run to twelve editions by the 1930s. Dearmer's preferred ritual style was colourful but restrained, working through the Prayer Book rites rather than seeking to sidestep them altogether.

Here, as in almost everything to do with the Anglicanism of the British and Irish Isles, regional variations were significant. Within the Church of England itself, High Churchmanship—both the moderate and the more advanced, Anglo-Catholic kind—was found in every diocese and in every region. But it was nevertheless stronger in some areas, and in some towns and cities, than in others. Predominantly 'High' dioceses included London, Chichester, Salisbury, Wakefield, Wells, and the new diocese of Blackburn (formed 1926). Strong personalities and networks of patronage had something to do with the variation. In Leeds, for example, the influence of the mid-nineteenth-century

⁵² G. L. Prestige, *The Life of Charles Gore, a Great Englishman* (London, 1935), p. 422.

High Church incumbent W. F. Hook had led to the permanent creation of a host of High 'daughter' churches, whereas in Cambridge, by contrast, the example of Charles Simeon and the work of the Simeon Trust ensured a distinctly 'Low' feel to the city overall. These regional contrasts continued largely unchanged to the end of the century, if in places increasingly threatened by the rise of charismatic and conservative Evangelicalism. The other Anglican Churches of Britain and Ireland were also a study in contrasts. In Wales and in Scotland, the presence of strong, rival Protestant traditions if anything disposed Anglicans towards the higher end of the spectrum. The theological college established at St Michael's, Llandaff, at the end of the nineteenth century to train clergy for the Church in Wales became increasingly influential under the leadership of Glyn Simon from 1939, a prominent High Churchman who thereby 'exercised a vast influence upon generations of Welsh clergy'.⁵³ Even as the Church in Wales underwent a 'progressive catholicization' in the 1920s and 1930s, its ethos remained overall 'decidedly cautious, conservative and traditionalist in tone'.⁵⁴ In Scotland the roots of High Churchmanship went further back into the eighteenth century, with resistance to Presbyterian criticism, the introduction of the Scottish Communion Office from 1764, and the influence of the Nonjurors. Even taking account of nineteenth-century controversies over the Oxford movement and eucharistic doctrine, the general tenor of worship in the Episcopal Church was markedly higher than that of England and Wales. The new Scottish Prayer Book of 1929, a correlate of the revised book in England, retained a distinct ethos of its own and was, in the words of one historian, 'catholic first and foremost, and Scottish and modern only in a subordinate sense'.⁵⁵ But in Ireland, the continuation of severe sectarian tensions, the strength of Roman Catholicism, and the bitter process of partition and civil war, had the reverse effect, cementing the Church of Ireland's more pronounced Protestant, 'Low' identity. Even then, High Churchmanship had its champions in Ireland, and ritual controversies as a result persisted in Ireland into the 1920s and 1930s. But these were relatively isolated cases. As one historian observed, the Church of Ireland shared with other denominations an Evangelical faith, participating in a wider 'pan-Protestant' culture; in that context, it was very difficult to see how Anglo-Catholicism could have gained much of a foothold.⁵⁶

These patterns of regional variation necessarily—and by inversion—affected Evangelicals too. But for the most part, in the inter-war years Evangelical Anglicanism was apparently in retreat. As a movement, Evangelicalism had been strongly affected by the growing acceptance of critical biblical and

⁵³ 'Simon (William) Glyn Hughes (1903–1972)', ODNB.

⁵⁴ Morgan, *The Span of the Cross*, p. 87.

⁵⁵ W. Perry, quoted in Goldie, *Short History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 136.

⁵⁶ Megahey, *The Irish Protestant Churches*, p. 12.

historical scholarship late in the nineteenth century, and there was never much of a move in Anglicanism to reassert the 'Fundamentals' of Evangelical Protestant doctrine to match the 'Fundamentalist' movement that had originated in Princeton and was widely publicized throughout America in the wake of the infamous Scopes trial, which had set 'Fundamentalists' against 'Modernists' over the teaching of evolution in schools in Tennessee. At the end of the twentieth century, as Anglican Evangelicalism became much more assertive and influential again, even in its more conservative form it was not comparable to the American movement characterized by biblical literalism and dispensationalism. In the first half of the century, Anglican Evangelicalism in Britain was, for the most part, moderate and cautious, adhering firmly to the Prayer Book. Scholars have commented on the relative paucity of strong Evangelical leaders in these years. Edmund Knox, former bishop of Manchester and determined opponent of the revised Prayer Book, was perhaps Evangelicalism's most redoubtable leader, but he was already in his seventies on his retirement in 1920. A younger generation were led by Christopher Chavasse, later bishop of Rochester, and a rising force in the 1930s. Nonetheless, even Evangelicalism's most sympathetic historians have tended to see the inter-war years as a time of withdrawal and relative quiescence—a 'walking apart'—with the social engagement of many Evangelical parishes at its lowest point for several generations, partly as conservative Evangelicals reacted to the liberalism of the 'Social Gospel' movement.⁵⁷

Worship at Evangelical churches mostly reflected this cautious, sober mood. Although Evangelicals had pioneered street missions and mission services (usually a 'hymn and prayer sandwich', with a long expository or exhortatory address), they remained closely wedded to the authorized services of the Prayer Book. Matins and Evensong formed the staple of Sunday worship, with the Lord's Supper still celebrated in some parishes once a month only, though by the 1920s a weekly celebration was more common. Surpliced choirs, chanted psalms, and congregational singing from the *Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer*, or even from *Hymns Ancient and Modern* or the *English Hymnal* (both of them more usually associated with High Churchmanship, but becoming ever more widely adopted by then) were by now typical of many Evangelical churches. Preaching remained absolutely central, with the sermon commonly forty minutes long, or more.

The liturgical life of many 'central' or 'Broad' parishes was similar, though here it was more likely that Holy Communion (still the commonly preferred term to the Anglo-Catholic 'eucharist' or brazenly Catholic 'mass') would be at least weekly, if not twice on Sundays. The reputation of Anglican Liberalism as a theological movement suffered, however, from the 'Modernist' label. Led by

⁵⁷ D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London, 1989), p. 181.

Henry Major (principal of the liberal Ripon College, outside Oxford), Hastings Rashdall, and J. F. Bethune-Baker, amongst others, the Churchmen's Union was committed to advancing liberal religious principles throughout the Anglican Churches, through publication and through its annual conferences. In 1921, at the outset of our period, the conference held at Girton College in Cambridge attracted wide publicity but also notoriety for the views stated by some of its speakers, which seemed to imply a 'low' Christology, in other words a view of Christ's nature that tended to describe it in terms of the highest achievement of human values, rather than as a divine gift. How far such views were really typical of 'central' Anglicans is hard to say, however. They were not typical of many liberal Anglicans, including William Temple.

The rejection of the revised Prayer Book by Parliament in 1927–8 and the widespread adoption in dioceses of that very book on an unofficial basis can give the impression that, by the late 1930s, Church 'party' tensions in the Church of England were fast fading. But the looming shadow of war as much as anything has clouded subsequent views. Tensions were very obvious over the proposed Church Union Scheme in India, for example, which led to the formal creation of the Church of South India in 1947, but which was under consideration throughout the 1930s. Anglo-Catholic opposition to the scheme, ultimately unsuccessful, hinged on the apparent compromise to the principle of apostolic succession involved in recognizing the ministries of those ordained originally in non-episcopal Churches. South India may have seemed far away to most British Anglicans, but the ecclesiological issues involved disclosed fundamental differences—irreconcilable to some—between Anglo-Catholic principles and those of many Broad Church and Evangelical Anglicans.

Nor did the Second World War and its aftermath in any meaningful sense diminish the differences. Despite Temple's leadership, and the very strong emphasis he placed on the principle of unity, both within the Anglican Communion itself and within the wider community of Christian Churches, Anglicanism remained a curious amalgam of three distinct ecclesiological systems. Even into the 1950s it appeared that Anglo-Catholicism, or at least High Church sympathies, remained in the ascendant. The 'Parish Communion' movement, organized in Parish and People and led by Henry de Candole, but inspired in part by Hebert's *Liturgy and Society* (1935) as well as by the continental Liturgical Movement, attracted many central church-people and some moderate Evangelicals as well as Anglo-Catholics to the ideals of reinstating the Eucharist as the main Sunday service. Thus Matins began its long decline in this decade, to the point where, by the 1990s, it had virtually disappeared from parish worship in Britain. But in the 1940s and 1950s Anglo-Catholicism looked modern, progressive, and intellectually robust, with an impressive cohort of theologians—including Michael Ramsey, Austin Farrer, Eric Mascall, Gregory Dix, Gabriel Hebert—as well as an

equally distinguished group of artists and writers as fellow-travellers, including T. S. Eliot, Dorothy L. Sayers, Charles Williams, W. H. Auden, and even C. S. Lewis, though Lewis was hard to pigeonhole neatly. In Wales its advance was thrown into relief by the sharp contraction in Protestant Nonconformity, and by the apparent collapse of Evangelicalism: in these years 'it was catholicism rather than evangelicalism or broad-churchmanship which was proving compelling'.⁵⁸

All this was to change in the last third of the century. Not only did the general decline in church-going from the mid-1960s on affect High Churchmen as much as any other group of Anglicans in the British Isles, but the balance of churchmanship changed rapidly over the next forty years. There were four main dimensions of this, though even to single these four elements out admittedly is to simplify greatly. First, unquestionably the most significant element for the future identity of Anglicanism was the impact of the Charismatic movement. Sometimes called 'neo-Pentecostalism' (the 'classic' Pentecostal Churches being predominantly early twentieth century in origin), this originated in America in the late 1950s, and involved the cultivation of charismatic gifts and informal worship within the mainstream or traditional Christian denominations, as well as in new associations outside them. The informality was crucial, because it chimed in with the rapid changes in popular culture working their way through Western society: the freedom of Charismatic worship enabled the synthesis of modern 'pop' music and culture with a largely conservative, though also personal and emotional, Evangelical theology. This proved to be a potent combination. One of the movement's early leaders in the Church of England was Michael Harper, curate at All Souls', Langham Place, in London, and it was in west London too that, by the 1980s, the most famous and probably most influential Charismatic Anglican church was to be found, namely Holy Trinity, Brompton (or 'HTB'). But this infusion of Pentecostal spirit into Anglicanism had effects well beyond traditional Evangelical congregations, for it provided a hospitable place for migrant church-goers otherwise unattracted to restrained, traditional British worship. By the end of the century, in most large towns, and certainly in all the major cities, there were large, lively charismatic Evangelical Anglican churches, often with eclectic congregations of a social and racial diversity unimaginable half a century before. This movement affected, therefore, all the four Anglican Churches of the British and Irish Isles to a greater or lesser degree. In Scotland, for example, the Scottish Episcopal Renewal Fellowship, formed in 1982, helped to expand the number of Episcopal churches affected by Charismatic renewal from five in that year to twenty-four in 1995.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Morgan, *The Span of the Cross*, p. 183.

⁵⁹ Luscombe, *The Scottish Episcopal Church*, p. 98.

But it was not only Charismatic Evangelicalism that upset the balance of Church parties. The more 'restrained', conservative Evangelicalism also experienced revival. Sociologists have argued a great deal as to why that was the case. Was it, perhaps, expressive of a flight from social and cultural change? Was it a movement of ethical resistance, reflecting a yearning for moral certainties seemingly undermined by the permissive society? What is clear is that at its heart was a determined movement of Evangelical renewal, led by John Stott, rector of All Souls', Langham Place—and therefore at one time the training incumbent of Michael Harper—that sought to assert the central place of Evangelical principles in the institutional Church, and to counter the alleged liberal 'takeover' of the Church. It was, therefore, simultaneously a movement of criticism of developments within the Church (especially the Church of England) and of affirmation of loyalty to the Established Church. Stott's open challenge to Martin Lloyd Jones—the famous Welsh Nonconformist minister who encouraged Evangelicals to leave their parent denominations and go apart—at the 1966 Keele Congress became probably the most famous confrontation in modern British Evangelical history, widely seen as a turning point in the fortunes of Anglican Evangelicalism. There was irony in this, as one of Stott's biographers has recognized, for whilst this move convinced Evangelicals that they could increase their influence over their Church, that Church itself 'was moving further to the margins of English life'.⁶⁰

Third, just as this reinvigorated Evangelicalism began to assert itself, the internal tensions of Anglo-Catholicism increased dramatically. For some Anglo-Catholics, the Second Vatican Council proved to be a mixed blessing: whilst they welcomed the new spirit of openness it signalled amongst Roman Catholics, the more it encouraged ecumenical dialogue between Anglicans and Catholics the more it potentially undermined the distinct position of Anglo-Catholicism, defending as it did a Catholic identity within a 'Protestant' Church. Nonetheless, the real harbinger of division and change in Anglo-Catholicism came with the various cultural and ethical changes of the era. Although arguments for women's ordination were theoretically separate from the broader question of women's status in society, feminism reinforced those arguments and made opposition seem more trivial and dated than had once been the case. But women's ordination as an issue fundamentally divided Catholic Anglicanism. Formal moves in this direction were accompanied by fractious argument and manoeuvring. Wales moved earliest with the ordination of women to the diaconate in 1980, followed by Ireland, Scotland, and England in succession; ordination to the priesthood came in the 1990s, and to the episcopate over a more drawn-out period, with England not achieving this until 2014. But how the different Churches dealt with division varied

⁶⁰ A. Chapman, *Godly Ambition: John Stott and the Evangelical Movement* (Oxford, 2012), p. 95.

substantially, the Church of England achieving some notoriety for its 'Act of Synod' of 1992, which enabled parishes conscientiously opposed to women's ordination to the priesthood to seek alternative episcopal oversight from a bishop also opposed, working under the authority of the diocesan bishop. This system of 'flying bishops', as they were colloquially called, was not followed elsewhere. It was mainly Anglo-Catholic parishes which chose this route; but many did not. New Catholic Anglican associations came into being to represent different views—Forward in Faith, for example, formed in 1992 to represent the views and interests of those opposed to women's ordination (amongst other issues), and Affirming Catholicism, formed two years before, to represent an Anglo-Catholicism that could include those in favour of it. Women's ordination, because it was interpreted by opponents as constituting an innovation in Church order, effectively separated these 'wings' of Anglo-Catholicism from each other, as they could no longer apparently share a sacramental ministry. The division was sealed by arguments over human sexuality, which broadly followed the same fissure, though the Church of England's refusal to follow the example of the Episcopal Church in America and abandon a traditional understanding of Christian marriage as between a man and a woman meant that arguments there were as much theoretical as practical.

Fourth, a mood of optimism briefly swept through Liberal Anglicanism, shaped partly by the growing influence of the social sciences, and partly by a mood of theological radicalism that fed on impatience with traditional doctrine and ethics. If John Robinson's *Honest to God* (1963) was the most famous manifestation of this, with its dependence on Bonhoeffer's 'religionless Christianity' and its appeal for a 'worldly holiness' and a 'revolution in ethics', the most extreme manifestation was probably what was sometimes called 'secular Christianity', represented by the American theologians Harvey Cox and Thomas Altizer; and later still, in the 1980s, the non-realist 'Sea of Faith' movement associated with the Cambridge theologian Don Cupitt.⁶¹ In this new 'modernism', traditional Christian metaphysics, with its assumption of objective and historical realism, was abandoned in favour of this-worldly approaches to religion, drawing on existentialism, amongst other movements of philosophy. The radical Anglican journal *New Christian* ran an article in 1967 called 'Radical Roulette' which joked about traditional Christian doctrines as if they were part of a game, jesting for example that 'At an agreed stage of play the last trump shall be sounded by the player who, by popular agreement, has produced the most ludicrous articles of faith.'⁶² This kind of flippancy may have been unusual, but it was indicative: just as Christian

⁶¹ J. Robinson, *Honest to God* (London, 1963), pp. 84, 105.

⁶² Cited in S. Brewitt-Taylor, '“Christian Radicalism” in the Church of England, 1957–70', DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 2012, pp. 19–20.

doctrine and ethics were to be recast or reinterpreted, Church organization and practice were to be reshaped, moving away from the formalism and hierarchy of the past. Despite *Honest to God's* impressive sales—over a third of a million copies in its first year of publication—the lasting appeal of this new radical theology probably reached not much further than a section of the clergy themselves, and perhaps a small circle of the theology-reading laity, but it left its mark on internal arguments about ethics and ministry. The decade which brought the decriminalization of homosexuality, the legalization of abortion, the widespread adoption of the contraceptive pill, and easier routes to divorce—the 1960s—thus appeared to synchronize with a new mood of impatience and reform in Christian teaching. The impact of this movement of radicalism was relatively short-lived: it did not reinvigorate Church life, but appeared even in some moods to be welcoming the very Christian collapse it was at the same time using as a justification for urgent change. By the mid-1980s it was on the wane.

That was the decade in which the resurgence of Evangelicalism in the Church of England, and perhaps also elsewhere, became evident. In the last third of the century, liturgical revision in Britain and Ireland reached a new phase, in which the language of the 1662 Prayer Book, and often its theological emphases too, were increasingly abandoned in favour of modern language texts. Liturgical revision inevitably provoked a reaction, as congregations—many of them dominated increasingly by the elderly, as the proportion of younger families declined—found themselves confronted with unfamiliar texts, seemingly imposed on them ‘from above’. One suffragan bishop even defended revision vigorously with the words ‘In a clerically led church *we* decide.’⁶³ The Prayer Book Society, formed in 1972 by people who feared the obliteration of the 1662 book under the rising tide of revision, came to be in England and elsewhere a formidable defender of the older liturgical texts, well supported by senior establishment figures, including politicians, peers, and royalty. Some were utterly opposed to all innovation. Others recognized the merits of liturgical experiment, and were sensitive to the theological complexities of the relationship between historical text and changing community of faith, but at the same time were determined to preserve and protect what they took to be a central pillar of the British tradition of public worship. They also questioned the underlying rationale of reform, namely that ‘the mission of the churches could be revived by rewriting the classic texts’.⁶⁴ Matters came to a head in 1984, in the wake of a petition to Parliament and a draft bill in favour of Prayer Book protection, when Archbishop Robert Runcie conceded that use of the Prayer Book should continue wherever parishioners wanted it to do so.

⁶³ D. Martin, *The Education of David Martin: The Making of an Unlikely Sociologist* (London, 2013), p. 164.

⁶⁴ Martin, *Education of David Martin*, p. 165.

By then, in England the *Alternative Service Book* (1980) had already been introduced and widely adopted. Followed at the end of the century by yet another revision, *Common Worship* (2000), these new texts reflected above all a growing liturgical variety at local level, with little common shape or structure, and each book in turn through a growing collection of different options validating innumerable different local decisions about worship. As perhaps was only to be expected from smaller Churches, each on the whole having a more definite doctrinal identity, the 'Celtic' Anglican churches tended to be more cautious in adopting alternatives to 1662, but a similar trend, albeit more conservative, was evident there too.

What is clear is that the growing preference for informality, and for many different choices of text, suited Church life in which Evangelicals were once again feeling more and more to the fore. Not only was there an increasing proportion of recruits for ordained and for lay ministry from an Evangelical background, but in England in particular Evangelicals began to dominate the clerical hierarchy, a trend particularly in evidence into the new century. Donald Coggan was the first Evangelical archbishop of Canterbury in over a century when appointed in 1975; George Carey followed Coggan's successor, Robert Runcie, in 1991; and Justin Welby followed Carey's successor, Rowan Williams, in 2013. By 2013, press commentary spoke of a tradition of alternation between Evangelical and High Church archbishops, but this was a 'tradition' scarcely a generation old. Probably the most startling sign of Evangelical strength was the enormous success of the Alpha Course, a course in Christian catechesis started at Holy Trinity, Brompton, in the 1970s, but overhauled and marketed so successfully from the early 1990s that by the 2000s it was claimed it had reached over 29 million people in 169 countries.⁶⁵ Thousands of Anglican churches in Britain and Ireland had tried it. By 2005, over 80 per cent of the 160 largest congregations in the Church of England were Evangelical.⁶⁶ Their membership had been supplemented and renewed by infusion from migrant communities, particularly in the larger towns and cities.

CHURCH, SOCIETY, AND NATIONS

We began this chapter looking at the seemingly timeless image of pastoral Anglicanism, and have seen how this belied the vast changes British and Irish society underwent in the twentieth century. In 1914, at the outbreak of war, despite years of anxiety about the fortunes of Christianity in Britain and

⁶⁵ <<http://alpha.org/our-story/>>, accessed Apr. 2016.

⁶⁶ <<http://anglicanmainstream.org/who-are-the-evangelical-and-charismatic-churches/>>, accessed Apr. 2016.

Ireland, the traditional, mainstream Christian Churches remained culturally and socially dominant, providing a wide range of philanthropic, educational, and leisure services, as well as religious worship. British and Irish society was still in effect a Christian monoculture, albeit one internally divided in denominational rivalries that in many places were deeply sectarian. By the end of the century, Christianity had become to all intents and purposes a minority culture in a highly pluralist society, if not in theory (a majority still professed belief in God), then certainly in practice. It had lost ground not just to secularism, of course, but also to the upsurge in other faiths—especially Islam and Hinduism—coming on the back of mass immigration from former colonies and dominions. Anglicans by then were having to renegotiate how they saw their relationship to the world around them, and to their own history. The link between the Church of England in particular and the nations of England and Wales was now increasingly complicated, strained at times, and changing rapidly. Again, what had seemed almost immovable in the early twentieth century—the union of Scotland and England—by then was being openly challenged.

It was in Wales that the major constitutional change in British Anglicanism occurred, early in the century, when the disestablishment of the Church of England's Welsh dioceses, proposed before the war, was finally enacted in 1920. It came as the achievement of a long campaign on the part of Protestant Nonconformists, who had seen their opportunity with the Liberal landslide of 1906. The newly autonomous Anglican province, acknowledging its minority status in taking to itself the title Church *in* Wales, began with considerable financial obstacles, after the loss of pre-1662 endowments and of support from Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Arthur Edwards, first archbishop of the new province, was a formidable ecclesiastical statesman who had long opposed disestablishment, but in the process, though himself a Welsh-speaker, had offended many potential supporters by his antipathy to Welsh-language education and ministry. He was not alone amongst leaders of the new Church in thinking this, but his view flew in the face of the missionary challenges facing it, since the Church's main gains had been made 'by Welsh-speaking clergy among Welsh-speaking people during a time when national sentiment was increasing in strength'.⁶⁷ Yet, paradoxically, despite this seeming contempt for Welsh popular culture and language, the removal of the state link liberated Anglicanism in Wales and ultimately permitted Welsh Anglicanism, as the chapels began a sharp decline between the wars, to emerge as a potent focus of national religious identity. Opposition to Welsh-language services and ministry declined, and after the Second World War, as Welsh nationalism began

⁶⁷ Morgan, *The Span of the Cross*, p. 35.

to emerge as a political force in its own right, the Welsh Church came decisively to embrace bilingualism. A sustained campaign to boost voluntary finance, sustained over many years, gradually improved the Church's economic standing. In this way, disestablishment in Wales allowed Anglicanism a new life apart from the influence of the Church of England, in the process freeing the Church of England itself from awkward entanglements. As Grimley has observed, 'Irish, and then Welsh, disestablishment had ended Anglicanism's awkward double life as both an English and a British church.'⁶⁸

In Ireland, as we have seen, the decisive political change also occurred between the wars, with the creation of the Irish Free State. Anglicanism was caught, as a result, in a difficult 'double-bind', as a small minority Church south of the border, but as part of a spectrum of dominant pan-Protestantism north of it. Managing this cultural and national dichotomy required considerable adroitness on the part of Church leaders, and it tended to encourage a certain caution. In the republic, it was said mid-century by one Anglican Irish politician and scholar, that the 'general policy adopted was "Lie low and say nothing"'.⁶⁹ But the complications and sectarian tensions of the north arguably conditioned the same policy, not least when, in the 1960s and 1970s, militant Protestantism was increasingly assertive politically. The Church of Ireland continued to produce outstanding leaders, such as the theologian Henry McAdoo, archbishop of Dublin in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and Robin Eames, primate for almost twenty years from 1986. These included the bitter years of the 'Troubles', from 1968 to 1998, when over 3,500 people were killed as a result of terrorist, police, and military action. Caught between republican sympathizers, mostly Catholic, and Protestant extremists, Anglicans in Ulster tried to occupy a conciliatory position. Eames in particular was valued as a respected figure of authority, having a hand in the drafting of the Downing Street Declaration of 1993, which helped to pave the way for a ceasefire and eventual peace agreement. But Irish politics was much too complicated for Anglicans to assume some sort of central religious and cultural role, as for a time they were able to do in Wales, not least when they were such a small community in the republic. Likewise in Scotland, resurgent nationalism after the Second World War rendered the profile of the Episcopal Church, with that disparaging tag the 'English Church', problematic. A mid-century assessment had asserted that if that Church was to fulfil its claim to be the ancient and historical Church of Scotland, it had to 'recognize its responsibility to the churchless thousands in the nation and do all it can to win them into living fellowship in the Church of Christ'.⁷⁰ This was

⁶⁸ Grimley, 'The Religion of Englishness', p. 892.

⁶⁹ Megahey, *The Irish Protestant Churches*, p. 116.

⁷⁰ Goldie, *Short History of the Episcopal Church*, p. 129.

a remarkable comment, in the face of the overwhelming numeric dominance of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, but it showed just how tenacious the national ideal was. It was, nevertheless, naïve, and certainly premature. By the beginning of the twenty-first century, Scottish Episcopalians were as likely to emphasize their distinct character and their difference from the Church of England as they were a common heritage, reflecting their recognition of the force of Scottish nationalism.

Thus, in the long run, centrifugal forces in British society, threatening what the radical journalist Tom Nairn dubbed the 'Break up of Britain', fragmented what had once looked like the unassailable influence and authority of the Church of England in British and Irish Anglicanism. This change was the local expression of the shift in world Anglicanism experienced in the post-colonial era, marking the end of the time when England exported bishops and other Church leaders to the British Empire and then Commonwealth, and when the authority of the archbishop of Canterbury was rarely questioned. But it reflected also the changing relationship of Anglicanism to British society as a whole, and here the position of the Church of England was particularly telling. In the inter-war years the Established Church maintained its apparent pre-eminence in religious and social life: archbishops were sought out by governments for advice, and the proximity of Lambeth Palace to the Palace of Westminster was something more than a historical accident. But political life was changing rapidly, with the rise of the labour movement. The first Labour governments of 1924 and 1929–31 may have been short-lived and limited in impact, but they reflected the arrival of a mass democracy and of a class-based politics that were bound to diminish the political influence of traditional Anglicanism. The General Strike in 1926, and the arrival of mass unemployment and distress with the 'Great Crash' of 1929, pitched a middle-class, gentrified Anglican leadership into an uncomfortably polarized situation. Only the charisma and social idealism of the left-leaning William Temple, it seemed, could stand for an Anglicanism that transcended class politics. This was important, and Temple was highly regarded, but it is doubtful how far his social commitments really changed the public perception of the Church of England. More characteristic of its difficulties was Cosmo Gordon Lang's clumsy public criticism of Edward VIII's decision to abdicate in 1936, which attracted the scorn even of Winston Churchill, and above all of the wider public.

Whether or not Churchill's dislike of Lang was a factor—it is often forgotten that Lang was at Canterbury for almost as long a period of the war (and that the most dangerous for Britain) as was Temple, who only stepped up to the role in early 1942 and died in October 1944—the Church of England's influence in the Second World War was markedly less than it had been in the First. In the First World War, relations between Lambeth and Downing Street had remained warm, close, and respectful. Archbishop Davidson, supported

by all the bishops, had opposed bombing reprisals against civilians and the use of poison gas by British troops, but he had done so privately in a letter to Asquith, and both of them had subsequently published 'mild letters of disagreement' in the press.⁷¹ In the Second World War, the government tolerated but rarely consulted Church leaders. Like Davidson, Temple was not averse to declaring his doubts about the conduct of the war. Even so, according to Andrew Chandler, Temple was unduly influenced by his respect for the state to believe the assurances he was given from the Air Ministry about Allied strategic goals.⁷² This was not the case for George Bell, bishop of Chichester, whose opposition to saturation bombing was principled and courageous in proportion as it was widely condemned. But, as Chandler has commented, 'Bell did not provoke the admiration of many bishops'—only one, in fact.⁷³ Bell famously disqualified himself by this means from preferment to Canterbury on Temple's death, though it is doubtful how well he would have suited the role; certainly Churchill's dislike of Bell was attested to in the diary of Alan Don, former chaplain to Cosmo Gordon Lang and canon of Westminster Abbey.⁷⁴ To say all this is not at all to imply that the Church of England somehow ceased to voice the concerns and hopes of the population during the war. It definitely did do so, though significantly it was matched by the expressed patriotism of the Catholic Church in England, led by Cardinal Hinsley, archbishop of Westminster—something inconceivable a generation before.

There was, then, in hindsight a subtle, almost imperceptible marginalization of the Church of England from public life underway in the first half of the twentieth century. This should not be overstated. The strong connection between the Church of England and the monarchy for one thing kept it at the heart of great moments of national mourning and celebration, and that continued into the twenty-first century. The coronation of Elizabeth II in Westminster Abbey in 1953, watched by millions who bought or shared television sets specifically for the purpose, put an Anglican service, with kissing of the Bible, reception of communion, and royal anointing, at the very front of national celebration of the new reign. Memorable royal and public occasions later included the state funeral of Winston Churchill in 1965, the marriage of the Prince of Wales and Diana Spencer in 1981, the funeral of Princess Diana in 1997, and the marriage of Prince William and Kate Middleton in 2011. Most of these events took place in Westminster Abbey, which

⁷¹ A. Chandler, 'The Church of England and the Obliteration Bombing of Germany', *English Historical Review*, 108 (1993): 920–46 (p. 922), referring to G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1935), pp. 757–60.

⁷² Chandler, 'The Church of England and the Obliteration Bombing of Germany', p. 943.

⁷³ A. Chandler, *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester: Church, State, and Resistance in the Age of Dictatorship* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2016), p. 121.

⁷⁴ Chandler, 'The Church of England and the Obliteration Bombing of Germany', p. 945.

thrived in its more traditional role as a national mausoleum and site of commemoration even when the pessimists were proclaiming its irrelevance. If there was any church that illustrated the privileges and the costs of establishment, it was the abbey. Just a couple of examples will suffice. In May 1976 Michael Ramsey protested to the dean about the proposed service to mark Chilean Navy Day—‘an occasion of increasing disquiet among those concerned with human rights in Chile’ under Pinochet—and one of the abbey’s own canons absented himself from the occasion, noting, however, the dilemma: ‘As a royal church it is supposed to minister to everyone and not take sides in political matters. Furthermore, it cannot easily get out of step with the Government’s foreign policy decisions.’⁷⁵ A compromise was the inclusion of prayers for those deprived of human rights. Two years later Nicolae Ceausescu—‘an unusually wicked man’—had to be welcomed at the abbey during a state visit.⁷⁶ Occasions like this aroused the ire of those who regarded establishment as an anachronism, falsely aligning the Church of England with a state, or government, whose actions were contingent on national or partisan interests and not the values of the gospel. There was little hunger for its dismantling, however, even as it was further called into question in the early twenty-first century over the Church of England’s resistance to same-sex marriage.

Westminster Abbey was typical of another significant phenomenon in this period, however, and that was the striking appeal of the cathedrals and ‘greater churches’ such as the abbey and King’s College, Cambridge, both to tourists and to Sunday worshippers eager for choral music, traditional liturgy, and perhaps the relative anonymity of a large building. Numbers of attenders at cathedral services remained relatively static in the 1980s and 1990s (significant in itself at a time of congregational contraction elsewhere), and increased modestly in the first decade of the twenty-first century.⁷⁷ It was not clear just why there should be the contrast with the experience of parish churches. But there was much talk of cathedrals functioning increasingly as iconic sacred spaces, because of their size and history, in a society increasingly unsure of its moral and religious identity. They were useful spaces, too, and increasingly susceptible to the lure of conference and concert income in order support the high costs of maintenance. A good example was Manchester Cathedral, a historic former collegiate church unable to rely on visitor income, and obliged instead to hire itself out to rock stars and conference dinners. The dean admitted in 2012 that this was simply a necessity: ‘We have always survived hand to mouth, now we have

⁷⁵ Beeson, *Window on Westminster*, p. 4.

⁷⁶ Beeson, *Window on Westminster*, p. 70.

⁷⁷ <<https://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2012/03/cathedral-attendance-statistics-enjoy-over-a-decade-of-growth.aspx>>, accessed Mar. 2016.

some surplus funds . . . these events are ways of raising maximum income.'⁷⁸ There was an uneasy relationship, then, between tourism, commerce, and the symbolic spiritual appeal of the cathedrals and greater churches. This was played out in wider Church concerns about the autonomy of cathedrals and their governance. A protracted and painful conflict amongst the chapter of Lincoln Cathedral in the early 1990s exposed the difficulties of managing what were, after all, sizeable and complex operations with the sometimes 'amateurish' approaches clergy brought to the task, and helped to trigger a fundamental review and reform of cathedral governance under a Cathedrals Measure passed by General Synod in 1999. Reform was probably necessary, but its introduction could give the misleading impression that cathedrals were somehow 'failing': the evidence, to the contrary, was that they were more visited, better maintained, and probably more useful to the wider public awareness of the Church than ever before.

Nothing could illustrate the complexity of what it meant, at the end of the twentieth century, to be 'Anglican' better than the position of the cathedrals. The cathedral, after all, was the seat of the bishop, and yet the bishops were now mostly no longer the recognizable leaders of public opinion they had once been: they headed a dwindling number of active church-goers in a society more diverse religiously and morally than ever before. The place of Anglicanism in British culture could almost be summed up in its historic continuity as exemplified by the cathedrals—a view sometimes sneeringly dismissed as the 'heritage' view—and yet that historic appeal seemed to grow even as the active base of church-going continued to slide.

Something of this seeming paradox can be attributed to the influence of mass media. The twentieth century was, after all, a century of enormous change in communications technology, and this rapidly widening range of popular and leisure provision represented both threat and opportunity for the Churches. With the establishment of the BBC in 1922 as a national service, the Church of England moved into a position of pre-eminence in the provision of religious broadcasting, though denominational objections were met by including religious services by non-Anglicans. The public service ethos of Lord Reith echoed Church of England notions of ethics and the place of religion in public life. At the middle of the twentieth century, the BBC was strongly committed to sustaining Christian values, and its radio programmes were shaped accordingly, with a daily service, and on Sundays no less than three services, along with a 'Sunday Half-Hour', which was reckoned in 1948 to attract an audience of 7 million.⁷⁹ The Reithian outlook was diluted rapidly in the 1960s, however, especially with the advent of television and a growing focus on broadcasting as entertainment. On radio, a daily service was maintained to the end of the

⁷⁸ *Manchester Evening News*, 19 Apr. 2012.

⁷⁹ P. A. Welsby, *A History of the Church of England 1945–1980* (Oxford, 1984), p. 51.

century, though the proliferation of BBC radio channels, and the rise of commercial radio stations, effectively marginalized it. On television, *Songs of Praise*, a Sunday evening programme of music, readings, interviews, and prayers, which was begun in 1961 and claimed to be the longest-running programme of its kind in the world, came to represent the one regular weekly religious commitment; it was determinedly non-denominational, and maintained a dedicated core audience of around 3.3 million into the twenty-first century. A similar trajectory can be traced in the treatment of religion by newspapers, with the growing impact of the sceptical and sensationalist tabloids from the 1960s on. To say as much is to reckon even without the rapid growth of the Internet and social media from the 1990s on. There, Churches could advertise themselves, project their views, and seek to influence people freely, but they faced immense, almost overwhelming challenges and competition from other perspectives, from critics, from celebrity culture, and from the pornography industry.

Yet, again, the difficulties Anglicans—like other Christians—faced by the beginning of the twenty-first century should not be exaggerated. The social, political, and religious hegemony apparently enjoyed by British Anglicanism just a hundred years before had passed away. Its influence may have waned, but through its established status the Church of England remained at the centre of national ceremonial and national rites of commemoration. In that sense, it remained an intrinsic aspect of historic national identity, even though its churches were used regularly by a diminishing minority of the population. British and Irish Anglicans could, on occasions, speak out on behalf of those marginalized or damaged by government policies, and in that sense they retained—even despite their greater strength of support amongst the privileged—a prophetic freedom. Especially during the controversial administration of Mrs Thatcher from 1979 to 1990, the Anglican Churches were often seen as a thorn in the side of the government. *Faith in the City* (1985), a report produced by a commission established by Robert Runcie, the archbishop of Canterbury, was risibly dubbed a ‘Marxist document’ by some government ministers, but in fact it was entirely at one with the tradition of Anglican social theology exemplified earlier in the century by William Temple, and its impact was considerable, inspiring innumerable local projects in the inner city, supported by the establishment of the Church Urban Fund. Anglicans also had a hand in the Council of Churches of Britain and Ireland report, *Unemployment and the Future of Work* (1997), which was very much in the same vein. As archbishop, first of Wales and then of Canterbury, Rowan Williams was unafraid to speak out against government policy, and to raise uncomfortable and controversial questions, as was his successor, Justin Welby. Anglicans may have lost much of the influence they once possessed as the ‘national Church’, but that did not stop them speaking with authority on behalf of the nation at large.

CONCLUSION

All four Anglican Churches of the British and Irish Isles were considerably smaller at the end of the twentieth century than they were at the beginning. Even taking into account population growth, and successive waves of immigration from Africa and Asia after 1945, their contraction would have seemed little short of catastrophic to Church leaders in 1914. It marked, not just the obvious difficulties in maintaining financial support and a paid, professional ministry, but also a decisive shift in British society. Parishes had to be amalgamated, churches closed and sometimes demolished, and educational causes and other philanthropic ventures abandoned or reconceived: all of this required immense internal soul-searching, and came frequently on the back of back-breaking effort and seeming failure. No one would have doubted that Britain and Ireland were a Christian society in 1914; by 2014, the very term was controverted and frequently denied. If the collapse and even disappearance of the mainstream Churches, forecast by some in the desperate contraction of the 1960s and early 1970s, had not happened, and in retrospect the predictions looked overblown, still the long-run effect of the erosion of numbers, money, and ministry should not be underestimated. It overshadowed everything.

Relative and absolute numeric decline thus provides a crucial context for understanding the history of British and Irish Anglicanism in the twentieth century, but it is not the only dimension worth stressing by way of conclusion. In the second half of the century, it became ever clearer that what was underway in British religious history was not simply the decline of Christianity, but its transformation. Just as, on the world scene, the old European empires were passing away by mid-century, so too the old certainties about the nature and leadership of Anglicanism world-wide were passing away. Immigration brought into Britain not only Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs in large numbers, but Christians too, and their energy and vitality began to change the very character of Anglicanism in Britain. Especially in the cities and larger towns, even the trajectory of decline was beginning to be reversed in the early twenty-first century, or at least held in check. Anglicanism was becoming more eclectic, more ethnically diverse, and perhaps more broadly Evangelical in spirit and in theology, but as a consequence significant cultural and religious gaps were perhaps opening up between the cities and the countryside, and that was potentially problematic for the future. Above all was this true for London, which was being hailed by the early twenty-first century as the one truly 'global' city in Britain; and in London, church-going was increasing. This is not to deny the powerful challenges that lay ahead, including the growing gap between traditional Christian sexual ethics and broader popular culture, and the negative impact of the terrible revelations of sexual abuse by Church people, often hidden or avoided by Church

authorities, which came to light towards the end of the twentieth century and on into the twenty-first.

Perhaps unconsciously influenced by the language of Christian eschatology, and certainly shaped by the habitual cycle of decay, hope, and renewal that runs through Christian experience and piety, time and again Anglicans like others have been quick to cast their own age as the decisive hour of crisis. But a historian might object that perceptions of crisis are a consistent feature of Christian interpretations of the present throughout the Church's history. If the fact of decline, and of change, cannot be denied, still there is something more to say by way of summary. It can perhaps be put this way. Anglican history in the twentieth century in Britain and Ireland is not only, or merely, a story of loss and reluctant adjustment. It is also a story of successful adaptation and improvisation, with successive attempts, more or less successful in places and in certain ways, to learn from the struggles of the past. Not only did Anglicans find ways to protect their built heritage, despite falling numbers, but they weathered world war, industrial and social conflict, and remarkable and unpredictable changes in taste and popular values, and they reformed and renewed their organizational life, their forms of worship and of ministry, their relations with other Christian traditions, their educational systems, and even their systems of authority. And yet in all obvious senses the Anglican Churches remained identifiably and demonstrably the same churches that they were at the beginning of this period.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bebbington, D. W., *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London, 1989).
- Bell, G., *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1935).
- Brown, C. G., *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800–2000* (2nd edn., London, 2009).
- Chandler, A., *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century: The Church Commissioners and the Politics of Reform, 1948–1998* (Woodbridge, 2006).
- Chandler, A., *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester: Church, State, and Resistance in the Age of Dictatorship* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2016).
- Davie, G., *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without Belonging* (Oxford, 1994).
- Field, C. D., *Britain's Last Religious Revival: Quantifying Belonging, Behaving, and Believing in the Long 1950s* (Basingstoke, 2015).
- Gay, J. D., *The Geography of Religion in England* (London, 1971).
- Gill, S., *Women and the Church of England: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (London, 1994).
- Goldie, F., *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland* (2nd edn., Edinburgh, 1976).

- Grimley, M., *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State Between the Wars* (Oxford, 2004).
- Harris, C. and R. Startup, *The Church in Wales: The Sociology of a Traditional Institution* (Cardiff, 1999).
- Hastings, A., *A History of English Christianity 1920–1985* (London, 1986).
- Iremonger, F. A., *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1948).
- Jones, I., *The Local Church and Generational Change in Birmingham 1945–2000* (Woodbridge, 2012).
- Lloyd, R., *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*, 2 vols. (London, 1946–50).
- Luscombe, E., *The Scottish Episcopal Church in the Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh, 1996).
- McDowell, R. B., *The Church of Ireland 1869–1969* (London, 1975).
- Maiden, J., *National Religion and the Prayer Book Controversy, 1927–1928* (Woodbridge, 2009).
- Mantle, J., *Britain's First Worker-Priests* (London, 2000).
- Megahey, A., *The Irish Protestant Churches in the Twentieth Century* (Basingstoke, 2000).
- Morgan, D. D., *The Span of the Cross: Christian Religion and Society in Wales 1914–2000* (Cardiff, 1999).
- Robbins, K., *England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales: The Christian Church 1900–2000* (Oxford, 2008).
- Thompson, K. A., *Bureaucracy and Church Reform: The Organizational Response of the Church of England to Social Change 1800–1965* (Oxford, 1970).
- Walford, R., *The Growth of 'New London' in Suburban Middlesex (1918–1945) and the Response of the Church of England* (Lampeter, 2007).
- Welsby, P. A., *A History of the Church of England 1945–1980* (Oxford, 1984).

Index

- Abrams, Ray H. 229
 Act in Restraint of Appeals (1532) 7
 Act of Synod (1992) 424
 Adams, Marilyn McCord 89
 Additional Curates Society 417
 Advisory Council on Mission Strategy (ACMS) 286–94, 314, 318, 390
 Affirming Catholicism 424
 Aldridge, Alan 142
 Allen, Horace 61
 Allin, John 297, 369–70, 373
 Allison, C. Fitzsimmons 110
 Allison, S. K. 290
 Alpha Course 129, 426
Alternative Service Book (1980) 426
 Altizer, Thomas 424
 American Association of Theological Schools 385
 Andrews, C. F. 129, 166
 Andrews, Mary 77
 Anglican Alliance for Development, Relief and Advocacy 264
 Anglican Board of Mission 77, 332
 Anglican Catholic Church 103, 352
 Anglican Church League 357–8
 Anglican Church of North America (ACNA) 103, 113, 323
 Anglican Church Women 87
 Anglican Communion (general) 246, 303–28
 institutional development of 42, 176, 271–302, 319–20, 348
 as term 281, 285–6, 303–12, 317, 408
 Anglican Communion Office 290
 Anglican Congress
 Minneapolis (1954) 180, 286–7, 314–15, 317–18
 Toronto (1963) 180, 291, 314, 317–18, 321, 387, 390
 Anglican Consultative Council xviii, 91, 266, 271, 292–6, 299–300, 303–14, 321, 324, 348, 392
 Anglican Contextual Theologians 44
Anglican Essentials (1995) 386
 Anglican Group for the Ordination of Women 76
 Anglican Mission in America (AMiA) 112–13, 304
 Anglican Orthodox Church 102
 Anglican Peace Fellowship (APF) 217–19
 Anglican Women's Training College, Toronto 82
 Anglicanism
 as identity xii–xix, 7, 12–15
 as term xii–xiii, 1–3, 303–7
 Anglican-Roman International Commission (ARCIC)
 ARCIC I 42, 208–9, 323, 352
 ARCIC II 209–10
 Anglicare 352
 Anglo-Catholicism xvii, 4, 25, 34–5, 40–4, 84, 98, 102, 108, 123, 129, 149, 189, 191, 194, 258, 312, 335, 341, 344, 348–50, 417–19, 421, 423–4
 ANZAC Day 180, 332
 apartheid 130–1, 168–9, 178–9, 253, 256–7, 389
Apostolicae Curae (1896) 144, 205
 Apostolic Tradition (*Hippolytus*) 56–7
 Appeal to all Christian People (1930) 40, 193–6, 200, 205, 211, 279, 313
 Archbishops' Council 416
 architecture 180–1, 346–7
 Armstrong, G. 345
 Arnold, Thomas 27
 Arnold, Walter 219
 Arnott, Felix 347
 Assumption, of Mary 206
 Ateek, Naim 43
 Auden, W. H. 422
 Aulén, Gustav 34
 Australia (general) 2, 5, 73, 77, 104, 143, 234, 257, 345
 Australia, Anglican Church of 331–61
 Church party 332, 338–40, 344, 348–50, 356–8
 Church, State and politics 118–19, 121–2, 125–7, 132–3, 227–8, 338–9, 349
 gender 75, 85, 87–9, 340–2, 350–2
 liturgy 181, 338, 340, 344, 346–9, 358
 mission 161, 178–80, 203, 337, 341, 343, 346, 352
 society, and 128, 152, 234–5, 254, 257, 333–5, 339–41, 342–3, 349–56, 358
 theology 127, 340, 350, 357
 Australian College of Theology 353
 Australian Council of Churches 344, 352
 Averill, Alfred 340, 342
 Azariah, V. S. 174

- Baddeley, Walter 238, 337
 Baker, Gilbert 296
 Baker, J. A. 36
 Baldwin, Stanley 121, 128
 Bangladesh 200
 baptism 57, 64, 87
 Baptists 199
 Barker, Ernest 123
 Barnes, E. W. 36, 219
 Barnes, Robert xi
 Barrett, Ellen 108, 371
 Barry, Alfred 311
 Barth, Karl 41
 Bartholomew I (Patriarch) 210
 Barton, Ethel 347
 Batty, Francis De Witt 126, 339
 Bayne, Stephen 42, 289–90, 318–19, 321, 390
 Beauduin, Lambert 206
 Beck, K. M. 359
 Bediako, Kwame 8
 Beecher, Leonard 172
 Beekman, Frederick W. 230
 Bell, George 5, 34, 192–4, 195, 201, 207, 211, 215, 219, 225–6, 247, 250, 252, 289, 342, 430
 Bell, Stuart 224
 Benedict XVI (Pope) 208–9
 Bennett, F. A. 335
 Benson, E. W. 205
 Benton, Pierre 387
 Bergquist, William 155
 Bethune-Baker, J. F. 34
 Biafra 233
 Birmingham 401
 Bishop Payne Divinity School 139, 367
 Bishops Messengers 78, 82
 Black Manifesto 368
 Black Power movement 368
 Blair, Tony 261
 Blake, Eugene Carson 201–2
 Blomfield, C. J. 314
 Blomfield, Reginald 119
 Board for Social Responsibility 261
 Bonhoeffer, Dietrich 34, 192, 424
 Bonn Agreement (1931) 203–4
Book of Common Prayer xvii, 12, 52–3, 55–6, 62–3, 79, 96, 107, 121, 123, 125, 222, 239, 306, 319, 331, 336, 371, 414, 418, 425–6
 Bosch, David 10
 Bottomley, Horatio 224
 Bowen, Louise DeKoven 80
 Boxer Rising 160
 Boyce, F. B. 227
 Bray, Gerald 326
 Bray, Thomas 309
 Brazil 391
 Brent, Charles 192, 211, 223, 365
 Breward, Ian 16
Bringing Them Home (1997) 354
 British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) 432–3
 British Council of Churches (BCC) 168, 173, 215, 251
 British Isles (general) 2, 5, 103–5, 137–59, 399–400, 434–5
 British Israelite movement 128
 British War Relief Society 230
 Britten, Benjamin 132
 Broomfield, Gerald 167, 169, 178
 Brotherhood of St Laurence 339
 Brown, Callum 88, 142, 403–5
 Brown, G. F. G. 171
 Browning, Edmund Lee 372–84, 392
 Bruce, Steve 142
 Buchanan, Pat 100
 Buck, Peter 331
 Buganda 164
 Bullard, Narelle 77
 Burgmann, Ernest 26–7, 339, 344
 Bush Brotherhoods 332
 Bush Church Aid Society 77, 332
 Butler, Hubert 126
 Butler, R. A. B. 240
 Buxton, Dorothy 247

 Caird, Edward 37
Called to Common Mission (2000) 202
 Calvin, John 186
 Cambridge 27–8, 46, 419
 Cambridge Mission to Delhi 166
 Cameron, Gregory 271
 Campaign for Christian Order 343
 Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) 132, 219, 221
 Canada (general) 2, 5, 73, 80, 143, 362–4
 Canada, Anglican Church of (general) 362–4, 384–90, 393–4
 Church party 110, 147, 313, 390
 Church, State and politics 118–20, 122, 228–9, 384
 gender 75, 77–8, 80, 82, 84–8, 377
 liturgy 63, 385–6, 388–9
 mission 203, 384–5, 389
 society, and 147, 180, 235–6, 362–4, 384–6
 theology 127, 129, 385
 Cannadine, David 151
 Carey, George 47, 110, 152, 208, 426
 Carnley, Peter 85, 357
 Carpenter, Edward 398
 Carrington, Philip 317–19
 Carter, Jimmy 101
 Case, Teague 80

- Casement, Roger 224
 Caswell, Henry 310
 Cathedrals Measure (1999) 432
 Cavell, Edith 236
 Ceausescu, Nicolae 431
 Census of Religious Worship (1851) 399–400
 Central Consultative Body (CCB) 276–90,
 292–3, 294
 Chadwick, Owen 414
 Chamberlain, Neville 218
 Chandler, Andrew 17, 430
 Chaplains, military 221–3, 236, 239, 333,
 342–3, 386
 Chapman, M. D. 300
 Charismatic movement 105, 407, 422–3
 Charles I xv–xvi
 Charles II xvi
 Charter of Rights and Liberties (Canada) 364
 Chartres, Richard 184, 288
 Chavasse, Christopher 420
 Cherrington, A. C. 336
 China 130, 165, 231–2
 Christchurch College 353
 Christendom Group 40
 Christian Action 168, 253, 256
 Christian Aid 251–4, 259, 264–5
Christian Believing (1976) 36
 Christian Coalition 101
 Christian Social Order Movement 127
 Christology 29–34, 207
 Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui (Holy Catholic
 Church of China) 231
 Church and Life movement 352
Church and the Bomb (1982) 219–20
 Church Army 230, 235–6, 340, 342, 410
 Church Assembly 75, 239, 414
 Church Growth movement 150
 Church League for Women's Suffrage 75–6
 Church Missionary Society (CMS) 42, 72, 77,
 98, 164, 166, 171, 176–8, 183, 190, 233,
 309, 332, 354
 Church of England Peace League 217
 Church Pastoral Aid Society 417
 Church Socialist League 217
 Churches Together in Britain and Ireland
 (CTBI) 201
 Churches Together in England (CTE) 201
 Churchill, Winston 25, 218, 342, 428
 Churchmen's Union (*see also* Modern
 Churchmen's Union) 34, 37, 421
 Civil Rights movement 107, 131, 366–7
 Clapham Sect 97
 Clark, David 148
 Clark-King, Ellen 149
 Class, social 140–4, 146–54, 404–5
 Clayton, Geoffrey 130, 169
 Clayton, P. T. B. 234, 240
 Clinton, Bill 101
 Coakley, Sarah 89
 Coates Hall 413
 Cody, H. J. 122
 Coggan, Donald 36, 134, 208, 297–9, 426
 Coke, Thomas 202
 Cold War 165, 167, 180, 254–5
 Colenso, J. W. 10, 99
 Coleridge, S. T. 27
 Collins, David 380
 Collins, John 132, 168, 183, 219, 221, 250, 253
 Colonial Bishops Fund 312, 314, 338
 Colonial Bishops Act (1852) 182
Colonial Church Chronicle 309
 Commission on Community Action and
 Human Development 369
Common Worship (2000) 426
 Community of the Resurrection (CR) 25, 131
 Compton Associates 346
 Conciliarism 187, 273, 292, 413–14
 Conference of British Missionary
 Societies 168
 Conference of European Churches (CEC) 201
 Conference on Christian Politics, Economics
 and Citizenship (COPEC, 1924) 38, 215
 Confessing Church 192
 Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament 417
 Consultation on Church Union (COCU) 201
 Consultation on Common Texts (CCT) 60–1
 Consultative Committee 274–6
 Consultative Council on Church Legislation
 (Scotland) 415
 contraception 79, 99–100, 144, 237, 281
 contextual theology 43–4
 Convocation of Anglicans in North America
 (CANA) 112
 Cook, Brian 397
 Council for the Clinical Training of
 Theological Students 385
 Council of African Provinces in Africa
 (CAPA) 321
 Council of Christian Unity (CCU) 199
 Council of Organizations for Relief Overseas
 (CORSO) 343
 Covenant, Anglican Communion 113–14,
 301, 322, 324, 393–4
 Coventry cathedral 132–3
 Coward, Noel 222
 Cox, Harvey 424
 Cox, Jeffrey 11, 18, 166
 Coxon, R. 153
 Cragg, Kenneth 322
 Cranmer, Thomas 52, 186
 Creighton, Louise 190–1
 Crew, Louis 384

- Crick, Bernard 125
 Cripps, A. S. 129
 Cromwell, Oliver xvi
 Cromwell, Thomas 144
 Crowther, Samuel 174
 Cuba 377
 Culin, Sam Van 63–4
 Cummins, G. D. 102
 Cupitt, Don 424
 Curry, Michael 47
 Curtis, Lionel 128
 Cyprus 164–5, 172–3
- Daly, Mary 89
 Darling, Barbara 351
 Daughters of the King 70
 Davidson, Allan 16
 Davidson, Melissa 228
 Davidson, Randall 4, 30–1, 119, 188–91, 205, 215, 217, 221, 224, 237, 245, 275–80, 413, 429–30
 Davie, Grace 142, 148
 Davies, Glenn 358
 De Candole, Henry 421
 Deaconesses 71–2, 76–7, 82, 412
 Dean, Ralph 292
 Dearmer, Percy 418
 Decade of Evangelism 320, 374, 411
 decolonization 7–11, 43, 120, 132, 160–85, 252–3, 256, 262, 265, 348, 429, 434
 Dees, James P. 102
 Denton, John 348
 Devine, F. 150
 Divorce 79, 88, 96, 349
 Dix, Gregory 41, 417, 421
 Dixon, Jane Holmes 379
 Doctrine Commission 35–6
 Doctrine in the Church of England (1938) 415
 Don, Alan 430
 Donaldson, St Clair George Alfred 227
 Donatist movement 96
 Douglas, Ian 291
 Douglas, Mary 94
 Dowell, Susan 89
 Dowling, Owen 350
 DuBose, William 28
 Duncan, Robert 113, 323
 Dunedin cathedral 347
 Durkheim, Emile 6
- Eames, Robin 86, 378, 428
 Ebanks, John 329
 Ecclesiastical History 16–17
- ecumenical relations (general) 55, 56–62, 186–213, 245, 343–4, 352–3, 365
 with Lutherans 202–3, 359
 with Methodists 186, 197–9, 202–3, 353, 359
 with Old Catholics 203–4, 365
 with Orthodox 193, 195, 210–11, 344
 with Reformed 197, 199, 201–3, 353
 with Roman Catholics 42, 186, 190, 194–5, 204–10, 344, 352, 359
 Edinburgh World Missionary Conference (1910) 3–5, 122, 137, 187–93, 211, 244–5, 248, 266
 education 135, 139–41, 152–6, 158, 191, 240, 250, 316, 331, 334, 338, 346, 353, 385, 404–5, 412–13
 Edward VIII 121, 428
 Edwards, Arthur 427
 Edwards, Phyllis 369
 Egerton, George 386
 Eliot, T. S. 125, 235, 422
 Elizabeth I xiv
 Elizabeth II 121, 135, 430
 Elkin, A. P. 339
 Elliott, Keith 219
 Emery, family 73
 Emery, Julia Chester 369
 Empire, British xvii, xix, 7–10, 71, 98, 118, 120, 124, 128–30, 160–85, 227–8, 246–7, 252, 311, 315, 331, 341
 Enabling Act (1919) 121, 123, 239, 414, 418
 Engels, Friedrich 151
 England, Church of (general) 272–301, 397–436
 Church party 25–6, 56, 110, 114, 181, 258–9, 316, 409, 411, 416–26
 Church, State and politics 7, 26–7, 117–36, 273–4, 406, 413–14, 430–1
 gender 75, 78–9, 83–5, 87, 411–12, 423–4
 liturgy 52–3, 56, 90, 400, 417–18, 420–1, 425–6, 431–2
 mission 98, 160–85, 409–12
 society 137–59, 214–42, 397–9, 399–400, 426–33
 theology 25–49, 127, 243–67, 415, 421, 434–5
 Ensor, R. C. K. 28
 environmental concern 260
 Episcopacy xvi, 32, 86, 124, 174–6, 196–9, 223–6, 271–2, 288, 295, 312, 316, 324, 377–9, 424
 Episcopal Church Women 81
 Episcopal Divinity School 81
 Episcopal Peace Fellowship 218
 Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity (ESCRU) 366, 368

- Episcopal Women's Caucus 371
Essays and Reviews (1860) 29
Essays Catholic and Critical (1926) 41
 Eucharist (Holy Communion, Lord's Supper) 58, 304–7, 357
 European Convention on Human Rights 250
 Evangelical Alliance 187, 258
 Evangelicalism xvii–xviii, 25, 27, 34, 46–7, 56, 84–5, 97, 101, 104–5, 124, 128, 147, 149, 169, 181–2, 187, 205, 258–9, 262–3, 312, 315, 320, 325, 332, 340, 344, 348–9, 356–8, 407, 410–11, 417, 419–20, 422–3, 425
 Evans, C. F. 138
 Evatt, H. V. 345
 Evelyn, John xvi

 Fadoyebo, Isaac 233
 Fairlie, Henry 397
 Fair Trade movement 254
 Faith and Order 192, 249, 365
Faith in the City (1985) 26, 46, 134, 140–1, 183, 433
 Falklands War 134
 Falwell, Jerry 101
 Farrer, Austin 39, 421
 Federal Council of Churches 364
 Feldman, David 135
 Fellowship of Reconciliation 217
 Fellowship of the Maple Leaf 77
 Ferguson, William 354
 Field, Clive 234, 238, 404
 Figgis, J. N. 25–6, 123, 131
Final Report (ARCIC) 209
 Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler 89
 First Promise 109
 First World War 28, 74, 119–20, 123, 214–42, 332–4, 386, 429–30
 Fisher, Geoffrey 51, 120, 160, 168–72, 175–9, 181–2, 197, 208, 220, 237, 250, 283–90, 348
 Fisher, 'Jacky' 222
 Fisher, John xi
 Fitchett, William 340
 Five Marks of Mission 266
 Fletcher, Brian 133
 Fletcher, Sheila 18
 Floyd, A. 347
 Forman, James 368
 Forward in Faith 424
Foundations (1912) 29–30, 38
 Fowler, Marguerite 78
 Francis I 210
 Frappell, Ruth 125
 Frere, Walter 189, 191, 205–6
 Fresh Expressions of Church 410

 Fundamentalism 94, 102, 420
 Furlong, Monica 89

 Gallup, George 374
 Garbett, Cyril 227
 Garland, David 119, 332
 Gay, John 401
 General Convention Special Programme (GCSP) 133, 368–9, 373
 George VI 121, 129
 George, Lloyd 218
 Gerard, G. V. 342
 Gibson, Paul 62
 Giddens, Anthony 140
 Gill, Robin 142
 Gill, Sean 18
 Girls Friendly Society 70–1, 341
 Girton Conference (1921) 34–5, 421
 Gladstone, W. E. 272
 Glasspool, Mary 111–12
 Global Anglican Futures Conference (GAFCON) 113, 321, 325, 356, 394
 Global Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans (GFCA) 394
 Goldsworthy, Kay 351
 Goodhew, H. 'Harry' 358
 Gore, Charles 26, 30–1, 107, 123, 189–94, 205–7, 216–17, 224, 418
 Gorer, Geoffrey 400
 Gothic Revival 54–5
 Gowing, Eric 345
 Graham, Alec 36
 Green, Simon 18
 Green, T. H. 127
 Gregory, Adrian 216
 Grimley, Matthew 9, 399, 428
 Grindal, Edmund xiv
 Groves, Charles 9
 Guéranger, Prosper 54
 Gumbuli, Michael 354
 Gunderson, Joan 68
 Gwynne, L. H. 232

 Habgood, John 134
 Haigh, Mervyn 225
 Haines, Ronald 381
 Haitt, Suzanne 85
 Halifax, Lord 205–6
 Hall, Kathleen 336
 Hall, Ronald 83, 237
 Hammond, R. B. S. 339
 Hammond, T. C. 348, 357
 Hardy, Dan 155
 Hare, David 149
 Harper, Michael 422–3
 Harries, Richard 110

- Harris, Barbara 86, 371, 378
 Harris, Jose 28
 Hartley, Helen-Ann 351
 Hasell, Eva 77
 Hassett, Miranda 17, 105
 Hastings, Adrian 16, 184, 409
 Hayes, A. H. 384–5, 388–9
 Hazlewood, John 349
 Head, F. W. 339
 Headlam, A. C. 194
 Headlam, Stewart 108
 Hearn, George 179
 Hebert, Gabriel 34, 41, 417, 421
 Heeney, Brian 75
 Hegelianism 25–6, 37
 Hempstone, Smith 373
 Henderson, Kenneth 335
 Henry VIII xi
 Henson, Hensley 31–3, 123, 135, 194, 205, 224
 Hickson, J. M. 335
 Hines, John 133, 289, 368–9
 Hinsley, Arthur 201, 430
 Hippolytus 56
 Hoare, J. H. 178
 Hobart, J. H. 310
 Hobhouse, Stephen 225
 Hobsbawm, Eric 10
 Hodgson, Leonard 39
 Holmes, David 272
 Holocaust 252
 Holy Trinity, Brompton 149, 422, 426
 Holy Trinity cathedral, Auckland 347
 Home Mission (Scotland) 402, 411
 homosexuality 43, 88, 93–116, 133–4, 258, 323, 355, 366, 371–2, 379–84, 388–90, 393, 395
Honest to God (1963) 44–5, 424
 Hong Kong 86
 Hook, W. F. 419
 Hornsby-Smith, Michael 400
 Hort, F. J. A. 28
 Horton, R. F. 196
 Hoskyns, E. C. 26, 41, 138
 Howe, John 296–8, 300
 Huddleston, Trevor 130–1, 168–9, 178, 183
 human rights 259–60
Humanae Vitae 293
 Hume, Basil 201
 Huntington, William Reed 42, 119, 196
 Huq, Rupa 149
 idealism 27, 37–40
 Iglesia de Jesús 394
 Ihaka, K. 347
 Immaculate Conception 206–7
 Indaba process 394–5
 India 8, 129, 162, 167
 Indian Church Act (1927) 121, 123
 Industrial Christian Fellowship 239–40
 Industrial Mission 140
 Inge, W. R. 37, 124
 integrity 371, 384
 Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Unity, Faith and Order (IASCUFO) 203
 Interchurch World Movement 364
 International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC) 62–5
 International Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission on Unity and Mission (IARCCUM) 210
 International Missionary Council (IMC) 191
 International Missionary Council Conference, Tambaram (1938) 163
 Ireland (general) xiv–xv, 2, 126–7, 397–436
 Ireland, Church of (general) 272, 403
 Church party 419, 422
 Church, State and politics 126–7, 272, 398, 403, 428
 gender 86–7, 423
 liturgy 63, 426
 mission 202, 409
 society, and 403, 408, 428–9
 theology 428
 Islam 245, 255, 265–6
 Jackson, Ernest 292
 Jacob, Edgar 31, 275, 277
 Jacob, W. M. 8, 120, 293
 James I xv, 308
 Jamestown Covenant 377
 Jamieson, Penny 86, 351
 Janowitz, Morris 221, 223
 Japan 231, 237, 275
 Jebb, Eglantyne 247
 Jenkins, David 106
 Jenkins, Philip 105
 Jenkins, Timothy 146, 148
 Jensen, Peter 356, 358
 Jerusalem 177
 Jerusalem Declaration (2008) 325
 John, Jeffrey 110–11
 John Keble Church, Mill Hill 417
 John Paul II 61, 208
 Johnson, Samuel 306, 310
 Johnston, T. J. 109
 John XXIII 208
 Jones, Edith 77
 Jones, Ian 18
 Jones, Paul 217
 Jubilee 2000 261–2
 Julius, Churchill 334

- Kabaka Mutesa II 164
 Karl, Elizabeth 381
 Kaye, Bruce 14, 16
 Keable, Robert 32
 Keele Congress (1966) 423
 Kellaran, Marion 298
 Kelly, Herbert 190
 Kempthorne, L. S. 337
 Kent, Bruce 220
 Kenya 129, 163–4, 171–2, 215, 233, 377
 Khomeini, Ayatollah 255
 Kidd, B. J. 206
 Kikuyu conference controversy 32, 194, 278
 King's College, Cambridge 431
 King's College, New York 306
 Kirk, Kenneth 40–1, 226
 Knight, Albion W. 223
 Knox, Broughton 350, 357–8
 Knox, Edmund 420
 Kolini, Emmanuel 110
 Kopuria, Ini 337
 Korea 165, 231–2
 Kosa, Stephen 215
 Kuala Lumpur statement (1997) 95
 Kuhn, Thomas 10

 laity 87–8, 348–9, 357, 367–8
 Lambeth Conference (general) 273–301, 304
 (1867) xviii, 187, 271, 273, 313, 318
 (1897) 274
 (1908) 62, 189–90, 275–8
 (1920) 40, 69, 74–6, 79, 119, 193–6, 211, 279, 313
 (1930) 76, 79, 99, 120, 144, 206, 217, 236, 280–4, 303
 (1948) 42, 63, 83, 127, 200, 252–3, 284–5, 288, 316–17
 (1958) 42, 100, 120, 283, 288, 318
 (1968) 84, 131, 253–4, 260, 293–4
 (1978) 86, 254–6, 260, 297, 378
 (1988) 86, 99, 259–60, 299, 323
 (1998) 136, 260, 299, 320, 323, 392
 (2008) 99, 305, 324
 Lambeth Quadrilateral 194–6
 Lampe, Geoffrey 36
 Lane, Libby 87
 Lang, Cosmo Gordon 121, 171, 190, 194–5, 217–19, 224, 278, 280–3, 429
 Laski, Harold 123
 Latimer House 353
 Laud, William xvi
 Lawrence, John W. 292
 Le Fanu, H. F. 340
 League of Nations 193, 247, 260, 341
 League of Soldiers' Friends 342
 League of the Church Militant 76

 Lectionaries 60–1
 Lee, S. 339
 Leeds 419
 Lennox-Boyd, Alan 172
 Leo XIII 205
 Lewis, C. S. 39–40, 422
 Liberalism 26, 29–36, 43–5, 100–2, 104–9, 112–13, 150, 258, 348, 352–96, 420–1, 424–5
 Lidgett, Scott 196
 Life and Liberty 38, 414
 Life and Work 192, 249, 365
 Lincoln cathedral 432
 Liturgical Movement 50–67, 288, 418, 421
 Liverpool 401
 Lloyd, Roger 142, 216, 407–8
 Lloyd Jones, Martin 423
 Loane, Marcus 352, 357
 Local Ecumenical Partnerships (LEPs) 200–1
 London 403
 Long, G. M. 339
 Longley, C. T. xviii
 Lutheranism 199–200, 202–3, 309 *see also* ecumenical relations
 Luther King, Martin 293
 Lutyens, Edwin 119, 240
Lux Mundi (1889) 29, 37

 Mabo, Eddie 355
 McAdoo, Henry 428
 MacArthur, Douglas 223
 McCoskry, S. A. 312
 MacCulloch, Diarmaid 2
 McGavran, Donald 150
 McGrath, Alistair 47
 McIntire, Carl 102
 McKernan, Michael 234
 Mackinnon, Donald 26, 47
 Maclean, Norman 145
 McLeod, Hugh 18, 142
 McLeod, Mary Adelia 379
 McLeod Campbell, John 287
 Macmillan, Harold 173, 288
 McNaughton, John 375
 Macquarrie, John 40, 294
 Madagascar 177
 Maitland, Sara 89
 Major, H. D. A. 34, 336, 421
 Makarios III 165, 167, 172
 Malcolm, Arthur 179, 354
 Malines Conversations 204–7
 Malta 165
 Malvern conference (1941) 38, 249
 Manchester cathedral 431
 Mandela, Nelson 256
 Manning, William T. 230

- Mantle, John 17
 Marching Rule 337
 Margaret, Princess 121
 Marriage 96, 382, 406, 424 *see also* Divorce;
 Polygamy
 Marshall, George C. 223
 Martin, David 6, 142
 Marx, Karl 151
 Masasi 176, 178
 Mascal, Eric 34, 421
 Mason, Herbert 125
 Matthews, Victoria 338, 351
 Matthews, W. R. 129
 Mau Mau 163, 171–2, 233
 Maurice, F. D. 13, 27, 42, 107
 Mauritius 177
 Maxwell, David 11, 129, 182
 Mbiti, John 43
 Meissen Agreement (1991)
 198–9
 Melancthon, Philip 186
 Melanesia 332, 336–8
 Melanesian Brotherhood 337
 Mercier, Désiré-Joseph 205–6
 Methodism 97, 186–7, 197–8, 202–3 *see also*
 ecumenical relations
 Mexico 394–5
 Milbank, John 47
 Miller, H. 353
Ministry of Women (1919) 75
 Mission 3–4, 9–12, 88, 122, 129–30, 162–6,
 174–5, 182–3, 188–93, 244–6, 262–6,
 286, 307–10, 313–17, 319–25, 326, 336–7,
 341, 356, 390, 410–12
 Mission and Public Affairs Council 259
Mission-Shaped Church (2004) 410
 Modern Churchmen's Union 417
 modernism 26, 29–36, 336, 385,
 420–1, 424
 Montgomery, Bernard Law 221
 Moore, Paul 122, 238
 Moore College, Sydney 353, 357
 Moral Majority, The 101
 Moravians 202–3, 277–8, 283
 More, Thomas xi
 Morgan, Densil 16
 Morgan, Emily 80
 Morpeth Theological College 339
 Morris, Stuart 219
 Morrison, Charles Clayton 189, 191
Mortalium Animos (1928) 207
 Mortimer, Robert 290
 Mote, James O. 103
 Mothering Sunday 79–80
 Mothers' Union 70, 79, 81, 88, 144, 166,
 175, 341
 Mott, John 188–90
 Movement for the Ordination of Women
 (MOW) 350
 Mowll, Howard 339–40, 344, 348
 Moyes, J. S. 133, 339
 Moyses, Cordelia 17
 Murphy, Charles H. 109, 113
 music 347–9, 420
 Mutual Church Aid 248–9, 252
 Mutual Responsibility and Inter-Dependence
 in the Body of Christ (MRI) 180, 291–2,
 314, 317–18, 322, 390
 Mylne, Louis 277
Mystery of Salvation (1995) 36
Myth of God Incarnate (1977) 36
 Nairn, Tom 429
 National Association for Apostolic
 Ministry 350
 National Association for the Advancement of
 Colored People 366
 National Committee for Commonwealth
 Immigrants 133
 National Council of Churches (New
 Zealand) 343, 353
 National Days of Prayer 124, 129, 170, 226
 National Mission of Repentance and Hope
 (1916) 224, 239
 National Secular Society 215
 Nationalism, and national identity xi–xii, xiv,
 16, 117–18, 120, 124, 126–9, 131–3, 135,
 163, 180, 226–30, 333, 337, 399, 427–8
 Nationwide Festival of Light 134
 Neill, Stephen xix, 3, 9, 12, 204
 New England Theological Schools Committee
 on Clinical Training 385
 New Guinea 231
 New Zealand (general) xvii, 2, 5, 43, 104, 257,
 345–6
 New Zealand, Anglican Church of
 (general) 272, 331–61
 Church party 335
 Church, State and politics 133–4, 229, 334,
 336, 343
 gender 75, 85, 88–9, 340–2, 350–2, 377
 liturgy 336, 346–9, 359
 mission 179, 203, 336, 344, 353, 359
 society, and 139, 141, 144, 149, 152–3, 219,
 235–6, 254, 257, 334–5, 338, 341, 345,
 349–56, 358–9
 theology 336
 Newbigin, Lesslie 10
 Newbold, Frank 125
 Newman, John Henry xii, 307, 310–11
 Ngata, Apirana 331, 335
 Niebuhr, H. Richard 145–6
 Niebuhr, Reinhold 38
 Nigeria 176–7, 215, 233

- Nippon Sei Ko Kwai (Holy Catholic Church of Japan) 231, 392
 Noble, James 354
 Noel, Conrad 117, 120
 Nonconformity, Protestant 124, 196–9, 427
 Norman, Edward 257
 North India, Church of 162, 200
Northern Catholicism (1933) 40
 Northern Rhodesia 176
 Nuclear weapons 131–2, 219, 223, 250, 255, 345
 Nuffield, Lord 338
 Nungalinga College, Darwin 346
 Nyasaland 176

Objections to Christian Belief (1963) 44
 Old Catholic Churches 203–4 *see also* ecumenical relations
 Oldham, G. A. 284
 Oldham, J. H. 190–1, 248
 Order of the Good Shepherd 72
 Order of the Holy Cross 107
 Ordinariate, Anglican 111
 Ordination of Aliens Act (1784) 182
 Ordinations for Colonies Act (1819) 182
 Orthodoxy, Eastern 195, 210–11, 324 *see also* ecumenical relations
 Orwell, George 125
 Overseas and Other Clergy (Ministry and Ordination) Measure (1967) 182
 Owen, W. B. 129
 Owen, Wilfrid 123
 Oxbrow, Mark 262
 Oxfam 251
 Oxford 27–8, 46
 Oxford Conference (1937) 248–50, 252
 Oxford Movement 27, 98, 147, 310

 Pacifism 132, 216–21, 241, 250, 254
 Pakistan 200
 Palestine 171
 Palmer, William 307, 309
 Pan-Anglican Congress (1908) 276, 314
 Papacy 207–9
 Papua 337, 342
 Parish and People 421
 Parish Communion 421
 Parish organization 408–12
 Parker, Stephen 235
 Parkin, Frank 140
 Parsons, Geoffrey 142
 Parsons, Talcott 140
 Partners in Mission (PIM) 321, 392
 Pastoral Letter on the Sin of Racism 376
 Paton, David 130
 Patton, George S. 223
 Paul VI 208
 Paul Report (1964) 412
 Peace Pledge Union (PPU) 217
 Peck, W. G. 40
 Peel, J. D. Y. 98
 Peers, Michael 388–9
 Pentecostalism 262
 Percival, John 216–17
 Pershing, John 223
 Perth College of Divinity 353
 ‘Philadelphia 11’ 370
 Philippines 231
 Pike, James 103, 106, 202, 369
 Pilcher, C. V. 342
 Piper, John 125
 Pirouet, Louise 8
 Pittenger, Norman 40
 Pius XI 207
 Planting, Church 410
 Plumer, Herbert 232
 polygamy 99
 Polynesia 337
 Portal, Fernand 205
 Porter, Andrew 128
 Porvoo Agreement (1996) 199
 post-colonial theory 9
 Posterski, Dan 387
 Powell, Enoch 133
 Powell, Michael 125
 Prague Spring 293
 Prayer Book Society 425
 Prelinger, Catherine 18
 Presiding Bishop’s Fund for World Relief (PBFWR) 251, 391
 Pressburger, Emeric 125
 Preston, Ronald 38
 Price, H. M. E. 280
 Primates’ Meeting xviii, 86, 91, 271, 297–301, 314, 393
Problem of Homosexuality (1954) 133
 Professional Standards Authority 358
 Professionalization of clergy 146–54, 164
 Programme to Combat Racism 257
 Progressivism 104–9 *see also* Liberalism
 Public Morality Council 237
 Puritanism 96
 Pusey House 33
 Putterill, Jack 167

 Quick, O. C. 39

 race, and racism 18, 107, 132–4, 139–41, 169–70, 174, 177–9, 183, 245–6, 249, 252–3, 256–7, 331, 333–5, 344–5, 354–5, 359–60, 366–70, 375–7, 389 *see also* apartheid
 Radner, Ephraim 47

- Railton, David 119, 240
 Ramsey, Ian 39
 Ramsey, Michael 13, 27, 41–2, 133, 168, 170, 177, 198, 208, 220, 290–2, 296, 322, 390, 421, 431
 Rashdall, Hastings 34, 421
 Ratana, Wiremu 335
 Raven, Charles 76, 217–18
 Rawlinson, A. E. J. 41
 Rayner, Keith 350, 352
 Reagan, Ronald 255
 Reckitt, Maurice 40
 Reeves, Paul 346, 359, 376
 Reformation, Protestant 96
 Reformed Episcopal Church 102, 304
 Reformed tradition 199 *see also* ecumenical relations
 Reiss, Robert 17
 Reith, John 432
 religious orders 71–2, 88, 337, 417
 Representative Church Council (RCC) 413–14
 resurrection 30
 Reuilly Agreement (1999) 199
 Rhodesia 170, 173, 220
 Rhymes, Douglas 44
 Richardson, Paul 283
 Righter, Walter 109, 381, 383
 Riley, C. O. L. 333, 342
 Riley, Charles 342
 Robarts, David 352
 Robbins, Keith 16
 Robertson, Pat 101
 Robinson, Donald 357–8
 Robinson, Gene 93, 106, 109–11, 323, 393
 Robinson, J. Armitage 190, 205
 Robinson, John 44–5, 106, 424
 Rodger, Patrick 193, 211
 Rodgers, John H. 109
 Rogers, Frederic 272–3
 Roman Catholicism 42, 54–7, 59, 60–1, 151, 190, 195, 204–10, 221–2, 308, 401–3
 see also ecumenical relations
 romanticism 54–5
 Roosevelt, F. D. 230
 Round Table movement 120, 332
 royal supremacy xiv, xviii, 7
 Royden, Maude 18, 76, 340
 Ruether, Rosemary Radford 89
 Runcie, Robert 86, 183, 208, 220–1, 238, 299, 377, 425, 433
 Russell, Anthony 146
 Ryle, Herbert 119, 240
 Sachs, W. L. xix, 8
 sacramental theology 124, 147
 Sadiq, John 318
 Sadlier, W. C. 336
Saepius Officio (1897) 415
 Saiving, Valerie 89
 Sambell, Geoffrey 357
 Samkange, Thompson 163
 Sanday, William 30–3
 Sanneh, Lamin 11
 Saucedo, José G. 395
 Savage, M. 150
 Save the Children Fund 247, 251
 Sayers, Dorothy L. 80, 422
 schools of sociology 40
 Schori, Katharine Jefferts 87, 111, 371
 Scotland (general) xv, 197, 306, 404–5
 Scott, Edward 84, 388
 Scott, Michael 130, 132
 Scottish Episcopal Church (general) 397–436
 Church party 419, 422
 Church, State and politics 398, 408, 413
 gender 69, 86–7, 423
 liturgy 55, 63, 419, 426
 mission 402, 411, 413, 428
 society, and 402, 408, 428–9
 theology 197
 Scottish Episcopal Renewal Fellowship 422
 Scudder, Vida 80
 Sea of Faith network 424
 Seabury, Samuel 310
 Second World War 80, 125, 214–42, 342–6, 396, 429–30
 secularization 4–7, 45–6, 94, 137–9, 148, 175, 246, 259, 265, 358–9, 362–3, 374, 387, 398, 400–7, 409–10, 426–7, 434–5
 Seeley, J. R. 311
 Selby, Peter 262
 Sellar, W. C. 125
 Selwyn, E. G. 41
 Selwyn, G. A. xvii, 272–3
 Selwyn Society 353
 Selznick, T. 154–5
 sexual abuse 380
 sexuality, human 93–116, 258, 300, 355, 379–84, 424
 Seychelles 177
 Shakespeare, J. H. 196
 Shattuck, Gardiner 17
 Sheppard, H. R. L. 217, 219, 234, 240, 414
 Sherlock, William 305
 Sherrill, Henry 285–90
 Shines, Robert 386
 Simeon, Charles 418
 Simms, George 290
 Simon, Glyn 419
 Simon of Cyrene Institute 140
 Singapore 236

- Sisterhood of St John the Divine 72
 Sisters of the Church 72
 slavery 97
 Smith, Arthur 409
 Smith, Constance Adelaide 79
 Smith, Elizabeth 347
 Smith, Ian 173
 social history 17–18
 social justice 243–67, 365–6, 385–6, 389, 391
 Societas Liturgica 64
 Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) 235
 Society for the Preservation of the Book of Common Prayer 371
 Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) 129, 175–7, 180, 182, 187, 190, 244–5, 308, 312–14, 338
 Society of St John the Evangelist (Cowley Fathers) 107
 Society of the Holy Cross 417
 Söderblom, Nathan 34
 Solesmes 54
 Solomon Islands 231, 337
Songs of Praise 433
 Sorokin, Pitrim 140
Soundings (1962) 44
 South Africa 130–2, 139, 163, 168–70, 174, 232–3
 South Bank Theology 44–6
 South India, Church of 8, 34, 162, 200, 281, 283, 285, 344, 421
 South Ormsby Grange 409
 Southern Rhodesia 163, 169
 South–South Encounters 320
 Spong, John S. 103, 106, 108–9, 381
 Stacey, Nick 398
 Stanley, A. P. 27
 St Augustine's College, Canterbury 286, 317, 322
 St Bede's College, Mthatha 139
 St Clement Danes 221
 St Hilda Community, London 90
 St John's, Port Moresby 231
 St John's College, Auckland 89, 139, 156, 335, 346, 353, 359
 St Michael's, Llandaff 419
 St Paul's, Toronto 119
 St Paul's cathedral, London 125
 St Paul's College, Cape Town 139
 Stephen, Reginald 227
 Steward, J. M. 336
 Stockwood, Mervyn 44
 Stone, Darwell 33
 Stopfel, Barry 109, 381, 383
 Stranks, C. J. 12
 Streeter, B. H. 29–31
 Stringer, Martin 148
 Strong, Philip 337
 Strong, Rowan 9, 161
 Stott, John 262, 423
 Studdert Kennedy, G. A. 234, 237, 239
 Student Christian Movement (SCM) 38
 Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee 368
 Student Volunteer Movement (SVM) 188
 Sturrock, Morna 347
 Suez, invasion of 172, 220
 Suggate, Alan 247
 Sumner, J. B. 187
 Sumner, Mary 71
 Sundkler, Bengt 8
 Swanwick Declaration (1987) 201
 Sword of the Spirit 201
 Sydney, archdiocese 85, 340, 344, 346, 349–52, 356–8
 Sykes, Stephen 12–15, 47
 Symons, C. H. 340
 Szeleter, Simon 144
 Talbot, E. S. 189, 224, 275
 Talbot, Neville 29
 Talley, Thomas 63
 Tanganyika 176–8
 Tanner, Mary 193, 211
 Tanzania 163, 182
 Tavad, George 3
 Tay, Moses 110
 Taylor, D. 344
 Taylor, John V. 36, 42, 130, 168
 Tearfund 258–9
 Temple, Frederick 27, 274–5
 Temple, William 26–7, 35, 37–9, 127–9, 162, 176, 192–3, 195, 211, 215, 219, 225, 227, 235, 237, 239–40, 247–9, 281, 283, 342, 414–15, 417–21, 429–30, 433
 Te Paa, Jenny Plane 89
 Te Rau College 335
 Thatcher, Margaret 134, 220, 254–7, 433
 theology 26–49, 239, 243–67, 303–28, 421–2, 424–5
 Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion 62, 191, 216, 331, 336
 Thomas, R. S. 126
 Thompson, J. M. 29–30
 Thornton, Martin 12–13
 Tim-Oi, Florence Li 83, 236–7, 239, 252
 Tobin, Robert 126
 Toc H 240
Together in Song 348
 Tomkins, Oliver 193, 211
 Tönnies, Ferdinand 6
 Torres Straits 354

- Tovey, Philip 65
Towards the Conversion of England
 (1945) 411
 Towler, A. 153
 Townsend, Peter 121
 Tucker, G. V. 339
 Tugwell, H. 280
 Turner, Alwyn 150
 Tutu, Desmond 43, 170
 Tyndale, William xi
- Uganda 164, 172, 174, 177, 377
 Unaipon, David 354
 Underhill, Evelyn 80
 Under One Roof (1987) 374
Unemployment and the Future of Work
 (1997) 433
 United Nations 253, 260, 345
 United Reformed Church 199
 United Society for the Propagation of the
 Gospel (USPG) 182–3
 United States (general) 2, 5, 71, 73, 79, 143,
 306, 362–4
 United States, Episcopal Church of
 (general) 272–300, 362–96
 Church party 93–116, 315, 372–5
 Church, State and politics 102, 118–20,
 132–3, 312, 329–30
 gender 73, 75, 78, 81–3, 86–7, 366, 368–72
 liturgy 55, 63, 102, 366, 369–72
 mission 73, 161, 168, 180, 201–3, 310, 319,
 390–3
 society, and 139–40, 144–6, 149–53, 155,
 158, 217–18, 222–3, 240, 251, 255, 257,
 319, 362–9, 372–3
 theology 104–9, 272, 306–12
 United Thank Offering 391
 Universities' Mission to Central Africa
 (UMCA) 166, 175–8, 182
 University of the South 367
- Vallière, Paul 272
 Vanstone, W. H. 128
 Vatican Council, Second 60, 187, 207–8, 211,
 293, 352, 423
 Velasco, Efrain Salinas 395
 Venn, Henry 174
 Vercoe, Whakahuhiui 351
Via Media 124, 152
 Victoria League for Commonwealth
 Friendship 120
 Vidler, Alec 34, 41, 44
 Vietnam 15, 220, 223, 254–5, 348, 368
 Vining, Leslie 177
 Virginia Report (1996) 300, 322–3
 Virginia Theological Seminary 139
- Wagner, C. Peter 150
 Waiapu 335
 Waikato 336
 Wake, William 186
 Wales, Church in (general) 397–436
 Church party 419, 422
 Church, State and politics 122, 124, 126,
 398, 402–3, 406, 427–8
 gender 69, 86, 423
 liturgy 426
 mission 409
 society, and 402, 406, 408
 Waller, Christian 347
 Walls, Andrew 11
 Wand, J. W. C. 7–8, 12, 339
 Ward, Kevin xix, 16
 Warren, Max 42, 167
 Waterloo Declaration (2001) 203
 Webber, William 347
We Believe in God (1986) 36
We Believe in the Holy Spirit (1991) 36
 Weber, Max 6, 141, 145
 Webster, Alan 183
 Webster, Douglas 292
 Webster, John 14
 Week of Prayer for Christian Unity 58, 352
 Welby, Justin 122, 210, 426, 433
 Welfare State 38, 127–8, 240, 249
 Wellington City Mission 219
 Wells, G. A. 229
 Wells campaigns 343
 Welsby, Paul 142
 Wesley, Charles 186, 197
 Wesley, John 186, 197, 202
 Westcott, B. F. 315
 Western Anglicanism, as term 1–2
 Westminster Abbey 398, 430–1
 Weston, Frank 30–3, 40, 98, 129, 194–5,
 232, 278
 West-Watson, Campbell 340, 342–3
 Wheen, Francis 255
 White, G. 333
 White, William 306, 310
 White Australia Policy 333
 Whitefield, George 197
 Wickham, A. K. 397
 Wickham, E. R. 148
 Wilberforce, Samuel 310–11
 Wilberforce, William 97
 Wilde, Oscar 108
 Wiles, Maurice 36
 Wilkinson, Alan 142
 Wilkinson, Leslie 346
 William Temple College, Rugby 39
 Williams, Charles 422
 Williams, N. P. 31, 40

- Williams, Raymond 28
 Williams, Robert 109, 380–1
 Williams, Rowan 47, 110, 113, 208–10, 220, 265, 272–3, 324, 393, 426, 433
 Williams, Sarah 18
 Williamson, Philip 124, 228
 Willimon, William 157
 Willis, Frederick 289
 Willis, Sabine 89
 Wilson, Bryan 405
 Wilson, John 141
 Wilson, Leonard 231, 238
 Windsor Continuation Group 301
 Windsor Report (2004) 113, 322–3, 393
 Winnington-Ingram, A. F. 224–5
 Winter, Gibson 150
 Wolfenden Report (1957) 112, 133
 Wolterstorf, Nicholas 265
 Women, in Anglicanism 18, 43, 68–92, 151, 191, 236–7, 260, 295–6, 323, 331, 333, 340–2, 350–2, 356–7, 366, 369–74, 377–9, 388–9, 403–4, 411–12, 423
 ordination of 83–91, 102, 107, 295–6, 323, 350–2, 369–72, 377–9, 388–9, 395, 404, 411–12, 423–4
 Women, Faith and Fêtes (1977) 89
 Women's Auxiliary (WA) 73, 75, 77–8, 81, 369, 388
 Wontulp bi baya, North Queensland 346
 Woodhead, Linda 142
 Woods, Frank 352
 Woodward, Josiah 97
 Woolf, Virginia 25, 28
 Worker priest movement 17, 412
 Workers' Educational Association (WEA) 38
Working as one Body (1995) 416
 World Christian Database 320
 World Council of Churches (WCC) 34, 38, 81, 131, 169, 187, 191–2, 211, 249, 256–7, 264, 322, 344, 352, 365, 383
 Wray, Mark 178
 Wright, N. T. 47
 Wylde, Arnold 344
 Wyler, William 227
 Yeatman, R. J. 125
 York 401
 Yoruba 98
 Zahl, Paul 14, 47
 Zanzibar 176
 Zanzibar rite 98
 Zusters, Renis 347