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ABSTRACT

The Anglican Church of Australia agreed to a national constitution in 1962. Yet at a national level it is hardly a cohesive body with a sense of unity and common purpose. Historically, Australian Anglicanism developed along regional lines, with the result that diocesan separateness rather than national unity became enshrined as a foundational principle of Anglicanism in Australia. This study questions this fundamental premise of the Anglican tradition in Australia. It argues (1) that it is not a true reflection of the Anglican ethos, both in its English origins and worldwide, and (2) that it prevents Anglicanism in Australia from embracing its national vocation.

An alternative tradition has been present, in fact, within Australian Anglicanism from the beginning, although it has not been considered to be part of the mainstream. Bishop Broughton, the first Anglican bishop in Australia, was deeply sensitive to the colonial context in which the Anglican tradition was being planted, and he adapted it accordingly. So too, a century later, Bishop Burgmann of Canberra and Goulburn argued for Anglicanism to embrace its national vocation. The views of both these pioneering bishops were consistent with the national principle that lay at the heart of the Anglican ethos from as far back as the English Reformation. The central part of this study explores this national emphasis in Anglican thought, which is present in the thought of Richard Hooker and received renewed emphasis in the writings of Broad Church Anglicans like Coleridge, Arnold and Maurice in nineteenth century England. The national principle did not disappear with the birth of global Anglicanism. The principle of inculturation, always implicit in the Anglican tradition in England, now became an Anglican imperative. The American Revolution indicated that the vocation of each cultural expression of Anglicanism is intricately bound up with the life of the particular society to which it belongs. A study of Lambeth documents demonstrates this growing cultural awareness within global Anglicanism. The present crisis of authority in the Anglican Communion should not
be allowed to divert attention away from the national vocation of each particular or national church, in keeping with one of the central tenets of the English Reformation.

Important theological and ecclesial issues are at stake. It is very easy for Anglicanism to lapse into an in-house conversation, forgetting that doctrine is part of a human and not just an ecclesiastical conversation. At the heart of the Anglican ethos is a ‘reconciling method’. In a fragmented world, Anglicanism is called to be a mediating presence, engaging with the differences that threaten to divide nations and communities. The Anglican *via media* needs to be released from ecclesiastical confinement to do its proper work within national life. So too, the notion of ‘comprehensiveness’, long considered to be a central aspect of the Anglican ethos, needs to be placed at the service of the national and international community, especially in a post-colonial world. Conversation and community need to take precedence over fragmentation and hostility. The Anglican tradition was made for such a time, and needs to apply its theological and ecclesial resources to broader issues than its own survival. Ultimately it is a question of integrity: whether Anglicanism is prepared to embody its vision of unity within its own life, and to share it with the wider human community; whether it is willing to live with the risks of engagement, accepting that the ongoing tension between gospel and culture is part of its vocation.

The final section of the study will seek to apply these insights to the Australian context. Anglicanism has, in fact, been part of the Australian story from the beginning of European settlement. It must not retreat into a private religious world, or assume a comfortable establishment status as it tended to do in the decades after Federation. It needs to be part of the ongoing debate about Australia – what Australia is and what it stands for. The Anglican tradition must both engage in the conversation about Australia and act as a prophetic and mediating presence, especially at the points of tension which cause fractures in national life. Particular attention will be paid to three key themes in Australian life: the Anzac tradition, race, and land. Each of these presents Anglicanism with both a challenge and an opportunity. Australia needs the insights and resources that the Anglican tradition brings, and Anglicanism needs to grasp that it is both Anglican and Australian. It must therefore get its own house in order for the sake of the nation.
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INTRODUCTION

I begin this discussion a decade ago, at the first National Anglican Conference held at the Australian National University, Canberra, in February 1997. The conference was the first of its kind, a popular rather than a legislative gathering. Anglicans from all over Australia – laity, clergy and bishops – came together to focus on the theme, ‘Exploring Our Future: Anglicans in Australia in the 3rd Millenium’.¹ This theme suggested that the Anglican Church of Australia was a church on the move, open to new possibilities and willing to engage with Australian society. During the first session Prime Minister John Howard and Opposition Leader Kim Beazley addressed the conference, encouraging and exhorting Anglicans to engage in the life of the nation. In their presence, the conference sang an Australian hymn with a decidedly Australian theme. In subsequent sessions, prominent Australian academics and commentators discussed social and political issues affecting Australian society and how the Anglican community might respond. Leading Anglican speakers explored how Anglican Christianity was managing its Australian experience. Indigenous Anglicans were prominent, highlighting how far Anglicanism in Australia had come since 1788, when the Reverend Richard Johnson arrived, full of faith and perplexity, with the First Fleet.

It was a promising moment in the history of this Australian church. The popularity of the conference, I suspect, was an indication that Anglicanism in Australia was feeling its way forward as an Australian church. However unconsciously, these dual threads of its life – being Anglican and being Australian – were being woven together. The conference, after all, was a self-styled ‘national’ one, with Australian political and community leaders gracing the platform, Australian songs being sung, and indigenous Australians being given an honoured role in the proceedings. Was not the theme of the conference declaring that the future of this church was intertwined

¹The programme and addresses of the conference are printed in the National Anglican Conference Journal, published by Church Press Ltd. as a supplement to Church Scene, March 21, 1997.
with that of the nation to which it belonged? Was it not important, then, to try to articulate in some way the nature of the relationship between this church and this nation? Failure to do so, it seemed to me, could easily lead to two equally undesirable conclusions: firstly, that being Anglican was really an ‘in house’ affair, isolated from the rest of Australian society; and secondly, that hidden assumptions about Anglican privilege, more in keeping with another time and place, were preventing Anglicanism in Australia from engaging in what was becoming an increasingly pluralistic society.

The relationship between Anglicanism and the Australian nation remained, as far as I could tell, more implicit than explicit. The sense of being a ‘national’ church was not explored. In so doing, an important dimension of Anglican tradition was neglected. My purpose, in this study, is to redress this situation. Put simply, I wish to explore the meaning of the term ‘Anglican Church of Australia’. My thesis is as follows. An intrinsic relationship between church and nation lies at the heart of the Anglican ethos. In keeping with its name, the Anglican Church of Australia must affirm and embrace the integral part the nation plays in its life, identifying itself as Australian and engaging in the life-world of Australian society. Both identity and vocation are involved: Australian Anglicanism exists both in and for Australia. It is, to use the words of F.D. Maurice, the nineteenth century Anglican theologian, a ‘church for the nation’.²

‘The Articles of Religion’ (1562), key Anglican documents of the English Reformation, provide a fundamental reference point for the discussion. Article 34 reads, in part: ‘Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying’.³ In the context of sixteenth century Tudor England, Article 34 was a declaration of the independence and distinctiveness of the English church over against the claims of the Papacy. It was an argument for ‘establishment’ – at that stage, a radically political term, with church and state bound together by law in an interdependent, organic relationship, with the sovereign (not

³ A Prayer Book for Australia (Sydney: Broughton Books, 1995), 833 (my emphasis).
the Pope) as spiritual head of the church.\(^4\) With the growth of the Anglican Communion, Article 34 was given a broader interpretation. Anglicanism had now become a global community of culturally diverse ‘particular or national churches’ in fellowship with the See of Canterbury. The Anglican Church of Australia is one of those churches. It must therefore take seriously its life as a national church.

I am not arguing that Anglicanism should try to take centre stage in national life. Such a stance is neither possible nor desirable. I am, however, rejecting the notion that Anglican faith can exist in isolation from the society to which it belongs. As Bruce Kaye argues, Anglicanism is a ‘church in society’ religious tradition.\(^5\) Its root system, we might say, reaches both backwards in time and outwards in space. It is in this sense that the words ‘Anglican’ and ‘national’ can be used together, as occurred in the Canberra conference: not in order to reclaim some kind of privileged status in the nation’s life, but rather to retrieve an essential aspect of Anglican tradition which has thus far been downplayed in the life of the Australian church. Church and nation exist in relationship. The nation provides the context in which Anglican faith is expressed and lived out.

I must confess to a personal investment in the matter. During the conference I walked to Parliament House and sat for a time in the galleries of both houses. Later I strolled to the High Court where, at that moment, the full bench was sitting. I felt within myself a strong sense of national pride, of being an Australian. I attended the National Anglican Conference as a ‘national Anglican’ – an Anglican and an Australian. Both are part of who I am. I did not choose to be Australian. I was born that way. Very early in life I felt my pulse beating on Anzac Day. I instinctively know what it means for the Aussies to beat the Poms. But being Australian is only one facet of my personality. Patriotism is not sufficient in itself. It takes more than this to make a human being.\(^6\) Indeed, patriotism can also have an ugly side when divorced from a humanising philosophy or a religious faith. My Australianness, I


\(^6\) As Wayne Hudson has argued, there is no way of being Australian that is not multifaceted. Wayne Hudson, ‘Cultural undergrounds and civic identity’, in *Creating Australia: Changing Australian History,* ed. Wayne Hudson and Geoffrey Bolton (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1997), 165-177.
must affirm, is also indelibly shaped by a religious tradition. My Anglican faith is intrinsically Australian, and my Australianness is intrinsically Anglican.

I am not an Anglican by birth. I entered the Anglican Church well into my adult years. It was a measured decision. My ancestry is, like that of many Australians, both English Protestant and Irish Catholic. As Miriam Dixson has reminded us, the ‘core culture’ of Australia is really hybrid: it is Anglo-Celtic. In personal terms, this means that my Anglican faith is not exclusively English in origin. I have become an Anglican in a very Australian way. The decades of sectarian struggle in Australian history may be seen as a stage on the way to a resolution of which my own personality is an embodiment. There is more than a hint of Irish rebellion in my veins. I am deeply concerned about political and social issues affecting Australian society and see their resolution as indelibly linked to my own Anglican faith. I am convinced, in other words, that Anglicanism has both the capacity and the responsibility to play a part in shaping Australia’s future. This conviction, while being personal, is not simply subjective. It is based, as I will seek to demonstrate, on a careful study of both the Anglican tradition and of the unfolding Australian story, of which Anglicanism itself is a part.

ANGLICANISM AND THE AUSTRALIAN STORY

The Reverend Richard Johnson carried a lot on his shoulders when he stepped ashore at Sydney Cove in 1788. Little did he know that the established church he represented would be forced to adapt to new circumstances. It would, for a start, have to compete with other Protestant groups – Presbyterians, Methodists and the like – as well as Roman Catholics, on a level playing field. It would find itself stripped of establishment status within an increasingly liberal, democratic society. Above all, it would have to struggle with this new antipodean land, so far away from English shores. All these factors came to be part of Anglican experience in Australia. Since the arrival of the First Fleet, there has never been a moment when Anglicanism has not been there, playing a part, whether popular or unpopular, in the Australian story.

See Miriam Dixson, The Imaginary Australian: Anglo-Celts and Identity – 1788 to the Present (Sydney: University of New South Wales, 1999). On this point, Patrick O’Farrell’s perspective as a Roman Catholic historian is worth noting. The term ‘Anglo-Celtic’ is both complimentary and hostile, he argues. ‘The compliment lies in the recognition of the achievement. The insult is in the hyphen, the failure to see what is Australian, what is whole’. Vanished Kingdoms: Irish in Australia and New Zealand (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1990), xxix.
The history of Anglicanism in Australia needs to be read in this light, rather than dismissed, as has often been the case, as extraneous to the main story. This means that issues like sectarianism, considered to be anathema to secular historians, need to be revisited. Could it not be that religious difference, however unpleasant, was actually an expression of the drawing together in Australia of different and even incompatible tribal and religious streams? Again, could not Anglican assumptions about power and privilege in nineteenth century Australia be seen to reflect values prevalent in England but ultimately unsustainable in Australia? Could not Anglicanism, as it grappled with change, be seen to have internalised and lived out some of the most fundamental aspects of the Australian experience? If the answer to these questions is ‘yes’, we then need to ask: how does Anglicanism respond in the future? What is its vocation? Such questions require a framework broader than the church itself. There is, I wish to argue, an integral relationship between the Anglican tradition in each location and its host society: the church is called to live as a prophetic and reconciling presence within that society. Australian Anglicanism, in order to be true to itself and to the nation of which it is a part, needs to embrace this vocation with a renewed sense of understanding and responsibility.

To do so, however, it will have to face its own demons. One of these is ignorance of its own tradition. Are Australian Anglicans aware of the strong links between church and nation in Anglican history? Do they understand that doctrine does not exist in a private theological world, but is actually part of a public conversation? Have they grasped that the Anglican emphasis on incarnation actually involves engagement with issues in society? It is important that Anglicans reclaim their own heritage in

---

10 I will revisit these questions in Part 3.
11 As will become apparent, I am drawing heavily, in this study, on the thought of F.D. Maurice, regarded as the founder of the Christian Socialist Movement. He is not the only Anglican thinker, of course, to emphasise the doctrine of the Incarnation. Before him came Anglican divines like Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes, while after him came Charles Gore and the tradition of Liberal Catholicism, not to mention E.B. Pusey and other members of the Oxford Movement, who were Maurice’s contemporaries. See James E. Griffiths, ‘Jesus Christ: God With Us’, in Theology in Anglicanism, ed. Arthur A. Vogel (Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse Barlow, 1984), 73-74. As will also become apparent, particularly in Chapter 6, there are those with reservations about the doctrine. I will pay particular attention to Rowan Williams’ concerns about Maurice’s approach. For brief discussion of some of the key issues at stake, see Arthur Michael Ramsay, An Era in Anglican
order to understand that Anglican faith cannot be separated from the conflicts and tensions of the wider society. This is the radical significance of Article 34. Australian Anglicanism exists in and for the society of which it is a part.

Another of its demons is its struggle with factionalism: the product, in its own way, of transporting English religious categories uncritically to a new world, allowing differences of doctrine or churchmanship to take on a far greater significance than was either desirable or necessary. This, as we will see, remains a major impediment. It is, of course, linked with the previous problem: ignorance of Anglican tradition. The Anglican genius for ‘comprehensiveness’ or inclusiveness is a case in point. This clearly needs to be put to work in a new way in the Australian context. Unless Australian Anglicanism can overcome its internal tensions, unresolved rivalries of doctrine or churchmanship within the tradition, it will fail to see clearly its broader vocation within the Australian community.

The third of its demons is the tendency to look backwards, a form of self-preservation. Letting go of England, as we will see, has been difficult for this particular Australian church. Colonial and imperial links have been strong. Patterns of privileged behaviour, while no longer relevant in the Australian context, have nevertheless been hard to put aside. Cathedrals, for example, still tend to be very English places, often giving the impression that ‘establishment’ continues to exist. The Anglican Church in Australia is still emerging from an antipodean mindset on its journey to becoming Australian. It is still looking over its shoulder. This is

---


12 In the words of historian George Shaw, ‘traditional denominational Christianity in Australia is a caricature of a caricature’. ‘Australia’s Anglicanism: A Via Media?’, in From Oxford to the Bush: Essays on Catholic Anglo-Catholicism in Australia, ed. John Moses (Hall, ACT: Broughton Press, 1997), 261. In a similar vein, Eric Sharpe, ‘Religion in an Australian Context’, St Mark’s Review (September 1981): 24, has argued that Australian Christianity began ‘as an almost anti-cultural form of religion, legal, ethical but hardly creative; and … it has retained much of that character, almost like a ground-base on which later variations have been superimposed’.

13 Sykes et al., The Study of Anglicanism, 499, describe ‘comprehension’ (more recently ‘comprehensiveness’) as ‘the character of the English Church prior to the reign of Charles I, whereby a refusal to narrow doctrinal boundaries ensured that many not entirely happy with the Anglican Church nevertheless felt able to remain in it’. While this is often applied to the internal workings of Anglicanism (the capacity to embrace doctrinal difference or varieties of churchmanship), I intend to apply the term in an even broader way, highlighting cultural and not just doctrinal inclusiveness. See especially Chapter 6.

Australia, after all, not England. It is here, not there. It is ‘home’. It is the task of the English church to be English. The Australian church needs to imagine itself as both Anglican and Australian. In so doing it will make its own special contribution to Australian society.

This does not necessarily mean that it will simply endorse the status quo. It has not travelled this long journey just to become a mirror image of what it once was. Establishment has long gone. The damaging years of sectarian conflict are over. Anglicanism in Australia, it seems to me, is now in the interesting position of being able to reinvent itself, without denying its own unique gifts: its remarkable capacity to embrace difference (comprehensiveness), and its equally remarkable commitment to the life of the society to which it belongs (incarnation). These are part and parcel of what it means to be Anglican. What is new is the freedom to apply these Anglican riches in fresh ways. As Alan Cadwallader has argued, a ‘measure of Antipodean, dissentient energy’ is needed to move beyond ‘mere tinkerings’ with the received English model of Anglicanism to embrace new possibilities for the Australian church. Insights can be sharper on the other side of the world. New beginnings become possible.

I suspect, nevertheless, that Australian Anglicanism, like Australian society as a whole, is still living in transition between one world and another. The antipodean path is still being travelled in Australia, even if, to use the expression of A.A. Phillips, the ‘cultural cringe’ is perhaps no longer as pervasive as it used to be. Australia, after all, has not yet embraced the Republic. The strong, residual ties with Britain are still there for many Australians, in spite of the death of Sir Robert Menzies a generation ago. Even so, these same Australians would clearly no longer regard themselves as ‘independent Australian Britons’, to use the term employed by

---


W.K. Hancock in 1930. At that stage of Australia’s history, Hancock sensed that Australians had not yet fully arrived in their new homeland:

Without some sending down of roots, no community can live an individual life – there cannot, indeed, be a community. The roots sent down in Australian soil by the transplanted British have only here and there struck deep beneath the surface. The great mass of Australian writing is concerned with things of the surface, describing in song and short story the pouring out of the British over the ‘wide, brown country.

Hancock wondered if it were possible ‘to be in love with two soils’ at once, the old world and the new. But he was also very much aware of voices calling for a distinctively Australian outlook. So too was Hancock’s contemporary, Ernest Burgmann, who served as Bishop of Goulburn (later Canberra and Goulburn) from 1934 to 1960. Addressing a gathering of diocesan clergy early in his episcopacy, Burgmann said this about the future of the church he loved:

The Church of England in Australia, if true to her genius, is destined to become an instrument by means of which the Australian can find his soul and God … The Church of England in Australia will always stand by the Anglican tradition, but she is becoming more and more a Church with an Australian temperament, conscious of an Australian task. That task is to strike the distinctive note for the formation of the national character. The Anglican Church should be the mother and bearer of the Australian conscience. She will live in history just in so far as she gives herself to and forgets herself in this National task … This is the peculiar task and responsibility of the Anglican Church.

This is where the discussion begins. I wish to situate the Anglican Church of Australia within the debate about Australia. I am not a lone voice. The conversation is already in progress, even if largely still in its infancy. Burgmann is one of many who have, over the years, called for Anglicanism in Australia to embrace Australia.

---

19 ibid., 42.
20 ibid., 51.
21 Quoted by Peter Hempenstall, *The Meddlesome Priest: A Life of Ernest Burgmann* (St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1993), 251. I will consider Burgmann’s thought in some detail in Chapter 2.
22 I will focus in particular, in Chapter 1, on the debates leading up to 1962 constitution. Those who championed the cause of autonomy for the Australian church included Australian-born bishops G.M. Long and J.S. Hart, who were a strong nationalist influence on Australian Anglo-Catholicism. See Ruth Frappell, ‘1933 and All That: The Oxford Movement Centenary in Australia’, in Moses, *From Oxford to the Bush*, 140. Special mention should also be made of Burgmann’s contemporary, Bishop
There is now a wealth of historical material to assist us with that task, but theological reflection on this material has been in short supply – until, that is, Bruce Kaye began to publish his thoughts in the 1990s. This study will build on Kaye’s work.

THE WRITINGS OF BRUCE KAYE

Bruce Kaye’s book, *A Church Without Walls*, published in 1995, was the first systematic attempt by an Australian Anglican to place contextual issues at the heart of the Australian Anglican theological and ecclesial agenda. Kaye’s thesis, presented with great cogency, is that Anglicanism is, at heart, a ‘church in society’ tradition. Australian Anglicanism, he argues, is not locked into an English way of thinking and acting. Anglican faith is incarnational. This means that ‘the very character of that faith should drive Australian Anglicans to see their faith in essentially Australian terms’. The challenge facing the Australian church ‘is to develop an effective and faithful way of relating to the Australian nation and people’.  

Anglican theology is necessarily about relating Christian faith and practice to the society in which it is located. We have not always been aware of the intellectual tradition in Australia, and sometimes we have gone so far as to deny its existence … [O]ne is bound to feel disappointed about the way in which the Anglican theological tradition has failed to grow in any local sense in Australia.  

As the title of his book indicates, Kaye is committed to the removal of the physical or ideological barriers separating church and society. If Anglicanism is a ‘church in society’ tradition, it is clear that the Anglican gaze, as it were, should turn outwards, where ordinary Anglicans live and work. Kaye is particularly interested in the lay vocation of Anglicans within the institutions of Australian society. I applaud Kaye’s approach, although my emphasis will be slightly different. I wish to position Anglicanism within the debate about Australia, asking what it means to be an Australian church within Australian society.


24 ibid., 113. See also George Shaw, ‘Australia’s Anglicanism: A Via Media?’ for similar comments.
More recently, Kaye has produced two outstanding books on being Anglican in Australia. The first, edited by Kaye, is called *Anglicanism in Australia: A History*. The book, through its various authors, is an extensive exploration of the history of Australian Anglicanism and its relationship with Australian society. In his General Introduction, Kaye comments on the paucity of research by historians into this topic thus far:

This book is cast not only in the context of the Australian experience and the Anglican experience in Australia; it is also set necessarily within the changing historiography of each. Australian historiography has been assiduous in ignoring religion, and Anglicanism in particular, as a recurrent factor in Australian life … [L]ittle attention has been given to the social dimension of Anglicanism or to its place in the broader currents of Australian life and history. There have been biographies, mainly of bishops, or institutional histories, usually of dioceses. What is missing on both fronts is an account of Anglicanism in its various manifestations within the broader framework of Australian social history. Our project in many respects is a pioneering work because it sets itself clearly in that location. It seeks to encourage the establishment of a discipline framed within the broader Australian social historiography but which takes seriously the understanding of Anglicanism as a religious tradition.25

It is clearly the view of Kaye and his fellow writers that Anglicanism must be understood contextually: it is part of Australian life and history. Kaye calls for the retrieval of a neglected field of historical enquiry, the relationship between Anglicanism and Australian society. What have been the forces shaping the Anglican tradition in Australia? In turn, how has Anglicanism contributed to the life of the nation? The historical essays are insightful and relevant, providing an enormous amount of material for reflection.

In his most recent book, *Reinventing Anglicanism*, Kaye launches, as in *A Church Without Walls*, into theological reflection on Anglicanism in Australia. The major themes of the earlier book are built on and extended. Both ‘history and location’ once again provide the framework for Kaye’s reflections.26 Anglicanism’s ‘engagement with the host society’ remains a central theme.27 Early in the book, he outlines the

27 ibid., 45.
historical epochs that have shaped Anglicanism through the centuries. The journey encompasses the Celtic, Saxon, Roman, Norman, Tudor and colonial phases of British history. The last two periods continue to influence the life of the Australian church, coating it with layers of imperial assumptions. The first layer consists of the language and institutional patterns of Tudor imperialism, the legacy of the English Reformation,\(^{28}\) which continue to shape – and distort – the way Anglican faith is perceived and practised in Australia. Over this layer of imperial assumptions is coated another layer: ‘colonial imperialism’, the legacy of British expansion, with its hidden assumptions about ‘law, property and the means and power to decide’. Racial issues are also part of the colonial legacy affecting both church and society. According to Kaye, disentangling the church from all this baggage is a key issue for Anglicanism in Australia as it seeks to reinvent itself.\(^{29}\)

Take the idea of establishment. After 1836, as we will see in Chapter 2, the Church of England lost any claim to be the established church in the colony of New South Wales. Even so, this notion continues to influence the way many Australian Anglicans behave or are perceived to behave. As Kaye notes, the imperialist mindset lives on. In particular, the Anglican Church has had great difficulty accepting the demise of the ‘Australian Settlement’ (the term coined by Paul Kelly to describe the pattern of Australian society from around 1900 to at least the end of the Menzies era, until its final disintegration during the 1980s).\(^{30}\) Anglicanism, argues Kaye, remained an ‘invisible partner’\(^{31}\) in a society based on five pillars: the White Australia policy, tariff protection, centralised arbitration, state paternalism and imperial benevolence.\(^{32}\) ‘In broad social terms’, Kaye writes, ‘Anglicanism in this period increasingly became a wallpaper culture of the social establishment’.\(^{33}\) This world has now passed, plunging Anglicanism in Australia into a crisis of confidence and identity.


\(^{29}\) Kaye, *Reinventing Anglicanism*, 8-9; also 44-46. See also *A Church Without Walls*, 10-27.


\(^{31}\) Kaye, *Reinventing Anglicanism*, 76.


\(^{33}\) ibid., 76.
The Australian Settlement has sat on the Australian landscape like a gentle fog, shielding a relatively wealthy country from the realities beyond its shores and defending it from the challenge to grapple with fundamental questions of social value and identity. It has also enabled Anglicans to persist with an ‘establishment’ picture of themselves while the social and religious realities of that establishment were disintegrating around them. The decline of the five pillars of the Australian Settlement to which Kelly refers has blown that fog away and brought an end to the certainty which it conveyed for Australians generally and for Anglican Australians.34

Kaye’s book is an attempt, not only at social analysis, but also at empowering Anglicans to engage with confidence in the issues confronting Australia at the beginning of the twenty-first century. As in his earlier book, concern for lay vocation remains a central focus of his work.35 By peeling back the layers of imperial baggage, Kaye hopes to free Anglicanism to engage in its vocation in Australian society in a new way.

In sum, Kaye’s writings constitute the most substantial attempt to date by any Anglican thinker to engage theologically with the contextual question of what it means to be an Anglican church in contemporary Australia.36 I must acknowledge, at the very beginning of this discussion, the foundational work Kaye has done and continues to do in preparing Anglicanism for a more creative role in Australian society. While my own attempt at an Australian Anglican theological approach will differ to some extent from Kaye’s, there are nevertheless striking similarities between his methodological starting point and my own. He begins, as we have noted, with history and location. In a similar vein, I have introduced the image of a root system, reaching both backwards in time and outwards in space. I am focusing, in a sense, on the creative spark produced when these two strands, tradition and context, are brought together. Anglicanism was never meant to be a religious tradition living in isolation from its place of belonging. It is, as Kaye has said, a ‘church without

34 ibid., 51.
35 ibid., 58: ‘I am interested in the challenge ordinary Australians face of making sense of their Christian vocation in contemporary Australia’.
36 For a similar evaluation of Kaye’s contribution, see Stephen Pickard, ‘Theology as Power: Traditions and Challenges for Australian Anglicans’, in Frame and Treloar, Agendas for Australian Anglicans, 99. See also, in the same volume, Tom Frame, ‘The Dynamics and Difficulties of Debate in Australian Anglicanism’, 166. The book in which these essays appear was commissioned in Kaye’s honour.
walls’. It cannot live without being both in and for the society of which it is a part. Identity and vocation go hand in hand. As the Anglican Church of Australia embraces, with imagination and courage, the implications of being both Anglican and Australian, it will, in my view, rediscover its vocation as a church for the nation.

IDENTITY AND VOCATION

A few additional comments about identity and vocation may be in order. While, as I have argued, they are integrally related, they are also quite distinct. The distinction is important. Take the issue of Australian identity. Debates about what being ‘Australian’ means were taking place long before Federation. However, as I will show in due course, attempts to locate an essential Australianness – in the bush legend, for example, or in the spirit of Anzac – are now outdated. Amidst the extraordinary cultural diversity of contemporary Australian society, the phrase ‘multiple identities’ seems more appropriate. The discussion about what it means to be Australian continues, of course, within this pluralistic context. Once, however, the notion of an Australian character is put aside in favour of the many ways in which Australians participate in Australian life, we effectively move from a focus on ‘essence’ (what being ‘Australian’ is) to an emphasis on ‘agency’ (ways of being Australian). From the perspective of agency, being Australian is not set in concrete, to be defined in a phrase or a set of particular characteristics. It is something that happens, a process, ‘forever-in-the-making’, dynamic rather than static. It has to do with vocation, we might say, and not just identity – with living out one’s calling as an Australian.

The same could be said of being Anglican. The essence of Anglicanism has been expressed in a number of ways. In particular, attention has been drawn to the capacity of Anglicanism to embrace difference. The key word here, as already noted, is ‘comprehensiveness’. Related to this concept, and crucially important for understanding Anglicanism, is the term ‘via media’, finding the mean between

38 ibid., 8.
extremes.\textsuperscript{41} According to Alec Vidler, disciple of F.D. Maurice, this reconciling quality describes not so much a theological system as the vocation of Anglicanism.\textsuperscript{42}

Anglican theology is true to its genius when it is \textit{seeking to reconcile opposed systems}, rejecting them as exclusive systems, but showing that the principle for which each stands has its place within the total orbit of Christian truth, and in the long run is secure only within that orbit or (in the idiom of today) when it is \textit{held in tension} with other apparently opposed, but really complementary, principles.\textsuperscript{43}

Paul Avis also draws attention to this ‘reconciling method’ coming through H.R. McAdoo’s celebrated study of seventeenth-century Anglicanism.\textsuperscript{44} The \textit{via media}, McAdoo argues, was not just compromise or expediency, but a quality of thinking, an approach in which elements usually regarded as mutually exclusive were seen to be in fact complementary. These things were held in a \textit{living tension}, not in order to walk the tight-rope of compromise, but because they were seen to be mutually illuminating and to fertilise each other.\textsuperscript{45}

In short, Anglicanism, by its very nature, is a ‘mediating tradition’.\textsuperscript{46} This point is pivotal to this study. By ‘mediating’ I mean a tendency at the heart of the Anglican ethos to seek for a deeper unity between parties or systems that, on the surface of things, seem irreconcilable. Within the life of the church, this Anglican quality is usually understood in relation to differences of doctrine or churchmanship. As Avis, Vidler and McAdoo have indicated, Anglicanism mediates between competing views within the tradition itself, not seeking compromise between them, but holding them in a ‘living tension’. But because Anglicanism is also a ‘church in society’ tradition, it also mediates, as I have already said, between tradition and context, balancing faithfulness to the Anglican theological heritage with sensitivity to contingencies of

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{41} Refer to Glossary for comments on how the term \textit{via media} is employed in this study.
\item\textsuperscript{42} ibid., 469.
\item\textsuperscript{43} Alec R. Vidler, \textit{Essays in Liberality} (London: SCM Press, 1957), 166-167 (my emphasis).
\item\textsuperscript{44} Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’, 469.
\item\textsuperscript{46} A term I have obtained from Timothy F. Sedgwick, in a suggestive article, ‘The New Shape of Anglican Identity’, \textit{Anglican Theological Review} 77 (2) (Spring 1995): 196. I will discuss this notion in detail in Chapter 6. See Glossary for further comments.
\end{itemize}}
history and location.\textsuperscript{47} This means that Anglican identity cannot be narrowly defined or contained within the religious community, unless, of course, that community has a wish to implode. Being Anglican includes being part of the society to which it belongs. The church is seen as incomplete unless it is incarnated in society; it is not an end in itself. The vocation of Anglicanism is to live with the ‘living tension’ brought about by belonging and engagement.

Within the Australian context, this means that being Anglican and being Australian are intertwined. It is no longer possible to define Anglican identity in isolation from its vocation and mission within Australian society. When the notion of comprehensiveness is released from a religious straitjacket and placed within a broader societal context, Anglicanism, it seems to me, then takes on a crucially important role in society. Its ‘reconciling method’ comes into its own. It becomes a ‘mediating tradition’ within the life of the nation, bringing together Christian faith and life in society in a creative synthesis. It embraces the nation, with all its contradictions, anxieties and tensions,\textsuperscript{48} and seeks to understand these in the light of the divine purpose.\textsuperscript{49}

I do not wish to dispute the importance of identity. I am simply making the point that, when treated in isolation, identity may become self-serving. A society can become protectionist or xenophobic. A church can become exclusive and inward looking. This is the problem with ‘essence’: with trying to define oneself too tightly over against the ‘other’.\textsuperscript{50} Self-definition can be very self-serving. All the spiritual, intellectual and material resources of a nation or group can be expended on self-preservation rather than service to others. Identity needs to give way to vocation –

\textsuperscript{47} See Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’, 474-475.
\textsuperscript{49} Note that there is a fundamental distinction between understanding and resolution. I am not claiming in this study that the vocation of Anglicanism is to resolve all differences and contradictions in national life. Understanding, however, is a different matter entirely. Anglicanism cannot solve all the problems in society – that is asking too much – but it can seek to interpret the society to itself, while also modeling in its own life how it is possible to live with unresolved difference. I am indebted to Samuel Taylor Coleridge and F.D. Maurice for this insight, as will become apparent in due course (see especially Chapters 4 and 6).
\textsuperscript{50} Geoffrey Stokes, ‘Introduction’, in The Politics of Identity in Australia, ed. Geoffrey Stokes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 5: ‘To claim an identity, however, is always to construct an “other” in more or less pernicious or benign ways’.
not just what the nation is, for example, but what it stands for. In Tom Frame’s words, there needs to be ‘a willingness to participate in a broad debate about the kind of nation Australia can and ought to be’. He believes that Anglicanism in Australia has an important part to play in such a conversation.\textsuperscript{51} From such a perspective, the society and not just the church becomes the arena of Anglican life and action. Being Anglican in Australia therefore means being Anglican and Australian at the same time, bringing the rich resources of the Anglican tradition to bear on the unfolding Australian story, and participating in that story.

\textbf{THE ARGUMENT IN OUTLINE}

The discussion will be divided into three parts. The first two parts will involve an internal exploration of the Anglican tradition itself. The Anglican vocation as a church for the nation, it seems to me, can be found within its own story. The refusal to recognise this and to act on it may represent a failure of nerve on the part of the Anglican community. It may also reflect a lack of understanding of the Anglican tradition, the result, perhaps, of a loss of corporate memory.\textsuperscript{52} I will therefore be seeking to retrieve aspects of the tradition that have been hidden or overlooked.

Part 1 will set the scene, highlighting the difficulties facing a national church that has expended more energy on its own internal divisions than on engagement with Australian society. Chapter 1 will explore the events leading up to the 1962 national Anglican constitution. It is a story of hesitation and fragmentation rather than national unity and purpose. I will then ask whether, in the years since then, the Australian church has been able to overcome its previous inertia to embrace its national vocation. In Chapter 2 a different approach to being Anglican in Australia will be presented, based on engagement with society and a stronger commitment to national unity. I will do so by focusing on the lives of two bishops, William Grant Broughton and E.H. Burgmann. These case studies will indicate that present practice is not necessarily the only possibility facing Australian Anglicanism. Alternatives, in fact, arise from within the Australian church’s own history.

\textsuperscript{52} See Paul Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 2.
I will continue this largely historical exploration in Part 2. My purpose in this section will be to demonstrate, first within England and then globally, the centrality of the ‘nation’ in Anglican self-understanding.\(^{53}\) Chapters 3 and 4 will concentrate mainly, though not exclusively, on England. I will argue that the relationship between church and nation has always been an integral part of the Anglican ethos. Chapter 3 will trace the development of this relationship from the English Reformation in the sixteenth century to the Oxford Movement three centuries later. The theory of church and state defended by Richard Hooker during Elizabeth I’s reign survived, in an increasingly weakened form, throughout this period.\(^{54}\) In the mid-nineteenth century, John Henry Newman rejected the Erastianism,\(^{55}\) as he saw it, of Anglicanism, and departed for Rome.

But the national idea did not depart from the English Church with Newman. It continued to be espoused by representatives of the Broad Church tradition, whom I will consider in Chapter 4. Bruce Kaye’s notion of Anglicanism as a ‘church in society’ tradition will conclude a survey of thinkers including F. D. Maurice and William Temple in England and William Reed Huntington in America. There is a strong cumulative argument, in my view, for affirming the national vocation of Anglicanism, whether in England, where establishment still applies, or in other parts of the Anglican Communion, including Australia, where establishment is neither possible nor desirable. Anglicanism is not just a religious tradition, complete in itself. It has always had the life of the nation at heart.

Chapter 5 will explore Anglicanism as a global Communion of ‘particular or national churches’. The principle of inculturation, a variation of the national idea, now becomes central to Anglican experience. The Englishness of Anglicanism is now seen for what it is – one cultural expression amongst many. In fact, Anglicanism was already culturally diverse even before its departure from English shores, as the

\(^{53}\) See Glossary for comments on the way the word ‘nation’ will be employed throughout this discussion.

\(^{54}\) Apart, that is, from the English republican experiment, dominated largely by Oliver Cromwell, between 1649 and 1660.

\(^{55}\) Erastianism, named after the Swiss theologian Thomas Erastus (1524-83), is the notion ‘that the state has the right to intrude upon the affairs of the Church and overrule decisions’. See Sykes et al., The Study of Anglicanism, 500. This does not mean that the church was simply a tool of the state. As Avis points out, the church retained its own inner integrity even within the sort of Erastian church-state framework prevailing in Tudor England. Paul Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church, Rev. edn. (London: T&T Clark, 2002), xiv.
experiences of the Welsh, Scottish and Irish churches demonstrate. But once the movement outwards occurred, it became impossible to contain Anglicanism within an exclusively English straightjacket. The American Revolution was a major milestone in this development. After this there was no turning back. The Anglican Communion would increasingly struggle with the implications of cultural diversity, as a study of Lambeth documents, especially since 1930, clearly demonstrates. These documents remain fundamentally important. I will conclude this chapter with a consideration of the idea of autonomous provinces, which, as Part 1 will indicate, is especially important within the Australian context where the word ‘province’ places regional differences before national unity.

In the light of the global experience of Anglicanism, it becomes impossible to discuss the Anglican ethos in isolation from the distinct cultural contexts to which Anglicanism belongs. In Chapter 6, comprehensiveness and the via media, central Anglican themes, will be reinterpreted contextually. The post-colonial nature of global Anglicanism will also be considered. The legacy of colonialism is an aspect of Anglican experience needing to be faced, especially in settler societies like Australia. I will be arguing that Anglicanism must be willing to play a prophetic, transformative role in the life of the host societies of which it is a part, even if this results in discomfort for the church itself. Paul Avis’ distinction between ‘static’ and ‘mystical’ approaches to the Anglican via media will shape the argument at this point. From there I will explore contemporary approaches to contextual theology, and consider how key Anglican doctrines like Incarnation and Trinity impact on the church’s vocation. That vocation, I will argue, is an invitation to live an ‘integral life’ in society, avoiding fragmentation and division and seeking a life of principled engagement. In sum, Part 2 will involve a discussion of the Anglican tradition itself, concluding that Anglicanism requires a contextual and national response. The Anglican emphasis on the nation allows for a particular expression of Christianity that engages with society and promotes community. It follows that the Anglican Church of Australia, as part of this global tradition, must become both an Anglican and an Australian church.

56 I am using the term ‘Lambeth documents’ in a general sense to refer to documents of the Anglican Communion, primarily those relating to Lambeth Conferences, but also reports of other Anglican conferences and commissions whose findings warrant particular attention within this study.
Part 3 will then explore what this means within the Australian context. Having established that the nation is integral to Anglicanism, it now becomes possible to consider Anglicanism’s contribution to national life. Australia is taken as the context in which Anglican identity and vocation may be understood. Chapter 7 will situate Anglicanism within the debate about Australia. Both before and after 1962, when the Anglican Church was preoccupied with internal matters, discussion was taking place in wider society about what it meant to be Australian. This secular debate about Australia, however, was remarkably silent about religion. Religion was either completely ignored or relegated to the margins of the Australian experience. During the Australian Settlement era, Anglicanism had fitted comfortably into the ethos of Australian life, drawing strength from its British heritage, but largely unaware of the colonial baggage which it carried. During this period the radical nationalists railed against things British, but even they presupposed the values of White Australia. But change was in the air. The twilight of the British Empire coincided with the departure of Sir Robert Menzies from his position of prominence in Australian society. Australia entered a new era. Waves of migration, both European and Asian, began to change the atmosphere of Australian life. The Anglican Church found it difficult to adjust to such changes. It took creative minds like Manning Clark to keep the rumour of God alive, in spite of his own unbelief and his distaste for the Anglican tradition. Yet in spite of the dismissal of religion in so much secular writing about Australia, new possibilities were emerging amidst the uncertainties of a changing society. In a culture of pluralism, Anglicanism now has every right to re-enter the debate about Australia as an equal player. In fact, it carries within itself theological and ecclesial perspectives capable of drawing together the multiple threads of an otherwise fragmented society.

Chapter 8 will explore key ‘myths’ in Australian life: the Anzac legend, the myth of White Australia and the notion of *terra nullius*. It will, as I describe it, be ‘a search for the nation’s soul’. The nation, I will argue, must first be understood in communal terms, as an open, inclusive society committed to embracing rather than excluding difference. It is then possible to evaluate these key myths and assumptions of Australian life. The Anzac myth raises questions about what is ‘sacred’ in Australian life, as well as questions about Australian nationalism. The issue of race, a constant theme in Australian history, arises acutely when considering White Australia and its
aftermath: a nation of cultural diversity. How does a religious tradition with such strong English ties embrace such diversity? Finally, there is the issue of the land, this island continent to which both indigenous and non-indigenous Australians belong. How should Anglicanism be contributing to the (as yet) unresolved debate about reconciliation with the first Australians? There is also the question of historical memory, which I will raise in concluding the chapter. What role should truth-telling play in the life of a nation and a people? This has been a contentious issue, especially in recent years. The Anglican tradition in Australia must play its part in calling for integrity in the way the Australian story is told. A mediating ecclesiology must embrace contradictions and tensions in Australian life and seek to interpret them within a comprehensive theological framework. This is part of the Anglican gift to the nation.57

In concluding these introductory remarks, a final note of qualification is in order. While recognising the need to release Australian Anglicanism from cultural baggage that prevents it from embracing its vocation as a mediating tradition, I do not wish to imply that everything from the past must be relinquished. In fact, a mediating tradition must also stand in the breach between past and present, between old world and new world. There are many treasures in our Anglican and English heritage which should be celebrated and affirmed. The same applies to the Australia of previous generations. The root system of Australian Anglicanism, as I have said, reaches both backwards and outwards. We cannot live without the past. Equally, the past becomes an encumbrance when it prevents us from embracing our present context and being open to the future.

57 I am not arguing for the abolition of tensions within Australian life, but the capacity to embrace difference in a creative, reconciling way – the task of a ‘mediating tradition’.
PART 1       FORMING A NATIONAL CHURCH

CHAPTER I       BEFORE AND AFTER THE CONSTITUTION

The term ‘Anglican Church of Australia’ became the official title of the national Anglican church in 1981.¹ From that moment, the Church of England in Australia ceased to be. At a time when many in the wider community were asking what it meant to be Australian, the change was timely. What, after all, did the word ‘of’ mean if not a self-conscious embracing of the life of the nation? Was this church expressing a desire to enter the national debate, perhaps even to lead the way in exploring who we were as a nation and a people? At the very least, the Anglican Church was declaring a sense of belonging to this land and its people. Perhaps it was indicating that, from now on, all its endeavours as a church would in some way be contributing to the life of the nation of which it was a part.

Nineteen years before, in 1962, the church had adopted a national constitution. This had not been achieved quickly. Indeed, it may not have been achieved at all had the Archbishop of Canterbury not given the church a push, or more precisely, a shove, in that direction. Letting go of England was not easy. Even with a new constitution and a name change, the baggage from the past would remain overwhelmingly heavy. To be fair, the Anglican Church was taking tentative steps forward as an Australian church. But, given how long it had taken even to begin disentangling the church from the ties binding it to England, it was unlikely that this same church would then, with energy and imagination, embrace its new identity as an Australian church.

I begin this study by exploring the long process leading up to the adoption of the constitution. The first General Synod had been held as far back as 1872, but it took

another ninety years for agreement on a constitution to be reached. The debate took many twists and turns along the way. What follows is a brief survey of the themes that dominated that debate during those long decades. To what extent, we might ask, did a sense of national vocation shape the agenda of General Synod between 1872 and 1962? It will become apparent that the church was, in fact, more preoccupied with internal disputes than with its participation in the life of the nation.

Since 1962 this pattern has, to a significant degree, continued to shape Australian Anglicanism. The national constitution is a document as fragile as the alliance of dioceses it is designed to hold together. National unity is constantly threatened with disintegration. In fact, the issues that dominated the debate throughout the long and tortuous process leading up to the formation of a national church were never fully resolved, and continue to divert Anglicanism in Australia from its calling as a church for the nation.

**TOWARDS A NATIONAL CONSTITUTION**

Two recurring issues required resolution before agreement could be reached on a constitution for the national church. According to John Davis, in his work, *Australian Anglicans and their Constitution*, these were, firstly, ‘autonomy for the Australian dioceses from the English Church’, and secondly, ‘the matter of unity and centralisation for the Australian dioceses as opposed to continuing regionalism’. ² Important matters of principle were at stake in each case. The fact that these two issues often overlapped made resolution even more difficult. It became necessary to move slowly and cautiously in order to achieve the ultimate goal of a national church.³ There is value, in my view, in reviewing how and why these issues became major hurdles, and to what extent a resolution was achieved when the constitution was finalised in 1962.

---


³ Davis quotes the Primate, Archbishop Wright of Sydney, in his charge to the 1910 General Synod: ‘It would be lamentable if any hasty legislation compelled some dioceses to withdraw from General Synod, and so mar that impressive and suggestive spectacle of a Church for a continent, a national organization corresponding to the national idea’. ibid.
The Quest for Autonomy

Davis points out that the autonomy movement paralleled, especially amongst Anglicans born in Australia, the nationalist sentiment prevalent in the 1890s and after Federation in 1901. Australian-born Anglicans were asking why Anglican structures were not reflecting developments in the Australian political scene. But sensitivity to the Australian political climate was not limited to the native-born. Bishop Saumarez Smith of Sydney, for example, speaking at his first General Synod as Primate in 1891, affirmed the federal movement as ‘noble in its idea and pregnant with important issues for the great island continent in which we live’.

Nine years later, on the brink of Federation, the English-born Dean of Perth, Frederick Goldsmith, proposed that the name of the church be changed to ‘Anglican Church of Australia’, appealing in his speech to ‘the growing nationalist sentiment’ in Australia. His motion was overwhelmingly defeated. Curiously, the largest opposition to Goldsmith’s motion came from the laity, the majority of whom were Australian-born, while his strongest support came from clergy who, like Goldsmith himself, had been born and trained in England. At this stage of Australian history, it seems, the links between Anglicanism and Empire were far too strong to allow for such a radical change in Anglican identity, in spite of the widespread enthusiasm for Federation within the Australian community. Indeed, for many, ‘nation’ did not mean detachment from England, but rather affirmation of the British Empire, of which Australia was a part. But churchmanship was also a factor in the debate. Goldsmith was a known ritualist, with strong roots in the Oxford Movement. His motion was strongly supported by high churchmen but received no support whatever from low churchmen, reflecting a suspicion that ‘a distinct churchmanship’ lay

---

4 ibid.
5 See Brian Dickey, ‘Secular Advance and Diocesan Response 1861-1900’, in Kaye, Anglicanism in Australia, 73. Smith spoke, notes Dickey, of the Anglican ‘patriotic ideal’, and added: ‘[N]ational life requires national religion if the nation is to prosper’.
6 Colin Holden, Ritualist on a Tricycle, Frederick Goldsmith: Church, Nationalism and Society in Western Australia 1880-1920 (Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1997), 155. Goldsmith later served as Bishop of Bunbury from 1904-1917.
7 ibid., 169-170. Indeed, as Holden notes (169), ‘Goldsmith himself, when he preached to synod in his first year as dean, had described Anglicanism as the English Church, and on the same occasion, and elsewhere, used “national” to refer to England’.
8 Holden discusses at length the controversies surrounding Goldsmith’s ministry in Perth cathedral, which was widely considered to be ‘radical, even subversive’. ibid., 42.
9 ibid., 171.
behind the push for autonomy.\textsuperscript{10} As it was, the vote foreshadowed things to come. To quote Ruth Frappell, within two years the ‘fervor of federation that could have contributed so much to the church and possibly bolstered its drive towards unity had already evaporated. The church had lapsed once more into parochial and diocesan politics’.\textsuperscript{11}

The English-born leaders of the Australian church who pressed the case for autonomy most forcefully were very much aware of related discussions taking place in the church in England.\textsuperscript{12} Even so, there were huge obstacles in the way, both legal and emotional. Overshadowing the debate was the question as to whether the Church of England in Australia was still bound legally by the laws of the church in England, and consequently whether severing ties with the mother church would jeopardise the status of the church in Australia.\textsuperscript{13} It was a complex issue, and opinion varied from diocese to diocese. A lot depended on how each diocese was originally constituted. The Dioceses of Adelaide, Western Australia and Queensland had been legally incorporated by consensual compact, whereas Victoria, Tasmania, and New South Wales had followed the path of legislative enactment.\textsuperscript{14} The difference was significant. ‘It seems reasonable to comment’, says Davis, ‘that as so often happens in Australian history, those describing or shaping seem unable to lift their sights beyond Sydney and Melbourne.’\textsuperscript{15} This meant that sensitivity to legal issues, especially in relation to property, became paramount in discussions on a national level.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item ibid., 176-177.
\item Ruth Frappell, ‘Imperial Fervour and Anglican Loyalty 1901-1929’, in Kaye, ibid., 76.
\item Archbishops Donaldson of Brisbane and Lowther Clarke of Melbourne, both English-born, led the autonomy debate at the 1900 General Synod. See Frappell, ibid., 89; Davis, \textit{Australian Anglicans}, 30-31.
\item ibid., 33.
\item ibid., pp. 34-6; also Kaye, \textit{A Church Without Walls}, 38-45.
\item ibid., 37.
\item Davis, ibid., 38, quotes Francis de Witt Batty, a member of the constitution committee in 1916, and later Bishop of Newcastle: ‘If we were to take any steps which could be represented as a departure from the standards of the Church of England in England, we could be accused of a breach of trust, and if the accusation were upheld, all Church property would pass into the possession of whatever section of the Church was prepared to adhere rigidly to the terms of the trust implied by the title “Church of England”… Parliament, which had given us our original property Acts, must be asked to amend those Acts so as to make the Church of England in Australia a completely self-governing body, with courts of its own for the interpretation of its formularies and laws’. See also Robert S.M. Withycombe, ‘Imperial Nexus and National Anglican Identity: The Australian 1911-12 Legal Nexus Opinions Revisited’, \textit{Journal of Anglican Studies} 2 (1) (June 2004): 63.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
As a consequence, in 1911 and 1912 legal opinion was sought in both England and Australia. The advice received from these enquiries, called the ‘Nexus Opinions’, reinforced the legal ties that bound the Australian church to the Church of England and profoundly affected the course of subsequent debate.\(^{17}\) Having chosen the legislative track, the national church was effectively bound by it.\(^{18}\) It may, however, have been easier to embrace the principle of autonomy much earlier and in a much more open way had the arguments coming from the ‘fringes’ of Australian Anglicanism beyond Melbourne and Sydney been heard – ‘those parts of the Church’, says Davis, ‘which, perhaps, had more directly to deal with the harsh realities of the differences between the circumstances of the Church in England and in Australia’.\(^{19}\) Archbishop Riley of Perth, for example, clearly saw no conflict in being both an Anglican and an Australian church. So strongly did he feel about the matter, that in 1913 he even raised the possibility of secession:

> Those who refuse to admit that Australia is to all intents and purposes a nation, with a right according to the teaching of the Church of England to a national Church, cannot complain if we, for instance, in the West rescind every determination of General Synod, form a province of our own and ask other provinces to join in a (new) General Synod. The first step towards keeping the unity of the Church in Australia is to reform General Synod, – a reform good and necessary in itself, magnificent in the prospect it opens out of a Church here marching onwards with full liberty, within the limits of the Anglican Communion.\(^{20}\)

On the other side of the continent, in Queensland, the separatist path was always a distinct possibility. Since 1905 the Queensland church had been organised on a provincial basis ‘with legislative power and strength, rather than being merely a geographical collection of dioceses’.\(^{21}\) Archbishop Donaldson had a clear vision of an independent Australian church, rather than ‘the Church of England in Australia’. He advocated a ‘national principle’ – ‘that the standard unit of Anglicanism was the nation (above province or diocese) and this national identity of Anglican churches

\(^{17}\) Davis, ibid., 39f.
\(^{18}\) Even so, as Ruth Frappell points out, the movement for autonomy also gained strength as a result of the Nexus Opinions. ‘Almost every Anglican could see this was an unsatisfactory situation’. Frappell, ‘Imperial Fervour and Anglican Loyalty’, 89.
\(^{19}\) Davis, *Australian Anglicans*, 41-42.
\(^{20}\) Quoted by Davis, ibid., 42; Withycombe, ‘Imperial Nexus and National Anglican Identity’, 73.
\(^{21}\) Davis, ibid., 39. As such, Davis argues, Queensland’s contribution to the national debate was, and continues to be, particularly important.
was recognized, especially, in Article 34’. In the 1912 Brisbane synod, a proposal was put forward to secure for the Church in Queensland – since it is impossible to secure it as yet for the whole Church in Australia, such freedom from the Government of the Church of England as by law established as shall enable her to adapt herself to Australian needs.

While being overwhelmingly supported by the clergy, the motion was defeated by the laity. Archbishop Donaldson, for one, was disturbed by what he saw as ‘the alienation of our laymen’ from ‘the national Australian sentiment’. In a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury after the 1912 vote, he wrote: ‘Everyone out here knows that the national self-consciousness is extremely strong and sensitive in young Australia, yet we heard stubborn old Englishmen in Synod maintaining that we are not a nation, and do not need a national Church’. The issue of autonomy was quite clearly not just a legal one: a lasting sense of *spiritual* connection to the mother church amongst the rank and file also worked against autonomy. The cry of ‘Hands off the Prayer Book’ reflected a fear that severing the ties with England would undermine the very spiritual foundations of Anglicanism, although this became a somewhat limp argument during a time when the English church was itself working on prayer book reform. Moreover, many conservatives still interpreted the movement for autonomy ‘as somehow faintly disloyal to the empire.’

This was where the matter rested until the meeting of General Synod in 1921. Meanwhile, the church in Australia remained bound to the Church of England by a two-fold nexus, both legal and spiritual. To quote Davis:

> The legal situation had been deliberately put in place by the framers of the diocesan constitutions beginning in the 1850s. All property was to be held in trust ‘for the purposes of the Church of England’. The spiritual nexus bound the adherents of the Church in the colonies to the

---

23 Davis, *Australian Anglicans*, 40 (from the notebook of Canon S.E. Langford Smith).
24 See Withycombe, ‘Imperial Nexus and National Anglican Identity’, 70.
25 Peter Bennie uses the phrase, ‘nostalgia of exile’, to describe this strong feeling of spiritual connectedness to the Mother Church, especially amongst the laity. Peter Bennie, ‘Anglicanism in Australia’, *Quadrant* 16 (3) (June 1972): 36.
27 Withycombe, ibid., 75.
formularies of the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Ordinal, as it had been received in the English Church. This connection between the two aspects of the ties that bound meant that any change in the formularies initiated from within Australia – even unanimously by synods – could have left the Church liable to civil action for all its property and endowments … The problem was how to break the legal nexus while retaining the desired spiritual ties and keeping the property.28

A satisfactory resolution to this impasse clearly had to be found. The creation of a national church was imperative in the light of political and social developments in Australia. The ties with England were still very strong, but Australia was also becoming a nation in its own right. The Anglican Church could not simply ignore such developments, especially when so many of its own members were Australian-born. The issue of being Anglican and Australian was the implicit subtext of the debate. Progress could not be made, however, unless the separate dioceses of the church in Australia were able to reach a common mind – to begin to think and act like a national church. The reform of General Synod itself arose as a major priority on the road to autonomy.29

Diocesan Separatism

The principle of diocesan independence became the overwhelming stumbling block to national unity in the decades that followed.30 This is hardly surprising. It had, in fact, been built into the constitutional structure agreed upon following the first General Synod in 1872, and simply became part of the fabric of the ensuing debate.31 Anglicanism in Australia operated naturally out of a regional mindset, reflecting the history of colonial settlement.32 The colonies, writes Kaye, ‘were stretched around the perimeter of a vast continent, developing in their own independent way’.33 Distance, in turn, encouraged difference: the development of independent dioceses,34

---

29 Withycombe, ‘Imperial Nexus’, 78.
34 ‘Diocesanism, accentuated by problems of distance, became a potent force, paralleling and in some measure reinforcing the loyalties which bound Australians to their own particular colony’. Brian
each with its own particular theological emphasis or expression of churchmanship, often reflecting the theological and ecclesial predispositions of long-serving bishops. It is somewhat ironical that this resulted in the weakening of ties between dioceses in Australia while at the same time strengthening the bond that each ‘fiercely independent’ Australian diocese felt for the ‘mother Church of England’.37

Ross Border places the blame for what he calls the ‘policy of unbridled diocesanism in the Australian Church’38 squarely on the shoulders of Bishop Frederic Barker of Sydney. Border focuses particularly on the process leading up to the passing in 1866 of the Act incorporating the Church of England in New South Wales. This legislation, prepared under Barker’s leadership, had begun on a provincial level as a joint project between Newcastle and Sydney, but was finally pushed through separately by the Diocese of Sydney in a form that effectively enshrined in law the principle of diocesan independence. Bishop Tyrrell of Newcastle objected strongly, but to no avail.39 Barker’s decision would, according to Border, have lasting consequences for the future direction of Anglicanism in Australia:

From the beginning, the two New South Wales bishops approached the question differently. Bishop Tyrrell felt that the Church in New South Wales as a whole should be the object of the Legislative Act and that the diocesan organization should proceed from that basis. Bishop Barker, on the other hand, looked first to the organization of the diocese as a legal unit. From this disparity of outlook, a course of action proceeded which later split the Australian Church into diocesan fragments, giving rise to an excessive diocesanism which hindered the Australian Church and denied it autonomy for nearly a century.40


35 See David Hilliard, ‘Anglicanism’, in Australian Cultural History, ed. S.L. Goldberg and F.B. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 16: ‘What was distinctive about the Anglicanism that evolved in Australia was that “churchmanship” came to vary from diocese to diocese. Each diocese developed its own style, traditions and predominant theological outlook which proved remarkably resistant to change’.

36 Davis, Australian Anglicanism, 18; also Dickey, ‘Secular Advance and Diocesan Response’, 55.


40 Border, ibid., 247. Stuart Piggin notes the strong unity of purpose between bishop, clergy and leading laity in the Diocese of Sydney achieved by the 1866 Act. This meant that ‘the diocese, not the
Border has been duly criticised for his vitriolic attack on Bishop Barker. Even so, his disappointment at the direction taken by Australian Anglicanism so early in its development can be readily understood. As already noted, the principle of diocesan independence was already entrenched before 1872, and continued to haunt the process of forming a national church right up to 1962. The movement for autonomy from the English church was always going to be difficult because the key players in the debate were often fighting to preserve the vested interests of their own dioceses instead of coming at the process from a national perspective.

Unity was never going to be attained easily in a church made up of independent dioceses divided along party lines, particularly when the goal was to leave no one out. In 1926, for example, the Diocese of Sydney dissented from the proposed national constitution, whereas the chief opposition in 1932 came from Brisbane. In the former case, the Evangelical Archbishop Wright of Sydney sought to protect ‘the Protestant and Reformed character of the Church’, whereas in 1932 Archbishop Wand of Brisbane stood his ground in defence of episcopal authority. Prior to the 1937 General Synod, Bishop Burgmann, for one, was pessimistic about finding a way through the predicament. Bishop John Moyes of Armidale, while sharing

---

41 ‘Bishop Barker was a weak, cautious, and unimaginative administrator’, Border wrote, ‘and he must be regarded by all constitutional historians as the “tragic bishop” of the Australian Church. On him lies the responsibility for the century-old constitutional divisions in the Australian Church which have been both its bondage and its shame’. ibid., 251. For a balanced discussion of Border’s book, including comments on the polemical nature of the work, see K.J. Cable’s review in *Journal of Religious History* 2 (1963): 266-269; also Stephen Judd and Kenneth Cable, *Sydney Anglicans: A History of the Diocese* (Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1987), 90-91. Davis comments that Barker was simply a man of his time. The parochialism of his perspective was echoed ‘in most other fields, from railways to education’. *Australian Anglicans*, 16.


43 Davis, *Australian Anglicans*, 57. David Hilliard, ‘The Ties that Used to Bind: A Fresh Look at the History of Australian Anglicanism’, *Pacifica* 11 (October 1998): 265-280, argues that while much is made of the diverse theological views which have tended to fragment Australian Anglicanism, there have also been strong uniting factors, especially amongst ‘moderate Anglicans’. See also Brian Fletcher, ‘Memory and the Shaping of Australian Anglicanism’, in Frame and Treloar, *Agendas for Australian Anglicanism*, 20.

44 ibid., 65.

45 ibid., 87-8; also Kaye, *A Church Without Walls*, 48.

46 ‘I realize we are in the frying pan now but the present proposed Constitution seems a very undesirable fire as an alternative. The 39 Articles interpreted as a legal document by Sydney or even Brisbane sends a shiver down my back. At present it is an old document. If we freshed it up and give it new authority the angels will have to work overtime to save Anglicanism in Australia’.
Burgmann’s analysis of the problem, challenged the disputing parties in the Australian church to seek a resolution:

We seek a Constitution, but are endangering it on the one hand by fear and on the other by a too close enslavement to tradition. We should make for elasticity, and possibilities of revision on the one hand, and refuse on the other to allow ourselves to limit our tribunals in their efficiency through fear of departing from what some believe to be tradition … We have an opportunity of trust and adventurous experiment that we should do well to take, and however far the extremes of our Church may distrust one another, the central body of Anglicanism has ever been noted for a certain wisdom and inspired commonsense, that ensures its finding a mean between the extremes and thus safeguarding sanity, without crushing the enthusiasm which is the vital gift our extremes have to make to the Church’s life.

The real focus of our attention, Moyes continued, should be on ‘working together in the applying of Christ’s principles to great national problems’. His plea, it seems, fell on deaf ears, for the impasse remained.

The debate during these decades was bitterly fought. ‘The issues ran very deep’, writes Davis. The Red Book Case of the late 1940s highlighted the absurdity of the situation. A civil court ruled that the Bishop of Bathurst did not have the authority to authorise a new Prayer Book, because the Church of England in Australia was still part of the Church of England. The action, taken by key players in Sydney, fought to preserve the principles of the English Reformation (interpreted, that is, along party lines). In fact, the Nexus Opinions were still being upheld at a time when the nation as a whole was groping towards its autonomy from Britain.

Ironically, it was Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury who intervened to break the ongoing deadlock, taking his stand on the principle of comprehensiveness, which

---

Correspondence between Burgmann and Bishop Batty of Newcastle, 2 June, 1937. Quoted by Davis, ibid., 93.
48 Davis, Australian Anglicans, 102.
50 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 49.
51 Davis, Australian Anglicans, 121.
outweighed doctrinal differences and party divisions. Fisher was also concerned that forces in Australia who rigidly defended the spiritual and legal nexus might obstruct proposed changes to English canon law. He encouraged the church in Australia to achieve its own self-governing constitution. To quote W.M. Jacob:

Fisher publicly criticized the lack of links between the Australian dioceses and emphasized the unsatisfactoriness of their continuing dependence on the Church of England, if they wished to develop institutions and worship appropriate for a country that was likely to develop differently from England. He suggested that there should be a metropolitan for the whole of the Anglican Church in Australia, and encouraged the Australian Church to begin to draw up a constitution that would safeguard the special concerns of the diocese of Sydney, and also change the name of the Church to something more appropriate than the ‘Church of England in Australia’.  

A national constitution agreeable to all parties came into being on 1 January, 1962, although, as already noted, the word ‘England’ remained in the title of the national church for a further nineteen years despite Fisher’s plea. At least, with the formation of the Church of England in Australia, the legal nexus had finally been overcome. The same, however, could not be said for the problem of diocesan rivalry, which remained alive even after the constitutional issue had been settled. As Hilliard notes, while the 1962 constitution facilitated ‘a stronger sense of being a national body with responsibilities that transcended the local diocese’, at the same time ‘the sense of diocesan autonomy remained strong and this produced resistance to any hint of centralisation’. In 1955, for example, Donald Robinson, in an article titled ‘Our Two Anglican Churches’, argued that the so-called comprehensiveness of the church in Australia was really an illusion: there were really two churches, not one.

We only remain united by maintaining two denominations in one organisation and allowing members of both to call themselves Anglican. But the real problem we have to face is that there is no unity between two

---

52 ‘He wanted the fragmented Church of England in Australia to be united under a new constitution, so that it would play its part in “the winning of Christ’s victory in the world”’. Stuart Piggin, ‘Australian Anglicanism in a World-wide Context’, in Kaye, Anglicanism in Australia, 210.
53 Davis, Australian Anglicans, 134; also Frame, ‘Local Differences’, 119.
divergent views at the level of local worship, which is the only valid test of unity. While this remains the case, the alleged comprehensiveness of the Church of England is a chimera.\textsuperscript{56}

The issue, as Robinson saw it, was by no means trivial. Doctrinal differences, he argued, cannot just be swept aside in a quest for some kind of artificial unity.\textsuperscript{57} Forty years later, as Archbishop of Sydney, Robinson would make the same claim in the Supreme Court of New South Wales while opposing the ordination of women to the priesthood. Kaye comments:

The story is illustrative both of the profundity of disagreement in the Anglican Church of Australia and of the possibility of a particular point of view being institutionally located in particular dioceses. It may also suggest that this institutionalised location leads to a low threshold in regard to the perception of the tolerable level of diversity in the Anglican tradition.\textsuperscript{58}

This remains an important issue in the present, highlighting the difficulty of talking about a ‘national church’, as I wish to do in this study. As Davis argues, the term can be misleading in the Australian context precisely because of regional independence.\textsuperscript{59} He also points out how unusual this is within the Anglican Communion as a whole:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{56} D.W.B. Robinson, ‘Our Two Anglican Churches’, \textit{The Australian Church Record} 20 (9) (May 12, 1955), 9. Davis, \textit{Australian Anglicans}, 149, and Kaye, \textit{A Church Without Walls}, 49, both draw attention to Robinson’s statement. Davis makes the additional comment that the point Robinson raised in 1955 has still not been resolved. \\
\textsuperscript{57} Robinson’s immediate concern in this article was the polarization he saw between two entirely different doctrines of the Eucharistic sacrifice in Anglicanism, resulting in two completely different understandings of redemption in Christ. More people are distressed by the consequent disunity in Anglicanism, he argued, ‘than are comforted by its comprehensiveness’. ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{58} Kaye, \textit{A Church Without Walls}, 49. Another example of the ‘two churches, not one’ mindset is provided by Frame, ‘Local Differences’, 119-120. He notes the ‘doctrinal tensions’ within Australian Anglicanism that surfaced during the 1959 Billy Graham Crusade. ‘It seemed to some that there were two Australian churches each claiming an Anglican heritage but having little in common’. More recently, Archbishop Peter Carnley of Perth has commented on the divisions which surfaced in the General Synod held in Brisbane in July 2001, at which he presided as Primate: ‘[O]ne perceptive Sydney clergyman spoke of the differences of opinion within Australian Anglicanism as being so profound as in effect to create a stratified Church, almost two different Churches in one. Within the Anglican Church of Australia two quite different mind-sets rub up against one another, he said, like two great tectonic plates that occasionally move and grate upon one another’. Peter Carnley, \textit{Reflections in Glass: Trends and Tensions in the Contemporary Anglican Church} (Sydney: HarperCollins, 2004), 13. \\
\textsuperscript{59} The term “national church” is inappropriate, because throughout this most gradual of processes the key organisational unit has remained the individual diocese. \textit{Australian Anglicans}, 20-21.
\end{flushright}
[T]he loose confederation which is the Australian Church has no parallel in any of the other churches of the Anglican Communion, where the body with the last voice on major issues is the provincial or general synod. Further in Australia, polarisation along lines of churchmanship or tradition has been much more between rather than within dioceses.60

The 1962 constitution dealt formally with the legal nexus, but a redefinition of the spiritual nexus clearly remained on the agenda of the national church. The responsibility for this task lay not just with Evangelicals, but also with those parts of Australian Anglicanism shaped by Tractarianism. For both parties the internal doctrinal integrity of the church could easily be debated in isolation from the church’s relationship to the wider culture.61 This appears to be what was happening through the long, drawn out constitutional debates leading up to the 1962 constitution. The crucial unifying factor, constantly forgotten or dismissed, was the nation itself.

The National Constitution

Yet a constitution had been achieved, and the church could move forward. Or could it? It is instructive to consider the constitution. Does it spell out a vision for a new Australian church? In fact, the constitution is an internal church document, dealing with matters of faith and administration. It begins, understandably enough, with ‘Fundamental Declarations’ about the church’s catholicity, the authority of scripture, faithfulness to Christ’s teaching, and the importance of the sacraments and the three orders of bishops, priests and deacons.62

This section is followed by ‘Ruling Principles’,63 which reaffirm the link between the Australian church and the Church of England through The Book of Common Prayer, the Ordinal, and the Thirty-Nine Articles. Bishops can to an extent approve variations in liturgy, but only subject to the fundamental declarations and in keeping with the authoritative texts of the English church. Kaye comments:

---

60 ibid., 21 (Davis’ emphasis). See also Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 45-46.
62 Constitution, paragraphs 1-3.
63 ibid., paragraphs 4-6.
These Ruling Principles are very interesting in a number of respects. In terms of the statement of the pedigree of this church, they are strikingly conservative. This can be seen in the way in which tradition is handled. It is not surprising that tradition is here presumed, since these principles begin by trying to identify the essential pedigree in the One Holy Catholic Church stretching back to Christ himself, of which this church is heir. That pedigree is further defined in terms of continuity and discontinuity with the Church of England. Such a formulation of the present in terms of the past is a definition by tradition.  

The Australian church, in other words, defines itself by looking backwards. This is clearly where its roots lie. ‘There is an absence here’, Kaye continues, ‘of any reference to contemporary or future guidance of the Spirit in leading this church into new truths. The orientation is upon the past and a quite rigid commitment to continuity with the past’.  

The past, however, is also servant of the present, and the present must be rooted in the context in which the church is located. The root system of Anglicanism, that is to say, is two-fold, reaching both backwards in time and outwards in space. The crucial question about the constitution of the Australian church is to what extent this double movement is recognised. By and large, it seems to me, the constitution of the national church looks inwards rather than outwards. It is more interested in the internal workings of the church than in its role in the life of the nation. Kaye reaches a similar conclusion:

There is little in the present constitution that tells us how this church views its own interaction with society, let alone the interactions of lay people with society. In a sense that ought not to surprise us too much, since this constitution is really about the domestic government of the church, not about its vocation and mission in the world.  

Here is the crux of the matter. As Kaye says, there are serious gaps in the constitution. It remains an internal church document, as though it is somehow complete in itself. This is not the case. It is important to pay attention to what is not

---

64 Kaye, *A Church Without Walls*, 60.
66 ibid., 63 (my emphasis).
said, for fundamental aspects of the Anglican ethos are missing: in particular, those relating to ‘its vocation and mission in the world’.67

Within the Australian context, the Anglican tradition is still discovering what this means. The constitution is no help in this respect, unless we tune into what has been left out. The point I wish to emphasise is this: Anglicanism in Australia is shaped, not just by matters of doctrine or church polity, but also by its relationship with Australian society. That is to say, Anglican identity emerges out of the creative tension between tradition and context. Unless this is recognised, the vocation of Anglicanism within the life of the nation is easily overlooked and the fragmentation of the national church remains unquestioned.

**The Problem of National Unity**

It is not my intention to blame the fragility of Australian Anglicanism on one party or another. My major concern is to find a way forward in which the goal of national unity and purpose takes on a new importance in the national church. Can a national vision become central to what it means to be the Anglican Church of Australia? As we have seen, the existence of a constitution and a General Synod has not been enough to create a ‘national church’. In Kaye’s view, this is still in the making: ‘[I]t is more accurate’, he argues, ‘to describe Australian Anglicans as a community that is still searching for a coherent national authority than a community that already clearly possesses one’68 This means that there is still serious work to be done: Anglicanism in Australia has yet to embrace its national vocation. The 1962 agreement on a national constitution was only a partial achievement – one small step along the way. There was still a blind spot in the church’s charter. The important work remaining for Australian Anglicanism was the need to see the nation itself as an integral part of what it means to be Anglican.

---


68 Kaye, ‘The Emergence and Character’, 172. Davis, *Australian Anglicans*, 183, makes a similar claim: ‘The consideration in detail of seventy or so years of Australian Anglicanism … cannot have left the reader with any clear impression of a “national church”. It does not exist: at least not in the way the visionaries of the 1920s had hoped and expected’. See also Keith Rayner’s discussion of these issues in ‘The Idea of a National Church in Australian Anglicanism’, especially 47-49.
This glaring omission was understandable in the period prior to Federation.\textsuperscript{69} Even members of the Church of England in Australia, however, could not avoid being touched by the growing sense of Australian nationalism from the 1890s onwards. The debate about autonomy was, after all, strongly influenced by what was happening within Australian society after Federation, and certainly after the enactment of the Statute of Westminster in 1931, which defined autonomous dominion status for countries like Australia and Canada.\textsuperscript{70} Bishop Long of Bathurst expressed the problem well as far back as 1926. The church in Australia, he claimed, is ‘the last of the great regional churches of the Anglican community throughout the world to set themselves the task of obtaining unity within their own territory.’\textsuperscript{71} A debate directed by factionalism was never going to accept national unity as a first principle, but it should have, given the importance of the notion of national churches expressed so clearly in Article 34. As a writer in \textit{The Church Standard} commented in 1945: ‘Keen advocates of the principles of the Reformation have been found challenging the basic Reformation principle that each particular or national Church has the inherent right to order its own life and worship.’\textsuperscript{72}

Diocesan separatism clearly remains the central obstacle to national unity. Behind it, of course, lie important issues of principle, as Donald Robinson’s statement about ‘two Anglican churches’ indicates. Indeed, historian Stuart Piggin sees the ‘predisposition for isolationism’ in Australian Anglicanism as a distinctively Evangelical quality, characteristic of Melbourne in the nineteenth century under its first bishop, Charles Perry, and of Sydney in the twentieth century. ‘Evangelicals,’ he argues, ‘have not proved unambiguous advocates of national unity and have given to Australian

\textsuperscript{69} As Kaye notes, \textit{A Church Without Walls}, 46: ‘[I]t is vitally important to realise that for the greater part of the nineteenth century the nation itself did not exist in any sense at all, not even in the dreams of many people.’

\textsuperscript{70} Davis, \textit{Australian Anglicans},184. But note the comment of E.M. Andrews, \textit{The Anzac Illusion: Anglo-Australian Relations during World War I} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 224: ‘Australian “independence” … did not come with the \textit{Statute of Westminster} in 1931, as has been argued. That may have been the \textit{legal} date, but it was certainly not the emotional, political or military one’. It is a moot point. Graham Seal, also a writer on the Anzac tradition, provides a counter-view to that of Andrews: ‘Although this Statute’, he argues, ‘which effectively gave Australia total control of its legislation, was not adopted until the fear of Japanese invasion impelled Prime Minister John Curtin’s famous speech, realigning Australia away from Britain and toward the USA, it marked the effective end of Australia’s political subservience to Britain’. \textit{Inventing Anzac: The Digger and National Mythology} (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 2004), 133.

\textsuperscript{71} See Davis, ibid., 65.

\textsuperscript{72} ibid., 97.
Anglicanism most of any counter-cultural determination it has expressed, including the stout refusal to ordain women to the priesthood."\footnote{37}  

The tension between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics within Australian Anglicanism, as we have seen, goes back a long way, and shaped the long debate about the national constitution. From time to time there were those who argued for a separation of Sydney from the rest of the Australian church, but the crisis became particularly acute in the early 1990s.\footnote{74}  

With the formation of the Reformed Evangelical Protestant Association (REPA) in February 1992, the Diocese of Sydney headed off in a new and potentially sectarian direction.\footnote{75} A number of writers have traced the impact of the so-called Knox-Robinson view of the church that has shaped a generation of students in Moore Theological College, including the next wave of rising leaders, culminating in the ascendancy of the present Archbishop, Peter Jensen.\footnote{76}  

In the late 1950s, Broughton Knox and Donald Robinson, Principal and Vice Principal of Moore College respectively,\footnote{77} argued that the only real church on earth is the \textit{ekklesia}, the local gathered congregation, and that the universal church exists in the heavenly realm.\footnote{78} This position shunned the idea that the church can exist in any broader or ‘catholic’ sense on earth. This meant that national, diocesan or ecumenical structures could only be seen as para-church organisations, rather than being part of the essence of the church itself.\footnote{79} According to Bill Lawton, the origins

of this view lie in Brethren ecclesiology: ‘a commitment to the church as “Little Flock”, an earthly manifestation of a heavenly reality, whose life is expressed in hearing the word and waiting for the return of Jesus’.\(^{80}\) This ecclesiological perspective now shapes parish life throughout the Diocese of Sydney, writes Lawton, with ‘a corresponding minimizing of diocesan influence and a tendency to congregational separatism’.\(^{81}\) Robinson later claimed that he had not intended to promote ‘congregational independency’, but rather to counter both the ecumenical movement and the push for a national Anglican constitution.\(^{82}\) Nevertheless, congregational independence seems to have been the long-term effect.\(^{83}\) This, combined with the impact of the debate over the ordination of women, has placed an increasing strain on the ties binding the Diocese of Sydney to the Australian church.

In early 1993 Bishop John Reid, as Administrator of the Diocese of Sydney, urged the synod ‘not to retreat into a ghetto’.\(^{84}\) In the following year, Archbishop Harry Goodhew made clear his desire to keep Sydney within the Anglican fold:

> As an evangelical diocese we must play our part in the Anglican Church of Australia. I would like to encourage the Synod to take a positive attitude towards our place in our national church … Unless we judge the Australian Church to be thoroughly reprobate, which I do not think it is,

\(^{80}\) Lawton, ‘Australian Anglican Theology’, 190.


\(^{83}\) ‘The Knox-Robinson ecclesiology reinforced the Low Church evangelical impatience with diocesan bishops and other traditions which were not based obviously on Scripture. Knox produced rectors who preferred a polity of congregational independence, who had trouble with infant baptism, robes, liturgical services and prayer books. It was felt that such traditions were not only unbiblical, but actually impeded the church’s outreach to the unchurched. Constant pressure was exerted in synod for relief from these encumbrances’. Piggin, Evangelical Christianity in Australia, 187. See also Marcia Cameron. An Enigmatic Life: David Broughton Knox, Father of Contemporary Sydney Anglicanism (Brunswick East, Vic.: Acorn Press, 2006), 193.

we must make our contribution as amongst brothers and sisters and not as amongst the enemy. Let us contend for gospel truth when we consider it to be threatened but we must love our fellow Anglicans as we would have them love us …  

Goodhew battled to hold the Anglican line throughout his episcopate, as his addresses to subsequent synods indicate. In 1995 he warned the synod of the dangers of ‘locking ourselves in an evangelical enclave isolated from every other stream of thought and life in the Anglican Church’. A year later, while acknowledging that ‘the “umbrella” of the Anglican Church in Australia is under great strain’, he reminded the synod that ‘Anglicanism is national in its focus. It takes seriously the life of the nation. It is transformative, seeking to influence the society of which it is a part with Kingdom values’. 

In his final synod address as Archbishop, Goodhew talked openly of the divisions cutting through the heart of the diocese, and of the potential isolation of the Diocese of Sydney from the rest of the Australian church. His warnings were ignored, however, by the new wave of leaders who had been trained under Broughton Knox and Donald Robinson. Bishop Robert Forsyth declared that ‘the change in mindset among Sydney Evangelicals is here to stay. Any Anglicanism which includes us will have to build on this basis or else somehow tear it down’. From a Sydney perspective, he argued, ‘the rest of the Anglican Church of Australia is typically regarded as simply irrelevant, or at worst, a joke’. He reaffirmed ‘the old familiar catchcry’: ‘evangelical first Anglican second’.

88 ibid., 332.
91 ibid., 11.
92 ibid., 11-12. In the 1980 Sydney synod, Archbishop Marcus Loane talked at length about Evangelicals and their place within Anglicanism, highlighting the Church of England as his true place of belonging. He saw himself as Christian first, Protestant second, and Anglican last, but without all three his Evangelical faith was not complete. ‘Presidential Address’, 1980 Synod, in The Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1981. The Church of England in Australia (Sydney: Diocesan Registry, 1981), 39
Under the leadership of the present Archbishop, Peter Jensen, the REPA agenda has finally arrived. Jensen has been single-minded in leading the diocese into a new mission based on the Knox-Robinson approach to ecclesiology, but with the added impetus of a renewed commitment to evangelism. In his first Presidential Address, he called for a ‘spiritually based Anglicanism in which the reality of the church is more important than its outward shape’. ‘The churches are the true heart of our Diocese’, he said. ‘The work of God goes forward especially in the churches; the Diocesan structures, even the most important of them, exist to serve the churches, not the other way around’. Jensen has also expressed the urgency of becoming a ‘native Australian’ church, but it seems likely that he has in mind something other than inculturation. In 2004, drawing attention to the growing multiculturalism of Australian society, Jensen said:

As a Diocese, our gift to this nation and its future is Bible-based churches. To be Australian, they need to be open to all people. These churches will arise from our Christ-centred evangelistic culture and our grasp of the gospel … The Diocesan Mission must involve an on-the-ground, serious encounter with the real nation, the new nation in which we now live, or we will deserve to sink into obscurity as a failed British experiment.

Jensen and his fellow bishops in Sydney have taken an increasingly uncompromising stance on issues affecting the life of the Anglican Church of Australia and, indeed, the worldwide Anglican Communion, grounded in a particular theological reading of church and culture, with the result that the right to disagree, even to the point of
fragmentation or dysfunction at the national (or international) level, has now assumed the importance of an ecclesiological principle in its own right. This is really a new departure, even for the Diocese of Sydney, which, even within its own borders, has in the past been much more tolerant of diversity. It presents the Australian church with an unprecedented challenge as it moves into a very uncertain and increasingly fractious future. But leaders in the Diocese of Sydney also must wrestle with the consequences of their own (doctrinally pure) intransigence, lest the mission they espouse locally should lead to an undermining of the church’s overall mission to the Australian nation.

The question is whether national unity can lay equal claim to being a fundamental Anglican principle, as I am proposing in this study. Must diversity necessarily result in fracture? Must comprehensiveness be interpreted as an opportunity for disagreement? In my view, comprehensiveness is only a viable Anglican principle when the church accepts its national vocation. I would like to suggest that the autonomy question was, and remains, dealt with only in part. Breaking the ties with the English church was only the first step in a double movement. The second step, which is essentially the theme of this discussion, involves becoming an Australian church. This is not a trivial or peripheral issue, but gets to the heart of what it means to be a national church, a church that is both Anglican and Australian.

98 Archbishop Marcus Loane was quite adamant on this point in his final Presidential Address before retirement: “It has often been said that the Diocese of Sydney is a monochrome Diocese; monochrome in character and churchmanship. This has never been true since the Diocese was formed under Bishop Broughton. What is true is the fact that it has remained predominantly Evangelical, but that there has always been a certain number of churches and clergy of a moderate High Church tradition. They are an integral part of the Diocese and I have learned to rely on their loyalty and good-will with great thankfulness”. Loane then went on to talk about what it is to be an Evangelical. “It should never be a mere party label, used in partisan hostility to those who are non-Evangelical”. Archbishop Marcus Loane, “Presidential Address”, 1981 Synod, in The Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1982. Church of England in Australia (Sydney: Diocesan Registry, 1982), 225-226. Twelve years later, Harry Goodhew, in his first Presidential Address as Archbishop of Sydney, announced his intention to ‘seek to act with charity and fairness’ within the diversity of the diocese. “Such diversity”, he continued, “can be invigorating or destructive depending on how we handle ourselves” – a telling comment. Archbishop Harry Goodhew, “Presidential Address”, October 1993 Synod, in The Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1994. Anglican Church of Australia (Sydney: Diocesan Registry, 1994), 304.

99 Bruce Kaye, Anglicanism in Australia, xv, notes that, in the last decades of the twentieth century, Anglicanism in Australia ‘made only modest progress in grappling with the challenge to move away from the nostalgically English character of Anglicanism. The gap between the culture of the institutional church and that of the wider society became a manifestly unavoidable problem’. As I see it, this problem remains largely unaddressed. Kaye’s writings, however, represent a major attempt to open up the questions for debate within the Australian Anglican community.
THE UNFINISHED AGENDA

By 1962 fundamental changes were taking place in Australian society. In a way, the long, drawn out debate over the constitution was possible because the British connection was still strong. But now the links were weakening.¹⁰⁰ Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies held on fiercely to the ties that bind, but his sentimental attachment to Britain could no longer be sustained.¹⁰¹ By 1967, Harold Holt, Menzies’ successor, publicly noted that both White Australia and British imperialism had simply faded ‘away into the mists’.¹⁰² As Davidson somewhat dryly comments, in the midst of this age of transition ‘even the Church of England conceded it was “In Australia”’.¹⁰³ It would, however, as we have noted, take a lot more than a piece of legislation to create a truly indigenous church.

Since 1962, Australia has changed immeasurably from what it was at the end of the Menzies era. A broad debate about Australia, still in process, has been taking place. Multiculturalism has become a byword, although the precise meaning of the term remains a matter of debate.¹⁰⁴ Women have taken a more prominent role in Australian life, and have been ‘written back’ into Australian history.¹⁰⁵ Indigenous Australians have gained a new voice, and non-British migrants have taken their place in the life of the nation. ‘The earlier concept of national identity’, writes Fletcher, ‘had largely been fashioned by white males of British origin. Now the nation was redefined in ways that took account of new attitudes to race and gender as well as the social and cultural changes that were transforming Australia’.¹⁰⁶

Yet Anglicanism in Australia could hardly be said to have embraced the changes with enthusiasm. As already mentioned, it took another nineteen years for the word

¹⁰⁴ I will consider this in some detail in Chapter 8.
¹⁰⁵ See, for example, Patricia Grimshaw et al., *Creating a Nation*. (Ringwood, Vic.: McPhee Gribble, 1994).
'England' to be dropped from the title of the national church. The spiritual nexus was holding on, long after the legal nexus had released its hold. At the same time, diocesan independence remained strong, offsetting any moves towards the establishment of a strong national Anglican body. Meanwhile a new generation of Australian-born leaders was emerging with a heart for the development of an Australian church, while Church Scene and Anglican criticised the church for holding on too tightly to ‘an outmoded image of England'. There were calls, from amongst leading voices of the Australian church, to present the universal faith ‘in a language and symbolism that makes sense to the experience of being Australian'.

Overall, however, the church was slow to embrace its Australianness. An Australian Prayer Book (AAPB), published in 1978, took tentative steps towards grounding Anglicanism within its Australian context. ‘Its cover bore the Australian colours of green and gold’, writes Fletcher, ‘it was entitled An Australian Prayer Book and was illustrated by drawings of Australian fauna. The language was modernized and there were occasional references to flood, drought, and bushfires’. In the Preface, Bishop John Grindrod, who chaired the Liturgical Commission, highlighted the fact that prayer book revision was a natural consequence of becoming ‘a particular or national Church’. He also noted the delicate process involved in producing a prayer book acceptable to a church characterised by huge differences in doctrine and churchmanship. ‘The Liturgical Commission has been a microcosm of the Church’, he wrote, ‘with the different traditions of Anglicanism represented in its membership. Where there has been a difference of interpretation, the Commission has sought to find a common ground behind divergences of tradition’.

112 ibid., 13.
These differences were still apparent in 1995 when yet another prayer book appeared, *A Prayer Book for Australia (APBA)*. The earlier book had, for a time, facilitated ‘a measure of unity and common practice which had previously been lacking’. But by the mid-1980s it became clear that further reform was needed.\(^{113}\) An extensive process of revision took place, with sensitivity to a wide range of issues as diverse as the need to cater for a multicultural society, and the changing patterns of book reading in Australia.\(^{114}\) Above all, notes Dean David Richardson, ‘[a] burning issue throughout has been to find a way of giving expression to an essentially Australian Anglicanism’.\(^{115}\) The new book did, indeed, include many references to Australian life, including prayers for Australia and its various levels of government, Anzac Day and Australia Day, and a prayer for reconciliation.\(^{116}\) In spite of objections from both ends of the theological spectrum, the vote of approval was given by the General Synod, but subsequently withheld by the diocesan synod in Sydney.\(^{117}\) This more recent prayer book has not been as widely accepted as its predecessor. As Hilliard notes, ‘its pattern of usage has reflected the Church’s theological fault-lines’.\(^{118}\)

Disputes within the Anglican community were particularly apparent during the debates which raged throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s over the ordination of women. Amidst cries of impending splits in the church and even schism, the General Synod cleared the way for women to be ordained in 1992. The national church survived the crisis, in spite of some dissent, most notably from the Diocese of Sydney.\(^{119}\) Even so, a number of dioceses, including Sydney, have not yet ordained women priests to this day. Commenting on this in the late 1990s, Fletcher wrote, somewhat aptly: ‘The original English flavour of the church had by no means vanished’.\(^{120}\)

---


\(^{114}\) ibid., 10-11.

\(^{115}\) ibid., 12.

\(^{116}\) *A Prayer Book for Australia*, 202-204.


\(^{118}\) Hilliard, ‘Dioceses, Tribes and Factions’, 80.

\(^{119}\) Hilliard, ‘Pluralism and New Alignments’, 133-137.

\(^{120}\) Fletcher, ‘Anglicanism and National Identity’, 344.
Throughout these turbulent decades a succession of church leaders have repeatedly challenged the church to embrace its national vocation. I will comment briefly on two recent Primates of the Anglican Church of Australia, Archbishops Sir Marcus Loane and Keith Rayner. While coming from completely different theological backgrounds, these two men stressed the importance of national unity and challenged the church to engage in Australian society. The election of Archbishop Marcus Loane of Sydney as Primate in 1978 was not insignificant, given his passionate Evangelical convictions. His leadership of the Australian church indicated that it might be possible for doctrinal differences to exist within a united Anglican Church in Australia. In his Presidential Address to the 1977 General Synod, for example, Loane appealed for a spirit of ‘Christian compassion’, drawing attention to the nineteenth century Evangelical social reformers in Britain as examples of what might be possible for the church in Australia. 121 His address to the next General Synod in 1981 was an outstanding call to become an Australian church at the beginning of a new era.

As from today, August 24th, 1981, the name of our Church will cease to be the Church of England in Australia and will henceforth become the Anglican Church of Australia … The new name may be seen as a symbol of the autonomy which our Church now enjoys as an independent member of the Anglican Communion. 122

Loane confessed to the gathered assembly that he had originally been opposed to the national constitution, but that now ‘we gladly recognise in it a true instrument in the cause of national unity’. 123 His speech presented a united view both of Australia and the Australian church. He also called on the church to speak out courageously on political issues, 124 even while acknowledging its minority status in an increasingly diverse society.


123 ibid., 10-11.

124 He especially highlighted ‘the plight of the boat people’, 19. See also his remarks on refugees in his Presidential Address to the 1977 Synod of the Diocese of Sydney, in The Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1978. The Church of England in Australia (Sydney: Diocesan Registry, 1978), 225-229, and
The Church still has a unique duty to fulfil in society or in the life of the nation. I mean something over and above the worship or the teaching for which it is responsible and must provide for its members. I mean something that must transcend its own immediate sphere of activity. The Church ought to be the moral and spiritual conscience of the nation.125

It was a courageous address to the national church from the leader of the Diocese of Sydney. Archbishop Loane was a unifying presence in the Australian church, capable of embracing Anglican diversity while remaining firmly rooted in Evangelical faith.126 This does not mean that he advocated an end to diocesan autonomy, but he was certainly sensitive to the dangers of isolationism, whether in politics or in the life of the church.

More recently, in the 1992 General Synod, Archbishop Keith Rayner, while accepting the reality of diocesan independence, urged the church to lift its sights beyond its own needs in order to engage in its wider mission ‘as the instrument and servant of the Kingdom of God’.127 He continued:

As Australia becomes less Anglo-Saxon and more multicultural, as it becomes less royalist and more republican, as it becomes less hierarchical and more egalitarian the alienation between the culture of the Anglican church and the community quietly increases.128

There is more at stake here than simply finding a way to evangelise, Rayner argued. Anglicanism in Australia has a broader mission to the nation of which it is a part. ‘That is not the least of the reasons why we need to be as cohesive a national Church as possible’.129 Rayner repeated this appeal at the next General Synod in 1995. He urged the Synod to accept diversity in the church as a strength rather than a weakness, and again urged the church to embrace its national vocation.

his remarkably comprehensive survey of issues confronting Australian society in his Presidential Address is the 1979 Synod of the Diocese of Sydney, in The Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney 1980. The Church of England in Australia (Sydney: Diocesan Registry, 1980), 218-234. This address was totally outward-focussed, with no reference at all to diocesan affairs.

125 ibid., 21.
126 See the remarks of Loane’s biographer, Bishop John Reid, Marcus L. Loane: A Biography, 133; also Judd and Cable, Sydney Anglicans, 286. See also Loane’s personal reflections on his role as Primate in his 1981 Presidential Address, ibid., 13.
128 ibid., 17.
129 ibid.
We also have a mission to the community, at the level of town and state and nation, and internationally too. We are called to do what we can to bring the values of the Kingdom of God to bear on human society so that all that makes for human dignity and righteousness and justice is fostered in the community. Human beings are not isolated units; we all participate in the solidarity of the human race and our individual lives are enriched or diminished according to the quality of the society of which we are a part. The question we must ask as the Anglican Church of Australia is this: do we have a mission to the nation as well as to the individual? I firmly believe that the answer is a ringing YES. That is why a healthy national church is needed if we are to be faithful to the gospel.  

Throughout his period as Primate, Archbishop Rayner consistently called the church to ‘think nationally’. He did not denigrate in any way the emphasis on the local church propounded so strongly by the Diocese of Sydney, but he argued that this was not enough. At the 1998 General Synod, he commented:

The local parish is a critical edge of mission: if the church fails at that level it will fail everywhere. But the total mission of the church cannot be fulfilled at local level. At the levels of city and state, nation and world, we have a gospel to proclaim. Though not an established church, we inherit from the Church of England a responsibility in regard to the spiritual, ethical and social life of our nation, and we shall fail as a church to the extent that we do not accept that responsibility. For that reason I strongly affirm the national, ecumenical and international dimensions of our church life.

CONCLUSION

It could be argued that Anglicanism in Australia lives and breathes in an atmosphere of ongoing crisis brought about by diocesan separatism, marked as it is by differences in doctrine and churchmanship. In other words, however inadvertently, disunity may have become the norm. Bill Lawton may be right in his assessment:

To be Anglican and Australian means to live as a member of a church in which these theological opposites continue to be present. In the face of such polarity, any appearance of unity that it can maintain seems

---


132 ibid., 20. Rayner’s comprehensive understanding of the national church idea in Anglican thought is readily apparent from his two recent essays: ‘The Idea of a National Church in Australian Anglicanism’ and ‘Historical and Global Contexts’, both already cited.
remarkable. But while its governmental structures are based on conciliar discussion and action, their effectiveness is limited by theological polarisation. Further, this debate can only weaken the church in relationship to broader society, which does not understand its dialect and is baffled (and sometimes disgusted) by its nuances.133

The beginning of Lawton's statement is an affirmation of the remarkable achievement of holding together an Australian Anglican church despite fundamental differences – a celebration of Anglican comprehensiveness, we might say. Lawton admits, nevertheless, that polarisation is a stronger force than national unity. In the end, he writes, Australian society itself remains the loser.

Bruce Kaye has made a similar claim. In a 1997 article, he reflects back on the three major debates which became much more than gentle internal disputes: the debate over the constitution, the bitter controversy over the ordination of women, and the introduction of APBA. In each case, he argues, destructive centrifugal forces were unleashed, not just by the content of the disputes, but by the way in which they were conducted. He counters this negative reading of Australian Anglicanism, however, by noting the centripetal forces at work throughout the national church community.

All of the Anglican agencies concerned with welfare, education and industry, have become more nationally self conscious. They have formulated different ways of keeping together nationally across diocesan boundaries because of the more national forces at work in the broader community.134

This is an interesting and important observation. Essentially, some institutions within Australian Anglicanism are both participating in the broader national debate and, in turn, being shaped by that involvement.135 Forces external to the life of the church, in other words, are providing these bodies with purpose and cohesion, in spite of the factionalism operating within the national church.136 Their point of unity, we might say, is not just doctrinal; it is also vocational.

134 Bruce Kaye, ‘The Landscape of the National Church’, 10.
135 ibid. In Kaye’s view, the major challenges facing the church include dealing with indigenous issues and people, the growing gulf between city and country, embracing multiculturalism rather than becoming an ‘ethnic boutique’, relating to youth, and encouraging lay vocation in pluralist Australia.
136 This same point was made by Archbishop Keith Rayner in his Presidential Address to the 1998 General Synod, 20.
Centrifugal forces – doctrinal differences, factionalism, and the like – will always be in danger of predominating when Anglicanism forgets its national vocation. Comprehensiveness, or the ability to embrace difference, which many see as the hallmark of Anglicanism, presupposes a cultural context, the sense of belonging to a place and a people; it is not simply an internal matter. Anglicanism has always implicitly been sensitive to, and part of, the wider culture. On this view, fragility occurs when a church looks inwards and talks only to itself, failing to appreciate that its root system is both internal and external, reaching both backwards in time and outwards in space. Doctrine, though crucially important, is not the only factor shaping the life of Australian Anglicanism.137

The societal context, I wish to argue, remains central to the Anglican ethos. That is to say, Anglicanism derives its purpose both from its sacred texts and religious tradition on the one hand and from its engagement with society on the other. It is not an end in itself. It must embrace and be part of the nation to which it belongs. It is a ‘church for the nation’, as F.D. Maurice declared a century and a half ago. Maurice was reiterating for his own time and place one of the central tenets of the English Reformation, the right of a national church to reform itself. Within the context of worldwide Anglicanism, as was noted earlier, this principle of ‘particular or national churches’, enshrined in the words of Article 34, took on new meaning. Each province of the Anglican Communion was faced with the task of expressing Anglican faith in indigenous forms. The Australian church is no exception.

In 1962, when the national constitution was agreed to, these issues were, at an international level, only in their infancy. The map of the world was being redrawn even as the debates took place. The Anglican Communion was entering a post-colonial age. Subsequent Lambeth Conferences would take up the issues as a matter of urgency. The Australian church was not ready for such discussion. The Menzies era, after all, was still in place. The ties with Britain were loosening, but were still intact. Not until 1967 were indigenous Australians given the right to vote. The

137 As will become apparent in later chapters, I am not placing doctrine and vocation in opposition to each other, although they can be, if the vocational dimension of belief is forgotten or misunderstood. My point is that doctrinal discussion separated from the life-world of a society is self-serving and may lead, as in the case of Australian Anglicanism, to fragmentation and disunity. Such an outcome serves the interests of no one. It disempowers the church and fails to serve the wider society.
turbulence of the Vietnam War still lay ahead. Debates about Australian identity were about to take place with renewed energy.

The Anglican Church was waking from its own internal sleep, but had not yet realised what becoming an Australian church might mean. Creating a sense of national identity as an Australian church was one thing; realising the church’s national vocation was another. Nevertheless, as we have seen, there had been those, throughout the long decades of debate, who had argued for Anglicanism to shift its gaze from England and to become an Australian church. In fact, this process had already begun even before the first meeting of General Synod in 1872.

In the next chapter, I will discuss the episcopacy of William Grant Broughton (1788-1853), the first and only bishop of Australia, whose ministry in New South Wales predated later divisions and controversies within Australian Anglicanism. Broughton quickly recognised the need to adapt Anglican tradition to its colonial context. He also placed national unity before diocesan independence, and foresaw the creation of a global communion of Anglican provinces. I will also consider the visionary leadership of Ernest Burgmann (1885-1967), controversial Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn, who constantly called for Anglicanism in Australia to become an Australian church and to accept its responsibility for shaping the life of the nation. While Burgmann was not afraid to talk about the Australian character and Australian nationalism, he also had a vision of a community of nations united in a common humanity.

For both Broughton and Burgmann, the Anglican ethos demanded participation in and engagement with Australian society. Broughton, based in Sydney, sought to shape the life of the colony; Burgmann, in Canberra, took with the utmost seriousness the future of the Australian nation. Both – each in his own way – saw Australia as part of an international community; their vision was both local and global. Nor did they regard the church as an end in itself; it lived to serve the society to which it belonged. They have left a powerful legacy to the Australian church. They challenge us to think through, perhaps far more deeply than has happened thus far, what it means to be a church that is both Anglican and Australian.
CHAPTER 2                 ALTERNATIVE VOICES:
BROUGHTON AND BURGMANN

As the first chapter demonstrated, the Anglican Church of Australia, while purporting to be a national church, has been, and continues to be, plagued by factionalism and fragmentation. The national constitution, arrived at after decades of difficult negotiations, remained effectively an in-house affair; it was hardly an expression of national unity. Nor could an appreciation of the Anglican vocation as a church for the nation be said to have been the critical factor in achieving agreement on a national constitution. Even today, a quarter of a century after the name ‘Anglican Church of Australia’ became official, national disunity remains the prevalent characteristic of this ‘national’ church. Anglicanism in Australia has still not grasped the significance for its own life of being an Australian church.

We have already noted the presence of counter voices in the debate: those who, even in the early years of the twentieth century, argued strongly that the future of this church was integrally related to its national context. Somehow the life of this church was bound up with the life of the nation. Nothing could be gained from clinging interminably to England. Advocates for this view were, however, overshadowed by those who failed to appreciate the importance of becoming a ‘particular or national church’, in keeping with Article 34. Nor was national unity considered to outweigh in importance the fundamental principle (as it was seen) of diocesan independence.

In this chapter I wish to focus on the lives of two bishops of the Australian church whose life and work, albeit in different eras, demonstrate an alternative approach to the prevailing currents of Australian Anglicanism. William Grant Broughton (1788-1853), the first Bishop of Sydney, began to tackle issues that have since plagued the
national church. As one of the first Australians,¹ he struggled to adapt the Anglican faith to its colonial context. As the diocesan structure of the Australian church was beginning to take shape, Broughton operated with a vision of unity rather than diocesan independence, laying the foundations for a national church that, in many ways, is still waiting to be born. This national vision also fed Broughton’s dream of an international communion of Anglican provinces. E.H. Burgmann (1885-1967), bushman and bishop, was in the eyes of many people a prophetic presence within Australian Anglicanism. He was passionately concerned about the future of Australia and the vocation of the church within the life of the nation. He also saw both the political and ecclesial potential for promoting international peace and justice. Both Broughton and Burgmann shunned fragmentation in their quest for unity, and saw engagement in society as an integral part of what it meant to be Anglican.

I am using Broughton and Burgmann as case studies. They are not the only Anglican leaders who might have been chosen. The choice of Broughton is appropriate because, as I have already suggested, he was the first bishop of the Australian church. His life and work belong to the colonial era, when Australian society was in its formative stages, and he was himself a key player in this societal process. It was only later, after his death, that Australian Anglicanism settled into the pattern of fragmentation this is so problematic today. It is worth considering what might have been had Broughton’s vision been carried through into the second half of the nineteenth century.

A century after Broughton, Burgmann wrestled with a different Australia, still part of the British Empire yet feeling its way forward as a nation. During decades which encompassed the Depression, the Second World War and its aftermath, Burgmann was an active participant in the debate about Australia’s future. Burgmann’s was not the only Anglican voice speaking out on social issues during this turbulent period. During the 1930s Burgmann was a member of the General Synod Social Questions Committee, which included other Anglican leaders like Bishop Crotty of Bathurst and Bishop J.S. Moyes of Armidale (1884-1972). Moyes chaired both this committee and the associated Christian Social Order Movement which functioned between 1943

and 1951, seeking with a sense of urgency to engage the church in all aspects of post-war reconstruction.² The movement, as Joan Mansfield has said,

drew its inspiration primarily from Christian Socialists of the Anglican tradition, Maurice, Ludlow, Scott Holland, Gore, Reckitt, and above all, Temple, deriving from them an incarnational theology which focussed on the unity of sacred and secular and the all-encompassing nature of the moral law.³

It is fitting, at the commencement of a chapter which focuses so heavily on Burgmann’s vision and legacy, that some mention should be made of Bishop Moyes. Moyes was in every way Burgmann’s contemporary and equal. Throughout his long ministry as Bishop of Armidale (1929-1964), Moyes, like Burgmann, was outspoken on a wide range of issues affecting Australian society. He used his annual Charges to diocesan synod in Armidale as a means of speaking to both church and nation. These addresses still make remarkable reading decades later. ‘Everything that the Church can do to inspire understanding of nation by nation, of class by class, is ours to do’, he wrote in 1934.⁴ Moyes was highly critical of the intellectual and spiritual mediocrity he saw in Australian life, and the many ways this shapes the life of the nation. ‘Mentally and spiritually Australians are inert’, he said in his Moorhouse Lectures in the midst of World War II. ‘Our opposition to the totalitarian powers today is based on fear, and hatred of their ideas, not on any passionate convictions of our own’.⁵ Moyes had a great deal to say on the themes of war and peace, and also on post-war reconstruction. He presented a spiritual vision for both national life and the future of the international community,⁶ never afraid to engage directly in public

³ ibid., 113.
⁵ John S Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future. The Moorhouse Lectures 1941. 2nd. edn. (Sydney: Robert Dey & Co., 1942), 15. Cf. his 1933 Presidential Address to Armidale Synod, Conflict and Creativeness: A Charge Delivered to the 3rd. Session of the Twenty-First Synod of the Diocese of Armidale (Armidale: Armidale Express Print, 1933), 1: ‘It is not easy to face the facts and appreciate their more than material significance, and win through to the spiritual purpose demanded of us. It is easier to do and die than it is to reason why, but we must realise that war is weakness, not strength. We arm because we are afraid. We slay our enemies, or they us, because morally we were too cowardly, too lazy, too weak, maybe too selfish, to face the strain of making them our friends while we had time’.
⁶ ‘A true nationalism is the basis finally of a true international unity ... Understanding within the nation is the best background and basis for international understanding and peace’. The Challenge to the Church Today, 12.
discussion when the occasion required it. He spoke about human relationships and values at every level of social life – home, church, education, industry and commerce, politics and the environment – interpreting each facet in spiritual terms.

Democracy itself was seen as a ‘spiritual conception, based on faith in God and through Him on the undying quality of man’. Needless to say, this theologically-inspired vision of national life, if realised, would require a revolution in the life of the church. ‘Here lies the church’s task’, he argued in 1933, ‘to interfere with the world’. But to do so the church must address its own spiritual crisis of ‘war, of conflict and dissension’, lest it fail in its real calling within national and international life. Moyes understood the destructive power of unresolved conflict, whether at the national and international level, or within industry, the church or the family. ‘Bitterness, hate and controversy can so easily be substitutes for thought’, he said in 1938. He countered this negative view of conflict with a more creative vision of what is possible when individuals, groups or nations stop fighting each other and ‘begin to think and act in terms of a larger loyalty’. Ultimately, he continued, the real and continuing task of the church is both spiritual and political: it is nothing less that ‘the search for God’ and the Kingdom of God. But, he added a
decade later, ‘the Kingdom of God is not the kind of life we have in Australia today’.\(^{15}\)

While Burgmann and Moyes were different personalities, they had much in common. Both were located within the Broad Church tradition of Anglicanism,\(^{16}\) and were regarded by many as radicals and even Communists.\(^{17}\) Bill Lawton has written that both Burgmann and Moyes ‘stand out as prophets and theological pioneers’. Each of these leaders, he wrote, ‘has been concerned with a theology for the Australian church and for the way theology touches justice’.\(^{18}\) In a similar vein, Keith Rayner sees Burgmann and Moyes as ‘two influential individuals raising afresh that aspect of the Anglican tradition that sees the vocation of the Church as a formative influence within the life and culture of the nation’.\(^{19}\) Clearly Moyes might well have been chosen as the second case study in this chapter rather than Burgmann. Nevertheless, there are also strong reasons for considering Burgmann’s unique contribution to the Australian church and the debate about Australia at this point in the discussion. As Lawton says: ‘[Moyes] is part of a continuing tradition in Australian Anglicanism which uses gospel imagery but is concerned more for enculturation. The same is more radically true of Burgmann’.\(^{20}\) Indeed, Burgmann has also left a powerful legacy to Australian Anglicanism, which I will consider more closely in this chapter. Both Broughton and Burgmann, in different times, were both visionaries and activists. It is therefore timely that their contributions be reconsidered.


\(^{16}\) ibid., 185. John Chapman, a leading figure in the Diocese of Sydney, claimed that Moyes was caught in a ‘theological time-warp’: not High, not Evangelical; not conservative enough to be acceptable to Sydney, and not sufficiently Anglo-Catholic to suit Brisbane or Melbourne. Lamb, *The Conscience of the Church*, 337.

\(^{17}\) On Burgmann, see Hempenstall, *The Meddlesome Priest*, especially 206-233; for Moyes, see, for example, *Revival or Revolution*, 5: ‘Some of you have named me a Communist for telling of changes that are coming! No! I believe in the Kingdom of God, not in any Lenin’s Paradise’.

\(^{18}\) Lawton, ‘Australian Anglican Theology’, 178. Note also the assessment made by Archbishop Frank Woods of Melbourne at the Memorial Service for Bishop Moyes in Armidale Cathedral on 11 February, 1972: ‘Moyes’s influence spread far beyond his own diocese. His presence was felt throughout Australia. He was the Church’s voice and its social conscience. Moyes, with Bishop Burgmann, was the outstanding prophet of this Church this century. One cannot help linking his name with that of the great Archbishop, William Temple. What Temple was for England, John Moyes might well have been for Australia had he been listened to’. See Lamb, ibid., 347.

\(^{19}\) Rayner, ‘The Idea of a National Church’, 46.

WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON

Broughton was the pioneering bishop of Australian Anglicanism, both a conservative and a radical innovator, both defender and shaper of Anglican tradition in early Australia. While remaining a staunch Tory High Churchman, he nevertheless recognised that many factors intrinsic to the life of the church in England had become an impediment in New South Wales. In particular, the relationship between church and state had to be reworked to fit a situation in which establishment was no longer relevant. Nevertheless, Broughton refused to allow the church to settle into a private world of its own, separate from the society to which it belonged. Nor did he interpret the restructuring of the Australian church into separate dioceses late in his episcopacy as an inevitable movement towards factionalism and parochialism. The future of colonial society, he believed, was dependent on a sense of united vision and purpose in the church. Church and society were integrally related. He was, to use George Shaw’s phrase, both ‘patriarch and patriot’.21

In a series of writings, Bruce Kaye has revisited Broughton’s life and work, motivated by the conviction that, at a time when Australian Anglicanism needs new direction, Broughton’s contribution is strikingly relevant.22 History, of course, tends to be written by the winners. Events following Broughton’s death took a different turn under the leadership of Frederic Barker. In many ways the future direction and shape of Australian Anglicanism unfolded in response to Barker’s episcopacy rather than Broughton’s, whose contribution was soon forgotten. To call him a failure, however, may be to overlook the lasting value of his life and work.23 Perhaps he was ahead of his time.


23 ‘It was not so much that Barker succeeded where Broughton had failed; it was rather that Barker succeeded because Broughton had failed.’ K.J. Cable, ‘The Dioceses of Sydney and Newcastle’, in
Broughton’s Background

Broughton was ‘a high churchman of the Hanoverian church/state mould,’24 associated with the influential Hackney Phalanx group of High Churchmen:25 a conservative, moderate Tory, a strong believer in the Protestant ascendancy, and an opponent of Roman Catholicism. In spite of all the strains placed upon it over the past two centuries of English life, the High Church group, Broughton included, remained committed to the principle of ‘royal supremacy’ that lay at the heart of the English Reformation settlement, with church and state regarded as ‘two inseparable aspects of one commonwealth’ under the one sovereign. ‘They still held’, writes Paul Avis, ‘to the notion of a sacral monarchy and to a belief in the divine origin of all power and authority, not only in the Church, where it was invested in the bishops in the apostolic succession, but also in the State’.26 As Broughton set sail for New South Wales, he took these assumptions with him. ‘He was a man of the ancien regime’, writes Kaye, ‘and, as such, he believed in the confessional state and the divine institution of the parts of that Christian state’.27 He fully expected to find the same English pattern in the life of the colony.28

There was always going to be a clash between Broughton’s imagined world and the realities of colonial life. Liberalism was becoming increasingly popular.29 He found himself dealing with a free and often hostile press, competition from other religious bodies, and a political climate committed to colonial self-government and egalitarianism, and thus opposed to church privilege.30 Moreover, the world that

25 For discussions of the Hackney Phalanx, see Peter Benedict Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); also Kenneth Hyolson-Smith, High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 101-120.
28 To quote Manning Clark: ‘Broughton believed passionately that the Church of England should be the established church in the colony, both as a divine instrument of truth and in recognition of her historic role in England as the vessel of catholic tradition, and as Protestant opposition to the errors and superstitions of the Roman Church.’ C.M.H. Clark, A History of Australia II: New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land 1822-1838 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1968), 191.
29 Judd and Cable, Sydney Anglicans, 11.
30 Border, Church and State, 63-79. See also George Nadel, Australia’s Colonial Culture: Ideas, Men and Institutions in Mid-Nineteenth Century Eastern Australia (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957), Chapters 1-5.
Broughton was trying to preserve was, as Manning Clark notes, completely out of touch with the interests of the native-born.31

While Broughton’s responses to changing events and the realities of colonial life were often reactionary and conservative,32 he was nevertheless able, as we will see, to adapt and to mould the church accordingly. Over time he came to appreciate how profoundly the convict era had shaped the pattern of life in the colony, and that a completely different approach to ministry was required from that prevailing back in England. As the number of dioceses in Australia increased, Broughton was anxious to convey this insight, gained from long experience, to the bishops who had only recently arrived.33 It is a fascinating journey for a Tory High Churchman to have undertaken. His commitment to Anglican faith did not diminish for a moment. He came to realise, however, that aspects of the Anglican tradition that he had previously held sacrosanct were actually no longer relevant in Australia.

The Collapse of Establishment

Broughton arrived in New South Wales in 1829 as Archdeacon, and in 1836, following a visit to England, returned as Bishop of Australia. As we have noted, his expectation at first was that the government would support the principle of establishment. He soon discovered that the partnership between church and state embodied in the principle of royal supremacy could not be assumed in the colony. The 1836 Church Act, initiated by the Governor, Sir Richard Bourke,34 was to

31 ‘There was much about the Lord Bishop to endear him to his people … In public he could be quite genial over a glass of wine. Yet the native-born eyed him as a man who did not belong in their great river of life. They loved to have a “hit” at the Lord Bishop for the stand he had taken against the liberal tendencies of his age.’ C.M.H. Clark, *A History of Australia III: The Beginning of an Australian Civilization 1824-18* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1973), 136. Geoffrey Partington notes Broughton’s anxiety as to whether ‘currency lads’ would be able or willing to accept the traditions of the English church and nation. As the years passed, however, Broughton gained more confidence in the native-born. *The Australian Nation: Its British and Irish Roots.* Rev. edn. (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1997), 43-44.
32 ‘Over the next 20 years Broughton fought a rearguard action in defence of his church, while at the same time he worked creatively to establish a new basis for its financial support and governance.’ John Hirst, ‘Broughton, William Grant’, in Davison et al., *The Oxford Companion to Australian History,* 92.
34 J.S. Gregory, *Church and State* (Melbourne: Cassell, 1973), 14, regards Bourke as, ‘of all the early Australian governors, the most farsighted and comprehensive in his statesmanship’. For a detailed discussion of Broughton’s struggles against the policies of Governor Bourke, see Shaw, *Patriarch and Patriot,* Chapters 4-7; also Border, *Church and State,* Chapter 7.
determine the future direction of Christianity in Australia.\textsuperscript{35} The Act declared denominationalism based on equality to be the only proper way of organising religious life in a society made up of so many competing interests. To quote Michael Hogan:

\begin{quote}
The Church Act of 1836 firmly established a principle which has prevailed in Australia until modern times. It can be stated quite simply: if government funds are to be available to any religious denomination, then they should be available to all on some basis of equality. The state should have no favourites on matters of religion.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

Bourke’s liberal policies were in their own way an attempt to protect the influence of Christianity in the colony by reshaping it to fit colonial circumstances.\textsuperscript{37} This meant official recognition by the state of all the major religious streams in the colony, including Roman Catholicism.\textsuperscript{38} But this was too much for Broughton, who regarded any acknowledgment of papal authority as a violation of the first principles of the English Reformation.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{35} ‘The Act was the most influential piece of ecclesiastical legislation passed in nineteenth century Australia.’ Judd and Cable, \textit{Sydney Anglicans}, 26.
\textsuperscript{37} Judd and Cable, \textit{Sydney Anglicans}, 23. Patricia Curthoys argues that the churches were in no position to function as voluntary bodies. The purpose of the Act was ‘to ensure the presence of institutional Christianity in a relatively fragile social context’. ‘State Support for Churches 1836-1860’, in Kaye, \textit{Anglicanism in Australia}, 31-32.
\textsuperscript{38} Bishop J.B. Polding’s arrival in September 1835 was an event of great significance. ‘He was’, writes Ian Breward, ‘the first officially recognised English Roman Catholic bishop since the Reformation, some time before the Roman Catholic hierarchy was restored in England and Scotland’. \textit{Australia: ‘The Most Godless Place Under Heaven’?} (Melbourne: Beacon Hill Books, 1988), 16.
\textsuperscript{39} ‘[T]he depth of Broughton’s Protestantism ought not to be underestimated. It was a Protestantism which saw Roman Catholicism not only as subversive, in the English setting, and at first also in the Australian setting, but also, and more enduringly, as a system which was fundamentally erroneous as to Christian truth’. Kaye, ‘Broughton and the Demise of the Royal Supremacy’, 51. See also K. J. Cable, ‘Religious Controversies in New South Wales in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: Aspects of Anglicanism, 1848-1850’, \textit{Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society} 49 (1) (1963): 60. For a detailed account of the development of Roman Catholicism in colonial New South Wales, including the ongoing differences between Broughton and Polding, see T.L. Suttor, \textit{Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia 1788-1870: The Formation of Australian Catholicism} (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1965).
Thus far Broughton had fought with courage and determination against the current to hold the colonial government to the principle of establishment.\(^{40}\) He was not just trying to preserve the privileges of the Church of England in the colony. More importantly he was battling to secure a central role for the Christian religion, as he saw it, within the life of civil society.\(^{41}\) The Church Act had, however, completely altered the ground rules. Hereafter Broughton changed course. In the face of ‘the unholy league between Rome’s old superstition and modern liberalism’,\(^{42}\) he determined to defend religion against the hostile forces which had been let loose in the colony. Given the collapse of state support for establishment, Broughton turned his attention to shoring up the inner integrity of Anglicanism to ensure its continuing influence in the life of the colony.\(^{43}\) He had come to New South Wales, says Shaw, ‘to serve an establishment: he remained now to serve a church’.\(^{44}\)

The Oxford Movement provided Broughton with the theological means he needed to deal with the changes brought about by the Church Act, above all the official recognition of Roman Catholicism. The Oxford Tracts derived the authority of the English church, not from its relationship with the state, but from its historical continuity with primitive Christianity. Broughton at first drew strength from this vision of the church as a divine society and of the bishops as successors to the apostles, and he put these insights to work in the colony.\(^{45}\) But he did not actually become a Tractarian.\(^{46}\) His initial response was positive because he discerned in the Tracts a clear call for the church to return to the teachings of the Reformers;\(^{47}\) they


\(^{41}\) Shaw, ibid., 103.

\(^{42}\) Shaw, *Patriarch and Patriot*, 100.

\(^{43}\) ‘They who are prepared with me to encounter the rage of the adversaries,’ said Broughton, ‘will lay the foundation here of a citadel, within the walls of which the Christian faith will find a sure refuge when all without is laid waste.’ ibid., 108.

\(^{44}\) ibid.

\(^{45}\) K.J. Cable, ‘Broughton, William Grant (1788-1853)’, in *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1968), 1, 162: ‘The Tractarians’ insistence on the spiritual autonomy of the church helped to give a sense of the basic independence of colonial Anglicanism; it was not simply the ecclesiastical department of the state.’ Also Judd and Cable, *Sydney Anglicans*, 34.


reinforced, that is, the views he already held as a High Churchman. But this meant that he also critiqued them as a High Churchman, interpreting them in the light of the Reformation. He was always ‘wary and cautious’, Shaw reminds us, about the direction of the Movement, particularly its ‘softness towards Rome’. The publication of *Tract 90* powerfully confirmed Broughton’s concerns. Thereafter he distanced himself from Tractarianism completely.

Broughton’s reaction to Tractarianism in the colony was different from that of the old High Churchmen back in England. The radical Tractarians, Newman in particular, faced with what they saw as the intrusion of the state into the affairs of the church, turned away from the Erastianism of the Reformation settlement outlined by Hooker, emphasising instead the church as a divine society independent of the state. This constituted a complete rejection of the royal supremacy. The High Churchmen, on the other hand, continued to affirm the importance of establishment, interpreting the notion of divine society in national rather than ecclesiastical terms.

Broughton, however, adopted a different stance. High Churchman though he was, he believed that the colonial context demanded a completely new response. As we have seen, Broughton recognised that the principle of establishment, so essential to the High Church position in England, was no longer possible in the colony: the government had clearly decided on a policy of denominational equality in New South Wales. Broughton protested on a number of occasions that, in placing the Roman Catholic Church on an equal footing with the Church of England, the oath of allegiance was not being observed by the crown. Rather than jettisoning the royal supremacy, however, he endeavoured to reinterpret it, ensuring that the colonial

---


50 Shaw, ibid., 209, records Broughton’s advice to Bishop Tyrrell of Newcastle in 1848: ‘So far am I from desiring an influx of what are commonly known under the name of Oxford principles, that in my opinion the less that such a man possess of them the better’.

51 Peter Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 85, writes of ‘Newman’s disenchantment not merely with what the state had done to the church since 1828 but with what she had done ever since the Reformation’. He continues: ‘Far from being a temporary abuse to which the Church of England had been occasionally subject in her history, Newman already now regarded “Erastianism” as her essential, natural condition.’ I will discuss the Oxford Movement further in Chapter 3.

52 ibid., 87-88.

church at least continued to live by it. Broughton, writes Kaye, ‘sought to transfer the terms of the theory of the Royal Supremacy into the new situation in a way that enabled him to reach striking conclusions about the nature of church government.’ The church would endeavour to uphold the Reformation settlement, even if the state had given it away.

Broughton was not, however, leading the church inwards, away from society. He continued, for example, to play a leading role in colonial government, even through these turbulent years of redefining the place of the church in colonial life. While the Oxford Tracts renewed his vision of the church, Broughton held firmly to the High Church vision of a Christian society based on natural law and a strong sense of God’s providence in the world. ‘It is the counsel and pleasure of God’, he preached in 1829, ‘to raise up here a Christian nation. The church must take seriously its role in the political and social life of the community, for it is in the life of the society, and not just the church, that the purposes of God are being worked out. In Shaw’s estimation, Broughton became ‘the archetypal political bishop not principally for the sake of the Church of England, but primarily so that the Church of England could serve colonial civil society’. He remained both patriarch and patriot.

The 1850 Bishops Conference
In 1850 Broughton called together the bishops of Tasmania, Newcastle, South Australia, Victoria and New Zealand to discuss the implications for the church of this

---

54 Kaye, ‘Broughton and the Demise of the Royal Supremacy’, 47: ‘The political side of the question was a dead letter, and he was increasingly turning his mind to the ecclesiastical and ecclesiological implication.’
56 See Kaye, ‘Bishops and Social Leadership’, 96.
57 Shaw, ‘The Promotion of Civilization’, 104-105, discusses Broughton’s contribution to three major issues: immigration, the disposal of crown lands, and the continued transportation of convicts.
58 Kaye, ‘Bishops and Social Leadership’, 99: ‘This conception of the providence of God rules both [Broughton’s] understanding of ecclesiology and his understanding of human society and history, and by that very fact provides a unity between the more strictly domestic ecclesiastical aspects of his role as bishop and his broader social involvements. It is thus that he sees no contradiction between his conclusion on the demise of the Royal Supremacy and continuing his involvement in the legislative process by chairing the Immigration Committee’.
61 Shaw, *Patriarch and Patriot*, 274, notes the words of the Chief Justice of New South Wales, Sir Alfred Stephen, shortly after Broughton’s death: ‘There was not one great object for the promotion of civilisation and special advancement in the colony with which he was not connected; there was not one effort to raise its name in the estimation of the world with which his name was not identified … if ever there was a patriot, in the best and highest sense of the word, that patriot, in the colony of New South Wales, was Bishop Broughton’.
fundamental change in church-state relations. For Broughton, the question was whether the Church of England in the colony had the authority to act independently, governing itself without reference to the state.

He wanted the colony to see the bishops of the Church of England assemble, consult, and issue guidance acting on their spiritual authority alone, and give lie to the oft-repeated papist quip that the bishops of the Church of England had no authority but that derived from the crown. Broughton hoped the bishops would agree to a future synod, and that Gladstone would in the meantime introduce legislation into the House of Commons freeing colonial churches to fashion their own forms of self-government. Such colonial synods would then be seen as originating in the will and authority of the local episcopate which first summoned them, and not in the crown.

The bishops differed amongst themselves about the extent to which the royal supremacy still applied in the colony. Broughton took the view that, since it was the crown that had violated the Reformation Settlement, the church was now free to exercise its own authority independent of the crown. Lay involvement in the church was focussed in the crown. The church was now free to absorb this lay aspect of church government into itself, establishing a synodical form of government that included both clergy and laity. To quote Ross Border:

Bishop Broughton believed that the substance of the Royal Supremacy lay in its being the expression of the will of the laity, and that once this substance ceased to be effective it was necessary to dispense with the mode by which the will of the laity had been expressed and to replace it with a more practical form.

The bishops agreed on the establishment of both diocesan and provincial synods and the involvement of both clergy and laity in the government of the church. Broughton saw this as consistent with the meaning of the royal supremacy, though adapted to

---


63 Shaw, ibid., 234-235.

64 ibid., 235: ‘He understood the crown’s prohibition on the church’s free exercise of power to be conditional upon the crown’s sustaining the privileges of the Church of England, and when the crown lapsed in the one the church was freed from the other.’

65 Border, *Church and State*, 239; also Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church*, 128.
colonial circumstances. In so doing, Shaw argues, Broughton was demonstrating an innate awareness of ‘the nascent Australian middle-class’, providing them with a form of church government to which they could now readily contribute.

What of the relationship between diocese and province? In terms of the subsequent development of Anglicanism in Australia, this is a critical issue. Broughton held the view that the fundamental unit of church government was the province, not the diocese, a perspective consistent with his High Church understanding of the role of a national church. This sense of the nation was to be sustained by the church even if the state itself no longer subscribed to the vision. He was opposed to diocesan separatism, arguing that only a united approach within a geographical region could address fundamental issues in the life of the church. The unity of the church was a fundamental church principle which, he believed, upheld the central tenets of the English Reformation.

Broughton and Bishop Perry of Melbourne clashed on this issue during the 1850 conference. As Shaw has noted, ‘Perry did not share Broughton’s belief that the subdivision of the Diocese of Australia was a challenge to united action but embraced it as an opportunity for diversity’. Broughton wanted the dioceses to have identical constitutions under the overall control of the province of Australasia. History, of course, was on Perry’s side, and even Bishop Tyrrell of Newcastle, one of Broughton’s allies, considered his vision to be unrealistic. Tyrrell convinced Broughton to settle instead for a province of New South Wales, uniting the Dioceses of Sydney and Newcastle. This was in 1852, not long before Broughton’s death.

---

66 Border, ibid., 240; also Shaw, Patriarch and Patriot, 251.
70 Shaw, Patriarch and Patriot, 230.
71 Judd and Cable, Sydney Anglicans, 56.
72 Shaw, Patriarch and Patriot, 252-253: ‘Apart from Melbourne’s ‘wish for isolation’ and Perry’s refusal to allow another bishop to represent him in negotiations with the Colonial Office, Tyrrell persuaded Broughton the project had been visionary from the start given the diversity of their diocesan predicaments. No single constitution could suit New Zealand’s native mission, Tasmania’s extensive convict population, a colony of free settlers like South Australia, or two dioceses such as Sydney and Adelaide where one claimed and another opposed state aid’. See also Kaye, ‘The Strange Emergence of Australian Synods’, 178.
73 Shaw, ibid., 253.
The unfolding of subsequent events under Bishop Barker meant that even Tyrrell’s compromise proposal was never realised.

Broughton’s provincial vision had emerged out of his years of soul-searching over the validity of the royal supremacy. He was clearly prepared to take a more radical position than his fellow bishops. As we have seen, he did so because circumstances in Australia demanded it. ‘Broughton thought the colonial issue distinct from the English,’ writes Shaw.\(^74\) He consequently believed that provincial synods should be autonomous, rather than under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and English ecclesiastical courts. Following the 1850 conference, the Diocese of Melbourne, under Perry’s leadership, took legislative steps to ensure that the Canterbury connection was maintained. Broughton was bitterly disappointed with Perry, who, he felt, was mistaken in his ‘blind affection for the worn-out arrangements of a fading era of royal supremacy’.\(^75\)

Broughton had become increasingly aware that the English church and the colonial church must, if necessary, take different paths while subscribing to the same tradition. The notion of royal supremacy was not to be held to rigidly, nor was it to be rejected, but must be translated in a way that worked for the good of the church. In this sense he was also arguing that Anglicanism was larger than any one of its cultural expressions.\(^76\) This accounts for Broughton’s developing vision of a worldwide Anglican Communion made up of separate provinces. To quote Kaye:

It is not surprising that Broughton envisaged the development of an Anglican communion which would comprehend all the colonial churches and be a testimony to the true faith of Christ as expressed in the Church of England. This reveals not only a whole hearted commitment to the Church of England, its doctrines and its forms, but also a visionary flexibility which accepted and looked towards a diversity of Anglican expression in different parts of the world.\(^77\)

Broughton’s dream of a worldwide ‘federal union’ of colonial dioceses, or ‘an even grander union of all episcopal churches in America, Scotland, Britain and the

\(^74\) ibid., 264.
\(^75\) ibid., 251.
\(^76\) As Kaye comments, ‘The Role of Tradition’, 231: ‘The tradition in English church life is not to be confused with the Christian tradition which Anglicanism represents’.
\(^77\) ibid., 230; also Shaw, The Promotion of Civilization’, 107-108.
colonies’78 emerged from his struggles with the Australian situation. It was in the forefront of his mind on his final visit to England in 1853. Shortly before he died, he presided over an inaugural meeting of colonial bishops in London to explore together the fundamental principles that would govern such a worldwide body.79 Interestingly, when the first Lambeth Conference took place in 1868, Bishop Barker, Broughton’s successor as Bishop of Sydney and Metropolitan of Australia, declined to attend, ‘disapproving of its implications of separation from the Crown’.80

A Lasting Legacy
Broughton remains uniquely placed to make a contribution to present debates about the life of the national church. His credentials speak for themselves. He was, after all, the pioneering bishop of the Australian church, the first and only Bishop of Australia, Metropolitan of the Province of Australasia, the architect of the first bishop’s meeting in 1850, and a leader and visionary thinker in the process leading up to the formation of the worldwide Anglican Communion.

As already noted, Broughton’s life and work predate later divisions. The restructuring of the Australian church into a number of separate dioceses happened quite late in his episcopate, long after he first began struggling with the problem of translating Anglicanism to the whole diocese of Australia. Even then, however, he saw the diocesan units as parts of the whole. It is perhaps understandable that his fellow bishops, who had arrived on the scene later, should have felt little enthusiasm for a ‘broad-based Anglicanism’ that viewed the province, rather than the diocese, as the primary unit of authority.81

Broughton was faced with the difficult task of drawing together the first threads of a national church. He was especially sensitive to the realities of transporting the Church of England from English shores to the colony of New South Wales.82 As Kaye says, Broughton ‘shows himself to be very much a colonial bishop without nostalgia for the old country, focussed on New South Wales, rather than pursuing his

79 ibid., 271.
80 Judd and Cable, *Sydney Anglicans*, 86; also Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church*, 163.
81 Judd and Cable, ibid., 56.
82 In 1850, Broughton spoke of the need to ‘bear in mind the impediments which must attend the transplantation of an ancient system to a new soil’. See Daw, ‘Church and State in the Empire’, 252.
episcopal vocation as an expatriate Englishman’. At the end of his career, Broughton would not have been daunted by the notion, so essential to the future of the worldwide Anglican Communion, that Anglicanism, through the process of adaptation to a variety of cultural contexts, transcends its own English origins.

This is not to say that Broughton had become in any sense ‘Australian’. In keeping with his time, he remained very much an Englishman. Nevertheless, as Shaw argues, he was profoundly committed to the future of the colony, and fought to ensure that the Church of England would continue to serve colonial society. In this he stands as one of the ‘founding fathers’ of Australia, in spite of the bad press he has subsequently received at the hands of historians and other interpreters of Australian life.

An ecumenical age will necessarily regard Broughton’s view of Roman Catholicism as the weak link in his position. As Kaye argues, while Broughton showed remarkable flexibility in adapting, rather than discarding, the notion of royal supremacy, he ‘could less easily come to terms with … the plurality of religions in…'

84 As Cable says: ‘[T]he conservative character of religion in general, and of Anglicanism in particular, made a conscious adaptation to the demands of the new land difficult to achieve. It would happen, not infrequently, that experiments in Australian churchmanship could be made only in terms of those in the home countries … This shift in emphasis was never quite understood by local churchmen; they appreciated only imperfectly that they were discussing colonial questions with a vocabulary fashioned for use in Great Britain’. K. J. Cable, ‘Protestant Problems in New South Wales in the Mid-Nineteenth Century’, Journal of Religious History 3 (2) (December 1964): 131.
85 Shaw, The Promotion of Civilization’, 104. Earlier, Shaw comments (101): ‘Broughton wanted all the new bishops to understand this and to act together to secure the Church of England a formative place in the evolution of Australian colonial civil society. He wanted them to understand their opportunity, to comprehend their problem, and to behave as bishops in Australia’.
86 ‘Broughton’s reputation remained firm and high throughout his century. But the twentieth century eclipsed it. The Australian church did not warm to his vision, paid trifling respect to local talent and embraced diocesan independence rather than provincial autonomy. The Australian state prized the liberalism Broughton despised and could not imagine that it owed him anything. The Australian community – civil society in its broadest form – promoted itself as longing for non-sectarianism and as almost being there, and had of necessity to dismiss Broughton as too zealous for the Church of England and therefore as essentially un-Australian. But the twentieth century has ignored that great matter of state which preoccupied those who laid Australia’s foundations: How to turn a settlement of convicts into a self-regulatory, self-governing civil society. Broughton contributed more lastingly to that great matter than he did to Anglican ambitions for colonial domination; and to the extent that Australia today, and Australian life today, is rooted in the judeo-christian tradition, and draws much of its harmony from being so, Broughton is to be reckoned among the true founders of Australia’. ibid., 108.
87 Kaye, ‘Bishops and Social Leadership’, 99: ‘[Broughton] is so committed to the distinctive qualities of his own Anglicanism and the positive effects which he sees that tradition having upon the welfare of society at large, that he does not readily join in any ecumenical liaisons’.
society and in particular a plurality of Episcopal churches in the same state’. 88 This aspect of royal supremacy remained, for Broughton, non-negotiable; there were limits to his flexibility. This, however, is not to deny his extraordinary achievement. Within his own place and time, he pushed the boundaries as far as he could, adapting the tradition he had brought from England to its new Australian context.

**E. H. BURGMANN**

The election of Ernest Burgmann as Bishop of Goulburn in 1934 was ‘something of a sea change from the usual English episcopal candidates in Australia’. 89 Burgmann was one of several Australian-born bishops appointed to positions of leadership during this period who ‘relished their British heritage, but possessed pride in country and a closer affinity with Australia than was true of many of their English fellows’. 90 In keeping with his time, he remained loyal to the monarchy and valued Australia's English heritage. 91 At the same time he was strongly attracted to the Australian radical nationalist tradition, with its emphasis on mateship and the bush, 92 and firmly believed that Anglicanism in Australia must become a truly indigenous church.

**The Formative Years**

Burgmann’s rural beginnings in northern New South Wales profoundly shaped his world-view. His 1944 autobiographical work, *The Education of an Australian*, which was widely read at the time, tells the story of his early years: his life on the land, his education, and his love of the Australian bush. 93 He carried all this with him as he embarked on his long career as priest, educator, author, social critic and bishop. He was ordained priest in 1912, and worked in a number of rural parishes before becoming Warden of St. John's Theological College, Armidale, in 1918.

---

88 Kaye, ‘Richard Hooker and Australian Anglicanism’, 244.
91 Tom Frame, ‘Local Differences’, 117-118.
Burgmann encouraged open debate on a wide range of issues. The syllabus expanded to include lectures on science, literature, economics, psychology and anthropology. Burgmann was delving deeply into the ‘new psychology’, linking the insights of Freud with traditional theological and pastoral disciplines. He also began teaching for the Workers' Education Association (WEA). His first course was on ‘Social Problems’, starting with the industrial revolution, and including the history of trade unions, socialist economics, class warfare and the value of national guild organisations. In later years his speeches and writings on issues of social policy would reach a much wider audience.

In 1925 St. John's College was relocated to Morpeth, outside Newcastle. Here Burgmann developed a reputation as a radical social reformer, writing and speaking out forcefully on behalf of the unemployed and the homeless in the Hunter Valley during the Great Depression. WEA lectures continued, and the publication of the Morpeth Review, in partnership with his colleagues Roy Lee and A.P. Elkin, provided a forum for Burgmann's views on Australia’s social and political problems, combining a religious world view with a passionate commitment to ‘a free and virile democracy’. Some claimed that the Morpeth Review was too theoretical, and that Burgmann himself was more of a visionary than a practical reformer. There is justification in such criticisms, especially when Burgmann’s philosophical perspective, combining Platonic mysticism and evolutionism, is considered: ‘the belief that human beings, both individually and collectively, should develop naturally and harmoniously towards a more religious appreciation of the world’, uniting the whole of humanity in a common brotherhood. On the other hand, his intellectual assumptions were very much in keeping with the expectations of his generation.

The model of reality which impelled … Burgmann, belongs to an age more accepting of the power of the transcendent. The ability of education to spark change, and the ultimate efficacy of divine grace working through prophetic personalities were realistic instruments for reform in the belief system of Christian intellectuals.

96 Melleuish, ibid., 137-140.
97 Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest, 135.
Burgmann’s theologically motivated social vision is, in fact, reminiscent of both the Christian mystical tradition and the early Christian Socialism of F.D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley. – a powerful combination by any standards, and certainly worthy of reconsideration in the present.

The Bush Bishop

In 1934 Burgmann was elected bishop of the diocese of Goulburn. Whether the prophetic radicalism in Burgmann was diluted by the appointment is an open question. During his time at Morpeth, Burgmann had been a strong critic of the churches. In accepting the role of diocesan bishop, he now found himself in a position of leadership and authority within the institutional church. In any case he hit the ground running. On the eve of his enthronement, Burgmann preached on ‘the worship of a nation’. He noted that Australia was ‘no longer a colony of exiles from Great Britain’, and called the church to embrace its national vocation:

Her mission is not a sectarian one, but a national one. If the Church of England is true to her origin and destiny she must have a sense of history and of national responsibility. She must feel that the making of an Australian nation is her special task. She must stand for the soul of that nation-in-the-making, she must ever sensitise its conscience, she must be its spirit in the process of incarnation. Because of this she must have a freedom, a toleration, a charity, that raises her above the denominational mind. She must become a focus where the best religious forces of the nation can meet and find articulation and expression.

Burgmann repeated this theme at an early clergy conference, pushing the sights of the clergy beyond parochial issues to the national and international stage. Hempenstall comments:

He talked to them critically about the thoughtlessness of Australians, their indifference to art, philosophy and education, their lack of religious seriousness. He let them in on one of his dreams: a church with an

---

Australian temperament, striking a distinctive note for the formation of national character, seeing the country in her strategic position in the alignment of the nations of the world, forming the soul and providing the energy ‘for the creation of a national culture, a culture that will create those insights which will make Australia a great beacon light of Christian civilisation in these Southern Seas’.  

Issues of church and society remained at the forefront of his agenda. During the 1930s he was, according to Hempenstall, the ‘critical maverick’ on the bishop’s bench. He was frustrated by the narrowness of the concerns of his fellow bishops and the lack of debate about the future of Australian society. For Burgmann, religion, politics and society were all integrally related. Whether in sermons, monthly letters, or on the ABC, Burgmann would speak about practical issues affecting ordinary Australians. As the bush bishop, he spoke about soil erosion, water resources and bushfire control, never for a moment doubting their religious significance. But while he affirmed things Australian, he was not nationalistic in a narrow sense. He was always searching for ways for Australia to contribute to the development of nations beyond Australian shores.

Burgmann's internationalism was a major theme of his 1942 Moorhouse lectures, published as *The Regeneration of Civilization*. Church and state must work together, he argued, to keep in balance the dual aspects of the human personality, spirit and reason. The churches must take seriously the work of healing required within the family of nations, providing a vision of hope as well as ideals which

---

102 ibid., 186: ‘He refused to identify himself with any “party” and would not join their occasional pogroms against influential citizens they saw as threats to institutional religion, like John Anderson at Sydney University. Nevertheless he repeatedly prodded his brother bishops to join together as a team to go back to first principles in working out a proper, modern relationship between church and society. Few joined him in his sympathies and causes. He was tolerated in a church noted for its latitudinarianism’.
103 ibid., 191: ‘He saw the world in sacramental terms. His every intervention made clear that social and economic reform helped to build the Kingdom of God on earth’.
104 ‘The Christian may love the land of his birth or of his adoption, but only in so far as he learns to love and respect the lands of other folk as well’. ibid., 206-207.
105 Engel, *Christians in Australia*, 110-111.
107 See especially Burgmann’s discussion of the roles of church and state, ibid., 55-74.
would stretch the nation beyond itself. He foreshadowed the formation of a United Nations organisation which, by laying the foundations of an international law, would hold in tension the competing forces present in human nature. Burgmann threw himself into the debate about post-war reconstruction, arguing on moral grounds for a just and fair society, with employment for all. Then, in 1944, as Australia faced its greatest challenges of World War II, Burgmann issued his autobiographical work, *The Education of an Australian.* In Hempenstall’s words:

*The Education* is the ‘bush legend’ writ large in the life of Australia’s ‘bush bishop’. The spirit of the driving narrative line is that of the 1890s and of Lawson and Furphy … *The Education of an Australian* celebrates the bush as the place of a truer, straighter way of life than the cities. Not many Australians shared his view that the bush was ‘one vast sacrament continually’, but, written as it was in 1944, as the European war was entering its last phase and the war against Japan inched doggedly towards the home islands, it struck a tribal chord across the country in recalling the ways Australians believed they held in common.

The book, as Hempenstall suggests, places Burgmann within the radical nationalist tradition of Australian literature, in fact preceding Russel Ward's *The Australian Legend* and Vance Palmer's *The Legend of the Nineties* by some years. But whereas Palmer’s vision of Australia was enclosed and self-sufficient, Burgmann’s was open to the family of nations. The greatness of a nation lay in its service to the world, not in its own self-possession. Hempenstall calls Burgmann ‘a religious nationalist’, whose nation-state ‘was a moral entity, essentially of God,
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108 ibid., 118-119. ‘The church’, Burgmann argued in a lecture in 1941, ‘must get ahead of the world and show the way along which man must go. This means that the church should be the school in which prophetic souls are informed and released to inspire the art, literature and culture of each emerging age and hold them up as the light by which man’s pilgrim steps may be guided into new and better ways’. Quoted by Hempenstall, *The Meddlesome Priest* 221.

109 ibid., 107-108. Melleuish, *Cultural Liberalism*, 147, notes that ‘Burgmann looked to a brotherhood of man, an international democratic and co-operative order … he seems to have desired an international order which reflected the spiritual and religious attainments of the mature individual’.


111 ibid., 235.


113 Melleuish, *The Packaging of Australia*, 23: ‘The ideal was, as Vance Palmer expressed it, a self-enclosed democracy seeking to pursue its vision of justice free from the rest of the world’.

114 ‘If, then, we set out to cultivate a strong Australian sentiment, a love of our native land, we do it as a relative thing. We recognize the right to existence of other countries, and we learn to respect them. We see them all as part of the great family of nations, the family of God’. Burgmann, *The Education of an Australian*, 125.

an organism for the remaking of the people and the world’.\textsuperscript{116} He also distinguishes between Burgmann's theology of the nation-state and the view of the ‘Godly nation’ espoused by ‘conservative civic Protestantism, with its fervour for the British Empire and church, its devotion to duty, and its accent on civic discipline’.\textsuperscript{117}

Rather than blessing the status quo, Burgmann's perspectives pushed at the boundaries, calling the nation to look outwards, especially to Asia and the Pacific. He challenged the White Australia policy, arguing for reciprocal trade and the establishment of chairs in Asian and Pacific studies in the universities.\textsuperscript{118} He was especially concerned with the way Anglicanism in Australia continued to hold on to an old world, instead of becoming an indigenous Australian church.\textsuperscript{119} The text of his 1937 address to synod is a kind of Australian manifesto: a call to belong to the land, to build a nation of fairness and justice in a family of nations, to let go of England and to become an Australian church.\textsuperscript{120} In response, the very English Francis de Witt Batty, Bishop of Newcastle, took Burgmann to task for his overt nationalism. Burgmann’s response included the following words:

\begin{quote}
You belong to a people nationally mature. I do not. I feel the pressure of your English tradition. I have great respect and admiration for it. I have learned almost all I may know from it. But I feel another pressure and it has been on me from the beginning of my life. It is the pressure of a new land, calling for fresh responses, and new formations of character and soul … What I feel is that we should encourage and seek Australian leadership for the sake of making an Australian Church and nation … The Church of England in Australia must become far more Australian in temper or it will fail to hold the rising generation.\textsuperscript{121}
\end{quote}

In practical terms, Burgmann argued, the church should celebrate Australian festivals and symbols, build Australian buildings, sing Australian songs and develop an

\textsuperscript{116} ibid., 251. See also Hempenstall, 'The Bush Legend', 570: ‘[H]is commitment to a new international order of political and economic co-operation (which led to allegations that he was a communist) could sit easily with a fervent nationalism of the kind made manifest in The Education of an Australian’.


\textsuperscript{118} Hempenstall, ibid., 252-253; also Burgmann, The Education of an Australian, 127-132.

\textsuperscript{119} Hempenstall, ibid., 254.

\textsuperscript{120} ibid., 256-259.

\textsuperscript{121} ibid., 259.
Australian constitution. As Peter Hollingworth has noted, Burgmann’s self-appointed task was ‘to decolonise the Australian church’. 

Burgmann sought, writes Hempenstall, ‘to link church and nation in a common and cooperative search for greatness’. He dreamed of a national Anglican centre where all the ideas about which he felt so passionately could be explored in depth. Anglicanism, Canberra and St Mark's Library were all an integral part of his vision for Australia. The library became one of Burgmann’s major preoccupations in his last years as Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn. Situated at the heart of the national capital, it would be a major catalyst for developing an Australian Anglican church.

Our scholars must be thoroughly Australian, able to express their knowledge in the Australian idiom, naturally and easily. I do not want to give the impression that I am in any sense anti-English. I have been described as more English than the English, and in the context I have not resented it. But I want the great things of abiding value in the English tradition thoroughly baptised into the Australian scene, blown through by Australian winds, and even coated now and then with Australian dust.

Burgmann’s passion for an Australian Anglicanism reflected, however, a somewhat lesser concern for ecumenism. Not that he was anti-ecumenical; he was just extremely pro-Anglican. He believed that the Anglican Church had a special responsibility to lead an Australian church, especially from the centre of national life. This is one of many paradoxes in Burgmann's armoury of ideas. He was not
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122 ibid., 254.
123 Peter Hollingworth, ‘Foreword’, in Hempenstall, ibid., iii. Cf. Hempenstall, ‘The Bush Legend’, 572: ‘His nationalism was partly a kind of anti-colonial protest against the long tradition of colonisation by the Anglican Church in Australia’.
128 Bishop’s address to Synod, 1953. Quoted by Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest, 314.
129 ‘There was never any suggestion that St Mark’s would become an ecumenical venture. Burgmann believed that the nation should deal with Anglicans as a distinct ecclesiastical body rather than as one manifestation of Protestantism’. Frame, A Church for a Nation, 250.
130 ‘[I]n his thinking and building, he simply postulated Anglican leadership. This annoyed some of his Presbyterian and Methodist friends and ecumenical colleagues’. Engel, Christians in Australia, 110; also Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest, 297.
131 Hempenstall, ibid., 296.
sectarian, by any means, but nevertheless wanted everyone to be Anglican, ‘for he saw in Anglicanism a broad, reformed Catholicism which served the pursuit of Truth with grace, reason and tolerance’. In fact, he regarded Anglicanism as better suited than Roman Catholicism to the task of being the true Catholic Church for Australia. It is interesting to note that, a century after Broughton's death, Burgmann also struggled with issues of Anglican identity in a religiously pluralistic society. He had little interest in church-focussed ecumenism or church union. His ecumenical spirit came to life, however, whenever the churches sought to engage in issues affecting the wider society.

A Great Patriot

We have already noted Burgmann's passionate sense of Australian nationalism, as well as his equally passionate internationalism. There is a difference, Melleuish argues, between healthy and unhealthy nationalism. Burgmann’s was of the former kind: comfortably Australian, yet taking its place in the world community of nations. His life-long struggle for social and political equality for all was a reflection of his belief in the Kingdom of God. It was a spiritual vision of human life which reached beyond national borders to embrace the whole of humanity.

In a lecture entitled The Church's Encounter with Civilization, delivered in London in 1948 just prior to the Lambeth Conference, Burgmann spoke about the possibilities of newly created organisations like the United Nations and the World Council of Churches. He reiterated his belief that the church was called to build bridges across the ever-increasing chasms separating human beings. Later in the same year Burgmann attended the first general assembly of the WCC in Amsterdam, and then joined six other advisers on the Australian delegation at the

133 Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest, 291-298.
134 Engel, Christians in Australia, 109-110. Bishop John Moyes held similar views on the value of different churches working together on ‘the big problems that concern human life and welfare’. See, for example, Moyes, The Challenge to the Church Today, 10.
137 Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest, 277.
138 Bishop Moyes was also at the Amsterdam WCC Assembly in 1948, and again at Evanston in 1954. He had also been a delegate to the Princeton Round Table of Christian Leaders in 1943, which discussed not only ecumenical issues but the future world order and the need for a just and durable
Paris meeting of the UN General Assembly. It was an extraordinary pilgrimage, symbolising the complexity of his vision of God and humanity. It is surprising, perhaps, though not inappropriate that, upon his arrival home, Bishop Batty described him as ‘a great Australian patriot’. Burgmann accepted the compliment with grace, though he had long been aware of the dangers of a narrow patriotism.

Years before, during his first sermon as bishop, Burgmann spoke about ‘the worship of a nation’. Anglicanism, he said, had a special role to play in the making of the ‘soul’ of Australia. He returned to this theme again and again throughout his episcopacy. As we have seen, Burgmann’s vision of an Anglican church passionately committed to the life of the Australian nation had certainly not been taken up in 1962 when agreement was reached on a national constitution. Other agendas dominated the General Synod debates during those decades. Burgmann was more than aware of the difficulty of overcoming factionalism. A ‘national Anglican Church’, he wrote in 1960, is ‘still in the dream stage’, and will remain so ‘even when the proposed Constitution does take effect’. He then put forward this challenge, which remains relevant in the present:

Anglicanism in Australia is without statesmanlike leadership, it is confused doctrinally, it is bewildered as to ways and means for forward movement. It can no longer look to England confidently for anything except literature, and it fears an Americanization which it has not the power to resist. Australian Anglicanism is at the crossroads. It is fighting for possession of its own soul … It has remained too long with the colonial mentality and now the inadequacy of that mentality leaves it enfeebled when the struggle is most intense.


Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest, 279-284.

ibid., 285.

ibid., 206-207.

See above, n.81.

CONCLUSION

In many ways Anglicanism in Australia has reached an impasse, the product of a history of doctrinal rivalry and diocesan separatism. This is unlikely to change — unless, that is, a serious case can be made for a shift in direction, some unifying vision of a national church with a national vocation. Bishop Broughton presented such a case a century and a half ago. His determined defence of the inner integrity of the church was matched by his commitment to the church’s vocation within the life of the nation. His provincial vision flowed out of this commitment, leading, in turn, to his dream of a culturally diverse worldwide Anglican Communion.

This was a remarkable achievement. As Kaye notes, the issues which unfolded for over a century in England were confronted in a concentrated form in Australia between 1829 and 1843. Broughton found himself faced with the complete collapse of establishment. There was a need to adapt. Broughton turned his mind towards the problem of how to sustain Anglican faith in the colonies – not just in Australia, but throughout the world. His own disposition was to search for an alternative to both Evangelicalism and Tractarianism, both of which, in their different ways, responded to the crisis in church and society by going inwards, emphasising personal piety at the expense of public faith. Broughton tried, Kaye writes, ‘to maintain the broader epistemological base of the high church tradition and consequently a conception of the church which was porous in its social boundaries’. The same could be said of Burgmann a century later.

Like Broughton, Burgmann was acutely aware that the Australian context is a formative factor in defining what it means to be Anglican in Australia. His bush background profoundly shaped his life and thought, connecting him with the radical nationalists during a period when things British were still of major importance to the majority of Australians, including Burgmann himself. His theological vision, however, was too broad to countenance an inward-looking, self-serving patriotism. Like Broughton, Burgmann was able to combine a united vision of Australia with a vision of humanity. His passion for a world of justice and equality was shaped both

144 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 24.
145 ibid., 41.
146 ibid., 24.
147 ibid., 164.
by his experiences of human suffering and ‘an incarnational theology consistent with the early Fathers’.\textsuperscript{148} According to Bill Lawton, he stands out as a prophet and a theological pioneer.\textsuperscript{149}

It would, as we have seen, be easy to dismiss Broughton as a failure in the light of later developments, just as Burgmann’s prophetic radicalism could be neutralised by being labelled as ‘unique’ or ‘eccentric’.\textsuperscript{150} But to do so would be a mistake. Both men staked their lives on the vision of a church committed to the life of the nation. This vision was neither a fabrication nor simply the product of cultural adaptation; it was part of the very fabric of the Anglican tradition. It emerged, that is to say, from within Anglicanism itself. The fact that neither Broughton nor Burgmann have been seen as part of the mainstream of Australian Anglicanism may not necessarily be a sound reason for rejecting their insights. Perhaps Australian Anglicanism, through ignorance of its own history, has overlooked something of crucial importance for its future, something intrinsic to the very essence of the Anglican tradition, thereby failing to embrace the radical implications of being a ‘particular or national church’.

As we have already seen, diocesan independence has been adopted as a foundational Anglican principle by the Australian church, in spite of Article 34 and centuries of Anglican experience. This has led to fragmentation rather than national unity, and it inhibits the Anglican Church of Australia from embracing its vocation as a church for the nation. A reconsideration of the Anglican tradition is in order. To this I will now turn.

As Broughton did at the end of his life, I wish now to return to England, where it all began, searching for the relationship between church and nation in the English church. I will first, in Chapter 3, attempt a survey of the subtle changes in the meaning of the term \textit{Ecclesia Anglicana} from the Reformation in the sixteenth century to the dramatic departure of Newman for Rome in the mid-nineteenth century. A complete reversal of the relationship between church and nation takes

\textsuperscript{148} Bill Lawton, ‘Australian Anglican Theology’, 185.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 178.
\textsuperscript{150} Hogan, \textit{The Sectarian Strand}, 221. Frame, \textit{A Church for a Nation}, 179, disagrees: ‘Burgmann was different but not unique’. Cf. Hempenstall, ‘An Anglican Strategy’, 9: ‘Burgmann was always regarded as a bit of a maverick in an Anglican church which, from the outside, seemed too often to be the comfortable Anglo-Saxon middle classes at worship. Burgmann’s fellow bishops tended to see him as a stirrer who intruded too often into affairs of state’.
place during this period – a movement from interdependence, we might say, towards independence. There were other voices, however, who continued, against the current,\textsuperscript{151} to wrestle with the importance of the church’s national vocation – members of the old High Church, as well as Broad Church thinkers like F.D. Maurice and William Temple in England and the American Episcopalian, William Reed Huntington. I will, in Chapter 4, pay particular attention to this latter group, who stand quite clearly within the mainstream ‘church in society’ tradition of Anglican thought identified by Bruce Kaye. I will also include Kaye in this discussion. It will become clear that Broughton and Burgmann do not stand alone, but are part of a long tradition. Anglicanism has the life of the nation at heart. To turn inwards, placing its own life before its vocation as a church for the nation, is tantamount, in a sense, to renouncing its own birthright.

\textsuperscript{151} Kaye, \textit{A Church Without Walls}, 24, notes their ‘contrary tendencies’.
PART 2  THE NATIONAL IDEA IN ANGLICANISM

CHAPTER 3  THE CHANGING FACE OF

ECCLESIA ANGLICANA

The central claim of this study is that the Anglican Church of Australia will only be true to itself when it accepts its vocation as a church for the nation. The factionalism and polarisation so characteristic of Australian Anglicanism, I have suggested, are not just an expression of internal doctrinal differences, but disclose a missing unitive factor: a strong sense of national purpose. On this view comprehensiveness, seen by many as a central ingredient of the Anglican ethos, is profoundly contextual and not just doctrinal; the roots of Anglicanism reach both backwards in time and outwards in space. This means that the Anglican Church of Australia must identify with its spiritual and cultural heritage as well as its present location if it is to discover and to live out its distinct calling as a church that is both Anglican and Australian.

In Part 2 of this study I will explore the interplay between church and nation in Anglicanism, beginning with the English experience. This is especially relevant for Anglicanism in Australia, which, as already noted, has shown an extraordinary preoccupation with its English roots. So then, let us do the same, travelling backwards and across the seas to the roots of Australian Anglicanism, in keeping with the words of Bishop Stephen Neill. ‘In the Anglican Communion’, he wrote, ‘so much of the past still lives on into the present, that the present can be understood only in the light of the past’. ¹ To understand Australian Anglicanism, whether theologically or culturally, we must start with the English church. If it can be shown

that the relationship between church and nation has been central to the Anglican ethos from the beginning, part of our English roots, it will be hard to justify the continuance of an Australian Anglican ethos which holds the nation at arm’s length.

Is a sense of national purpose central to the Anglican ethos? The answer to this question will require careful exploration. Church and state were clearly interdependent in the England of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I. Subsequent events, however, placed unbearable strains on the principles embodied in the Henrician and Elizabethan settlements. The notion of establishment became hard to sustain in an increasingly diverse society and is still hotly debated in the Church of England to this day. The issue I wish to discuss, however, is not that of establishment. Like Bishop Broughton, I am willing to surrender it to the dustbin of history. But breaking the links between church and state implicit in the principle of establishment is not the same as severing ties between church and nation. The former is an institutional question; the latter has to do with the life-world of a place and a people. These overlap, of course, as we will see: issues of church and state remain even when establishment disappears, since the church is part of a political society and must live with the resultant tensions present within national life. It must take the nation seriously, with or without establishment. My intention in Part 2 is to demonstrate that the national idea is central to the Anglican imagination even where the official state connection no longer exists, as is the case in all parts of the Anglican Communion outside England. I will begin the exploration within England and then move outwards in subsequent chapters to discuss Anglicanism as a global Communion of which the Australian church is a part.

This chapter will survey changes that have taken place in the understanding of Ecclesia Anglicana. I will pay particular attention to the relationship between church and state, noting the gradual crumbling of the Elizabethan Settlement during the two centuries following the Restoration in 1660. John Henry Newman’s departure for Rome in the 1840s was perhaps the most dramatic rejection of this profoundly Erastian (as he saw it) arrangement. Newman’s action was not just the product of immediate political events, but reflected a firm belief in the church’s inner integrity independent of the state, based on its apostolicity. Even so, as the next chapter will demonstrate, the Oxford Movement did not necessarily have the last word in the
matter. The question of the church’s national vocation would survive the dramatic
events of the first half of the nineteenth century. Thinkers like F.D. Maurice in
England and William Reed Huntington in America would continue to pose questions
about the role of the church in the life of the nation. Bruce Kaye, writing within the
Australian context, takes a similar stance, arguing that Anglicanism is essentially a
‘church in society’ tradition.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

It is worth bearing in mind that the English church predates the English Reformation.
After the Council of Whitby (664), the English church was simply the Roman church
in England. This was the sense of the phrase Ecclesia Anglicana as described in
Magna Carta (1215) – the local expression of the universal church in England. There were ‘at this time no nationalistic or even necessarily patriotic connotations’, writes Avis. ‘It simply referred to a geographical entity (sometimes including
Wales), the provinces of the western Church situated in England’. The actual
statement in Magna Carta was Quod Anglicana ecclesia libera sit (‘that the English
church shall be free’). Interestingly, the document was seeking to protect the church
from the king, and not the pope. The English Reformation brought about a reversal
of these roles, and in so doing produced a dramatic change in the way Ecclesia
Anglicana was understood.

Did a new church come into being in sixteenth century England? Put differently, ‘did
a “Church of England” replace a “Church in England” at the time of the
Reformation?’ The rupture with Rome was clearly a defining moment in the history
of the English church and nation. The declaration, in the preamble to the Act in
Restraint of Appeals (1532), that ‘this realm of England is an empire … governed by
one supreme head and king’ ushered in a new era in English history. The king’s
sovereignty henceforth incorporated both temporal and spiritual matters. This
principle was enshrined in the Act of Supremacy (1534), which declared the king to
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3 Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’ 460.
Sykes et al., *The Study of Anglicanism*, 479.
5 Henry Bettenson (ed.), *Documents of the Christian Church* (London: Oxford University Press,
be supreme head of the Church of England. With the English Reformation, therefore, the Church of England became an independent national church.\(^6\)

Yet the intention of both Henry VIII and Elizabeth I – and, indeed, of the English Reformers – was not to create a new church, but to reform the existing one.\(^7\) This is an important distinction. It means that strengthening the local, or national, sense of the church was seen as being thoroughly consistent with remaining a part of the universal church. Even when, during the reign of Elizabeth, the rupture with Rome became complete, Elizabeth insisted that the Church of England ‘followed or invented no new way; instead it continued in the way of the primitive Catholic Church as expressed by the most ancient fathers’.\(^8\) The Reformers, too, saw continuity between the English Church and primitive Christianity (which included the early, pre-Augustinian British Church).\(^9\) In both a political and a religious sense, therefore, papal claims to exercise jurisdiction in England were being challenged by pointing to precedents from within British history. This view reinforced the Englishness of the English church, but also highlighted its claim to true catholicity. It was a nationally defined understanding of catholicity – a ‘national catholicism’\(^10\) – reflecting the distinctively political nature of the English Reformation.\(^11\) As historian Kenneth Hylson-Smith says: ‘The whole separation of the English Church from Rome in the sixteenth century was part of the creation of a nation state, and the English reformed Church may be viewed in the first place as national, and an element in the forging of national identity’.\(^12\)

This pattern continued under the Elizabethan Settlement. Church and state were regarded as two inseparable aspects of an autonomous nation, a Christian commonwealth, unified by the principle of royal supremacy. In his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Richard Hooker (1554-1600) strongly defended the settlement
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\(^8\) Vogel, *Theology in Anglicanism*, 7.
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\(^12\) Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship*, 15.
and the system that supported it. Hooker was born during Mary’s reign, and grew up within the Elizabethan church. His work is a carefully crafted and subtle apology for the reformed catholicism that had emerged under Henry and Elizabeth. Hooker held a unified view of society in which powers both temporal and spiritual worked together for the common good. The one could not be understood in isolation from the other. This is clearly spelt out in Book VIII of Hooker’s *Laws*.

The Church of Jesus Christ is every such political society of men as doth in religion hold that truth which is proper to Christianity. As a political Society it doth maintain religion; as a Church that religion which God hath revealed by Jesus Christ … there is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth nor any man a member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England … no person appertaining to the one can be denied to be also of the other.14

This organic and inclusive model of church and society, one commonwealth, one church,15 grounded as it was in the Incarnation,16 would hold together as long as difference was incorporated within the principle of unity in one nation.17 Catholics and Protestants could live together, in this scheme, ‘in as broadly comprehensive a scheme as there was ever to be in the pre-Victorian Established Church’.18 The Church of England was forging a middle path, a via media, both Catholic and Reformed. The problem lay with those at the extremes, whether Roman Catholic or
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13 William P. Haugaard, ‘From the Reformation to the Eighteenth Century’, in Sykes et al., *The Study of Anglicanism*, 11. Hooker’s position was not, however, an unqualified endorsement of the status quo, as will become apparent when considering Kaye’s understanding of Hooker in Chapter 4.
15 ‘Hooker’s vision of Christian faith in general and Anglicanism in particular is through and through a vision of church and society, two realms that he could only envision in an organic relationship made possible by the establishment of right religion’. Sedgwick, ‘The New Shape of Anglican Identity’, 190-191.
17 ‘Post-Reformation Anglican theology developed on the basis of the assumption that the Church of England was a national church – that it was the visible Church of Christ in England’. Vidler, *Essays in Liberality*, 153. See also Bruce Kaye, ‘Power, Order and Plurality: Getting Together in the Anglican Communion’, *Journal of Anglican Studies* 2 (1) (June 2004): 90: ‘The nation is the fundamental and complete jurisdictional entity for Hooker’.
Puritan, who threatened to undermine the peace of the nation. In this sense the *via media* was not just a matter of finding the mean between two theological extremes; it was also political.  

One must feel sympathy for those whose convictions left them stranded outside the acceptable limits of the Elizabethan Settlement. In a sense, a battle for the soul of England was taking place, including the soul of the English church. What shape would religion in England take? What would be the meaning of *Ecclesia Anglicana* in a society polarised between disputing parties? It is easy, in the light of subsequent history, to assume that Anglicanism as we know it was always meant to be, perhaps momentarily forgetting the traumatic events of the mid-seventeenth century, as the nation was plunged into civil war. A different outcome could have given England a completely different national church, with a completely different ethos. To quote Stephen McGrade:

> [A]s Hooker conceived it, the church of England was the community of all English Christians. On this conception, the deadly controversies of the day were disputes within Anglicanism – that is, within the *ecclesia Anglicana* – disputes between an aspiring Presbyterian-Calvinist version of Anglicanism, a Roman Catholic version of Anglicanism, and a nationally independent Episcopal form of Anglicanism. As is so often the case, history belongs to the victors, and so only the last of the three visions of the English church is now known as Anglicanism.

Paul Avis describes the model of church and society operating in sixteenth century England as the ‘Erastian paradigm’ or the ‘nation-as-church model’. In the

---

19. ‘The doctrine of the Royal Supremacy was constructed in the 1530s to safeguard the unity and integrity of the realm. Ultimately it was for national self-defence’. Avis, *Church, State and Establishment*, 23.


21. Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church* (1989), Part 1 (Chapters 2-5) is headed ‘The Erastian Paradigm and the Formation of Anglican Ecclesiology’. The words ‘the Erastian Paradigm’ have been removed from the heading in the revised edition (2002), although Avis continues to use the term to describe the relationship between church and society in Reformation England. He qualifies its use, however, by adding this sentence (xiv): ‘But I do not by any means imply that the reformed English Church of that period can be reduced to the Erastian aspect’. It is well to remember that Avis is using models or ideal types to assist him in identifying the shape of Anglican identity in different periods of Anglican history. The paradigms he uses are valuable investigative categories; they should not be applied too rigidly either to the period of history in question or to any particular Anglican divine. See also Avis’ later remark (344): “[E]very slogan has its limitations as well as its uses. There is no suggestion here that the ecclesial life of the Church of England can be reduced to the Erastian model. That is simply a convenient rubric under which we construe aspects of Anglicanism during this period”. 
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seventeenth century and into the eighteenth, he argues, this began to give way to the ‘apostolic paradigm’ or ‘episcopal succession’ model, which reached its peak with the rise of Tractarianism in the nineteenth century. I will discuss Avis’ typology in more detail towards the end of the next chapter when considering Bruce Kaye’s ‘church in society’ model of Anglicanism. At this point in the discussion, Avis’ categories help us to discern the shifts taking place in Anglican self-understanding after Hooker.

DEVELOPMENTS AFTER HOOKER

We move now through the seventeenth century. The Elizabethan world had passed into history. A king and an Archbishop of Canterbury were executed. The nation was fractured. During this period, a distinct Anglican theology was emerging, the ‘classic Anglicanism’ or ‘normative Anglicanism’ of the Caroline divines. It survived the rupture of civil war and exile, and returned with Charles II at the Restoration. While being diverse in many respects, the High Church tradition emerging during these decades continued to uphold Hooker’s vision of a national, comprehensive church, forging a middle path, a via media, between Roman Catholicism and Puritanism.

Cracks, however, were appearing in the conceptual structure holding together church and state. ‘As the godliness of the godly prince became questionable’, writes Avis, ‘the episcopal office acquired new lustre’. The English episcopate was not as compliant towards the royal court as had been the case prior to Cromwell’s ascendancy, as Jeffrey Collins notes:

The Restoration marks a watershed point in the church’s long post-Reformation experiment with Erastianism. Thereafter, the dualist concept of two spheres of authority, temporal and spiritual, began a recovery. The
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English Revolution, by attaching the church more firmly to a *jure divino* view of its own authority, wrought this new intellectual consensus in the church. The revolutionary trauma of Charles I’s execution and the church’s exile had shaken the bishops’ support of the long-dominant Erastianism in English ecclesiastical affairs.27

A change in episcopal self-understanding was taking place. If bishops increasingly viewed episcopal authority as divinely given in its own right, royal supremacy would inevitably be weakened.28 The Restoration bishops continued to support the monarchy, but were much more circumspect about the sort of monarchy they were willing to support.29

Not so the Nonjurors, who left the established church in protest against the deposition of James II, in keeping with their commitment to the doctrine of the divine right of kings.30 As Sachs notes, the Nonjurors believed that ‘the Church of England had invalidated itself, and they created a religious underground rather than compromise their scruples’.31 In other words, they saw themselves as the true Church of England, but in practice they placed themselves outside the church. This major schism in the life of the English church severely ruptured Hooker’s unified vision of church and society.32 At the same time, the schism demonstrated the possibility of propounding an alternative Anglican vision, one in which the integrity of the church could be maintained in isolation from the state. The Nonjurors reflected the growing emphasis on the doctrine of the apostolic succession of the episcopate as an essential aspect of the life of the church.33
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28 ibid., 559.
29 ibid., 556.
30 For a discussion of the Nonjurors, see Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship*, Chapter 4; also Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, Chapter 1.
32 ‘It was after the Restoration and particularly after 1688-90, with the deposition of James II, the Nonjuring schism and the Toleration Act, that the distinction between Church and society became polarised over a whole range of issues’. Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*. Rev. edn. (2002), 68.
They were not the only dissident voices in seventeenth century England. Protestant Nonconformists were on the increase, and could no longer simply be absorbed into a diverse commonwealth in which everyone belonged to the one church. A series of Parliamentary Acts endeavoured to limit the influence and the movements of dissenters, but England emerged from the bitter disputes of Cromwell’s commonwealth as a divided society.\(^{34}\) As Neill says, the Nonconformists effectively became a ‘second nation within the nation, a nation that stood permanently at a disadvantage, that was denied equal privileges with others and the right of taking part in its own government’.\(^{35}\) Denominationalism was emerging, and the seeds of nineteenth century political and religious change had been planted. Henceforth the Church of England could claim in name only, but not in practice, to be the church of the English people. ‘No longer was it argued that all men of England could be incorporated into one Church’, says Swatos. ‘The monopoly was broken with the severing of the head of Charles I’.\(^{36}\)

By now *Ecclesia Anglicana* is describing an established English church, still claiming to be both catholic and comprehensive, but also containing the marks of an ‘incipient denominationalism’.\(^{37}\) It begins, that is, to refer specifically to a type of theology and ecclesiology that distinguishes it from alternative expressions of the Christian faith.\(^{38}\) The vision of comprehending the whole of English society is slowly slipping out of the equation, even while establishment is maintained. The church is increasingly defining itself in terms of its own inner integrity.

This trend becomes more pronounced in the eighteenth century. As Avis’ typology indicates, the eighteenth century church moulded together both the old and the new. The church was a ‘curious blend of breadth and narrowness, latitude and Erastianism’, writes Sachs. The acceptance of the church’s national role was coupled with an increasing awareness of its apostolicity, and all this at a time of increasing social diversity. Latitudinarians, who played a prominent role in the church
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\(^{34}\) Peter Hinchliff, ‘Church-State Relations’, in Sykes et al., *The Study of Anglicanism*, 396-397.

\(^{35}\) Neill, *Anglicanism*, 166.


\(^{37}\) Swatos, ibid., 47.

\(^{38}\) Rawlinson, *The Anglican Communion*, 5-6: ‘The church was coming to stand also for a distinctively and consciously “Anglican” theological outlook, and for a distinctively “Anglican” tradition and practice of worship and piety’. 
throughout this period, were happy to embrace tolerance on the proviso that it maintained national consensus.\(^3\)\(^9\) Interestingly, it may be that this flexibility was more characteristic of members of the church hierarchy, while most of the lower clergy maintained ‘a nostalgia for the Hookerian ideal of a nation united politically and religiously’.\(^4\)\(^0\)

Nevertheless, the assumed links between church and state enshrined in the Reformation settlements were coming apart. Dissenters were demanding religious equality. Calls for parliamentary reform were challenging the inherited alliance between the church and the political nation.\(^4\)\(^1\) As an integral part of the English political establishment, the Church of England could not avoid the forces at work in English society.\(^4\)\(^2\) As Alan Gilbert writes:

This was the crux of the serious religious-cultural crisis which confronted the unreformed Establishment. The moral imperatives which had inspired popular conformity in the past, the deferential compliance with prescribed authority characteristic of pre-industrial society, the consensus between the rulers and the ruled that the social harmony symbolised and defended by the Church was worth preserving: these things were disappearing. People in increasing numbers turned from the Church to the voluntary associations of Nonconformity not merely because the Church was inefficient, not only because it continued to behave like a monopoly in a competitive ‘market situation’, but also simply because it was the ‘Establishment’. It became an axiom of English radicalism that, while religion itself was intrinsically ‘kind and benign’, an established religion was a pernicious thing. As Thomas Paine put [it] in his seminal \textit{Rights of Man}, written in the early 1790s: ‘By engendering the church with the state, a sort of mule-animal, capable only of destroying, and not of breeding up, is produced, called \textit{The Church established by Law}.’\(^4\)\(^3\)

As I will show in Chapter 5, the American experience, in the wake of the War of Independence, demonstrated that, once transferred to a different place, a new expression of Anglicanism was possible, unencumbered by assumptions about establishment.

\(^3\) Sachs, \textit{The Transformation of Anglicanism}, 13.
\(^4\)\(^0\) Gascoigne, ‘Unity of Church and State’, 63.
\(^4\)\(^1\) Sachs, \textit{The Transformation of Anglicanism}, 31.
\(^4\)\(^2\) ibid., 33.
THE ANGLICAN EVANGELICALS

The Evangelical Revival that swept through Britain in the eighteenth century was part of an international phenomenon. German pietism was one expression. America experienced its Great Awakening. Within England, it was divided between three parallel movements: Arminian Methodism, Calvinist Methodism and Anglican Evangelicalism.44 Butler calls the latter a form of ‘moderate Calvinism’. 45 While Evangelicalism could be seen as a reaction against the latitudinarianism that permeated the Church of England during the eighteenth century,46 it did not challenge the principle of establishment, as the radical members of the Oxford Movement would do. ‘The Evangelicals’, writes Hylson-Smith, ‘with varying degrees of emphasis, sought to carry out the revival strictly within the context of existing ecclesiastical structures and practices’.47 Their real concern was the salvation of the soul, and the call to a serious and holy life. Bradley comments:

Labouring under an intense sense of mission, they believed that their task was to call their fellow men to seriousness. It was to this end that they bombarded their contemporaries with sermons and tracts, set about attacking all those influences in the world which they believed to be evil, and consciously lived out their own lives as examples to be followed.48

The Evangelicals set out to convert the nation, one person at a time.49 Since Methodist preachers had concentrated on the lower classes, the Anglican Evangelicals focussed especially on members of the upper classes. William Wilberforce’s Practical View and Hannah More’s An Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World both singled out the aristocracy.50 Evangelical influence in the

45 ibid., 34.
46 Ian C. Bradley, The Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians (New York: Macmillan, 1976), 19: ‘It was against this vague, undemanding concept of Christianity, which pushed God and his commandments far into the background of man’s consciousness, that the Evangelicals rebelled’. See especially Chapter 4 of Bradley’s book: ‘Assault on the Church’.
47 Hylson-Smith, Evangelicals, 12.
48 Bradley, The Call to Seriousness, 32.
49 ‘The Evangelicals were prepared to try anything if there was some chance that it might lead to a soul being saved’. ibid., 34.
50 The full title of Wilberforce’s book, published in 1797, was A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country contrasted with real Christianity. ibid., 19, 37.
universities of Oxford and Cambridge increased. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Evangelicals had become a sizeable and influential group within the Church of England. Indeed, argues Butler, the first three decades of the century can be seen as their golden age.

But it was amongst the middle classes that Evangelicalism made its biggest impact, amongst civil servants, bankers, merchants, member of the professions, and officers in the Armed Services, including the members of the Clapham Sect, the group of moderate Evangelicals associated with William Wilberforce (1759-1833). Neill rightly comments on the unique contribution this group of like-minded Evangelicals made to the social, political and religious life of Britain, both at home and abroad. The battle for the abolition of slavery alone was an outstanding achievement. Wilberforce’s burial in Westminster Abbey in 1834 was a fitting recognition of the Evangelical impact on the life of the nation during decades of radical upheaval in British political and social life.

In their attitudes to the sufferings of the poor within Britain brought about by the Industrial Revolution, however, the Evangelicals have been accused of ‘hypocrisy and double standards’. Stephen Neill dismisses this claim, but does acknowledge their inability to understand the root causes of the evils of industrialism. Quite simply, they did not have the intellectual apparatus to deal with them. They were living nineteenth century lives with an eighteenth century mindset.

31 See Hylson-Smith, Evangelicalism, 70-76, for a discussion of the influence of the great Evangelical preacher, Charles Simeon (1759-1836) in Cambridge.
32 Butler, ‘From the Eighteenth Century’, 34. Neill, Anglicanism, 234-235, notes that in 1815 the Evangelicals were the most powerful group in the Church of England, highly influential, but also highly unpopular.
33 Bradley, The Call to Seriousness, 51.
34 The term ‘Clapham Sect’ was not used during Wilberforce’s lifetime. The contemporary nickname given to the Evangelical Parliamentarians associated with Wilberforce was ‘the Saints’. See Hylson-Smith, Evangelicals, 80.
37 See Hylson-Smith, Evangelicals, 89.
38 ‘I suspect’, writes Neill, ‘that Charles Dickens’s Bleak House is more responsible than anything else for the perpetuation of this myth; but it keeps cropping up in quite respectable works on the nineteenth century’. Anglicanism, 241.
They took it for granted that poverty would always exist, and that all that could be done was to mitigate the sufferings which accompanied it. They failed to see that the Industrial Revolution had for the first time made possible the abolition of human poverty. They fought like giants against evils within the system which they knew. It required a more prophetic mind and vision than theirs to recognize that the system itself must be changed, and could be changed, if the conscience of a Christian nation could be set to work in new and more revolutionary ways.  

The work of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury (1801-1885), social reformer and philanthropist, is a case in point. He worked tirelessly to alleviate the sufferings of the poor and disadvantaged. The basis of his social criticism, however, was an Evangelical faith that was both sentimental and paternalistic. As already noted, the fundamental concerns of Evangelicals like Shaftesbury were the salvation of the individual soul and the call to seriousness in social life. He was basically a deeply religious man who sought to obey God in all aspects of his life. While it could hardly be said that he was oblivious to the sufferings of the poor and oppressed, it is possible that he failed to understand them. To quote Hylson-Smith:

All the Evangelicals were united in their final analysis of cause and effect in matters political, social and economic. To them it was ultimately a question of morality and personal religion. Whatever the issue currently at stake, the most pressing need was for the country to return to Christian morality.
It is interesting to note where the Evangelicals stood during the events leading up to the beginning of the Oxford Movement. Basically they were on the side of political reform, even if it meant improving the lot of those with whom they differed.\textsuperscript{65}

The Evangelicals were Whigs, and as such were in favour of reform in all directions, in politics and in the Church, in the law and in social affairs. Strenuous Protestants and Erastians as they were, they were unwearied in their advocacy of Roman Catholic Emancipation and of the relaxation of the disabilities under which the Nonconformists still suffered.\textsuperscript{66}

While, for the Tractarians, such reforms raised fundamental issues about the integrity of the English church and its relationship to the state, the Anglican Evangelicals remained committed to the principle of establishment. Reforms from within Evangelicalism were not likely to undermine the royal supremacy.\textsuperscript{67} It may be for this reason that Avis chose, in the first edition of his work, Anglicanism and the Christian Church, not to include the Evangelical movement within Anglicanism in his typology.\textsuperscript{68} It would appear that, according to Avis’ schema, they represent a continuation of the ‘Erastian paradigm’.\textsuperscript{69} This may very well be the case. It would be misleading, however, to suggest that Evangelical faith somehow prevented them from engagement in the life of the nation. As is readily apparent, their influence on

\textsuperscript{65} Hilton discusses at length the involvement of the Saints in political reform. The Age of Atonement, Chapter 6: ‘The Politics of Atonement’.

\textsuperscript{66} Neill, Anglicanism, 242.

\textsuperscript{67} Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context, 30-32, argues that, prior to Tractarianism, Evangelicals in the Church of England were to a large extent High Churchmen. See also Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church. Rev. edn. (2002), 163-164. As Avis notes, it was really from 1847 onwards, in response to the Gorham case (over baptismal regeneration), that a major rift developed between Evangelicals and High Churchmen. In Erastian fashion, the Evangelicals fought out the issue in the secular courts. The Tractarians, on the other hand, were appalled by this blatant example of secular interference in matters of doctrine.

\textsuperscript{68} Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church (1989), xiv: ‘I do not deal with them’.

\textsuperscript{69} In his expanded and revised edition of Anglicanism and the Christian Church (2002), Avis includes a brief discussion of Methodism and Evangelicalism (Chapter 7). He devotes only a few pages (162-170) to the Anglican Evangelicals who, as noted above (n. 67) remain on the Erastian end of the spectrum. In terms of their theological substance, Avis is diffident. He has clearly set out, in this second edition, to be more inclusive, by focussing in much more depth on the Evangelical position, especially the writings of E.A. Litton. He concludes (169): ‘I have taken perhaps the strongest example of nineteenth-century Evangelical ecclesiology [Litton’s work] and set out to expound it in good faith. But I have found myself concurring with Gladstone, in his marginal comments, that this work is marred by caricature and false antitheses. I can well understand why Gladstone’s marginalia peter out before the end of the book’. As Avis later notes (199), Evangelicalism, as far as Gladstone was concerned, was ‘incomplete’ or ‘abnormal’ as a system: ‘it lacked a theology’. I have examined the copy of Litton’s work to which Avis refers, The Church of Christ in its Idea, Attributes and Ministry (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1851), which is part of Gladstone’s collection in St Deiniol’s Library, Hawarden, Flintshire. I concur with his assessment.
the moral life of English society, their philanthropic work and their involvement in major issues like the abolition of the slave trade were remarkable by any standards.

**THE OXFORD MOVEMENT**

Political events in the first part of the nineteenth century brought the crisis facing the church to a head. In spite of establishment, legislation favouring both Roman Catholics and dissenters clearly indicated that the Church of England was no longer the church of the nation, but rather one Christian body amongst many. The actions of the state also demonstrated that Parliament was no longer Anglican. The Reformation Settlement had effectively broken down. In the turbulent 1830s a movement of dissent arose from within the ranks of the established church, emphasising the church as a divine society and rejecting the traditional links between church and state. The Oxford Movement was born.

Newman regarded 14 July 1833 as the beginning of the movement. On that day John Keble preached his famous Assize sermon on ‘National Apostasy’. It was a milestone in the history of English religion. Keble warned his listeners that England was rejecting the fundamental principle that ‘as a Christian nation she is also a part of the Christian Church, and in all her legislation and policy bound by the fundamental rules of that Church’. Recent events demonstrated that the Church of England had now become subservient to the state. The very foundations of the church’s authority, based on its apostolicity, were being called into question.

Keble’s sermon was not in itself a call to sever the relationship between church and nation; it was a prophetic challenge to the nation to remember that relationship and what it stood for, and to warn of the dangers of apostasy. Politically, as Chadwick
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70 Hinchliff, ‘Church-State Relations’, 398.


72 John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 1908), 23. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 69, suggests that an earlier political episode, Oxford University’s repudiation of Peel in 1829, could be regarded as a more appropriate date for the beginning of the Movement. Either way, it is interesting that politics played an important role in the beginnings of a movement noted for its espousal of the church’s inner integrity.

73 Hyolson-Smith, *High Churchmanship*, 149, regards it ‘as one of the half dozen most noteworthy sermons in the whole history of the Church of England’.

74 Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, 433.

points out, Keble’s position was that of the old High Church tradition, inherited from the Caroline divines.

The sermon is more akin to the sermons of high churchmen in Queen Anne’s reign than to the high churchmanship of Hurrell Froude or Newman. It is high churchmanship with regard to the State and dissent, a claim to retain the rightful privileges of the Establishment, and less markedly the type of high churchmanship which asserted the independent and divine status of the Church, whether the Church was established or disestablished. 76

Other Tractarians, including Newman, shared this view during the early stages of the movement.77 Newman appealed to his fellow clergy in the Church of England to protest against the encroachment of the government on their apostolic calling. ‘There is an unexceptionable sense’, he wrote early in the series of Tracts for the Times, ‘in which a clergyman may, nay, must be political. And above all, when the Nation interferes with the rights and possessions of the Church, it can with even less grace complain of the Church interfering with the Nation’.78 Newman, however, became increasingly disillusioned. By 1836, under the influence of his radical friend, Hurrell Froude, he had abandoned completely his belief in the royal supremacy, forced to choose between monarchy and church.79 He now regarded the whole state of the Church of England since the Reformation as Erastian.80 Gascoigne comments:

While Keble was still too wedded to the ideals of the Caroline divines to take the momentous step of actively promoting disestablishment, Hurrell Froude made it plain that he thought that the church ought to separate from an increasingly liberal state. In fact, Froude’s dislike of Erastianism became so pronounced that he was to urge the need for episcopal control over church affairs to an extent that was, as he recognised, quite foreign


77 Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context, 78; also Avis, ibid., 179-180.

78 These words appear early in Tract 2, on ‘The Catholic Church’, written by Newman. Newman was particularly outraged about the government’s interference in the Irish church. For the text of Tract 2 (and all other Tracts for the Times) see http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html.

79 Nockles, ibid., 77. Avis, ibid., 211, quotes Froude’s biographer, Piers Brendon: ‘It is not too much to say that the electric suggestiveness of [Froude’s] Remains charged the extreme High Church movement with its initial life. Froude’s personal example of holiness, his romantic vision of the medieval Church, his corresponding denigration of the Reformation, his ambitions to “unprotestantise” the Church – all these things inspired the secessionist wing of the Tractarian movement’.

80 Nockles, ibid., 85. See also Cornwell, Church and Nation, 17.
to Hooker … For Newman the only acceptable response was eventually to abandon the Church of England as irredeemably tainted by Erastianism and to turn to Rome.  

In Avis’ terms, whereas, since the Restoration, the ‘apostolic paradigm’ had coexisted with the ‘Erastian paradigm’, the more radical members of the Oxford Movement severed the tie with the state completely. This represented a fundamental departure from the position of the old High Church. While the Tractarians regarded the Nonjurors as examples to be emulated, the leaders of the Hackney Phalanx saw them as ‘a dangerous precedent of schism and marginalisation’, whose attack on establishment would encourage a sectarian spirit. To be fair, the Tractarians were not trying to be sectarian; they were simply opposing Erastianism. The integrity of the church, they argued, was based, not on its relationship with the state or the culture and people of England, but on apostolic precedent. ‘Their viewpoint was entirely intrinsic to the church’, writes Nockles. ‘They evinced a reluctance to consider the church’s role and mission in relation to the nation at large’. But the irony was that in leaving Anglicanism for Roman Catholicism, it was not only the ‘Erastian paradigm’ that the likes of Newman and Manning rejected. As Avis says, ‘The apostolic paradigm had [also] proved a broken reed’. They gave up their Anglican quest for the perfect apostolic church and decided to seek it elsewhere.

It is interesting to contrast their position with that of William Ewart Gladstone (1809-1898). According to Avis, Gladstone belonged to the mainstream of the Oxford Movement, which included Keble and Pusey, Church and Gore. Rather than questioning ‘the validity and integrity of the Church of England as a branch of the catholic Church’, they ‘upheld its integrity, independence and authority’. The national church remained intact in their reckoning, even though they differed on their understanding of the relationship between church and state. Gladstone, writes Nockles, ‘viewed church-state relations from the wider national perspective’. The
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81 Gascoigne, ‘The Unity of Church and State’, 75. Nevertheless, as Nockles points out, ibid., 78, Newman’s lingering royalist sympathies ‘acted as a brake’ on his eventual shift to Rome in 1845. 
82 Nockles, ibid., 90. 
83 Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, 121. 
84 Nockles, The Oxford Movement in Context, 87. Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church. Rev. edn. (2002), 184, comments: ‘F.D. Maurice judged that the Tractarians were opposing to the profane, secularising spirit of the age, not the Spirit that blows where it wills, but the spirit of a past age – that of the Middle Ages’. 
fact that the relationship of so many people to the Church of England was merely nominal ‘did not invalidate the church’s wider duty to minister to the whole nation – the grand principle of Hooker’s theory’. In fact, the real ‘national apostasy’, in Gladstone’s view, would be to cut the people off from the national church.86

This was, of course, the position of Gladstone’s early work, *The State in its Relations With the Church.*87 At this stage of his life, standing firmly within the old High Church tradition, he continued to espouse Hooker’s view of establishment, a position that even Keble regarded as a utopian dream.88 But over the years Gladstone’s views would change in the direction of ‘a liberal, tolerant Anglican Catholicism, one compatible with modern pluralism’.89 He would, for example, increasingly acknowledge the need for a more accommodating attitude towards Nonconformists and other minorities. This ultimately led him to review his hitherto passionate defence of establishment. ‘He did not renounce the principle of establishment as such’, writes Avis, ‘provided it fitted the facts of the situation’.90 While his commitment to the established Church of England remained unshakeable,91 he conceded that establishment did not fit the Irish situation. By 1868, Gladstone had steered through parliament a bill to disestablish the Church of England in Ireland.92 While he was more reticent about Welsh disestablishment, the precedent set in Ireland provided added impetus for a similar outcome in Wales (though this did not happen until 1920).93 Gascoigne comments:
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86 Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 87-88; also Avis, *Church, State and Establishment*, 53. For Gladstone’s views at this stage of his career, see Richard Shannon, *Gladstone, Volume One, 1809-1865* (London: Methuen, 1982), 76-87.
88 Hilton, *the Age of Atonement*, 349. It was more likely, Keble felt, to result in ‘the secularization of the clergy, not the spiritualization of the state’. Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*. Rev. edn. (2002), 177, describes this early work as ‘the swansong of the old doctrine’. Looking back in 1868, comments Avis (178), Gladstone wrote: ‘I found myself the last man on the sinking ship’.
89 Avis, ibid., 197; also Avis, *Church, State and Establishment*, 54. Similarly, Hilton, ibid., 350, argues that Gladstone’s shift to a more *laissez-faire* approach to religion paralleled the shift in his political views. See also Clark, *Churchmen and the Condition of England*, 87-96.
91 ibid., 197: ‘Gladstone’s faith in the Church of England and the vocation of Anglicanism was itself an impregnable rock’.
Gladstone’s passage from the apologist for a confessional state to the agent of partial disestablishment epitomized the more general transition which England made in the nineteenth century from a nation which, at the beginning of the century, still maintained much of the ecclesiastical and civil polity which Hooker had known to one which, at the end of the century, only retained an established church because it no longer had sufficient power for it to be a pressing political issue.94

A change had taken place in what it meant to be ‘Anglican’. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there was a gradual movement away from Hooker’s organic understanding of the role of the English church in the life of the nation. The principle of establishment continued, but within an increasingly pluralistic society. The church’s catholicity independent of the state came more sharply into focus. ‘Anglican’ increasingly came to refer ‘more specifically to a distinct theological position’.95 By the mid-nineteenth century it had come to mean ‘not simply “English” or “pertaining to the Church of England”, but also, ecclesiastically, and more broadly, “historically descended from the Church of England”’.96 Similarly, the term ‘Anglicanism’ came into usage at this point,97 referring to a particular church within Christendom. As we will see, it came to refer to a worldwide fellowship of churches, related to Canterbury, but no longer bound to England.

CONCLUSION

This chapter began with the question: Is a sense of national purpose central to the Anglican ethos? We have sought to answer this question, at least initially, by tracing the shifting meanings of the term Ecclesia Anglicana in England between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. We noted first that the English church predates the Reformation. The subsequent settlements under Henry VIII and Elizabeth I expressed an organic view of church and nation. This remained in place throughout the following centuries, even while society was changing and the ties binding church and state were loosening. As English society grew increasingly diverse, the Church of England, while remaining the established church, found itself facing a crisis of allegiance. The Evangelicals, while profoundly influencing the political and moral

94 Gascoigne, ‘Unity of Church and State’, 78.
95 Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’, 461.
97 It was first coined by Newman. Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’, 461.
life of the nation, left unquestioned the relationship between church and state, 
supporting the political reforms against which Keble was moved to protest.

During these turbulent times, the Oxford Movement released new life into the church 
by reminding it that it existed by divine right and not because of the state. The more 
radical members of the movement severed completely the links between church and 
state, rejecting the Erastianism that, in their view, provided the real rationale for the 
Ecclesia Anglicana. As events unfolded, the Oxford Movement did not provide the 
impetus for disestablishment. It did, however, bequeath to posterity ‘a new Anglican 
Catholic view of the place of the church in society, and more especially of its 
relations with the state’. 98 This was to have a powerful impact on Anglican 
expansion in other parts of the world, including Australia, where establishment was 
neither practical nor desirable. The movement was a prophetic call to the church to 
purify itself, to recover its vocation as a spiritual community. 99 It was a call that had 
to be made; Keble’s sermon had to be preached.

Meanwhile, the church was being swept forward by events beyond its control. It 
would not come out of the 1830s and 1840s unscathed. ‘In the emerging pluralistic 
situation,’ writes Alan Gilbert, ‘the socially integrative functions of the religious 
Establishment became progressively less capable of comprehending the whole of 
English society’. 100 The Church of England remained the church by law established, 
but with a much more uncertain relationship with the state. As the nineteenth century 
progressed, many clergy became increasingly anxious about the possibility of 
disestablishment. 101 Others assumed such an outcome to be inevitable. But either 
way, the church had to be true to its own calling. As Owen Chadwick remarks, 
‘Englishmen sometimes needed reminding that the church would continue to be the 
church whatever its relation to the state’. 102

98 Hylson-Smith, High Churchmanship, 194-195.
99 ‘The prevailing spirit of rationalism, liberalism, erastianism and Utilitarianism was anathema to 
Keble, Froude and Newman. All three conceived of the Church’s mission in essentially spiritual 
terms’. ibid., 126.
100 Gilbert, Religion and Society, 140.
101 Chadwick, The Victorian Church, 437: ‘The members of the Church of England valued 
establishment chiefly because many of them could hardly conceive the Church of England without it. 
To some of them disestablishment looked like disembodiment, so inextricably was the history of the 
church bound with the history of the nation’.
102 ibid.
In terms of Avis’ typology, it was becoming increasingly difficult for Anglicanism to continue to operate on the assumption that the ‘Erastian paradigm’ or ‘nation-as-church’ model was still intact. This model had been the presupposition of the English Reformers, including Hooker, the Caroline Divines, the Evangelicals and even the Tractarians. Keble’s sermon, after all, was a call to the nation to remember the paradigm. Newman finally left for Rome because, in his view, the church had lost its soul to the paradigm; it could not exist without it. As we will see in the next chapter, Avis considers that both the ‘nation-as-church’ model and the ‘episcopal succession’ model have outlived their usefulness. ‘The Erastian paradigm is dead’, he says. Avis searches for a new model, proposing a ‘baptism paradigm’ or ‘communion-through-baptism’ model as a more authentic way of conceiving of Anglicanism in an ecumenical, global context. While I do not wish to dispute the wisdom of Avis’ exploration of a baptismal approach to Anglicanism, I am, as the next chapter will indicate, reluctant to dismiss completely the ‘nation-as-church’ model, although I will be suggesting that the phrase ‘national church’ model is a more appropriate way to express what Avis has in mind. Indeed, Avis’ thought needs to be placed alongside that of Bruce Kaye, for whom the enmeshment of the church in society is central to the Anglican ethos.

Before engaging in that discussion, however, another group of nineteenth century thinkers, among them Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Arnold and F. D. Maurice, need to be considered. Avis includes them in his list of supporters of this ‘nation-as-church’ model. In terms of the categories of churchmanship, these ‘liberal’ thinkers, according to Avis, belong to the Latitudinarian or Broad Church tradition, but he also describes their particular expression of Anglicanism as

103 Avis, *The Anglican Understanding*, 16.
104 Hinchliff, ‘Church-State Relations’, 399: ‘In fact, as is clearly shown by John Keble’s famous “National Apostasy” sermon of 1833, it was an ideal relationship with the state which they were concerned to defend’.
106 ibid., ch. 18; also *The Anglican Understanding*, 23-26.
107 Avis himself applies a shift in terminology, from ‘nation-as-church model’ to ‘national model’, without indicating that the change has occurred. Perhaps he did so inadvertently rather than through sleight of hand. There is, however, a huge difference between the two, especially if ‘national church’ is interpreted, not in terms of status or identity, but rather in terms of vocation – a church for the nation, or (using Kaye’s expression) a ‘church in society’. Avis, *The Anglican Understanding*, 16-19.
108 ibid., 16.
I will include in the discussion consideration of the thought of William Reed Huntington and William Temple, concluding with the thought of Australian theologian, Bruce Kaye. For all of these writers, the church cannot be understood without also considering its vocation in the life of the nation. But were they, as Avis (perhaps inadvertently) seems to suggest, the last word in a dying cause, or does their willingness to continue to wrestle with a theology of church and nation call for a reworking of the ‘nation-as-church’ model? I hold the latter view. It is possible, I will argue, to dispense with any last traces of Erastianism without releasing Anglicanism from its national vocation. As I have noted, Avis changes his terminology at this critical point in his argument, replacing the term ‘nation-as-church’ model with ‘national church’ model. I will be endeavouring to show that Avis’ detection of a residual ‘national church’ model within contemporary Anglicanism is no cause for alarm, but rather recognises the very point that these Broad Church thinkers were trying to raise: the Anglican calling as a church for the nation. Their contributions to Anglican thought also reinforce Bruce Kaye’s contention that Anglicanism is above all a ‘church in society’ tradition.

The importance of the mystical dimension of their writings (especially Coleridge and Maurice) will become apparent in Chapter 6, when introducing Avis’ distinction between the ‘static’ and ‘mystical’ via media. Sanders, ibid., 14-15, helpfully distinguishes between two schools of ‘Broad Churchmen’: an Aristotelian one closely associated with Oxford, and a Platonic one linked with Cambridge. The Oxford group, including Thomas Arnold, was more logical, whereas the Cambridge group, which included Coleridge and Maurice, was highly intuitive (in Avis’ terms, ‘mystical’). ‘The first group’, writes Sanders, ‘in its love for progress and change, became hostile to tradition and church authority; the second loved progress, but sought to reconcile love of change with reverence for the past and its institutions. Although both venerated history, the former read history in the light of the present, the latter, in the light of the past’. This is certainly true of Maurice. Maurice valued highly the traditional beliefs and practices of the Church of England, including the Thirty-nine Articles. As a person who shunned all party labels, he was also reluctant to be classified as Broad Church, even if those who have come after him find it a more than apt way to describe his position. In adopting this approach in this study, I am sensitive to Maurice’s discomfort, but also feel that it is important to highlight the distinctiveness and breadth of his theology, including his social vision of the Kingdom of Christ. See also Jeremy Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 55-63.

The last chapter began with the Reformation Settlements of Henry and Elizabeth and ended with the turbulent events leading to the birth of the Oxford Movement. Newman’s departure for Rome can be seen as the ultimate protest against what he saw as an unworkable and corrupt system. Paul Avis, as we have noted, employs a typology to explain the subtle shift in Anglican self-understanding during this period. The terms ‘Erastian paradigm’ and ‘apostolic paradigm’ are used to describe the two parallel but increasingly divergent ecclesiologies operating within the English church between the Restoration in the seventeenth century and the rise of Tractarianism two centuries later.

At the close of the chapter I also noted Avis’ dramatic announcement: ‘The Erastian paradigm is dead’. He continues: ‘In a partly secular and increasingly pluralistic culture there is no nostalgia for it … [Indeed] the Erastian model never applied to the greater part of the Anglican Communion in any case’. He is right, of course, about the history of global Anglicanism. We have already noted the impossibility of sustaining the notion of establishment in colonial New South Wales. Bishop Broughton was forced to reinvent Anglican ecclesiology, in a sense, in keeping with his social context. Broughton’s Australian experience was reflected in colonies throughout the Anglican world. But in rejecting the ‘Erastian paradigm’, as Avis does, one must be careful not to throw the baby out with the bathwater. The loss of establishment in no way alters the Anglican vocation as a church for the nation.

I have already foreshadowed that Avis’ declaration warrants closer scrutiny. While I agree with Avis that Erastianism is no longer a viable model for the Anglican tradition, it seems to me that a powerful case can still be made for the view that a close relationship between church and nation has been, and continues to be, an

---

1 Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church, Rev. edn. (2002), 347.
important part of the Anglican ethos. Avis seems to sense this himself when, early in the second edition of his work, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, he qualifies his earlier evaluation of the Erastian paradigm, giving it, we might say, a more positive spin. The paradigm highlights, says Avis, ‘the importance of a theology of the State (woefully lacking, on the whole, today) and the desirability of a partnership between the Church and the State where this is possible without infringing the divine calling of the Church’.2 As already noted, the sticking point for Avis seems to lie in the fact that the Church of England was, and remains, the established church in England, long after Hooker’s synthesis was laid to rest. That aside, he also seems to be trying to emphasise the ongoing importance of the political and social context in which Anglicanism must live and breathe, and the Anglican vocation within the life of the nation. If this is his intention, I heartily concur with his qualification.3 These are precisely the issues on which I am focusing in this study.

It is time to introduce the Broad Church tradition into the debate. In Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Arnold and Frederick Denison Maurice we encounter thinkers who sought to preserve the sense of being a national church, but in a completely different way from the Evangelicals or the Tractarians. They responded, of course, to the same events that moved Keble to preach his historic sermon. They continued, however, to believe that a national principle lay at the heart of the Anglican ethos. So too did William Reed Huntington in the American context and the twentieth century Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple. Central to the ecclesiology of all these thinkers, with or without the benefits of establishment, was an ongoing commitment to the life of the nation and a belief in the reconciling role of the church in society.4 I will also include in this chapter the contemporary Australian theologian, Bruce Kaye, whose conviction that Anglicanism is a ‘church in society’ tradition is central to this study. Like Huntington, Kaye demonstrates that it is possible to be committed to the life of the nation without the privileges of establishment – in other words, to reshape Avis’ typology by dispensing with Erastianism (as Avis wants to do), while preserving the commitment to society that lies at the heart of the Anglican ethos.

---

2 ibid., xvi.
3 It certainly seems that this is what Avis is doing. After declaring the Erastian paradigm dead, Avis adds, in the revised edition: ‘This paradigm can be rejected without abandoning the entirely proper and necessary relationship that Church and State, as two divinely ordained institutions for human well-being, must inevitably have’. ibid., 347.
4 Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement*, 264.
SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE

I will begin with Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834), romantic poet and theologian. As ‘one of the seminal minds of the nineteenth century’, Coleridge profoundly influenced many leading thinkers of the time, including Newman, Thomas Arnold and F.D. Maurice. Coleridge believed firmly that an established church (‘the third estate in the realm’) was essential for the life of the nation. While the state must reconcile the demands of law (‘permanence’) and liberty (‘progression’), he wrote in his essay, *On the Constitution of Church and State According to the Idea of Each* (1829), the purpose of the national Church is ‘to secure and improve that civilization, without which the nation could be neither permanent nor progressive’. A disciple of Hooker, Coleridge was concerned for the spiritual welfare of the nation.

The way of achieving this was to push the meaning of comprehensiveness to its limit, extending the influence of the national church as widely as possible, especially by means of national education, with the ‘clerisy’ serving as the nation’s educators and guardians. Membership of the ‘clerisy’ was not limited to ‘clergy’ in the traditional sense. The ‘sages and professors’ of ‘all the so-called liberal arts and sciences’ were included, covering a wide range of disciplines, ‘the possession and application of which constitute the civilization of a country, as well as the theological’. Although Coleridge was clearly operating with a broad definition of the terms ‘theology’ and ‘divinity’, he was by no means downplaying the importance of the church’s

---

8 Colmer, ibid., 156-157.
9 Coleridge, ‘On the Constitution of Church and State’, 694. Coleridge’s imagined national church, writes Hinchliff, ‘Church-State Relations’, 399, ‘was the sum of all the nation’s spiritual resources, including art, science, literature and scholarship’.
distinctiveness. In his own mind he distinguished between the church of the clerisy and the Church of Christ – the mystical, universal church, a kingdom not of this world. The former, to which he gave the name enclesia, is the national church, ‘an order of men, chosen in and out of the realm, and an estate of that realm’. It has the task of ensuring the continuance of civilisation, binding together past and present. It is not necessarily Anglican, or even Christian. The ecclesia, the Church of Christ, is the ‘befriending opposite’ of the state, exercising a spiritual function, concerned with the individual as person rather than as citizen. The two churches exist side by side in a constant tension, providing the nation with its moral and spiritual foundations.\[11\]

Sachs comments:

Coleridge sensed the outline of a new Anglican understanding of the Church as religious establishment. He balanced the Church’s ability to foster national development with the need for faithfulness to the ideal of the Church of Christ. Mediating between the two, the establishment is challenged to realize the God-given natures of both the nation and the Church, and thus to fulfill their potential compatibility.\[12\]

It was an ingenious and somewhat elusive theory, effectively protecting the spiritual uniqueness of the church while at the same time reinforcing its role in national life. The elusiveness is reflected in the wide range of responses it has evoked. One scholar, for example, has described Coleridge’s proposal as an expression of ‘transcendental catholicity’, a vision of a national church embracing everyone.\[13\] Another writer has argued that Coleridge’s ecclesiology places utility before theological identity, reflecting the shifting patterns of belief and unbelief in the life of the nation.\[14\] While there is truth in all these claims, we must not forget the living

\[11\] Coleridge, ibid., 694-695. For discussions of this aspect of Coleridge’s thought, see Alec R. Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution: 1789 to the Present* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1961), 82; also Sedgwick, ‘On Anglican Polity’, 204-206. ‘Anglican polity’, writes Sedgwick (212), ‘returns again and again to the unity under God of church and commonwealth’. G. Kitson Clark, *Churchmen and the Conditions of England*, 81-82, argues that Coleridge’s view of the Church of Christ left to do its spiritual work without interference from the state, even though some of its members were also clerisy engaged in the moral education of the nation, was a timely answer to the problems facing the church in the turbulent 1830s, especially for people like Newman.

\[12\] Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism*, 42.


\[14\] ‘Coleridge’s conception of a church establishment carried with it then an implicit secularization of function which reflects the growing difficulty of maintaining the old ideal of a confessional state in the face of rapid political and intellectual change’. Gascoigne, ‘Unity of Church and State Challenged’, 70. See also Gilbert, *Religion and Society*, 75.
tension in Coleridge’s thought: his capacity to hold together seemingly opposing ideas without regarding them as contradictory. A utilitarian reading of Coleridge’s views on church and state presents only a half-picture; it fails to appreciate the spiritually subtle, even mystical quality of his thought.

Coleridge, who regarded himself as a Platonist, saw truth as essentially spiritual, the underlying foundation of human life, accessible to all intuitively rather than through the senses. The operating forces of truth, resting in God, he called ‘ideas’, laws dwelling in the mind, requiring the exercise of the human will, but not subject to it. Coleridge criticised the rationalists who would not reach beyond the limits of their own thinking, but praised the mystics, George Fox, Jacob Boehme and William Law, who had, he claimed, assisted him in avoiding ‘being imprisoned by any single dogmatic system’. At the same time he distrusted those, religious or otherwise, who settled for half-truths rather than searching for the whole truth. ‘He, who begins by loving Christianity better than truth’, he wrote in *Aids to Reflection*, ‘will proceed by loving his own sect or church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself

---

15 See, for example, Coleridge’s note about the difference between *opposite* and *contrary*. ‘On the Constitution of Church and State’, 687. ‘Opposite powers are always of the same kind’, he argues, ‘and tend to union’. Stephen Prickett, *Romanticism and Religion: The Tradition of Coleridge and Wordsworth in the Victorian Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 9-33, explains Coleridge’s ability to see things on a number of levels at once, as in his poem, *The Ancient Mariner*. In a similar way, the Church of England is, for Coleridge, two ideas coexisting in ‘a single organic entity’ (32). ‘Stereoscopic vision’, writes Prickett, ‘requires two separate points of view, but it gives not two images, but a single coherent view of the world “in depth”. Existing under tension between two contrary ideas, the Church of England is itself a paradigm concrete example of what Coleridge had been struggling to say about the nature of religious language ever since the *Ancient Mariner*’.16

16 Sedgwick, ‘On Anglican Polity’, 198, makes the point that Coleridge’s clerisy was eventually changed by John Stuart Mill ‘into a secularized utilitarianism, where pleasure was reconceived as ideals or values’.

17 Alex R. Vidler, *F.D. Maurice and Company: Nineteenth Century Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 209: ‘The first thing to notice about [Coleridge] is that he was convinced of the reality of an invisible world upon which the visible world, the world of nature, is dependent, and to which it is secondary’.

18 Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement*, 24-28. As Willey comments, an Idea for Coleridge ‘may be true without ever having been a historical “fact”, or without being fully realized in day-to-day living’. Basil Willey, *Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew Arnold* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), 45. We should be careful, however, not to dismiss Coleridge’s ‘ideas’ as mere abstractions. For Coleridge, writes Colin Gunton, an ‘idea’ ‘is concerned more with common ways in which the human mind interacts with reality than with fixed or static concepts’. In Gunton’s view, Coleridge’s purpose was to develop a philosophy of engagement. *The One, the Three and the Many: God, Creation and the Culture of Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 143, 15. Gunton’s work is to a large extent a profound contemporary dialogue with Coleridge’s thought.

19 Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement*, 31. Coleridge also distinguished between good and bad mystics. The former employed intuitive reason in a natural way; the latter used inward feelings not open to everyone ‘as evidences of the truth of any opinion’ (34). F.D. Maurice agreed with this distinction (213). See also Morris, *F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority*, 113.

---
better than all’. These words made a powerful impact on Coleridge’s Broad Church disciples.

Coleridge was able both to cherish the past (as a true conservative) while evaluating it in the light of the present (as a true liberal) by a process of intuitive, mystical reason. Because invisible truth was the foundation of all human knowledge, Coleridge sought to reconcile – to comprehend – all disciplines. ‘Motivating all of Coleridge’s thinking’, writes Sanders, ‘was his burning desire to bring everything into harmony, to discover a single principle to which his mind might relate everything that came within it’. How might human beings live in peace? How might conflicts, both internal (within the individual) and external (within society) be reconciled? Coleridge believed that the reconciliation of conflict through tolerance or compromise left sectarianism intact, and demonstrated an indifference to truth. The real challenge, he argued, was to find the fundamental truth upon which each position rested. Herein lay the key to his understanding of religion. Religion was not a system of dogma, but ‘a life and a living process’. His vision of the universality of Christianity provided one of the key principles of the Broad Church movement. It also explains his approach to the national church and the role of the ‘clerisy’ within it. Coleridge’s church was ‘broad’ and comprehensive.

Coleridge painted a picture of the church as it might be in the life of the nation. The disadvantage of such a theoretical approach was its theoretical nature: as Colmer says, it ‘bore little relation to existing conditions’. Nevertheless, while his ideas had

21 Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement*, 32.
22 ibid., 72-74. The parallel in Maurice’s thought will become apparent in due course.
23 ibid., 65.
24 ibid., 76-77.
25 ibid., 86.
26 Colmer, *Coleridge*, 158. According to Clark, *Churchmen and the Condition of England*, 89, Coleridge’s idea of the clerisy ‘remained an amorphous and unconvincing conception’. Vidler describes Coleridge’s two-fold view of the church as ‘complicated and paradoxical’. ‘Some call it dialectical’, he continues, ‘since it appears to affirm two opposite things about the Church and yet somehow to hold them together’. Vidler, *F.D. Maurice and Company*, 214. According to Prickett, *Romanticism and Religion*, 33, Carlyle made a similar criticism at the time, regarding Coleridge’s idea of the church as ‘a mystical and perverse dualism that enabled Coleridge to perform the impossible: to defend a corrupt, lax, and time-serving ecclesiastical establishment by seeing in its very degradation the seeds of eternal life’. Ironically, writes Prickett, even as Carlyle spoke the seeds were producing
little practical impact on actual church-state relations in England, his influence on subsequent theological developments was profound.

THOMAS ARNOLD

We have already noted Coleridge’s influence on Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), famous headmaster of Rugby from 1828-1841. Avis calls him ‘a pillar of the Broad Church, and one of the greatest of the Liberal Anglicans’. Arnold’s response to the age of reform, in which the exclusive rights of establishment were becoming increasingly difficult to sustain, was, like Coleridge, to push comprehensiveness wider than even the Elizabethan Settlement had done. ‘Without an establishment’, he wrote, ‘although it may happen that the majority of Englishmen may still be Christians, yet England will not be a Christian nation’. Arnold envisaged radical changes in the church’s self-understanding in order to enable dissenters who were currently excluded to become part of the national church.

These principles I believe to be irrefragable; that a Church Establishment is essential to the well-being of the nation; that the existence of Dissent impairs the usefulness of an Establishment always, and now, from peculiar circumstances, threatens its destruction; and that to extinguish Dissent by persecution being both wicked and impossible, there remains the true, but hitherto untried way, to extinguish it by comprehension; that different tribes should act together as it were in one army, and under one command, yet should each retain the arms and manner of fighting with which habit had made them most familiar.

Recognising the wide variety of opinions over religious questions in English society, Arnold called for a ‘united, comprehensive church’. The national church, he argued, would need to become more tolerant and flexible, allowing greater diversity in doctrine, liturgy and church polity. Arnold regarded as secondary what


27 Hinchliff, ‘Church-State Relations’, 399.
29 Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church. Rev. edn. (2002), 271. It was, in fact, Arnold’s biographer, A.P. Stanley, later Dean of Westminster, who first used the term ‘Broad Church’ in an article in the Edinburgh Review in 1850. See Butler, ‘From the Eighteenth Century’, 38; also Sanders, Coleridge and the Broad Church Tradition, 7.
31 ibid., 87.
32 ibid., 107-108.
33 ibid., 109-140. See also Williamson, The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold, 129-133.
many others regarded as essential. What was essential was national unity. ‘**England**, to a true Englishman’, he wrote, ‘ought to be dearer than the peculiar forms of the *Church of England*’. But there were limits. Roman Catholics, Quakers and Unitarians were excluded – the first two because they could not be regarded as ‘national’, and the latter because it could not be regarded as ‘Christian’.

Nevertheless, Arnold regarded his scheme with great optimism, arguing that within fifty years many of the religious divisions in the life of the nation could be set aside by embracing as many as possible within the one national church.

Education held the key. At Rugby, Arnold put his principles to work in a practical way to form a Christian society in microcosm, developing a curriculum designed to build a sense of duty and responsibility in the students under his care. Arnold preached a practical, ‘muscular Christianity’ which pervaded every aspect of the school. It was Arnold’s belief that the whole society would be reformed if the same principles were applied on a national level. Avis comments:

> For Arnold, truth was to be discovered in history, not in introspection. Fulfilment was to be found in social action, not in personal cultivation. Conservative in his view of Church and State and working in the tradition that runs from Hooker through Burke to Coleridge, Arnold was at the same time committed to radical change in social conditions as well as in educational methods.

Like Coleridge, Arnold has been criticised for placing the function of religion in national life before its substance. The challenge as he saw it was to make the church more accessible in a nation of increasing diversity. He was certainly not
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34 Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism*, 44: ‘Restating a principle derived from Richard Hooker, Arnold argued that the Church is the religious aspect of the state … The Church should not insist upon episcopacy, or any other external feature, as essential to its identity, which derives from its function in the life of the nation. The Church embodies a way of life, not a structure or a speculative system. The Church’s task is to christianize the life of the nation’.


36 ibid., 111.

37 ibid., 154.

38 Quinn, *To Be a Pilgrim*, 179; Willey, *Nineteenth Century Studies*, 53.

39 Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, Rev. ed. (2002), 271. See also Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement*, 101-102. See also Chapter 3, n.110 above, for the contrast between Arnold’s more logical approach and the mystical or intuitive method of Coleridge and Maurice.

trying to rock the boat as far as establishment was concerned. Nor was he wedded to
the idea of preserving the church as a divine society in its own right, as the
Tractarians were doing; this appeared to Arnold to be a dereliction of duty on the part
of the national church.41 His real passion lay in his vision for a Christian society in
which the state takes responsibility for the moral and spiritual welfare of national
life, working in partnership with the national church to achieve its goal. Hence his
defence of establishment.42 He had no intention of trivialising religion, in spite of his
willingness to make adjustments to much that had previously been held sacrosanct.
As Willey points out, he was just as opposed to a secular state as he was to a church
obsessed with bishops and doctrinal purity.

He was equally opposed both to the Jacobinical-Evangelical view of the
State as existing only for physical ends, and to the priestly view of the
Church as a separate society governed by a divinely appointed hierarchy;
it was above all the perversion of the Church into a sacerdotal caste
which hindered the coming of the Kingdom. The Nation (and in
miniature the School) was in his view the true sphere for the realization
of Christianity, and this could never be achieved as long as there were
great areas of human activity – war and peace, economics, education –
which were regarded as secular or profane, and thus as exempt from the
spiritual critique.43

Arnold’s liberal vision of church and nation, politically and doctrinally broad and
inclusive, met strong opposition at the time,44 even from the Dissenters whom he was
endeavouring to embrace. ‘The irony of the Arnoldian perspective’, writes Jeremy
Morris, ‘was that it aimed at including in the national Church Protestant
Nonconformists whose own theology would not permit them to accept the derogation
of doctrine that the Broad Church seemed to be advocating’.45 Nevertheless, in the

41 ‘He felt revulsion’, writes Avis, ‘for the reactionary conservatism of the Tractarians, regarding their
programme as a reversion to the dark ages of sacerdotalism and superstition’ Avis, Anglicanism and
the Christian Church, Rev. ed. (2002), 271-272. See also Williamson, The Liberalism if Thomas
Arnold, 135-146. Interestingly, Arnold’s Principles of Church Reform was published in the same year
(1833) that Keble preached his sermon on national apostasy.
42 See Clark, Churchmen and the Condition of England, 74-75.
43 Willey, Nineteenth Century Studies, 54.
44 Gascoigne, ‘Unity of Church and State’, 71. J.B. Mozley regarded Arnold’s vision for the national
church as ‘repugnant to the feelings and ideas of almost all her members to a man’. See Avis,
Anglicanism and the Christian Church, Rev. ed. (2002), 220. In Michael Ramsey’s view, acceptance
of the views of Broad Church thinkers like Arnold would have been fatal for the Church of England.
45 Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority, 111; also Neill, Anglicanism, 246;
Williamson, The Liberalism of Thomas Arnold, 147.
longer term, Arnold’s impact on Anglicanism has been more lasting. His ideas on comprehensiveness now permeate Anglican assumptions, not just in England, but throughout the Anglican Communion. Together with Coleridge, Arnold’s thought provided the basis for a new Anglican view of mission, of the way the church must adapt to new cultural settings. At the very least, they were placing culture in the theological ring and insisting that the life of the nation must be a central aspect of any Anglican ecclesiology. But there is something else of perhaps even greater importance hidden in their approach to comprehensiveness: their belief in the unity of society, and the essential relatedness of its citizens. The role of the church, they believed, was to bind the nation together.

F.D. MAURICE

We turn now to Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-1872), another apostle of unity and, like Arnold, well versed in Coleridge’s thought. Basing his doctrine of church and state on the Old Testament, Maurice argued, in The Kingdom of Christ (1838 and 1842), that nations were part of the divine purpose and that life in a national

---

46 For a discussion of the ongoing importance of Arnold’s themes, especially the need for the church’s engagement in society, see M.J. Jackson and J. Rogan, ‘Introductory Essay’, in Arnold, Principles of Church Reform, 5-9, 70-81; also Williamson, ibid., 95-111, 146-157, 205-222.


48 Sachs, ibid., 47. Alan Atkinson, ‘Time, Place and Paternalism’, 17, makes an interesting comment about the 1836 Church Act in New South Wales (discussed in Chapter 2): ‘In England Broad Churchmen such as S.T. Coleridge and Thomas Arnold argued for the essential simplicity of Christianity, and for the idea of national community free of sectarian division and united in faith. This was also the idea behind the Church Acts: thus “plainness” of a native-born kind was made a religious virtue. But whereas in England the ultimate solution seemed to lie in the relaxation of the tenets of the Church of England so that Dissenters (at least) might return to the fold, in New South Wales various denominations were to be maintained under the supervision of the State’. Sanders, Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement, 91, comments that both Coleridge and Arnold lived ‘in the seedtime’ of the Broad Church movement, ‘not in the time of harvest’, which began in about 1848. Essentially, they were the pioneers.

49 Vidler, F.D. Maurice and Company, 215, notes Carlyle’s comment that if there had been no Coleridge there would have been no Maurice. It is true that Maurice immersed himself in Coleridge’s thought, though not uncritically. See Maurice’s Dedication to Coleridge in F.D. Maurice, The Kingdom of Christ, Vol. 1 (London: James Clarke & Co., 1959), 4-18. Sanders, Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement, 185, comments thus: ‘The chief thing that Maurice got from Coleridge was not a set of ideas completely worked out, but a mode of thinking, a way of using the mind. Both Coleridge and Maurice are more easily and rightly understood in the light of each other’. Sanders devotes a whole chapter specifically to the relationship between Coleridge and Maurice (179-209), but the subsequent chapters on Maurice continue to demonstrate Coleridge’s influence on his thought. See also Alec R. Vidler, Witness to the Light: F.D. Maurice’s Message for Today. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1948), 26-27; Arthur Michael Ramsay, F.D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), 14-21; Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority, 34-43.
community was essential for the preservation of faith in a living God.\textsuperscript{50} Israel’s history, he declared, was ‘the Divine specimen of national life’; its call to be a holy nation disclosed the divine calling of all nations,\textsuperscript{51} including England. Maurice argued this consistently through the ensuing decades. In a sermon preached at Lincoln’s Inn in 1852, for example, Maurice declared:

I believe that we have as much right to call England a holy nation as the prophets had to call Judaea a holy nation. I believe that it is holy in virtue of God’s calling; that the members of it are unholy when they deny their calling and their unity … Would to God that we could all preach this doctrine, that we could claim every Englishman, whatever his caste or occupation may be, as a sharer in the covenant, in the holiness, in the blessedness of the Nation!\textsuperscript{52}

In Maurice’s view, church and state share responsibility for the life of the nation. The Jewish commonwealth, he argued, was not ‘a national body plus an ecclesiastical, but a body which could not be national if it were not ecclesiastical, or ecclesiastical if it were not national’.\textsuperscript{53} Over against those who maintain that state and church are separate bodies, one secular and one ‘anti-secular’, Maurice insisted that both are essential for the moral and spiritual wellbeing of national life.\textsuperscript{54}

To me it seems clear, from experience as well as reason, that the State is an excellent admonisher to the Church respecting her inward corruptions, because it comes in contact with those outward evils which are the fruit of them, even as the Church is a most excellent admonisher to the State respecting its sins, because their effects in destroying the Nation’s heart are most evident to the spiritual man; but that each will do mischief if it attempts, according to its own maxims, to set the other right.\textsuperscript{55}

Both state and national church become ‘secular’ when they regard themselves as separate bodies, ends in themselves, each ‘violating the law of its existence by

\textsuperscript{50} Maurice argued that the ‘national position’ was one of the key aspects of the Reformation. ‘The Reformers’, he wrote, ‘had resorted to the Scriptures, not merely for their authority, but for their practical character. But that practical character is especially exhibited in the Old Testament, and in the Old Testament every truth is brought out in relation to the events of a national history. Their own time interpreted the Scriptures to the Reformers, and the Scriptures in turn interpreted their own time’. \textit{The Kingdom of Christ}, Vol. 1, 83-84.

\textsuperscript{51} ibid., 179.

\textsuperscript{52} Frederick Denison Maurice, \textit{Sermons on the Sabbath Day, on the Character of the Warrior, and on the Interpretation of History} (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1853), 71-72.

\textsuperscript{53} Maurice, \textit{The Kingdom of Christ}, Vol. 2, 183.

\textsuperscript{54} ibid., 227-231.

\textsuperscript{55} ibid., 231.
refusing to be that which the Scriptures affirm and history proves that it was meant to be. Their relationship is one of partnership and mutual accountability: in acting and reacting upon each other, each fulfilling its purposes in the divine order, they exist in ‘perfect harmony’.

What, then, is the role of the national church?

A National Church should mean a Church which exists to purify and elevate the mind of a nation; to give those who make and administer and obey its laws, a sense of the grandeur of law and of the source whence it proceeds, to tell the rulers of the nation, and all the members of the nation, that all false ways are ruinous ways, that truth is the only stability of our time or of any time. It should exist to make men tremble at the voice of God speaking to them in their consciences … This should be the meaning of a National Church; a nation wants a Church for these purposes mainly; a Church is abusing its trust if it aims at any other or lower purposes.

Maurice took with absolute seriousness the national principle that lay at the heart of the English Reformation. Only national churches, he argued, could embody the sense of belonging to one universal church. Both sectarianism and Romanism, each in its own way, contradicted the national principle, denying the indelible link between church and nation. In spite of its internal divisions, Maurice still regarded the Church of England as the clearest expression of the universal society it was called to represent. He also dreamed of a universal family of nations, but this could only be realised if each nation was true to its own unique history and character.

---

57 Maurice, The Kingdom of Christ, Vol. 2, 189. See also Maurice’s comments on church and state in The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice: Chiefly Told in His Own Letters. ed. Frederick Maurice (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1884), II, 584-586. Here Maurice specifically rejects any form of Erastianism in the church’s relationship to the state. ‘Believing a union of Church and State to be implied in the existence of each’, he writes, ‘and to be necessary for the protection of moral freedom, I see equal dangers in the disposition of Churchmen to make the Church into a powerful and domineering State, and of statesmen to make themselves dictators in the Church’. By the union of church and state, he continues, I mean ‘the co-operation of spirit with law; the abandonment of the attempt to put one for the other, or to dispense with either’.
58 From a sermon preached in Lincoln’s Inn. Quoted by Vidler, Witness to the Light, 191-192; also Quinn, To Be a Pilgrim, 219.
60 Maurice, The Kingdom of Christ, Vol. 2, 249; also Maurice, Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament, xxii-xxv.
Destroy national characteristics, reduce us merely into one great society, and whether the bond of that society is a pope, or an emperor, or a customs-union, the result is the same. A living God is not feared or believed in; He is not the centre of that combination; His name or the name of a number of Gods may be invoked in it, but His presence is not that which holds its different elements together. Therefore let us be sure that if we would ever see a real family of nations ... a family of nations which shall own God as their Father and Christ as their elder Brother, this must come from each nation maintaining its own integrity and unity.62

It was the responsibility of the national church, Maurice argued, to educate the nation and its citizens.63 Both sectarian and secular education, he argued, works against the national purpose.64 Only the national church is able to teach people about the covenant between God and the nation,65 or point beyond itself to the one universal church that unites all peoples under God. Maurice eventually conceded that sectarianism was too pervasive for his theory on education to work, calling on the state to do what it could for the education of its people. But even then, Maurice argued, the national church must still do everything possible at every level, by its prayers, confessions, and sacraments, and by its life and witness, to remind the nation of its divine calling and purpose.66

Maurice is perhaps best known for his involvement in the Christian Socialist movement.67 Maurice and his colleagues, J.M. Ludlow in particular, worked amongst

---

Denison Maurice: Rebellious Conformist (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1971), 87, 175, comments on Maurice’s ‘conforming conservatism’ which ‘amounted to an apologia for the Church of England, and indeed for the general institutional framework of society as it existed in his time’. She adds, quite rightly, that this conservative quality also gave him his cutting edge.

62 Maurice, Sermons of the Sabbath Day, 93-94. Brose, ibid., 276, notes that Maurice found the whole notion of empire, whether political or ecclesiastical, completely abhorrent, ‘and he felt great relief that both had given way to the distinct nations and churches of modern Europe’.


64 See Maurice’s remarks on the 1870 Education Bill in Maurice, The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, II, 610-613.

65 See Maurice’s sermon, ‘The Covenant the Ground of National Education’ in Frederick Denison Maurice, Christmas Day and Other Sermons (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892), 114-130.

66 See Vidler, Witness to the Light, 192-193.

the urban poor, establishing workingmen’s associations, as well as the Working Men’s College in London, which offered courses in a wide range of subjects, including law, economics, history and mathematics. Here was a practical expression of Maurice’s belief in the importance of education,\(^{68}\) and the partnership between church and state in service to the nation. ‘Maurice sensed’, writes Sachs, ‘that the Church must evolve an identity rooted in *praxis* in mission’.\(^{69}\) He regarded the Kingdom of God as a present reality.\(^{70}\) Above all, we see reflected here Maurice’s conviction that the whole of life, religious or political, belongs to God.\(^{71}\)

Maurice believed that overseas developments would provide the mother church with insights it could not gain within England. He was impressed with the relationship between church and state developing in the United States. He also saw promising developments in the colonies. In a letter to Australian clergy in 1868, Maurice emphasised once again that church and state are both divine: the church ‘is not more exclusive than the State but is the all embracing Society, while the State’s business is to assert the dignity and distinctness of each people and race’.\(^{72}\)

Stephen Sykes has criticised Maurice for ‘his whole-hearted commitment to the theory of national character and destiny’, which pervaded much early nineteenth century theology in England and Germany. It was part, says Sykes, of the romantic

---

\(^{68}\) Sachs, ibid., 108: ‘These courses presented Maurice’s belief that the Church was by nature the nation’s educator, because education could not be distinguished as secular and sacred. Society could be regenerated through the discovery of its inherent harmony. This Christian Socialist idea, as well as a Maurician belief in the integrity of every culture and in the role of the Church in the redemption of culture, became a constituent of the Anglican approach to mission’. Avis comments that Maurice’s Christian socialism was ‘the rather paternalistic form of social amelioration, mainly through education’. *Anglicanism and the Christian Church.* Rev. edn. (2002), 296.


\(^{71}\) A church in partnership with the state, Maurice wrote in *The Kingdom of Christ*, Vol. 2, 178, enables us ‘to rid ourselves of the Manichaean notion that the outward and visible universe and the ordinary social relations are the creations of an evil spirit to be esteemed lightly by all who have attained to the perception of a higher economy’. See also Cornwell, *Church and Nation*, 13; Brose, *Frederick Denison Maurice*, 148.

\(^{72}\) See Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism*, 73.
reaction against ‘the facile internationalism of the Enlightenment’. Sykes also questions Maurice’s claim that it is possible to be both catholic (or universal) and national. He notes the comment of Maurice’s interpreter, Alec Vidler, on this point:

No one will be able to understand Maurice nor, what is more important, the English Church and the Anglican Communion, who presupposes that the Catholic Church and National Churches are incompatible, or that as a Church becomes more Catholic it becomes less national, or who doubts that the Kingdom of Christ consecrates the life of nations. The Anglican Communion is confessedly a fellowship of national or regional Churches which ‘are independent in their self-government as integral parts of the Church Universal.’ Its existence is a living protest on behalf of the principle of nationality and of the direct responsibility of bishops and rulers to Christ, and against the notion of a visible head of the Church and a centralised government.74

Sykes regards this ‘extraordinary annexation of the romantic nationalism of Maurice’s theology to the very raison d’etre of Anglicanism’ as a distortion of the meaning of catholicity – or, at the very least, a redefinition of it, ‘to fit a new, Anglican, theory of the church’.75 He objects, presumably, to the suggestion that ‘the principle of nationality’ has any place in ecclesiology. He also seems to be exposing what he sees as Maurice’s espousal of some kind of militant nationalism.76 There is no doubt truth in Sykes’ claim that Maurice reflected many of the presuppositions of his own time. Rowan Williams expresses similar misgivings. We need to read Maurice ‘a little more suspiciously’, he claims, pointing in particular to ‘the hierarchical assumptions that sit comfortably in his social thought and his theological positivism about the state as divinely instituted’.77

74 ibid., 17. See Vidler, Witness to the Light, 208-209. The quote within the quote is from the 1930 Lambeth Conference Report. It is interesting that Sykes omits this sentence.
75 ibid.
76 As Sanders points out, Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement, 259, Maurice defended a nation’s right to engage in military activity. ‘It is not altogether accidental’, Sanders continues, ‘that both his son and his grandson rose to places of high command in the British Army. Little of Coleridge’s pacifism is to be found in him’. In his later work, Social Morality (1869), Maurice acknowledged the role of wars in the formation of the nations of Europe, including Britain. See Brose, Frederick Denison Maurice, 275; also Frank Mauldin McClain, Maurice: Man and Moralist (London: SPCK, 1972), 130-134.
77 Rowan Williams, Anglican Identities (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2004), 91. In a similar vein, Brose, Frederick Denison Maurice, 279, comments that Maurice’s ‘tendency to absolutize
As will become clear, I am certainly not arguing that Anglicanism can only be true to itself when it adopts a narrow nationalistic platform. Nor, I believe, was this Maurice’s intention. While he clearly regarded the existence of nations as an expression of the divine purpose for the world, he also consistently argued against ‘isms’ of any kind which deny unity. As Wolf points out, Maurice constantly described his whole life as ‘a search for unity’. He saw the nation in organic terms, as a society in which everything was connected. It consisted, first, of families and local communities, which were then drawn together into a national community. Each nation, in turn, had its own distinct spiritual polity, through which it was able to contribute to the whole family of nations.

The same could be said of the church. For Maurice, no national church, even Anglicanism, is an end in itself; it is always reaching beyond itself to a higher catholicity. In this sense Maurice’s understanding of the Church of England as a national church was profoundly ecumenical. He opposed sectarianism – anything that fractured national unity or detracted from the strong sense of national feeling

---

78 Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority, 70-71. Morris also concedes, however, that Maurice’s nineteenth century assumptions about ‘the force and distinctiveness of national character and identity, influenced by Romanticism’, are a weak link in his thought (106).


81 Vidler, Witness to the Light, 178: ‘It was first through a family, then through a nation, and finally through a universal society, that God had made Himself manifest, and the earlier manifestations were intended to be continued within the last. The smaller societies are training grounds where lessons are learned that are to be lived out in the wider and universal sphere’.

82 ibid., 209.

83 Prickett, Romanticism and Religion, 145-146: ‘Nationalism, for [Maurice], is not the antithesis of universal; it is rather the condition of universality. To belong to a universal society, a man must have roots in one particular place’. Prickett notes that this argument is restated in the twentieth century by T.S. Eliot and Simone Weil.

84 Wolf, ‘Frederick Denison Maurice’, 96.

85 ibid., 84-98; also Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority, 68, 204-205.
that bound the nation together.\textsuperscript{86} It is in this context that Maurice’s interpretation of the Anglican \textit{via media} as ‘a union of opposites, not a mere balance of opinions’ may be understood.\textsuperscript{87} Sykes regards Maurice’s position as anathema, an evasion of theological rigour, and a denial of real differences within the Church of England.\textsuperscript{88} But Maurice was on a quest for national unity. This was no mere exercise in some kind of patriotic nationalism. Rather, as Avis says, Maurice was ‘digging beneath competing systems to discover the living principles which they at the same time systematized and distorted. It was inconceivable to Maurice that those principles, born of encounter with “the divine order”, could ultimately be incompatible’.\textsuperscript{89}

\textbf{WILLIAM REED HUNTINGTON}

It is interesting to note Wolf’s contention that the writings of Maurice were the real source of the \textit{Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral} (1886/1888). According to Wolf, the American Episcopalian William Reed Huntington (1838-1909) drew on Maurice’s thought and amended it in his influential book, \textit{The Church-Idea} (1870).\textsuperscript{90} It certainly appears that Maurice was a strong influence on Huntington,\textsuperscript{91} though it may

\textsuperscript{86} Avis, \textit{Anglicanism and the Christian Church}, Rev. edn. (2002), 349: ‘Maurice believed that one of the positive principles of the Reformation was its recognition of the validity of national feeling and he linked this to the socio-political pyramid structure that incorporates family and local community into national life as its base’.

\textsuperscript{87} Vidler, \textit{Witness to the Light}, 216. I will explore this aspect of Maurice’s thought in some detail in Chapter 6.

\textsuperscript{88} Sykes, \textit{The Integrity of Anglicanism}, 19: ‘Maurice’s opposition to system-building has proved a marvellous excuse to those who believe they can afford to be condescending about the outstanding theological contribution of theologians from other communions and smugly tolerant of second-rate theological competence in our own; and the failure to be frank about the issues between the parties in the Church of England has led to an ultimately illusory self-projection as a Church without any specific doctrinal or confessional position’. For Avis’ response to Sykes on this issue, see Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’, 470-471. See also Morris, \textit{F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority}, 129, 201-202.

\textsuperscript{89} Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’, 469; also Avis, \textit{Anglicanism and the Christian Church}. Rev. edn. (2002), 295. Cf. Sanders, \textit{Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement}, 243: ‘Like Coleridge, Maurice made the quest for unity the dominant interest of his life, refused to align himself with any party, insisted that the parties and sects could be permanently reconciled, not through toleration and compromise, but through finding the truth which lay beneath their various opinions’. Note also the discussion of this aspect of Maurice’s thought by Richard Norris, ‘Maurice on Theology’, in \textit{F. D. Maurice: A Study}, by Frank McClain, Richard Norris and John Orens (Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 1982), 3-21.

\textsuperscript{90} Wolf, ‘Frederick Denison Maurice’, 88.

be impossible to prove Wolf’s claim. Both struggled with the relationship between church and nation, but in different contexts. Maurice, in England, with an organic view of church and nation, saw disestablishment as a denial of the divine order. Huntington, in the United States of America, saw the separation of church and state as a protection for the church from state interference. To quote Michelle Woodhouse-Hawkins:

It was [Huntington’s] contention that only when the church is free from the state can it fully realize its catholicity. He saw the Episcopal Church as able to provide the national church of which Maurice spoke, not because it was the established church, rather because it was disestablished. They agreed, though, that the nature of the Church of England and of the Episcopal Church, as seen in their comprehensiveness, loyalty to Scripture, creeds, sacraments of Christ, and holy order, provided the best possibility to serve as an umbrella for a universal church.

Huntington affirmed what he called ‘the mutual independence of Church and State’—a partnership of two entities with distinct identities. He belonged to a minority church in a pluralistic society. He nevertheless still urged the Episcopal Church to take upon itself the task of drawing together the different churches of America to form a national church— to become ‘the Church of the Reconciliation’, as he called it, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the nation.

This is a significant development in an Anglican context outside England: perhaps an expression of what Maurice might have argued had he been unencumbered by establishment. Huntington distinguished between the ‘Anglican principle’ and the ‘Anglican system’. ‘The writer does not favour attempting to foist the whole

similar themes may have been emerging quite independently of, or at least in parallel with, those of Maurice.

92 For a full discussion of the issues, see Michelle Woodhouse-Hawkins, ‘Maurice, Huntington, and the Quadrilateral: An Exploration in Historical Theology’, in Wright, Quadrilateral at One Hundred, ibid., 61-78.

93 Avis comments, Anglicanism and the Christian Church. Rev. edn. (2002), 349: ‘Huntington is a scathing critic of the Erastian concept of Anglicanism’.

94 Woodhouse-Hawkins, ‘Maurice, Huntington, and the Quadrilateral, 70.


Anglican system upon America’, he wrote, ‘while yet he believes that the Anglican principle is America’s best hope’. There is an interesting subtlety to his argument. The ‘English State-Church’ is rejected for its inability to secure comprehensiveness on English soil. To transplant this ‘Anglican system’ to a country like America would therefore be self-defeating: it would result in sectarianism rather than national unity. The ‘Anglican principle’, however, contains within itself the promise of uniting the ‘divided household’ of Christendom into a truly national church, even at cost to itself.

If our whole ambition as Anglicans in America be to continue a small, but eminentely respectable body of Christians, and to offer a refuge to people of refinement and sensibility, who are shocked by the irreverences they are apt to encounter elsewhere; in a word, if we care to be only a countercheck and not a force in society then let us say as much in plain terms, and frankly renounce any and all claim to Catholicity. We have only, in such a case, to wrap the robe of our dignity about us, and walk quietly along in a seclusion no one will take much trouble to disturb. Thus may we be a Church in name and a sect in deed.

The issue of catholicity is an interesting one. For Huntington, three ingredients were necessary for a church to be catholic. It must hold to the essentials of the catholic faith (the Anglican principle), it must be comprehensive (a ‘Church of the Reconciliation’) and it must be a force in society – a church for the nation. Philip Thomas comments as follows:

[Huntington] was drawing out of the inheritance of the Church of England theological resources which could unite Christians in North America, and he was doing this in order that the message and reality of the incarnation of Christ might have a formative influence on the emerging life of the new nation.

This vision, which was both ecumenical and American, lay behind the Quadrilateral adopted by the House of Bishops in Chicago in 1886. When translated to Lambeth two years later, however, a change of meaning took place. The Lambeth

---

97 Huntington, ibid., 114.  
99 ibid., 153.  
100 ibid., 152.  
Quadrilateral speaks instead of ‘Home Reunion’, referring, presumably, to ‘the practical need to hold together Anglican churches in widely different conditions all over the world’.\(^\text{102}\) The radically national focus of Huntington’s vision was lost. The internal unity of global Anglicanism was placed before Anglican’s national vocation. This was unfortunate. Both Maurice, in the English context, and Huntington in America, had interpreted such issues as catholicity and comprehensiveness in a uniquely national way. The church, they argued, was to be a transformative presence in the life of the nation.

WILLIAM TEMPLE

Other seminal minds have continued to place the nation at the heart of Anglican theology and ecclesiology, including William Temple (1881-1944). In his lectures published in 1915 as *Church and Nation*, Temple argued, in the tradition of F.D. Maurice,\(^\text{103}\) that the purpose of the church was to serve the nation, to infuse the nation with the spirit of the Kingdom of God.\(^\text{104}\) In this way both church and nation would fulfil their divine callings.

If we believe in a Divine Providence, if we believe that the life of Christ is … the governing principle of all history, we shall confess that the nation as well as the Church is a divine creation. The Church is here to witness to the ideal and to guide the world towards it, but the world is by divine appointment a world of nations, and it is such a world that is to become the Kingdom of God. Moreover, if it is by God’s appointment that nations exist, their existence must itself be an instrument of that divine purpose which the Church also serves.\(^\text{105}\)

\(^{102}\) Gillian R. Evans, “‘Permanence in the Revealed Truth and Continuous Exploration of its Meaning’”, in Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, 112. The text of *The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/1888* can be found in the American *Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1979), 876-878. See also Wright, *Quadrilateral at One Hundred*, vii-ix.


\(^{104}\) Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism*, 263.

\(^{105}\) William Temple, *Church and Nation* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1916), 44-45. Temple repeated this view two years later in *Mens Creatrix*, as John Kent notes: “Temple explicitly said that the energy which created and sustained the nation-states was that of the Divine Spirit, for nation-states … “are the operation of God immanent in history, while the life of the Church is the energy of God transcendent”’. John Kent, *William Temple: Church, State and Society in Britain, 1880-1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 47.
While the church transcends any one nation, Temple wrote, this does not mean that it can stand apart from national life.\textsuperscript{106} Nor does the inclusion of all nations in a family of nations mean that national distinctions are thereby made redundant.\textsuperscript{107} The church does, however, have the task, through its universality, of bringing the nations together.\textsuperscript{108} Only then can we truly speak of catholicity.\textsuperscript{109}

During the 1930s, Temple’s hitherto liberal spirit was tempered by the reality of evil in world affairs.\textsuperscript{110} As Sachs notes, Temple ‘increasingly distinguished the Church from the world, equating loyalty to the nation as a false allegiance’.\textsuperscript{111} Being a citizen and being a Christian, he argued, could no longer be regarded as the same thing. This movement in Temple’s thought, writes Sachs, reflected a significant shift in Anglican self-understanding, in response to the horrors of the time.\textsuperscript{112} Even so, while stepping back from his earlier, more liberal understanding of the relationship between church and nation, Temple did not withdraw the church from a commitment to society. The role of the church, he consistently maintained, is ‘to win this world for the Kingdom of God’.\textsuperscript{113}

To do this the church must uphold a theological vision of justice and the transformation of society.\textsuperscript{114} In spite of Temple’s more realistic grasp of the demonic

\begin{footnotes}
\item[106] Temple, ibid., 54.
\item[107] ibid., 51.
\item[108] ibid., 96.
\item[109] ibid., 200.
\item[111] ibid., 270.
\item[112] ibid., 285. During World War II, in calling the nation to prayer, Temple wrote: ‘But let it be quite clear that when we turn to prayer, it cannot be as Britons who happen to be Christians; it must be as Christians who happen to be British. Otherwise we fall into the error of our enemies, whose distinctive sin is that they put nationality first. It is quite true that the British Empire is at stake; if we are defeated it is doomed. And that Empire, in spite of some dark pages in its history and many imperfections in its present life, is yet the bearer of a tradition so noble and so precious to mankind that duty would call us to fight for its preservation, even if nothing further were at stake. Yet in our prayers we must think first, not of the British Empire, but of the world-wide family of God. It is for the hope and opportunity to work for the peace and goodwill of that great family that we strive; it is for the realization of that hope that we pray’. William Temple, The Hope of a New World (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970), 78-79.
\item[114] Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, 285. Cf. Kent, William Temple’, 122; ‘Temple … always thought of “the redemption of the world” as meaning the conversion of individuals within the framework of a society which was also being redeemed’.
\end{footnotes}
potential of nations, embodied especially in Nazism, the nation and the family of nations remained central to his understanding of the divine purpose for creation. In *Christianity and Social Order* (1942) he wrote:

Each individual is born into a family and a nation. In his maturity he is very largely what these have made him. The family is so deeply grounded in nature and the nation in history that anyone who believes in God as Creator and as Providence is bound to regard both as part of the divine plan for human life. Their claims have to be adjusted to one another, and so have the claims of the several families within each nation and of the several nations in the family of mankind … The aim of the nation must be to create a harmony of stable and economically secure family units; the aim of the world as a whole must be to create a harmony of spiritually independent nations which recognize one another as reciprocally supplementary parts of a richly harmonious fellowship.115

The emphasis here is on providence and the natural ordering of national and international life. As the national church, the Church of England continued, in Temple’s view, to play a pivotal role in keeping the nation true to its calling. To quote Michael Ramsay:

Whereas Gore had treated social problems partly in terms of a prophetic denunciation of evil, and partly in terms of the Church as the brotherhood following ‘the way’ in the midst of an unrighteous world, Temple, possessing as he did a doctrine of the State as well as of the Church, was more ready as a social thinker to trace the lines of a divine order of society, and as the ground for this he turned increasingly to the concept of Natural Law … Believing in a divine order, he had a high conception of the Church’s role to permeate society with the right conviction of its possibility, and this caused him to be far less antagonistic than Gore to the establishment of the Church. Unless and until the State desires to cast off its union with the Church, let the Church retain that union as a burden to be borne in the service of the community.116

As noted earlier, Temple stands within the English Broad Church tradition, which has consistently struggled to articulate the relationship between church and nation. Indeed, the key word is ‘relationship’. These Broad Church thinkers understand faith in social terms. Individual faith is not excluded, of course, but the individual is always part of a social world of families and nations, and these, in turn, are part of


the divine purpose for the whole creation. The ongoing presence of Hooker is apparent. Both the identity and vocation of the church are shaped by its life in society. Within Hooker’s world, of course, commitment to establishment made such a stance inevitable. Even so, the issues do not simply disappear when establishment goes away, as Huntington’s thought indicates.

It is now time to consider Bruce Kaye’s claim that Anglicanism is, first and foremost, a ‘church in society’ tradition, and to reintroduce Avis into the discussion. The typology of Paul Avis needs to be adjusted to accommodate Kaye’s insights. The fact that Kaye is an Australian theologian, intimately familiar with the English church but also deeply involved in the life of the worldwide Anglican Communion indicates that, even beyond England’s shores, a reconsideration of the relationship between church and nation in Anglican thought is both timely and possible.

A ‘CHURCH IN SOCIETY’ TRADITION

As we have seen earlier, Avis dispenses with the ‘Erastian paradigm’, or, as he later called it, the ‘nation-as-church’ model. It was, he says, the presupposition of Hooker and the Caroline Divines, and remained fundamental to the ecclesiology of the Tractarians (who ‘gave it a different twist’) and the Broad Church theologians, Coleridge, Arnold and Maurice. This model of church and state, Avis argues, continues to shape the life of the Church of England. He then goes on: ‘These conditions do not pertain elsewhere in the Anglican Communion, but the national church model persists when Anglicans outside England see themselves as having a mission to the whole community and to the nation’. Kaye himself is specifically mentioned as an example of such persistence.

117 Maurice, for example, in his lectures on Social Morality, wrote: ‘Many writers begin with considering mankind as a multitude of units. They ask, How did any number of these units form themselves into a Society? I cannot adopt that method. At my birth I am already in a Society. I am related, at all events, to a father and mother. This relation is the primary fact of my existence. I can contemplate no other facts apart from it’. F.D. Maurice, Reconstructing Christian Ethics: Selected Writings, ed. Ellen K. Wondra (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 139. Again, in a letter written in 1838 to explain what lay behind The Kingdom of Christ, Maurice wrote: ‘I was sent into the world that I might persuade men to recognise Christ as the centre of their fellowship with each other, so that they might be united in their families, their countries, and as men, not in schools and factions; and through forgetfulness of this truth myself I have been continually separating myself from relations, letting go friendships, and sinking into an unprofitable solitude’. Maurice, The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, I, 240.

118 Avis, The Anglican Understanding, 16.

119 ibid., 19 (my emphasis). See also Avis, Church, State and Establishment, 84.
I am intrigued by the shift in terminology. Perhaps this reflects what Avis is really trying to say. One moment Avis refers to the ‘nation-as-church’ model, but then, in the final paragraph of the section, with particular reference to the Anglican Communion, the terminology changes to the ‘national church’ model. There is a huge difference between the two. Avis admits that this model lives on in the absence of establishment, with ‘a mission to the whole community or nation’. I heartily concur. Surely this is a statement of purpose or vocation and a long way from being Erastian. Establishment does not have to be part of the equation. As Huntington indicated, a ‘national church’ could simply be committed to serving the nation, rather than occupying a privileged status within it. Avis also suggests that the slogan for the ‘nation-as-church’ model might be ‘the citizen as Anglican’. Perhaps a more useful slogan might be ‘the Anglican as citizen’. This is what Bruce Kaye seems to be suggesting in his claim that Anglicanism is a ‘church in society’ tradition.

We have already noted Avis’ proposal that a ‘baptismal paradigm’ offers the best way of expressing what is distinctive about Anglicanism in an ecumenical age. Kaye, who admittedly is responding to the first edition of Avis’ book, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church* (1989), does not dispute the value of Avis’ suggestion from the perspective of ecumenical relations, but he does question whether it really identifies ‘the leading characteristics or the essential quality of the Anglican theological tradition’. He puts forward a counter-proposal:

> I would like to suggest that a better clue to understanding the characteristically Anglican approach to Christianity is to be found in the way that church has been enmeshed with its society. From the earliest days of Christianity, church and society, church and state, bishop and governor, bishop and prince have been working together and interacting in various ways. One need only reflect on the different patterns of this relationship which have developed in the Eastern churches, the Roman Catholic Church, or the Lutheran and Reformed traditions. While it is undeniable that Anglicanism remained as part of the Catholic Christianity of Western Europe, it nonetheless has demonstrated from the earliest times a somewhat different pattern of relating to society.

120 Rayner, ‘The Idea of a National Church’, 29-32, makes a similar distinction.
122 Kaye, *A Church without Walls*, 103-104.
Over many centuries, Kaye argues, the Anglican theological tradition was shaped by the interrelationship between church and society. He traces the story of that relationship – beginning with the close links between church and society in Celtic and Anglo-Saxon times, the introduction of Roman authority following the Synod of Whitby in 664, through the Norman period and up to the time of the English Reformation. The settlements of Henry and Elizabeth, grounded in the royal supremacy, were therefore not the first word, but part of a process stretching back to the beginnings of Christianity in Britain. With the rejection of papal authority in England, the revolution brought about by Henry ‘constitutes in many ways a return to a coherent conception of English society’. The relationship between church and state, based in the theory of royal supremacy, became, as we have seen, the foundation of English life until the nineteenth century, by which time Hooker’s vision of an organic society was no longer sustainable. The privatisation of religion was taking place in the midst of an increasingly secular and pluralistic society. Even so, Kaye argues, ‘contrary tendencies’ to this trend continued to be expressed by thinkers like F.D. Maurice, as well as members of the old High Church group, who still advocated strong links between church and nation.

By and large, Kaye argues, Anglicanism has, since earliest times, been a ‘church in society’ type of Christianity. ‘It is that broad underlying set of instincts and dispositions which is the foundational pedigree of Anglicanism’. This is an important statement. Kaye is going below the surface of things, to an underlying set of presuppositions, of ‘instincts and dispositions’, that have been part of the Anglican ethos from the beginning. He calls this the ‘human life context’. We might speak instead of ‘habits of the heart and mind’, the way things just happened in church

123 ibid., 15-18. See also Kaye, Reinventing Anglicanism, Chapter 1.
124 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 19.
125 ibid., 24.
126 ibid., 26 (my emphasis).
127 ibid., 116.
128 The phrase, ‘habits of the heart’, was popularised by Alexis de Tocqueville in his study on American democracy. See Robert Bellah et al., Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life. Rev. edn. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1996), 37 and 312 (n. 28). W. Taylor Stevenson applies the same term directly to Anglicanism in a discussion of the political and social conditions in England in the sixteenth century in which the ‘Anglican ethos’ was able to develop. He continues: ‘An ethos is made up of the predominant conditions and assumptions of an ethnic group; it is the underlying feelings which inform the beliefs and customs of that group. An ethos tends to be intractable because it consists of underlying assumptions and feelings, and because they are underlying they go unchallenged and thereby dominate the group. An ethos is a “habit of the
and society in England. Behind it was a deep sense of divine providence. This remained the case even when the imperial formula of royal supremacy was officially adopted as the way church and society in England should operate.

Kaye argues that the Reformation Settlement muddied the waters somewhat. Thereafter the relationship between church and society was expressed in imperial categories – to use Avis’ typology, in terms of either the ‘Erastian paradigm’ or the ‘apostolic paradigm’. It was not until the Oxford Movement made its protest in the 1830s that the church was really forced to wrestle with what had been happening. Even then, Kaye writes, the real significance of the relationship between church and society was not understood. The outward form was taken as the real thing. ‘It was unfortunate’, writes Kaye, ‘that the power of imperial concepts in the popular culture at the time confused the issue even for the Tractarians. As a consequence, the form of the Royal Supremacy was taken to represent the substance of the religious tradition’. 129

As a result of this misreading, Kaye argues, Avis classes Hooker’s thought as Erastian. 130 But Hooker was not wedded to an imperial understanding of church and state. He defended the Elizabethan Settlement because it did not ‘work to the ill’. 131 He was responding to the world as he found it. Underneath his political analysis, however, lay deeper theological themes: his belief in providence, 132 and his emphasis on the Incarnation and God’s relationship with the world. 133

The form of argument used by Hooker to defend the Elizabethan settlement and the Royal Supremacy is … a combination of providence and utility. It is adventitious in so far as it is designed to defend what exists, rather than to establish what ought to exist according to some prescribed principle … What he is committed to in principle is that

---

129 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 117.
130 ibid., 104. As I have already pointed out, Kaye is responding to the first edition of Anglicanism and the Christian Church (1989). Avis carefully qualifies his earlier position in the later edition (2002), bringing his argument more in line with the very point Kaye wishes to make.
131 In Reinventing Anglicanism, 119, Kaye comments: ‘Hooker thought that the Elizabethan settlement in its place was theologically defensible, but he did not believe it in any fundamental sense’. Kaye’s discussion of Hooker in the earlier book, A Church Without Walls, is extended further in this later work. See especially pages 116-123, 166-169, 176, 214-215.
132 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 21.
133 ibid., 104-106.
doctrine of providence and the application of that principle of utility to different circumstances at different times … What is fundamental for him [therefore] is not the Royal Supremacy but God’s providence and the freedom and the responsibility to apply the principle of utility.134

Kaye’s reading of Hooker is sound.135 Hooker was not dogmatically committed to the principle of royal supremacy at all. The circumstances of his time led him to affirm the Elizabethan Settlement, but he may very well have argued for a different political configuration in another time and place.136 Avis makes the same point in the second edition of Anglicanism and the Christian Church, stressing the ‘element of expediency and pragmatism’ in Hooker’s thought.137 What this means, writes Kaye, is that ‘Anglicanism is not and never has been captive to the theory of the Royal Supremacy’.138 Underlying Hooker’s position was a theology of God’s engagement

135 Hooker’s approach to many issues, including church polity, the relationship between church and state, and even the interpretation of Scripture, may be summed up in a statement from Book III of his Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity (xi. 8): ‘A more dutiful and religious way for us were to admire the wisdom of God, which shineth in the beautiful variety of all things, but most in the manifold and yet harmonious dissimilitude of those ways, whereby his Church is guided from age to age, throughout all generations of men’. Richard Hooker, The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr Richard Hooker, Vol. 1; arr. J. Keble; 7th edn; rev. R.W. Church and F. Paget (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1870), 398.
136 Cf. F.J. Shirley, Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas (London: SPCK, 1949), 241: ‘Hooker was … a realist, and his philosophy in largest measure was derived from the facts of the day. He had also a consummate sense of historical process and development, as when he writes: “In these things the experience of time may breed both civil and ecclesiastical change from that which hath been before received, neither do latter things always violently exclude former, but the one growing less convenient than it hath been, giveth place to that which is now become more”’.
137 Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church. Rev. edn. (2002), 32. Later, Avis demonstrates how this same principle applies in Hooker’s view of episcopacy: ‘While [Hooker] holds episcopacy to have been ordained by God in the time of the Church’s infancy, and therefore to be apostolic in its foundation, he does not accept the inference that it is therefore binding on the Church for all time and in all circumstances’ (45). See also Stephen Sykes, Unashamed Anglicanism (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1995), Chapter 5: ‘Richard Hooker and the Ordination of Women to the Priesthood’, and H.R. McAdoo, Anglicans and Tradition and the Ordination of Women (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1997). Sykes highlights the centrality of reason in Scriptural interpretation, enabling Hooker to take a flexible approach to issues of ecclesiastical polity. In a similar vein, McAdoo demonstrates Hooker’s opposition to a legalistic reading of Scripture that does not allow for changing circumstances. McAdoo makes a similar assessment of Hooker’s approach to the traditions (but not doctrines) of the church in his essay, ‘Richard Hooker’, in The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism, ed. Geoffrey Rowell (Oxford: Ikon, 1992), 113-114. McAdoo comments: ‘Hooker appears to me to be reminding us that tradition is not an ever-increasing accumulation of irreversibles but a transmission process in which reduction and change may have a place as well as acceptance within the Spirit-led community of faith’. Some relevant sections from Keble’s edition of Hooker’s works are as follows: Book III (viii. 18) (Keble Vol. I, 379-380): ‘the discourse of reason aided with the influence of divine grace’; Book V (viii. 1-2) (Keble Vol. II, 33): ‘All things cannot be of ancient continuance, which are expedient and needful for the ordering of spiritual affairs … Laws touching matters of order are changeable, by the power of the Church; articles concerning doctrine not so’; Book V (lxv. 2) (Keble Vol. II, 318), on traditions: ‘… the inventors of them were men’.
138 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 100.
with the world. His theological agenda was much broader and deeper than the political settlement for which he was arguing at that particular moment in history. Working from this theological base, he was able to enter into and interpret his historical and social context with sympathy and insight. In another context, his social analysis would probably have been quite different.

Kaye’s proposal leaves Anglicanism firmly ‘enmeshed with its society’. Not surprisingly, Kaye translates this insight out of an English context into an Australian one, in keeping with the spirit of Hooker.

The Anglican Church today is most assuredly not established in any sense, nor does Australia profess to be an Anglican Christian country. Nonetheless, Anglican Christianity still represents a particular and distinct kind of Christian faith. It emphasises a sense of the providence of God in human society and a focus upon the incarnation of the Son of God in the person of Jesus Christ. Because of that sense of God’s providential presence in society, this religious faith is a faith of engagement with society and mission to it.

The challenge before Australian Anglicans, Kaye argues, ‘is to develop an effective and faithful way of relating to the Australian nation and people’. He points to the ‘particular social and cultural context with which any Anglican theology in Australia must grapple’, noting with regret the absence of any real commitment to this agenda in Australian Anglicanism.

As a consequence, there has been in the Australian tradition a very thin theological account of Australian society, and the explanation of that society has often gone by default to other voices such as the historian Manning Clark. Yet it is a curiosity that, in the Anglican tradition

139 ibid., 104. In Reinventing Anglicanism, 122, Kaye argues that Hooker’s legitimisation of the Elizabethan settlement ‘is vastly more open-textured than the political theory implied in the legislation’.

140 Kaye argues that what William Grant Broughton achieved in New South Wales was very much along the lines of Hooker’s approach, but he failed to go far enough. His final solution was to reinterpret the theory of royal supremacy in terms of church government. He was unable to push the logic of his argument further into the area of church and society, though he went further than his fellow bishops, who were reluctant to tamper with such a fundamental Anglican doctrine (as they saw it). Hooker’s underlying providential and utility arguments, Kaye argues, would have enabled Broughton to let go of the notion of royal supremacy completely, and to attempt a theological account of the new society to which Anglicanism now belonged. See Kaye, ‘Richard Hooker and Australian Anglicanism’, 237.

141 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 198 (my emphasis).

142 ibid., 100.
generally, an account of the society in which the church is located, and to which the church is related, has been a strong focus and interest. In that respect, one is bound to feel disappointed about the way in which the Anglican theological tradition has failed to grow in any local sense in Australia.\textsuperscript{143}

I will return to this important statement in due course. At this point I simply wish to endorse Kaye’s words, but to interpret them in a specific way. In order to give an account of Australian society, it seems to me, it is important to reflect on what it means to be Australian. It is in this sense that I am using the word ‘nation’ in this study. It conveys the sense of belonging to a place and a people. This is consistent with the Broad Church views discussed earlier. I am not espousing some form of ‘nationalism’, unless it is the ‘soft’ variety, celebrating national life, but ‘porous in its social boundaries’, always leaning towards the universal.\textsuperscript{144} This, I believe, is a distinctly Anglican perspective. As Philip Thomas notes, it is possible ‘to discern a distinct national consciousness in the English church almost from its inception; but the thinking found within the formularies of the Church of England cannot be described as nationalistic’. There was always a sense of belonging to the universal church, while also possessing ‘a particular vocation and calling’.\textsuperscript{145} As we will see, the Anglican Church of Australia, as a member of a worldwide Communion, is well placed both to participate in national life, and to draw the nation beyond itself into its universal calling as part of a world community.

CONCLUSION

Australian Anglicanism has inherited a tradition which has, for centuries, lived with an unresolved tension – the tension between the universal and the particular, being both catholic and national. There have been times throughout the meandering history of Anglicanism in England when this tension has been misused, leading to repressive measures for the sake of national unity. This was understandable, of course: the stability of both church and nation depended upon it. Nevertheless, there were those who felt strongly that the inner integrity of the church – its catholicity – was being

\textsuperscript{143} ibid., 113.
\textsuperscript{144} J.W.C. Wand lists ‘nationalism’ as one of the four distinctive features of Anglicanism (the others being comprehensiveness, continuity and biblicism). My own view is that Bishop Wand was not rigorous enough in his choice of terminology. See J.W.C. Wand, Anglicanism in History and Today (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1961), 62-69.
\textsuperscript{145} Thomas, ‘Doctrine of the Church’, 253.
compromised. To use the words of John Kater, “the vision of “national Catholicism”
that moved the Anglican Reformers created a kind of cognitive dissonance between
what Anglicans claimed to mean when they spoke of a “catholic” church and their
actual experience”.146

There were ruptures along the way. The Nonjurors made a stand on principle for the
sake of both church and nation by separating themselves from what they considered
to be a violation in the divine order of things. The Church of England survived the
schism, as it has always done, by adjusting to the political and social realities of the
time and living with the tension, but it was becoming increasingly difficult to pretend
that the established pattern that existed in England was really comprehensive. As the
civil war had shown, England was full of dissenters. Moreover, the industrial
revolution distanced the church from an increasing number of citizens, and plunged
the nation into an era of reform. The church, in turn, was faced with a crisis.

Tractarianism, which began as an attempt to shore up the old order, became a reform
movement within Anglicanism devoted to strengthening its inner integrity. Its protest
against state interference in the life of the church was not necessarily a rejection of
the vocation of the church within the life of the nation. The leaders of the Oxford
Movement were endeavouring to reform the English church, the church of the nation,
by rediscovering its true catholicity.147 Newman finally gave up the attempt,
believing that the English church was so connected to England that it could never be
truly catholic.148 He departed for Rome. He rightly discerned the tension at the heart
of Anglicanism between its national life and its catholicity.

Broad Churchmen saw things differently. In particular, F.D. Maurice sensed the
importance of sustaining the vision of a national church. He agreed with the
Tractarians that the Church of England was called to provide the religious identity of

146 Kater, ‘Whose Church is it Anyway?’, 49.
147 ibid., 51: “Like the Non-Jurors, the leaders of the Oxford Movement considered that a truly catholic
episcopate, far from being the department of state it had permitted itself to become, is the cornerstone
that guarantees the faithfulness of a truly catholic English church and people”.
148 ‘The claim to Catholicity which Newman asserted as an Anglican eventually destroyed itself, like a
thread that has been made so taut that it bursts’. George H. Tavard, The Quest for Catholicity: A Study
the entire English people,149 but he rejected their method of achieving it. In Maurice’s view, they had simply formed a new ‘catholic’ party within Anglicanism.150 As Kater notes, ‘Maurice set about to discover the truly catholic foundations of a society that would begin, not by constructing institutions and “systems” but by discovering the God-given order of people and things’.151 The church is ‘catholic’ when it participates in the establishment of God’s reign in the world. Both church and nation are called to unity. The church cannot be truly catholic, in Maurice’s view, unless it is also truly national, a church for the nation.

As we have noted, both Huntington and Kaye have argued that, for Anglicanism to be true to itself, it must engage with the society to which it belongs. Both have written, albeit in different eras, from the perspective of the worldwide Anglican Communion, far away from the establishment theory of church and state, yet nevertheless sensitive to their respective societal contexts. The translation of Anglicanism to other parts of the world has heightened Anglican sensitivity to the variety of cultural contexts in which this religious tradition, born in England, is now trying to exist. When Article 34, with its emphasis on ‘every particular or national church’, was taken outside England, it took on a whole new meaning. What had been a powerful defence of the right of the English church to reform itself now became an affirmation of national and cultural diversity.

This also meant, of course, that the spotlight was turned back on England itself, highlighting the Englishness of the English church. As Kater has written, sooner or later the Church of England must grasp the fact that both its identity and its mission (and, indeed, its sense of catholicity) are ‘related to its roots in English soil, the English people and their culture’.152 This, it seems to me, is a liberating realisation, both for the English church, which is now able to claim Englishness as part of what it is and embrace its vocation to its own nation and people,153 and also for the worldwide Anglican Communion, which is empowered to accept its calling as a

149 Kater, ‘Whose Church is it Anyway?’, 51.
150 Tavard, The Quest for Catholicity, 177.
151 Kater, ‘Whose Church is it Anyway?’, 51.
152 Ibid., 45.
153 Cf. William Temple’s comment: ‘The Church of England, like other Churches, has often failed to be completely Christian … but it has never failed to be utterly, completely, provocingly, adorably English’. See Kent, William Temple, 35.
diverse church in a diverse world, freed from ‘Anglo-Saxon captivity’.\textsuperscript{154} Maurice’s concern for national unity is now pushed into a global context. ‘Today’, writes Ian Douglas, ‘the growing plurality and multicultural reality of the Anglican Communion forces Anglicans to see that our common identity lies not in a shared English culture but in the experience of locality in universality’. Douglas describes this experience, and the defining characteristic of Anglicanism, as ‘the embrace and celebration of apostolic catholicity within vernacular moments’.\textsuperscript{155} We could also describe these ‘vernacular moments’ as ‘habits of the heart and mind’, each related to its own societal context.

For settler countries like Australia, this insight is particularly important. It took a long time, as we have seen, for the Australian church to accept that being English was no longer a prerequisite for being Anglican. It is still learning, however, what it means to be Australian, to discover and celebrate its own vernacular moments. Even so, the call for Australian Anglicanism to be both Anglican and Australian is asking no more of Australians than what is being asked of other members of the worldwide Anglican Communion. It must do so if it is to be true to itself and to its own Anglican heritage. As this chapter has demonstrated, this same process of belonging to a nation – a place and people – lies at the heart of the Anglican story. I will quote Ian Douglas again to emphasise this point:

The roots of a contemporary understanding of Anglican identity lie not in a newly constructed form of Anglican self-definition but rather in a reclamation of the historic processes of contextualization which lie at the heart of the English Reformation … The advent of the Church of England marked a reconception of the body of Christ on the English shores that was at once profoundly particular and profoundly catholic. This process of contextualization, in which the church becomes grounded in the local realities of a particular people while remaining in communion across the differences of culture and geography, particularly through a shared history with the See of Canterbury, is where Anglican identity lies.\textsuperscript{156}


\textsuperscript{156} ibid., 35.
I will explore these themes in more depth in the next two chapters. The translation (or rather, migration) of the English church to other parts of the world beyond English shores drew to the surface of Anglicanism contextual issues that had simply been assumed previously and so not even noticed. In a culturally diverse worldwide Anglican Communion, however, contextuality becomes an integral part of ecclesiology. The ‘vernacular moments’ of which Douglas writes, emerging from particular locations, become part of the raw material of the Anglican ethos. In an Australian context, the issue of what it means to be Australian then becomes an integral Anglican issue. Broughton’s provincial vision reappears in this context, beckoning a fragmented Australian church to face squarely its national character.

There is also another matter that has to be faced once we accept cultural diversity as one of the hallmarks of contemporary Anglicanism – the issue of colonialism. Building on Maurice’s insight that the quest for catholicity is inseparable from the quest for social transformation, Kater questions whether Anglicanism can ignore the global injustices brought about by its own translation into a worldwide Communion.157 As Kwok Pui-lan has written: ‘Facing the twenty-first century, the Anglican Communion must determine whether it will be a relic of the colonial past, or a bridge to the postcolonial future’.158 Confronting the history of colonialism is crucially important, it seems to me, if Anglicanism is to face up to its existence as a post-colonial Communion in a post-colonial world.

157 Kater, ‘Whose Church is it Anyway?’, 53.
CHAPTER 5  THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The last two chapters have explored the extent to which the national idea has been present in the Anglican tradition since the English Reformation in the sixteenth century. We have now dispensed with Avis’ concern that a continuing interest in the relationship between church and nation is a form of Erastianism. Our survey of Broad Church thinkers has demonstrated that, for at least one Anglican stream, the life of the nation remains central to the way the Anglican vocation is understood. Even William Temple, while recognising the demonic possibilities of nationalism, did not withdraw from a commitment to society. If anything, Temple’s position of leadership in a time of war highlights even more the need for the church to stay true to its calling as a prophetic and mediating presence, willing to give a theological account of the nation’s life. Temple, of course, continued to support establishment, seeing it as a means whereby the church could continue to serve the nation. The examples of Huntington in America and Kaye in Australia, however, indicate that outside the English context issues of church and nation live on without the benefits of establishment. As Kaye argues, Anglicanism is, by its very nature, a ‘church in society’ tradition.

As noted in the conclusion to the previous chapter, the perspectives of writers like Huntington and Kaye have emerged out of Anglicanism’s global experience. The purpose of this chapter is to reflect more deeply on the implications for Australian Anglicanism of this move outwards from English shores to become, in due course, a worldwide Communion. The Australian church needs to be seen in this global context, rather than merely as an extension of the English church. It is one expression of Anglicanism amongst many. By failing to appreciate the indelible links between church and society, Australian Anglicanism has missed the point of its own tradition. The Anglican global experience forces the Australian church to think again. It cannot live in isolation from its own context. It is an Australian church within an Australian
nation, and its vocation is to serve that nation. It is still only beginning to grasp the radical implications of being a ‘particular or national church’ in the Antipodes.

In recent decades, as former British colonies have achieved political independence, Anglicanism has had to confront the implications of being a post-colonial, culturally diverse Communion. The meaning of Article 34, we might say, has been forced to change with the times. As I have noted, the Anglican Communion is no longer predominantly Anglo-Saxon, or even white. At the first Lambeth Conference in 1867, for example, all seventy-six bishops present were white and were either British or American citizens. More recently a dramatic shift has occurred in the centre of gravity of Anglicanism towards the global South. The common mind of the Anglican Communion, it seems, will increasingly be formed ‘from a cultural, economic, and linguistic context which is non-Anglo-Saxon, and non-First World’. ¹

As far back as 1930, in preparing the ground for the Lambeth Conference of that year, Canon A.E.J. Rawlinson reminded the English church that it was now only one small part of a global Communion.² ‘The Anglican Church is no longer specifically English’, he declared.³ The work of the conference subsequently included an exploration of the nature of the Anglican Communion.⁴ Resolution 49 reads, in part:

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 by the common counsel of the bishops in conference.⁵

³ ibid., 77.
⁴ The relevant subcommittee was chaired by Bishop St Clair Donaldson of Salisbury, formerly Archbishop of Brisbane. See Alan M.G. Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences (London: SPCK, 1978), 164.
⁵ ibid., 6 (my emphasis).
In Paul Avis’ view, this resolution highlights the fact that, while worldwide Anglicanism shares a common faith and order, this is embodied within ‘a providential ordering of distinct cultures and national destinies’. The cultural diversification of Anglicanism is both an expression of the divine purpose and the outworking of a hidden potential within Anglicanism itself. Anglicanism, Avis argues, is by nature predisposed to work with the grain of the given contours of human and social identity, expressed through geography, political structures, cultural traditions, and the shared history of a people. The role of particular or national churches has evolved within Anglicanism into an affirmation of the principle of inculturation.

This is a crucial point. The way forward for Anglicanism, according to Avis, lies in embracing, rather than resisting, cultural diversity, and in accepting the principle of inculturation as an Anglican imperative. The report of the 1948 Lambeth Conference puts this well: ‘Each branch of the Anglican Communion expresses loyalty and service to its own nation, and its primary duty is to serve the people of its own land’. The report calls for ‘national leadership and authority’ and ‘indigenous growth’ to enable the church to realise its purpose in each context. It continues:

> It is therefore of paramount importance that the Anglican Communion, as a fellowship called of God for the service of the nations, should preserve its unity and strengthen those bonds that make for a common service for mankind. Distance separates the different branches of this Communion, and it becomes an urgent necessity that each should interpret its spiritual life, culture, and service to the others …

The full impact of colonial independence had not yet been felt when this document was written. Even so, there was clearly a desire to recognise indigenous churches, and to encourage the formation of new Anglican provinces. A number of African provinces were formed in rapid succession during the following decade under the leadership of Archbishop of Canterbury Geoffrey Fisher, in each case before political independence had even been granted. John Howe describes this shift from...

---

7 Avis, The Anglican Understanding, 63 (my emphasis).
8 The Lambeth Conference 1948: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops; together with Resolutions and Reports (London: SPCK, 1948), 87 (my emphasis).
missionary churches to autonomous provinces as a watershed in the life of the Anglican Communion.\(^9\)

But with this shift came another watershed: the problem of mutual accountability. What are the essentials of Anglican identity? What structures of authority should exist? What holds this worldwide fellowship of Anglican churches together?\(^10\) When Howe wrote, in the 1980s, such questions had not been resolved;\(^11\) two decades later, they have become even more urgent. There is an ongoing tension within the worldwide Anglican Communion between the concept of provincial autonomy and the need for interdependence.\(^12\) The tension is unavoidable, part of the fabric of a tradition that has for centuries claimed to be both universal and particular, both catholic and national. As Avis has reminded us, global unity cannot be achieved aside from the principle of inculturation. To repeat the words of Ian Douglas in the conclusion to the last chapter: ‘the church becomes grounded in the local realities of a particular people while remaining in communion across the differences of culture and geography’.\(^13\) The 1948 Lambeth Report put the issue this way:

\begin{quote}
The Anglican Communion today is like a river that is made up of streams, each of which passes through a different country, each with a colour drawn from the soil through which it passes, each giving its best to the full strength of the river, flowing toward that ocean symbolic of a larger comity when the Anglican Communion itself will once again become part of a reunited Christendom. No one stream is superior to another. The glory of each is its contribution to the river which, while being enriched by all, enriches all the countries of the world wheresover it flows.\(^14\)
\end{quote}

The Anglican Church of Australia has for far too long been more enthusiastic about flowing into the river than in grasping the colour of its own stream. It has seen itself as an offshoot of England rather than as an integral part of a new society. As we have

---


\(^10\) ‘It is not surprising’, writes Kaye, ‘that, where a tradition is most obviously thought of in terms of a particular national church, its identity becomes ambiguous once it spreads beyond the bounds of its nation of origin’. *A Church Without Walls*, 95.


\(^12\) See Hamid, ‘The Nature and Shape’, 93-95.

\(^13\) Douglas, ‘The Exigency of Times and Occasions’, 35.

\(^14\) *The Lambeth Conference of 1948*, 83.
seen, it took a long time for agreement to be reached over a national church constitution, largely because the legal nexus with England was so strong. More than four decades later, Anglicanism is still only beginning to take root in Australian soil and to accept the vocational implications of being ‘a particular or national church’. The Australian church cannot sidestep such matters, either wilfully or through ignorance. It is not immune from the struggles facing every other province in the Anglican Communion, nor does it have the right to ignore imperatives that have emerged from within the Anglican tradition itself. Australian Anglicanism is, after all, one aspect of this larger story: a story, as we will see, which drives each ‘particular or national church’ to embrace the principle of inculturation.15 By virtue of its membership of a global Communion, therefore, the Australian church must focus more intentionally on its national vocation – to be both in and for Australia.

I will begin this exploration within the borders of Britain itself, where the ‘home church’ was divided into a number of ‘definite national churches’ – England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland.16 I will then turn to a consideration of the American experience, which called into question a range of assumptions about how an Anglican church outside England should look and behave. The War of Independence separated American Anglicanism from its English origins, and forced the Episcopal Church to identify with the new nation. Through a survey of key documents of the Anglican Communion, I will then explore the gradual growth in awareness within global Anglicanism, especially in recent decades, of the importance of contextualisation and inculturation. Finally, I will return to the question raised by Bishop Broughton during the formative period of Australian colonial life: where does authority lie, at the diocesan or the provincial level? This issue remains of central importance within the Australian context, where the principle of diocesan separatism continues to obscure the church’s calling as a church for the nation.

A number of important issues which must be addressed by the Australian church will emerge in the course of the discussion: assumptions about Anglo-Saxon superiority, the question of Anglican links with British imperialism, and finally, the implications

16 Wand, Anglicanism in History and Today, 24.
of being a post-colonial church in a post-colonial Communion. Facing these issues openly and honestly is an essential step towards embracing what it might mean to be a church with a national vocation. This may result in some discomfort once issues of power or race emerge like ghosts from the past to haunt both church and society. So be it. To quote a sentence from the 1988 Lambeth Conference report: ‘The Church is, by its nature, an uncomfortable presence anywhere’.17 This is all part of the Anglican calling, as the document prepared by the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission for the 1988 Lambeth Conference, For the Sake of the Kingdom, makes clear.18 In my view, the contents of this document have still to be absorbed throughout the Anglican Communion.

CULTURAL DIVERSITY WITHIN BRITAIN

The establishment pattern that emerged through the reforms of Henry and Elizabeth was designed for the English context.19 Nevertheless, there was something about the Anglican tradition that allowed it to develop the way it did once it left English shores: a potential for adaptation, we might say, rooted in British experience prior to its great outward movements. In fact, Anglicanism was never merely English, even before the years of colonial expansion. ‘It took root in Wales’, writes Jacob, ‘it took partial root in Scotland in a modified form, and it took partial root in Ireland’.20 The Anglicanism that developed in these Celtic parts of Britain was not just a carbon copy of the English model – it was Welsh, Scottish and Irish.

Even when, through an Act of Parliament in 1536, Wales became part of England, it retained a distinct national identity, not least of all because of the survival of the Welsh language.21 Wales had its own distinct culture, and there were distinct differences in temperament between the English and the Welsh.22 By 1567, a Welsh translation of the Bible and the Prayer Book had been completed, and other improved

20 Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 2.
21 ibid., 22. Henry VIII’s intention, in the 1536 Act, was to achieve both political and cultural assimilation. But, as Reginald Coupland notes, ‘this attempt to denationalise the Welsh broke down’ in spite of all the material benefits gained as a consequence of union with England. Welsh and Scottish Nationalism: A Study (London: Collins, 1954), 47-51.
22 Wand, Anglicanism in History and Today, 23.
editions quickly followed. Without them it is doubtful whether the Reformation would have taken root in Wales as a Welsh rather than an English phenomenon.\(^{23}\) Bishop Richard Davies expressed this clearly in his preface to the 1567 translation of the New Testament. The Reformation, he wrote, reconnected the church with the early period of British Christianity that preceded the arrival of Romanism under Augustine of Canterbury. His aim, Jacob argues, was ‘to refute the accusation that the Reformation was an English imposition, and to identify the reformed Church with age-old notions of Welsh nationalism’.\(^{24}\)

Anglicanism flourished in Wales at least until the late eighteenth century.\(^{25}\) Thereafter it had to contend with the popularity of non-established churches.\(^{26}\) Even in its prime, however, there were difficulties in being part of the English church. A Welsh bishopric, for example, had considerably less status than an English one. Moreover, Welsh bishops were often non-resident or could not speak the Welsh language.\(^{27}\) Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the push for disestablishment gained in intensity. Legislation to that effect was finally realised in 1920 – ‘an act of belated justice’, according to Bishop Wand.\(^{28}\) Anglicanism in Wales was now officially Welsh, self-governing and indigenous.\(^{29}\) It is notable that in 2002 a Welshman, Dr. Rowan Williams, was appointed to the see of Canterbury – the first non-Englishman to hold that office since the Reformation.

Scotland and England were independent kingdoms until James VI of Scotland also became James I of England. Even then, however, the churches of England and Scotland remained separate.\(^{30}\) Within Scotland, a protracted struggle was already in

\(^{23}\) The importance of these translations for the survival of the Welsh language should also be noted. See Coupland, *Welsh and Scottish Nationalism*, 58-59.
\(^{24}\) Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church*, 23.
\(^{25}\) ibid., 24.
\(^{26}\) Hoppen, *The Mid-Victorian Generation*, 530-538.
\(^{27}\) Neill, *Anglicanism*, 317; also Coupland, *Welsh and Scottish Nationalism*, 60.
\(^{29}\) Neill, *Anglicanism*, 318: ‘The Church is the Church of the country and no longer an alien importation ruled from far away’. Cf. John Kent’s comment in *William Temple*, 61: ‘The Welsh case for disestablishment had rested firmly on nationalist grounds: the Church of England was “alien” in Wales, and the majority of Welsh people did not belong to it’.
\(^{30}\) James made no conscious attempt to forge a unity between the two churches, although this may inadvertently have been the effect. See John Morrill, ‘British Patriarchy: Ecclesiastical Imperialism
process between Presbyterians and those who followed an episcopal form of church order. The Stuart kings, James and Charles I, favoured the Episcopalians.\textsuperscript{31} Such was the reaction to Charles’ policies during the 1630s, however, that the Scottish church abolished bishops altogether, strengthening the links between Presbyterianism and Scottish nationalism.\textsuperscript{32}

Following the Restoration, four new Scottish bishops were consecrated in England to ensure the apostolic succession, and they, in turn, consecrated six others upon their return home. In 1689, however, all the bishops, in loyalty to the Stuarts, refused to swear allegiance to William III, becoming Nonjurors. Presbyterianism thereafter became the established religion in Scotland,\textsuperscript{33} and Episcopalians became ‘a brutally persecuted minority’.\textsuperscript{34} A century later, following the death of the last legitimate Stuart claimant to the throne, the Scottish bishops finally recognised the house of Hanover. The 1792 Act of Toleration once again allowed clergy ordained by Scottish bishops to officiate in Scotland.\textsuperscript{35} The Episcopal Church was weak, a shadow of its former self.\textsuperscript{36} Nevertheless, through all these years the apostolic succession had been preserved, though without royal authority. The Scottish church had maintained its own liturgical tradition, and retained a strong sense of independence.\textsuperscript{37} Anglicanism therefore survived in Scotland with neither the privileges nor the restrictions of establishment.\textsuperscript{38} As we will see, this proved to be of crucial importance for the American church at a time when links with England were no longer possible.

\textsuperscript{31} Daniel B. Stevick, ‘Canon Law’, 222. Morrill, ibid., 217, claims that what mattered to James was not the imposition of an English system onto the Scottish church, but rather the principle of episcopacy and apostolic succession.

\textsuperscript{32} Haugaard, ‘From the Reformation to the Eighteenth Century’, 22. Morrill, ibid., 233, argues that Charles’ real mistake was his inability to think in terms of Scottish law and custom.

\textsuperscript{33} Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Communion, 26-27.

\textsuperscript{34} Neill, Anglicanism, 279; also Stevick, ‘Canon Law’, 222.

\textsuperscript{35} Wand, Anglicanism in History and Today, 23.

\textsuperscript{36} Neill, Anglicanism, 280, notes that there were ‘no more than four bishops and about forty priests. The diocesan and parochial systems had collapsed. Everything had to be begun afresh in the organization of a Church which had lived for many years without a clear confession of faith, with a confused order of worship, and with hardly any discipline’.

\textsuperscript{37} ibid., 279-280; also Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 27-30.

\textsuperscript{38} Even after 1792, the English bishops were reluctant to support their Scottish counterparts. Jacob, ibid., 30, suggests that this may have been due to the growth of the number of dissenting bodies in England. ‘If they had supported recognition for the Episcopal Church in Scotland, consistency would have required them to support the granting of recognition to the dissenting churches in England, thus undermining the traditional Anglican understanding of identity between Church and State’.

\textsuperscript{142}
The Irish situation was different again. Like Wales, Ireland was ruled by the English monarch, but had only been partially settled by the English. It therefore retained its own distinctive language and culture.\textsuperscript{39} By and large, the Irish bishops accepted the reforms instituted during the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth. Nevertheless, the reformation of the Irish church was viewed as an English imposition, and caused widespread resentment.\textsuperscript{40} ‘The crown’, writes Jacob, ‘seems in fact to have paid little attention to the need to assist the Reformation to take root in Ireland’.\textsuperscript{41} The same could be said of the English church.\textsuperscript{42} During Elizabeth’s reign, few of the reformed clergy could speak Irish, considering it to be ‘a barbarous language of a backward people’, and so focussed their attention on the English minority.\textsuperscript{43} The Church of Ireland was Anglican and established, but without the support of the people, who returned to the Church of Rome.\textsuperscript{44} Translations of the Bible and the Prayer Book did not appear until the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{45} By then, it was too late: the religious division of the Irish people had settled into a fixed pattern that has changed little since then.\textsuperscript{46} Although it was officially the established church in Ireland, the Irish church remained small and impoverished.

This anomalous situation was brought into sharp focus during the political upheavals of the 1830s. Little over ten percent of the Irish population were actually associated with the Irish church. The great majority by far were Roman Catholics.\textsuperscript{47} It was the government’s cost-cutting decision to reduce the number of dioceses in Ireland in keeping with the church’s constituency that led, of course, to Keble’s Assize sermon and the birth of the Oxford Movement. But what seemed like sacrilege from an Anglican perspective was a question of justice from the standpoint of the Irish opposition.\textsuperscript{48} Over time, Gladstone came to accept the legitimacy of the grievances

\textsuperscript{39} ibid.
\textsuperscript{40} Neill, \textit{Anglicanism}, 292-293.
\textsuperscript{41} Jacob, \textit{The Making of the Anglican Church}, 31.
\textsuperscript{42} Morrill, ‘British Patriarchy’, 213.
\textsuperscript{43} Jacob, \textit{The Making of the English Church}, 33.
\textsuperscript{44} ‘Yet the Irish \textit{via media} did not wean the people from Catholic recusancy’. Morrill, ‘British Patriarchy’, 213.
\textsuperscript{45} Neill, \textit{Anglicanism}, 293.
\textsuperscript{46} ibid.
\textsuperscript{48} ‘The anomaly of a state church catering to only a small minority of the population was one of the grievances dwelt on by Daniel O’Connell and his followers, who wished to repeal the union’. ibid. See also Hoppen, \textit{The Mid-Victorian Generation}, 559-560, for similar discussion.
of the Irish majority. As Prime Minister he championed the cause of Irish disestablishment, which was duly achieved on 1 January, 1871.\textsuperscript{49}

In summary, it could be argued that the Anglican Communion began within Britain itself.\textsuperscript{50} Even before its translation to other parts of the world through travel and migration, the English church had been faced with the impossibility of simply duplicating itself in other places. Anglicanism was proving to be larger than the English model, capable of adaptation in a range of different cultural contexts, even without government support. To quote Jacob:

\begin{quotation}
It had transcended the English language and was flourishing in Welsh-speaking Wales. In Scotland it had demonstrated a capacity to adapt to a changing polity, until bishops were excluded from the Church of Scotland. Thereafter the Episcopal Church showed that Anglicanism could survive without the support of the crown and the civil government … Ireland in particular illustrates the need to provide the Bible and the liturgy in the vernacular, and of locally-based preaching ministers … it is clear that [in Ireland] the coercive power of the State was insufficient to impose Anglicanism.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quotation}

These early lessons would need to be relearned as the Anglican faith spread throughout the world during the following centuries.\textsuperscript{52} As we noted earlier, the Anglican Communion has only in recent times begun to see the principle of inculturation as an Anglican imperative, and still wrestles with the legacy of its English origins, in spite of Welsh, Scottish and Irish precedents. It took a major disruption elsewhere, however, to force Anglicanism to let go of England and to become part of a new nation. I refer, of course, to the American War of Independence, a defining moment in the history of Anglicanism worldwide.

THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

By the time of the American Revolution, religious diversity had long been part of the fabric of colonial life.\textsuperscript{53} The English church was only one of many competing for the

\textsuperscript{49} See Bebbington, ibid., 146-150; Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 184-193.
\textsuperscript{50} See Frederick H. Shriver, ‘Councils, Conferences and Synods’, in Sykes et al. The Study of Anglicanism, 208.
\textsuperscript{51} Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 34.
\textsuperscript{52} ibid., 293.
\textsuperscript{53} ‘If England had thirty different religions, then America had hundreds, and none of them was traditionally organized’. Gordon S. Wood, The Radicalism of the American Revolution (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 112.
attention of the colonial population throughout the thirteen colonies stretched along
the Atlantic seaboard. The foundations of Anglicanism in America were laid in
Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607, and it was in Virginia that the principle of
establishment was most successfully realised on American soil.\textsuperscript{54} Even so, the church
in Virginia developed its own character, which, in English terms, could hardly be
called ‘established’. It enjoyed the privileges of official recognition by the colonial
legislature, but without the oversight of either monarchs or bishops.\textsuperscript{55}

This was the pattern throughout all the American colonies: the development of an
Anglican church without an episcopate.\textsuperscript{56} Ordinations took place in England. In the
main, the clergy and laity of the colonies were quite content with this arrangement,
which ‘kept the ministry regular, episcopal vigilance to a minimum, and vestry
influence strong’.\textsuperscript{57} As the eighteenth century unfolded, opposition to the idea of an
American episcopate increased. Its only support came from the high churches in the
northern colonies.\textsuperscript{58} Up and down the Atlantic seaboard, however, Anglicans were
united in their loyalty to the monarchy. Wood comments:

By the time of the Revolution there were some four hundred Anglican
congregations in the North American colonies. Even moderate Anglican
preachers continually stressed the sacredness of authority and the need
for subjects to honour and revere those set over them and thereby lent a
monarchical tone to the culture than it otherwise would have had.
Although the Anglican church often appealed to the poorest and the most
powerless of the colonists, as the king’s church it was also especially
attractive to the top of the social scale – to royal officials and other elites.
Indeed, by mid-century Anglicans held public office in numbers out of
proportion to their numbers in the society, which further contributed to a
strengthening of monarchy in the colonies.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{54} See Robert Prichard, \textit{A History of the Episcopal Church}. Rev. edn. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania:
Morehouse Publishing, 1999), Chapters 1-3; also John Frederick Woolverton, \textit{Colonial Anglicanism in North America}
\textsuperscript{55} Woolverton, ibid., 19; also Peter M. Doll, \textit{Revolution, Religion, and National Identity: Imperial
Anglicanism in British North America, 1745-1795} (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University
Press, 2000), 205.
\textsuperscript{56} Jacob, \textit{The Making of the Anglican Church}, 57.
\textsuperscript{57} Shaw, “Collision With the Nation”, 251; also Quinn, \textit{To Be a Pilgrim}, 115.
Identity}, traces the long history of high church pressure on the British government to provide a bishop
in the English mode. By 1766 Samuel Johnson was arguing that if England would not act the colonists
should take action themselves, finding a bishop by any suitable means. Doll notes (208) that after the
American Revolution, the high churchmen broke into two camps, one supporting the established high
church episcopate in Nova Scotia, and the other opting for a more spiritual and non-political model in
the United States.
\textsuperscript{59} Wood, \textit{The Radicalism of the American Revolution}, 18.
The American Revolution forced Anglicanism in America to align itself with the future of the republic. The monarchy was rejected completely, nor was it possible to even countenance the reintroduction of episcopacy in the English mode. Royal supremacy was dead. In the northern colonies, Episcopalian support for the British had remained strong, whereas a significant proportion of Anglican laypersons in the middle and southern states, including a large proportion of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, supported the Revolution. Thousands of lay people in the north fled to Nova Scotia and Ontario. Many Episcopalian clergy were dismissed or forced to stand aside, and a number suffered severe persecution. ‘Like the nonjuring clergy at the time of the Glorious Revolution in England’, notes Prichard, ‘they believed that their oaths left them little other choice’. The Reverend Charles Inglis, Rector of Trinity Church, New York, one of the most prominent loyalists, left New York with the British forces in November 1783, maintaining to the last that the American revolutionaries were violating what God had ordained.

The most pressing issue confronting the Anglican congregations scattered around the new nation following the War of Independence was, quite simply, institutional survival. How could the newly independent American church be true to its Anglican heritage while ceasing to be English? The shift from being an English church to being an Episcopal one was by no means easy, given the widespread suspicion of bishops in the American colonies thus far. William White (1748-1836), a clergyman from Philadelphia, proposed a way forward. In the patriotic atmosphere of the post-revolutionary period, White was in no hurry to introduce bishops. He

---


61 ibid., ibid.

62 ibid., 77-79.

63 ibid., 75.

64 ibid., 76-77; also Woolverton, *Colonial Anglicanism*, 228-231. Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 230, argues that Inglis’ English loyalties ‘bordered on foolhardiness’. He cites one instance when he insisted on reading the prayers for the royal family despite the presence of George Washington. Again, on another occasion he insisted on continuing the prayers even when a company of revolutionary soldiers threatened to shoot him in the church.

65 Mullin, *Episcopal Vision/American Reality*, 4. Cf. Jacob, *The Making of the Anglican Church*, 61: ‘To thoughtful Anglicans it became clear that to survive as a distinctive church in the post-war era, they would have to reorganize their Church structure, accept a new status and achieve their identity under drastically altered conditions from those they had known in the past’.

66 Mullin, ibid., 5.
recommended as a short-term measure the adoption of a presbyterian pattern of ordination, as well as a congregational model of church government based on the principle of voluntary association, with strong lay participation.\textsuperscript{67} To quote Jacob:

In essence this implied that, in his view, each episcopal parish was independent and free to participate in any plan for organization it wished, at either state or national levels. The basic tenet of White’s plan was that the organization of the Church should be built from the parish upwards, not from the diocese downwards. This proposal expressed the American revolutionary idea that in free government, the people’s interest and good government are identical, and that the best way to ensure that is to allow the people a maximum say in the formation and opinion of government.\textsuperscript{68}

On the level of church structure, White’s transparently American solution to the problem of disestablishment became the basis of church organization in the Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{69} He was less successful on the issue of bishops. In 1783 a group of Connecticut clergy took matters into their own hands, despatching Samuel Seabury (1729-1796) to London to be consecrated bishop.\textsuperscript{70} The Archbishop of Canterbury, however, was not able to proceed, since Seabury could not make an oath of allegiance to the crown.\textsuperscript{71} Nor did the leaders of the English church – or government, for that matter – wish to interfere in the affairs of an independent state.\textsuperscript{72} The problem was solved when, in 1784, Seabury was consecrated in Aberdeen by three Scottish bishops who, as Nonjurors, were able to act without reference to the state.\textsuperscript{73} ‘Thus’, comments Woolvert, ‘was a Nonjuring bishop

\textsuperscript{67} See Sachs, \textit{The Transformation of Anglicanism}, 66-67. Shaw, ‘“Collision With the Nation”’, 252, comments: ‘In short, political expediency demanded an episcopal hiatus; or, for its long-term good the Church must become subservient to the nation as embodied in the new patriotic spirit’.

\textsuperscript{68} Jacob, \textit{The Making of the Anglican Church}, 63; see also Stevick, ‘Canon Law’, 225: ‘This principle echoed the article of American political faith that laws derive their just powers from the consent of the governed’.

\textsuperscript{69} James E. Griffiss, \textit{The Anglican Vision} (Boston: Cowley Publications, 1997), 33-34: ‘[T]hose who gathered to organize a new church after the war modeled its government on the newly formed government of the United States. They considered themselves no longer members of the Church of England, but part of an independent church in a new nation with its own form of government and its own \textit{Book of Common Prayer}’.

\textsuperscript{70} Shaw, ‘“Collision With the Nation”’, 252-253, argues that, had the high churchmen in Connecticut not taken this action, episcopacy in post-revolutionary Anglicanism may have been lost. By defying political expediency and calling the church back to its apostolic foundations, writes Shaw, they effectively did for America what the Tractarians did for England.

\textsuperscript{71} Neill, \textit{Anglicanism}, 226; Prichard, \textit{A History of the Episcopal Church}, 88.

\textsuperscript{72} Jacob, \textit{The Making of the Anglican Church}, 67.

\textsuperscript{73} Stevick, ‘Canon Law’, 222-3. Neill, \textit{Anglicanism}, 227, writes: ‘So it came about that, on 14 November 1784, in an upper room of Bishop Skinner’s house in Aberdeen, three bishops of this
Americanized and placed in the pantheon of liberty without losing his spiritual episcopal prerogatives’. 74

Seabury’s consecration forced the hand of the British government. 75 Within two years an Act of Parliament was passed in England empowering the Archbishops of Canterbury or York to consecrate as bishops citizens ‘of countries out of His Majesty’s Dominions’, without requiring the oath of allegiance – even before the end of the schism with the Scottish Nonjurors. 77 In February 1787, William White and Samuel Provoost, Rector of Holy Trinity, New York, were consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury in Lambeth Palace. 78 Yet the episcopal model agreed to by the American church was different from that of England. The office of bishop would be ‘purely spiritual in character and constitutionally limited in powers’: 79 an episcopacy shorn of prelacy, 80 in keeping with the spirit of the Revolution. 81 A new version of Anglicanism had clearly come into being. As Stevick notes, the American experience, echoing the Scottish, set a precedent for other provinces throughout the emerging Anglican Communion. 82

Nor was the English church immune from the effects of this process. The birth of the American church confronted the mother church for the first time with the persecuted Church … following apostolic order, raised to the episcopate the first Anglican bishop ever appointed to minister outside the British Isles’.


75 Doll, Revolution, Religion, and National Identity, 221.

76 Neill, Anglicanism, 227.

77 Swatos, Into Denominationalism, 80-83, argues that this action of the English authorities was in response to negotiations with the American church rather than to Seabury’s consecration. If anything, the latter had a negative effect in England because of its association with the Scottish Nonjurors, who had still not been brought in from the cold. It did, however, bring the plight of the Scottish church into the spotlight, triggering a sympathetic response from many English high churchmen who agitated for a repeal of the penal laws. In this way, Seabury was able to return the favour.

78 Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 69-70.


80 See Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 286.

81 The repudiation of royalism in any form was the major issue confronting the republic during the period of uncertainty following the War of Independence. See William A. Clebsch, ‘American Churches as Traducers of Tradition’, Anglican Theological Review 53 (1971): 29.

82 Stevick, ‘Canon Law’, 228: ‘As the Anglican Communion grew, the Provinces, in assuming independence while remaining loyally Anglican, even though they did not always specifically follow a Scottish or an American pattern, were doing what the Scottish and American experience had shown could be done’. See also Thomas, ‘Unity and Concord’, 17.
consequences of colonial independence. Anglicanism had suddenly become an international phenomenon, capable of separate development in contexts where establishment was neither practical nor desirable. Within the United States, where religious freedom was part and parcel of what it meant to be American, this meant, among other things, learning to live alongside other religious traditions, as ‘partners in the American enterprise’. Denominationalism, which remained problematic in England, had become part of the American way.

But what was the American way? Throughout the nineteenth century Americans debated endlessly about the implications of nationality. Episcopalians were no exception. As Mullin notes, ‘The decades-long battles between high church and Evangelical spokesmen often evolved into a debate over the meaning of the American nation’. Evangelicals, passionately committed to creating a new Christian nation, emphasised America’s calling as the new Israel. This millennial vision made a great impact on nineteenth century America. It was not shared, however, by high church Episcopalians, who withdrew completely from engagement with American political life. John Henry Hobart (1775-1830), bishop of New York, emphasised the church as a spiritual society, deriving its authority from primitive Christianity. This essentially sectarian view left no room for the nation in the divine plan. As Mullin writes:

84 ibid., 83: ‘The American Episcopalians were demonstrating that the Anglican system could be placed into “competition” with other creeds and not be dissimulated or destroyed thereby. Similarly, while it was not entirely consistent with the Anglican plausibility structure’s concept of jurisdiction, Anglican, Roman, and Methodist bishops could co-exist on the same soil without civil war. In short, government could be separated from religious organization without society going to hell’.
85 Clebsch, ‘American Churches’, 25. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 332, comments: ‘Just as the people were taking over their governments, so, it was said, they should take over their churches. Christianity had to be republicanized’.
88 ibid., 85. Mullin comments: ‘In the mind of a person like Lyman Beecher, society and Christianity were inextricably tied together by the fervent belief that “this nation is, in the providence of God, destined to lead the way in the moral and political emancipation of the world”’.
89 ibid., 86.
90 ibid., 87. The similarity with the principles of the Oxford Movement is apparent. Interestingly, as Geoffrey Rowell has noted, when Bishop Hobart visited Newman in Oxford just prior to the beginning of the Oxford Movement, Newman, while applauding Hobart’s ecclesiology, ‘was puzzled how [it] could co-exist with such a republican and democratic political outlook’. ‘The Identity of the Church of England’, in Warren, *A Church for the Nation?*, 116. At the same time, Newman and his fellow Tractarians were inspired by the separation of church and state in America. For Newman, the Episcopal Church proved ‘that the Church, of which we are, is not the mere creation of the State, but
The social aim of the Hobartians was neither organic union of church and state nor millennial glory, but apostolic purity. The social effect of the apostolic metaphor was to erect an unbreachable wall between the church and the secular world of politics, since the church alone was divine and the state merely mortal.91

Hobart’s stance was at odds with the rest of religious America.92 The laity especially found it difficult to sustain,93 but there were also dissenting voices amongst the clergy. William White, for example, maintained that the church should be engaged with society, not detached from it.94 Nevertheless, by the 1830s the Hobartians were espousing a social vision of sorts. Prominent writers Calvin Colton (1789-1857) and James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851) presented the nation with ‘a mature American Episcopal apologetic’95 – a Hobartian vision of society. The only hope for America, it was argued, lay in adopting the pure church principles of the Episcopal Church.96 America, in other words, must become Episcopalian.97

It was unlikely that America would embrace such an exclusive vision of national life. Even so, this was a major concession on the part of the high church movement – the first time, says Mullin, that High Church Episcopalism was presented as ‘a refuge of peace and order rather than as the preserver of apostolic truth’.98 In so doing they challenged the popular reading of America’s past focussed on the Pilgrim Fathers has an independent life, with a kind of her own, and fruit after her own kind’ (Newman’s words). See Doll, Revolution, Religion, and National Identity, 262.

91 ibid., 89.
93 Mullin, ibid., 95-96: ‘[M]any a layman was all too aware that the apostolic metaphor was better suited for third-century Carthage than nineteenth-century New York’.
94 ibid., 90.
96 Mullin, Episcopal Vision/American Reality, 116.
97 Woolverton, ‘Whither Episcopalianism?’, 142: ‘Colton and Cooper proposed for their country a new (or was it an old?) ‘establishment’ marked by a ‘higher’ spiritual order. No longer content with mere exceptionality, they lauded the religious and civilizing influence their denomination might have on fellow citizens as a whole. If only those citizens would leave the cabal of Puritan revivalism and accept the aristocratic hospitality of the Anglican heritage?’
98 Mullin, Episcopal Vision/American Reality, 117. In point of fact, as Radner argues, no group within the Episcopal Church, whether high, liberal or evangelical, was immune from the impact of the American pluralistic context, even if, in the case of the high church party, this meant remaining stubbornly anti-pluralistic. ‘Theological Accoutrements’, 35.
with its celebration of liberty and individualism and put forward an alternative vision for the future that was essentially at odds with the American democratic spirit.\(^9^9\) This made it of doubtful value to American society as a whole, especially in the midst of increasing divisions over the question of slavery. ‘Slavery was an issue’, writes Mullin, ‘that the Hobartian system was simply incapable of dealing with, without abandoning some of its most cherished assumptions’.

With the outbreak of the Civil War, the Hobartian separation between church and state became impossible to sustain without engaging in some form of mental gymnastics.\(^1^0^1\) Yet this is clearly what the church was asking of the many Episcopalian laity who were also active in American political and social life – at a time when the opposite was really required.\(^1^0^2\) At the 1862 General Assembly of the Episcopal Church, barely a week after Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation, the matter came to a head. The final resolution of the convention committed the Episcopal Church to a stance in favour of the Union. The ‘Hobartian paradox’, writes Mullin, had become one of the casualties of the crisis tearing at the nation’s soul.

The presiding bishop, John Henry Hopkins, was absent during the reading of the subsequent Pastoral Letter issued by the House of Bishops. Unable to step forward into a new era, he chose instead to make a silent protest against the church’s involvement in politics. In his view, early church precedent demanded a distinction between church membership and citizenship.\(^1^0^4\) The convention took a different position, accepting, at least in part, some sense of responsibility for the life of the nation. But it was a weak response.\(^1^0^5\) Unity at all costs was the pervading theme of

\(^9^9\) Mullin, ibid., 138-139.
\(^1^0^0\) ibid., 130; also Robert W. Prichard, *The Nature of Salvation: Theological Consensus in the Episcopal Church, 1801-73* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997) 105.
\(^1^0^1\) Mullin, ibid., 206: ‘[T]he firing on Fort Sumter and the later call for emancipation strained to the breaking point the fragile paradox upon which the Hobartian social vision rested’.
\(^1^0^2\) ibid., 202: ‘The mobilization of will, both on the individual and social levels, called for an integration of the great concerns of religion and nationhood’.
\(^1^0^3\) ibid., 203.
\(^1^0^4\) ibid., 204. Hopkins saw the American Constitution as a Christian document, and ‘citizenship having no significance other than Christian association’. See Nagel, *This Sacred Trust*, 188. Paradoxically, Hopkins had also emphasised the blessings of slavery. See Fredrica Harris Thompsett, *Living With History* (Boston: Cowley Publications, 1999), 115.
\(^1^0^5\) Phillips Brooks, one of the most vocal Episcopalian opponents of slavery, recorded his impressions of the convention: ‘It was ludicrous, if not so sad, to see those old gentlemen sitting there for fourteen days, trying to make out whether there was a war going on or not, and whether if there was it would be safe for them to say so’. See Thompsett, ibid., 112.
the convention. The question of slavery was avoided, and was not even mentioned in the Pastoral Letter. Not surprisingly, the failure to address this important national issue was regarded as betrayal by black Episcopalians, who deserted the church *en masse* following emancipation. The overall Episcopalian response to the issue of slavery was, in fact, weaker than that of any other Protestant group in America.

The War of Independence severed the umbilical cord attaching Anglicanism in the United States to the English church. The future of the Anglican tradition in America would henceforth be indelibly linked to the life of the new nation, and even shaped by it. As we have seen, High Church Episcopalians like John Henry Hobart distanced the church from the nation in order to preserve its purity. Yet even Hobart’s conservatism was not an attempt to return to an English form of establishment; it presupposed the republic. In this sense his stance of separation and aloofness was only one American religious response amongst many. The Civil War, however, raised acutely for all Americans, Episcopalians included, unavoidable questions about national purpose. It was clearly not possible for the Episcopal Church to stand aside from broader issues of American life.

How Anglicanism in the United States has managed to respond to the challenge of inculturation is ultimately a matter for the American church to decide. There is no doubting, however, the impact of the American experience on the rest of the Anglican world. As W.S.F. Pickering comments, what happened in the United States ‘really set the pattern for the possibility of indigenization and freedom from British
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106 ibid., 116; also Gardiner H. Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000), 9: ‘Episcopal leaders had been generally unmoved by abolitionist rhetoric and … had maintained a unified church during the bitter national controversy over slavery in the 1830s and 1840s. Abhorring ecclesiastical schism more than the suffering of people held in bondage, white Episcopalians had argued that slavery was a purely political question and, as such, beyond the church’s concern’.


108 Mullin, *Episcopal Vision/American Reality*, 205. Thompsett, ibid., 111, argues that the Episcopal Church, ‘unlike other major American Protestant denominations, officially chose not to speak out on slavery or on the morality of the war itself’. This silence on matters of race and racism was maintained until the 1960s. Thompsett’s full discussion of these matters appears under the heading, ‘Ignoring Conflict: The American Civil War’, 110-123. See also Lewis, *Yet With a Steady Beat*, 37-38.

109 See Nagel, *This Sacred Trust*, 198.
control’ within global Anglicanism. The American Revolution and its aftermath had irrevocably changed the way Anglicanism would be understood and practised.

LAMBETH DOCUMENTS

When the term ‘Anglican Communion’ was first used, in 1851, it referred, in the main, to an English phenomenon. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States was, as we have noted, part of a politically independent nation, but it nevertheless remained very Anglo-Saxon. While, at the first Lambeth Conference in 1867, the American bishops felt like outsiders, they were present nevertheless, bound by ties that were cultural, theological and racial. Most of the remaining dioceses represented belonged to areas of British emigration – Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the West Indies. Only a very small number of ‘missionary dioceses’ had as yet been formed.

One of the major issues at the 1867 conference was the relationship between the colonial churches and the English state. Broad churchmen and evangelicals supported ongoing links with the crown. High churchmen favoured a synodical model, which would then draw together independent provinces. Synodical government was already being practised in many colonies in response to the realities of colonial life, and a number of dioceses were already effectively independent of the Church of England. Following the Privy Council’s decision in the controversial Colenso affair in 1865, the Colonial Office had ceased the practice of issuing
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111 Butler, ‘From the Eighteenth Century’, 41; also Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 157.
112 They had all been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, writes Jacob. It was ‘a close-knit world’. ibid., 168-169.
113 Victoria (Hong Kong) in 1848, Sierra Leone in 1852, Mauritius in 1854, Labaun and Sarawak in 1855, the Zambezi (subsequently Zanzibar and East Africa) in 1861, Honolulu in 1861, Melanesia in 1861 and the Niger in 1864. ibid., 194.
114 ibid., 158.
115 Including the United States, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa – but not Australia. ibid., 153, 170-171.
116 In 1863, Bishop J.W. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, was charged with heresy by the Metropolitan of the Province of South Africa, Bishop Robert Gray, and found guilty. Gray deprived Colenso of his bishopric. Colenso appealed to the Privy Council, which ruled in his favour. The Privy Council also ruled that the Letters Patent appointing Bishop Gray as Metropolitan were invalid in law. Thereafter the Church in South Africa existed as an independent province. For a detailed discussion of the Colenso affair, see G. Parsons, ‘Rethinking the Missionary Position: Bishop Colenso of Natal’, in Religion in Victorian Britain, Vol. V: Culture and Empire, ed. John Wolffe (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 135-175; also Jacob, ibid., 144-151, 174-178; Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, 199-201; Hinchliff, ‘Church-State Relations’, 401-402; Neill, Anglicanism, 304-305; Rawlinson, The Anglican Communion, 11-12.
letters patent for the consecration of overseas bishops. This led to uncertainty amongst colonial bishops about the nature of their authority. The first Lambeth Conference attempted to address this question. It affirmed the synodical principle ‘wherever the Church is not established by law’, and recommended that the colonial churches should henceforth elect their own bishops. The conference was a first attempt at clarifying the nature of Anglicanism as a global phenomenon.

Lambeth Conferences have met at regular intervals ever since. The first black bishop was present in 1878. The Archbishop of Canterbury, E.W. Benson, who called the 1888 conference, was convinced of the importance of establishing native churches. His dream would, however, be difficult to achieve in practice. The overall response to the issue of polygamy, in particular, indicated that the bishops of the Anglican Communion were either unable or unwilling to grapple with the social and pastoral consequences of cultural diversity. Bishop Colenso, a disciple of F.D. Maurice, argued strongly but unsuccessfully in favour of baptising polygamists and their wives. The voice of an African church had still to be heard.

The ground shifted slightly in 1897. The Anglican Church, the conference declared, is not just an English phenomenon, but ‘the form of the catholic Church for English-
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117 Jacob, ibid., 154-155.
118 Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, 201.
119 While the Colenso issue was not on the business paper, discussion was allowed, and a committee was formed to make recommendations. It was clearly a major point of contention throughout the conference. See Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences, 35-40; also Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 165-168.
120 Jacob, ibid., 167-168; also Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, 203.
121 Bishop Holly of Haiti, from the American Episcopal Church. See Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences, 62.
122 Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 240.
123 ibid., 242-243. As Parsons’ essay indicates, the influence of F.D. Maurice on Colenso’s thought was highly significant. Maurice’s emphasis on the presence of God in the whole of humanity, and hence, in some way, in all cultures and societies, shaped Colenso’s approach to missionary work. African culture must be treated with respect, he argued. Hence his sensitivity to the plight of polygamists who converted to Christianity. Colenso actually became convinced that traditional missionary preaching was a corruption of Christianity. His critique of Western Christianity later broadened to include a scathing attack on the racism inherent in white imperialism. Parsons describes Colenso as ‘one of the most remarkable Victorian bishops and missionaries, who understood the dilemmas of the encounter between European Christianity and traditional African culture, and who may even be described as a pioneer of the exploration of an authentically African understanding of Christianity’. ‘Rethinking the Missionary Position’, 171.
124 Of the 147 bishops at Lambeth 1888, only eleven were working in Africa. Seven of those were working in South Africa, probably mostly among white settlers. Jacob, ibid., 242.
speaking Christians’.\(^\text{125}\) The centre of gravity had shifted slightly away from England, but the Anglo-centrism of Anglicanism remained. The first Anglican Congress held in London in 1908 continued this emphasis. In a preliminary paper, Dean Armitage Robinson of Westminster wrote:

> The Anglican Communion … has grown with the expansion of the Anglo-Saxon race, and is predominantly Anglo-Saxon in character … It thus witnesses to a unity which survives political separation … The ideal function of the Anglican Communion is to express and guide the spiritual aspirations and activities of the Anglo-Saxon race.\(^\text{126}\)

By the time of the 1920 Lambeth Conference, a further change of expression had occurred. ‘The Anglican Communion of today’, said the conference report, ‘is a federation of Churches, some national, some regional, but no longer predominantly Anglo-Saxon in race, nor can it be expected that it will attach special value to Anglo-Saxon traditions’.\(^\text{127}\)

We have already encountered Resolution 49 of the 1930 conference report, which reaffirmed the Reformation emphasis on ‘particular or national churches’. The conference also agreed to proposals to establish a Church of South India, which would draw together both episcopal and non-episcopal churches into a new configuration in keeping with the needs of the churches in the region. This was a significant initiative, which demonstrated a genuine openness to the principle of inculturation.\(^\text{128}\) But it was still early days in the life of the Anglican Communion. Awareness of ‘Anglo-Saxon captivity’ was growing, but the structures of colonialism, while beginning to crumble, were still in place.\(^\text{129}\)

\(^{125}\) Jacob, ibid., 245.
\(^{126}\) Stephenson, Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences, 1-2.
\(^{128}\) Declaration 20 of the 1930 Constitution of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, agreed to by the Lambeth fathers, declared: ‘As the Church of England, receiving Catholic Christianity from the individual Church, has given characteristically English interpretation to it, the Church of this province aspires to give characteristically national interpretation of that common faith and life.’ In John S. Pobee’s view, this declaration is a classic example of the need to place the elements of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral into dialogue with ‘the various contextual situations of the Communion’. Pobee, ‘Non-Anglo-Saxon Anglicanism’, 452.
\(^{129}\) Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 260: ‘The bishops also criticized the Anglo-Saxon races for their attitude of racial superiority, and agreed that the continuation of colonies could only be defended if it was intended to share government with the “subject race”’.
Due to the outbreak of the Second World War, the next meeting of Lambeth bishops was delayed until 1948. As noted earlier, the conference affirmed the cultural diversity of autonomous provinces throughout the Anglican Communion, using the imagery of streams flowing into the wider Anglican river. The conference report foreshadowed the formation of new provinces in East, Central and West Africa, and the Pacific. This was taken up, as we have seen, by Archbishop Fisher during the following decade. Fisher travelled extensively, fired with a vision of an expanded Communion of autonomous provinces, with remarkable success – even, we recall, in Australia, which proved to be his most difficult assignment.

The 1958 Lambeth Conference reflected the changes that had taken place since 1948. It was the first to include a significant number of non-European bishops. This, writes Jacob, ‘affirmed it as an international and interracial Christian fellowship, rather than an almost accidental imperial and missionary prolongation of the established Church of the English nation’. The Anglican Communion was moving forward, tentatively, into the post-colonial era. Significant changes in Anglican self-understanding were taking place. The conference declared, for example, that mission should henceforth be understood in terms of the whole world, with ‘no frontiers between “Home” and “Foreign”’. The Anglican Congress in Toronto in 1963 repeated this theme, but with added emphasis on the interdependence of the provinces of the Anglican Communion. The document prepared for the congress, ‘Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ’ made a powerful impact on deliberations. It included these words:

130 The Lambeth Conference 1948, 83.
131 Jacob, The Making of the Anglican Church, 267; also Stuart Piggin, ‘Australian Anglicanism in a World-wide Context’, 210-211.
132 See Jacob, ibid., 273-277.
133 Jacob notes, however, that most of the bishops outside the American Episcopal Church network were at this stage still English and had been educated in England. ibid., 292.
134 ibid., 282.
135 Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, 319; ‘The loss of colonial identity became the prime feature of Anglican life during the 1950s and 1960s’.
It is a platitude to say that in our time, areas of the world which have been thought of as dependent and secondary are suddenly striding to the centre of the stage, in a new and breath-taking independence and self-reliance. Equally this has happened to the Church. In our time the Anglican Communion has come of age ... It is now irrelevant to talk of ‘giving’ and ‘receiving’ churches. The keynotes of our time are equality, interdependence, mutual responsibility.\footnote{Fairweather, ibid., 118. Archbishop Michael Ramsey declared at the Toronto conference (16): ‘We must plan our mission together and use our resources in the service of a single task. The word “missionary” will mean not colonialism of any kind but going to one another to help one another. Let African and Asian missionaries come to England to help convert the post-Christian heathenism in our country and convert our English church to a closer following of Christ’. See also Yates, ‘Anglicans and Mission’, 492-493.}

This ‘dealt a death blow’, Jacob comments, ‘to the paternalism that had existed towards other provinces by the English and American churches’.\footnote{Jacob,\textit{ The Making of the Anglican Church}, 283; also Hamid, ‘The Nature and Shape’, 84.}

Whereas, before 1960, the Anglican Communion was held together, to a large extent, by the Englishness of its bishops, an increasing number of indigenous bishops emerged during the 1960s.\footnote{Jacob, ibid., 294.} It was a turbulent time in the Christian world. The map of the world was being redrawn as former colonies claimed their political independence. African, Asian and Latin American theologies began to appear, expressing the theme of liberating Christianity from Western imperialism.\footnote{Jacob, ibid., 284.} The Anglican Communion was not immune from such challenges, as the subsequent explosion in the number of new provinces in the non-Anglo-Saxon world indicates.\footnote{Many of these have been in Africa, but also places like Burma (1970), Indian Ocean (1973), Melanesia (1975) and Papua New Guinea (1977). See Howe, \textit{Highways and Hedges}, 220-222; also Pobee, ‘Non-Anglo-Saxon Anglicanism’, 447-448.} As a consequence, in recent decades a radical shift in the centre of gravity of the Communion has taken place, reflecting ‘an Anglican Communion which has moved beyond the Anglo-Saxon moorings to embrace other cultures’.\footnote{Pobee, ibid., 448. See also Jacob, \textit{The Making of the Anglican Church}, 298.}

In preparation for the 1988 Lambeth Conference, the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission produced an important document, \textit{For the Sake of the Kingdom}. The commission noted the theological movements (including theologies of liberation) that had grown out of recent political, social and economic
developments throughout the world. It especially highlighted the colonial legacy pervading worldwide Anglicanism, and the importance of encouraging indigenisation throughout the provinces of the Communion.

Anglican Christianity often arrived – in the Caribbean, for example, and in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific – in the wake of, or in close association with, British colonial administration. Its identity has thus inevitably been seen as closely tied to British culture, and its strengths and weaknesses have been understood in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of that culture. Particularly in the decades since the Second World War, there has been a natural and often harsh reaction against the colonial legacy; and one consequence of this reaction has been questioning or rejection of a Christianity heavily marked by its alien context, and apparently identified with the civilization of a colonizing power. The fact of this reaction has been an obstinately inescapable datum for our Commission: it quickly became clear to us that to be ‘Anglican’ not only could no longer be, but in fact was no longer, a matter of being ‘English’.

The report admits that with the movement away from England, with its ‘vision of a certain symbiosis of church and nation’, Anglicanism lost its centre. Because of this, the question of Anglican identity has been raised acutely, especially within such a dispersed and culturally diverse Communion. The commission chose, however, to focus elsewhere – on vocation, we might say, rather than identity; on the ‘here and now’, out of ‘the concrete experience of particular Christians in particular localities’. Key questions emerged: the ‘cultural strangeness’ of Anglicanism in many places, the problem of an ‘established’ style of theology and practice in situations of political and economic oppression, and ‘the disengagement of the church from a culture and a social order with which it had become all too thoroughly identified’. The overall issue was a theological one: the presence of the Kingdom of God in a wide range of places, calling both church and society to account.

In a section headed ‘Belonging and Not Belonging’, the commission drew attention to the fact that the Anglican Communion consists of churches identifying, not just
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144 For the Sake of the Kingdom, 4, paragraph 1.
145 ibid., paragraph 2.
146 ibid., 5, paragraphs 3-4.
147 ibid., 6, paragraph 5 (the document’s emphasis).
148 ibid., 10-11, paragraph 13.
149 ibid., 11-12, paragraphs 14 and 15. The similarity to the interests of F.D. Maurice is striking.
with a religious tradition, but also with a ‘particular cultural world’. This applies as much to England as to anywhere else to the church in Western societies like Australia, we might say, as much as to churches in the ‘developing’ world. There is a tension in this, the result of simultaneously ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’, of being part of a culture, yet experiencing ‘discontinuities’ with it, as the history of colonialism demonstrates:

Thus the close relationship between Anglicanism and the civil administration of colonial territories was inherently ambivalent. It allowed scope for the church’s social and moral witness, but at the same time it blunted the critical, prophetic edge of that witness. The point is, however, that this ambivalence admirably illustrates a perpetual tension in the church’s life. A church belongs and yet does not belong to the social and political system under which it operates. Its life is both continuous and – even if sometimes only implicitly and in principle – discontinuous with the structures of its society.

The report affirms the importance of ‘every cultural or national setting’. Indigenisation is crucial. Without context, the Scriptures and creeds would exist in a vacuum; their message would not find a ‘home’. But the Kingdom of God is not identified with any one culture. Rather, it pushes both church and culture beyond themselves ‘to the transcendent hope that relativises every culture’. Failure to make this distinction is to lapse into idolatry, as churches in the ‘first world’ have tended to do. ‘The Kingdom of God’, the report declares, ‘is a principle both of affirmation and of challenge’.

The last section of the report stresses, for one last time, the importance of diversity or ‘pluriformity’, part of the ‘genius of Anglicanism’. The church always exists ‘in a radically “located” fashion’.
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150 ibid., 15, paragraph 19. In the terms I have used earlier in the discussion, the report admits the importance of a root system reaching both backwards in time and outwards in space.
151 ibid.
152 ibid., 16, paragraph 19.
153 ibid., 17, paragraph 23 (my emphasis).
154 ibid., 41, paragraph 65.
155 ibid., 42, paragraph 66. Note also 51, paragraph 82.
156 ibid., 52, paragraph 83.
157 ibid., 57, paragraph 92.
158 ibid., 58, paragraph 58.
The church exists in particular places and at particular times, and the truth which its life and action carry is conveyed only to the extent that it too is ‘located’. This means, as we have seen, that Christians in a given place and time both will and must share the cultural idiom of their geographical and social locale. It also means that their life and witness both will and must address the issues, moral and political, with which historical circumstance confronts them in that locale. The church belongs to all its many places and times, and it is in this fact that its legitimate pluriformity is, in the end, rooted.\footnote{ibid., 58, paragraph 94.}

The final paragraphs of the report recognise the need for unity and mutual accountability within the Anglican Communion, but not at the expense of ‘local and regional initiative’ within ‘particular societies and cultures’.\footnote{ibid., 59, paragraph 95.} The Kingdom of God, the life source of the whole church, is always embodied locally.\footnote{ibid., 59, paragraph 96.} Every human culture ‘has God’s Kingdom as its horizon’. Through dialogue, understanding of the Kingdom is broadened and enriched.\footnote{ibid., 60-61, paragraphs 98-99.} It is not something to be avoided because of conflict or division.\footnote{ibid., 60, paragraph 97.} The Anglican Communion will only hold together, according to this report, if each church is true to its own vocation, and enters into fellowship and dialogue with other churches which do the same. Global unity is understood in relation to the role of particular or national churches in their own contexts.

The official report of the 1988 Lambeth Conference shows signs of having grappled with this important document, as the section report on ‘Dogmatic and Pastoral Concerns’ indicates.\footnote{The Truth Shall Make You Free, especially 81-92.} It addresses the need for contextualisation,\footnote{ibid., 89, paragraph 33: ‘The Church seeks to contextualise, to draw on and affirm the resources of the culture in which it has taken root’.} while warning against the dangers of trivialising or distorting a culture in the process of trying to be part of it.\footnote{ibid., 89, paragraph 34.} It acknowledges the importance of critiquing cultures\footnote{ibid., 84, paragraph 14: ‘The Church exists in an extraordinary variety of settings. It is free from cultural constraint, at least in principle, and capable of challenging its cultural context’.} and seeking to transform them,\footnote{ibid., 85, paragraph 16: ‘Christianity does not offer to replace cultures, but to change them’.} highlighting the ongoing tension between gospel and culture.\footnote{See the section, ‘Christ and Culture’, ibid., 87-92.}

The report then makes this striking statement:
The Gospel, then, is always being communicated in a framework shaped by the historical and social situations of believers. It acquires a kind of ‘sediment’ of local idiom and tradition. It is both the glory and the deadly danger of Christianity that it can enter deeply into a people’s soul, so that it carries the most profound hopes and values of a nation or civilisation.\textsuperscript{170}

The report also addresses the issue of colonialism, acknowledging the ‘Babylonian captivity’ of colonial culture, assumptions about Anglo-Saxon superiority and the church’s complicity in colonial expansion.\textsuperscript{171} But it also admits that there is no quick and easy way of resolving such issues – certainly not just ‘a merely guilty or sentimental politeness to what is thought to be “indigenous culture”’.\textsuperscript{172}

It involves an imaginative sensitivity to the concrete social processes at work in specific contexts – to how nations and peoples are actually becoming themselves – and a serious listening to how people themselves perceive their hopes for fuller liberation from alien systems of domination.\textsuperscript{172}

These are important statements, highlighting what is at stake when talking about what it means to be a ‘particular or national church’. In each separate context, the Anglican vocation involves living with the tension between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’, between gospel and culture. The fact that Anglicanism is also a global Communion is a reminder that particular churches also transcend their cultures. It is important to identify what Anglicanism is from a global perspective, but it is equally crucial not to dispense with the particularity of each church and its calling. The 1988 Lambeth Conference Report prefaced its remarks on these issues by re-emphasising the delicate balance between provincial autonomy and mutual accountability – ‘what it means to be Anglican “in communion”’.\textsuperscript{173}

\textit{The Virginia Report}, prepared by the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission for the 1998 Lambeth Conference, struggled with these issues.\textsuperscript{174} While

\textsuperscript{170} ibid., 88, paragraph 27 (my emphasis).
\textsuperscript{171} ibid., 88, paragraph 28, and 89, paragraph 36.
\textsuperscript{172} ibid., 89, paragraph 36 (my emphasis). See also Stephen Sykes’ comments on the delicacy of the hermeneutical task implicit in this paragraph of the report in \textit{Unashamed Anglicanism}, 180-181.
\textsuperscript{173} ibid., 81, paragraph 5.
acknowledging the rich comprehensiveness of worldwide Anglicanism, it also suggests that there are ‘limits to diversity’. autonomy does not mean absence of accountability. The report appears in many ways to be a defensive document, protective of global unity in a diverse Communion threatening to disintegrate. For example, while highlighting the principle of ‘subsidiarity’, which, it argues, safeguards the church against centralism, it then appears to express regret that such a principle applies within the Anglican Communion because of the conflicts and tensions that inevitably arise. Again, in a section headed, ‘The Particular Church and the Church Catholic’, a powerful statement is made about the importance of cultural diversity. ‘The life and mission of the church’, it says, ‘is at its most authentic and vibrant in a particular context, that is a cohesive geographical region or an area covered by a people, tribe or group with its own traditions and customs’. Indeed, the point is made that the ecclesiology of the Elizabethan Anglican divines, Richard Hooker and Richard Field, was ‘a locally embodied ecclesiology for a


ibid., paragraph 3.4.


‘At the end of the decade one question for Anglicans is whether their bonds of interdependence are strong enough to hold them together embracing tension and conflict while answers are sought to seemingly intractable problems’. ibid., paragraph 3.54.

Put simply (in the words of G. R. Evans, Authority in the Church, 56): ‘Nothing should be done at a higher level than is necessary’. I am interested in Ian Douglas’ observation that, to the best of his knowledge, the notion of subsidiarity had not been used to describe Anglican polity prior to The Virginia Report. He explains that the word was first used by Pope Pius XI in 1931 in his encyclical, ‘Quadaragesimo Anno’, probably as a way of avoiding dealing with the problem of fascism. Given this history, Douglas writes, ‘I would be more comfortable not using the term at all to describe Anglican polity’. Ian T. Douglas, ‘An American Reflects on the Windsor Report, Journal of Anglican Studies 3 (2) (December 2005): 164-165. See also Philip Turner’s comments in Ephraim Radner and Philip Turner, The Fate of Communion: The Agony of Anglicanism and the Future of a Global Church (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, 2006), 195, on the origins of the term, and Radner’s interesting claim (235) that subsidiarity is not so much a declaration of the right to determine as many things as possible at the local level as a way of involving all levels of the church in being part of the ‘common mind’.

The Virginia Report’, paragraph 4.9.

A strong statement affirming the local is followed by an equally strong statement opposing it; e.g. see paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13. The former affirms the ‘clear and bold’ decisions taken by autonomous provinces. The following paragraph then reverses what has been said: ‘However, when decisions are taken by Provinces on matters which touch the life of the whole Communion without consultation, they may give rise to tension as other Provinces or other Christian traditions reject what has been decided elsewhere’.

ibid., paragraph 4.22.
particular time and place’. The report continues: ‘It is not a “translation” of a universal ecclesiology, which can then be (as it were) “retranslated” into different time and places. It is, as ecclesiologies should be, a whole-hearted attempt to embody the saving presence of God in a given culture’. 182 This is a refreshing statement, in keeping with the very point made by Bruce Kaye earlier in our discussion. The following paragraph, however, quickly qualifies this statement, emphasising the danger of local autonomy, and the capacity for local theologies to ‘make mistakes’.183

Of course, the report was commissioned in the first place because of the problem of maintaining unity in a worldwide Communion of autonomous provinces.184 In the end, however, the answer given seems to involve an increase of centralised authority.185 In Bruce Kaye’s view, The Virginia Report ‘does not seem to have escaped from [an] imperial or colonial framework’, 186 it is hierarchical rather than democratic and synodical.187 It is suspicious of the diversity or pluralism of global Anglicanism, rather than interpreting them in the light of providence.188 Finally, he argues, it places issues of ministry and order before ‘the church as a community of the baptised’.189 Kaye gives vocation priority over issues of identity.

The same criticism could be made of the more recent document, The Windsor Report.190 In this report, the issues (and solutions) expressed in The Virginia Report
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182 ibid., paragraph 4.26.
183 ibid., paragraph 4.27.
184 See Mark Dyer, ‘The Anglican Communion and the Four Instruments of Unity Briefing’, in Rosenthal, The Communion We Share, 174: ‘It’s a holy struggle I believe that primates do have to deal with, because the question we ask in The Virginia Report is, “Is the internal unity, coherence, and inter-dependence of the Communion strong enough to make the necessary witness, that one must make to the Gospel, as a world Communion?” … Is the Communion strong enough when contentious issues arise out of a particular context and culture, and a province goes ahead in its own specific way out of that context and culture, because it is the last legislative authority in the Communion?’
187 ibid., 30: ‘Where in this [report] is there respect for the conciliar or synodical tradition in Anglican theology and the notion of dispersed authority?’ See also Douglas, ‘The Exigency of Times and Occasions’, 31-32. Douglas describes the attempt to shore up the central structure of authority in the Anglican Communion as ‘curialization’. In a similar vein, Carlos Calvani argues that the emphasis in The Virginia Report on ‘institutional and juridical mechanisms’ indicates ‘that we do not have a “true communion” and that the discussion has moved off in a political direction’. ‘The Myth of Anglican Communion’, Journal of Anglican Studies 3 (2) (December 2005): 142.
188 ibid., ibid., 31.
189 ibid., 30.
are reworked and extended. As in *The Virginia Report*, any mention of contextuality results in an immediate word of qualification. The opening paragraph of the section headed, ‘Diversity within Communion’, is a case in point:

The nature of unity within the Anglican Communion necessarily includes the rich diversity which comes from factors such as local culture and different traditions of reading scripture. Diversity is a great strength; without care, however, it can be a source of great tension and division. Within the Communion we have developed theological and practical ways of working at this problem and of distinguishing acceptable and unacceptable forms of diversity.\textsuperscript{191}

As with *The Virginia Report*, this report arose out of the perceived need to build control mechanisms into the way the Anglican Communion works. Autonomy, for example, is seen as autonomy-in-relation.\textsuperscript{192} There is nothing wrong with this, of course:\textsuperscript{193} it expresses the theme of mutual responsibility and interdependence that had been established at the Toronto Congress in 1963, but without the corresponding celebration of cultural diversity and commitment to local mission expressed at that congress. The emphasis now is on the ‘limits to diversity’.\textsuperscript{194} This is linked to issues like subsidiarity and *adiaphora* (things non-essential or ‘indifferent’).\textsuperscript{195} Essentially the report argues that the local province is free to determine issues of local importance, but that ‘central’ issues should be dealt with at a global level. This, of course, raises the question of authority: who decides what is essential or ‘indifferent’? Who declares that an issue is of local or universal significance?\textsuperscript{196} The view taken in the report is that this broader authority is two-fold: the authority of Scripture as well as authority of ‘the decision-makers in the Church’.\textsuperscript{197} It may be,

\textsuperscript{191} ibid., paragraph 71.
\textsuperscript{192} ibid., paragraphs 76-84.
\textsuperscript{193} A delicate balance is required between the local and the global. As David Bosch has rightfully argued, ‘particularity does not mean isolation’. Bosch also makes the point that, while it is true that the church exists primarily in ‘particular’ churches’, these only have existence in the first place by virtue of the church’s catholicity. David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1991), 457.
\textsuperscript{194} ibid., paragraph 86.
\textsuperscript{195} ibid., paragraphs 83-95.
\textsuperscript{196} These are issues of great importance. As R. William Carroll argues, the report ‘uses subsidiarity to centralize rather than disperse authority’. ‘Restoring the Bonds of Affection’, *Anglican Theological Review* 87 (4) (Fall 2005): 625. There is a great danger here. As Carroll claims (and I concur), the authors of the report seem to believe that ‘local’ issues are of less importance. Moreover, they seem to regard autonomy, not in positive terms, but as a threat to unity. In effect, *The Windsor Report* is dismissive of the unique and strategic importance of each ‘particular or national church’. It is almost as if the local provinces only exist to enable the Anglican Communion (viewed centrally) to exist.
\textsuperscript{197} ibid., paragraph 95.
however, that the very things that have become so important as to warrant a special report at an international level are themselves non-essential, and that contextual issues of a local nature are more essential for the church’s mission.

*The Windsor Report*, it seems, follows the same path as *The Virginia Report*, seeking solutions in centralised authority, strengthening the ‘instruments of unity’ without which communion seems impossible. Both reports thereby shift attention away from the radical implications of the earlier report, *For the Sake of the Kingdom*. The challenges of that document are still waiting in the wings, overshadowed for the moment by the crisis of unity in the worldwide Communion. While important in their own right, issues of authority and unity should not be allowed to overshadow the principle of inculturation, which remains an Anglican imperative. *The Windsor Report* mentions inculturation in passing, limiting its meaning to one of translating eternal truths within different cultural contexts. But there is more to inculturation than translation. Translation falls short of incarnation, of ‘belonging’ to a given culture and people, and working for transformation from within. The current quest for catholicity in the Anglican Communion must not allow attention to be diverted from the critical importance of the church’s vocation within each particular or national context. Nor must post-colonial perspectives be suppressed or forgotten in the quest to articulate Anglican identity. The price is too high.
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198 The instruments of unity are the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference, the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates’ Meeting. Ibid., Section C. Ian Douglas questions this emphasis on centralised authority. ‘The question must be asked: Is this slide toward a structural or instrumentalist approach to issues of authority and unity, and its related representative understanding of the episcopate, the only way forward for the Anglican Communion? Are there other understandings of the nature of communion at work in Anglicanism that would be more hopeful and helpful in these times?’ Douglas believes the answer lies in relationships of mutual responsibility and interdependence ‘across the differences of culture, location, ethnicity, and even theological perspective to serve God’s mission in the world’. Diversity is seen vocationally rather than as a ‘problem’ of unity. See Ian T. Douglas, ‘Authority, Unity, and Mission in the Windsor Report’, *Anglican Theological Review* 87 (4) (Fall 2005): 572-573. Philip Turner concedes that the missional concerns of people like Douglas have a point, but considers them to be ‘overblown’. The intention of *The Virginia Report*, for example, was not ‘to set up a curia but to deal with crises’. However, Turner does concede that the report probably placed more emphasis on structures than on *koinonia* as the solution to the problems of communion. Radner and Turner, *The Fate of Communion*, 190-197.

199 Having raised the issue of inculturation, the report then says: ‘This means that the much discussed problem of “Christ and Culture” is in large part a problem of how to communicate the gospel effectively in widely differing cultural situations’. Ibid., paragraph 85. As I will endeavour to show in the next chapter, this is only one (very limited) way of understanding inculturation.
AUTONOMOUS PROVINCES

One remaining issue needs to be considered as part of the discussion of the Anglican Communion. It is a matter unique to Australian Anglicanism. Earlier we noted how Bishop Broughton’s provincial vision was quickly superseded by a policy of diocesan separatism that was out of step with developments in other parts of the worldwide Communion. Regionalism took precedence over national unity. As provinces developed in Australia, they did so along regional lines, without posing a threat to diocesan autonomy.200 Broughton’s provincial vision, on the other hand, many decades before the Commonwealth of Australia came into being, covered the whole of Australasia. It was a vision of the whole, we might say, at a time when the ‘nation’ was still a collection of separate British colonies spread around the Australian coastline. This was part of Broughton’s genius. He was viewing Anglicanism globally, and could already envisage the importance to the whole Anglican world of a Province of Australasia.

It is worth recalling that at this time, Anglicanism was made up of the established Church of England and Ireland, the Episcopal churches of Scotland and the United States, and ‘a far-flung collection of colonial churches, more or less under the jurisdiction of Canterbury’.201 Colonial bishops like Broughton knew only too well the need to adapt the Anglican faith to the realities of colonial life, and the corresponding need for an international forum in which voices from the colonial churches could be heard. But how would such a body be formed, and what shape would it take? Bishop Gray of South Africa favoured ‘a National or Imperial’ synod drawing together the various parts of the Anglican Communion, at first even contemplating the inclusion of colonial bishops as members of Convocation in England.202 But the push for colonial autonomy was too strong, and the Communion developed in a different way: in the words of the 1930 Lambeth Conference report, as a fellowship of ‘particular or national churches’, bound together, ‘not by a central

200 A ‘province’ within contemporary Australian Anglicanism is roughly coterminous with a state, the Metropolitan of the province being the Archbishop of the diocese based around the state capital. See ‘Tricia Blombery, The Anglicans in Australia (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service,1996), 39.
202 Ibid., 155-156.
legislative and executive authority but by mutual loyalty sustained by the common counsel of the bishops in conference’.203

The Virginia Report also comments on this historical process leading to provincial autonomy within the Anglican Communion. The document notes ‘the expansion of the Church of England as a result of British colonisation’ leading to ‘the formation of Provinces, each with its own episcopal and synodical structures for maintaining the life of the Church’.204 As we have seen, the real concern of this report (and, indeed, of The Windsor Report) is global unity: how to hold together provincial autonomy and interdependence;205 how to manage what Sykes describes as ‘an apparently ever-increasing pluralism, without discernible restraint or boundaries’.206 The report sees potential threats to Anglican integrity emerging from the tendency of provinces to become too closely aligned with their particular cultures.207 It does not, however, dispute the fundamental importance of ‘particular or national churches’ themselves, or deny the principle of provincial autonomy or the value of provinces to the worldwide Communion.208 It is worth noting that, in keeping with a global perspective, the definition of ‘province’ employed throughout the report is more in keeping with Broughton’s vision than with the pattern that has subsequently developed within the Australian church.

There are counter-voices, of course, within the Anglican Communion. Some, for example, question the very concept of provinces. The idea of a ‘province’, the argument goes, ‘reflects the colonial legacy of seeing these churches as outposts of historic Western churches’.209 From this perspective, the very structures of global

203 See n. 5 above.
205 ibid., paragraph 3.28. For Philip Turner, the crisis in the Anglican Communion that prompted The Windsor Report raises an important question for ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada: ‘[T]he decision is whether they wish to be self-identified as autonomous churches within the Anglican Communion or as denominational boutiques within the fan of Protestant options that now comprise the religious scene in North America’. For the Anglican Communion, he continues, the issue is whether it wishes to be a communion of churches or a religious federation ‘bound together only by pragmatic arrangements and a rapidly disappearing historical memory’. These are telling questions, relevant also to the Australian context. Radner and Turner, The Fate of Communion, 199.
206 Sykes, Unashamed Anglicanism, 215.
208 ibid., paragraph 4.12: ‘Decision-making by Provinces on appropriate matters has proved a source of strength to the Anglican Communion’.
Anglicanism may be seen as a form of neo-colonialism, a continued expression of eurocentrism. Such post-colonial readings of contemporary Anglicanism highlight the cultural uniqueness of each particular or national church, and ensure that the uncomfortable legacy of colonialism in Anglicanism is not forgotten. They do not, however, elevate diocesan independence over national unity within ‘national or particular churches’. Fragmentation is not their intention.

What, then, of the relationship between provinces and dioceses? Where does the authority lie? As we have seen, this issue is of crucial importance, especially for the Australian church. The Virginia Report is vague on this issue, perhaps because the Australian situation is more the exception than the rule. Within the Anglican Communion, it says, ‘there is no legislative authority above the Provincial level’. Having commented on the principle of provincial autonomy, and the need for a proper balance between provincial autonomy and interdependence, it simply says: ‘A further question is the relationship between the autonomy of a Province and the theological importance of a diocese which is reckoned to be the basic unit of Anglicanism’. Later, while discussing the principle of ‘subsidiarity’, it notes: ‘In Anglicanism today canonically binding decisions can only be made at the level of a Province or in some cases at the level of a diocese.’

How, then can the matter be resolved? It may be wise to go back to the beginning. At the first Lambeth Conference in 1867 provincial synods were given priority over diocesan synods. Each had its special purpose, of course. Provincial synods ‘should deal with questions of common interest to the whole Province, and with those which affect the Communion of the Dioceses with one another and with the rest of the Church’. Diocesan synods were ‘left free to dispose of matters of local interest and to manage the affairs of the Diocese’. As G.R. Evans notes, the principle of provincial autonomy is central to the Anglican Communion. He comments (213): ‘Fisher was fired by the nationalistic values of the British heritage to be found in the Commonwealth, which were bound to come into conflict with the newer, competing nationalisms of post-colonial regimes, including that incidentally of Australian nationalism’.

203 ibid., paragraph 4.11. See also Dyer, ‘The Virginia Report Presentation’, 189.
204 The diocese ‘is bound to accept positive enactments of a Provincial Synod in which it is duly represented, and … no Diocesan regulations have force, if contrary to the decisions of a higher Synod’. See Evans, Authority in the Church, 55.
of subsidiarity ‘preserves the diocesan synod as the fundamental unit of Church organization in such a conciliar structure’ 214 – but only, we must note, in terms of its relationship to the province.

Overall, it seems to me, the issue remains unclear. This may not matter so much in churches like England, Canada and the United States, where canons at the national level take immediate effect in each diocese. In Australia, however, this situation is reversed. Each diocese may decide whether or not to accept canons of General Synod. Diocesan synods, in other words, have power of veto over resolutions at the national level. As Kaye notes, this is unique in worldwide Anglicanism. The challenge for the Australian church is therefore ‘how to sustain national unity in the face of institutionalised local diversity’. 215 This is precisely the issue. In my view, the principle of diocesan independence and the related state-based provincial system operating within Australian Anglicanism have become justifications for avoiding the principle of provinces of ‘particular or national churches’.

The fact is that, regardless of how independent Australian dioceses see themselves, the Australian church as a whole, from a global perspective, is indeed an autonomous province of the Anglican Communion. This, in a sense, satellite picture of Australian Anglicanism, lifts it beyond regionalism to embrace a national perspective. 216 As we have already noted, Paul Avis, for one, admittedly writing from the English context, regards this national vision as a fundamental aspect of the Anglican ethos.

The importance of national churches derives not only from the growing importance of national aspirations at the time of the Reformation, but also from the incarnational emphasis of Anglican theology. The incarnation represents and establishes the involvement of God with humanity in all its particularity … The role of particular or national churches has evolved within Anglicanism into an affirmation of the principle of inculturation. 217
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214 ibid., 56.
215 Bruce Kaye, ‘The Emergence and Character’, 163. In churches with stronger national bodies, the question is ‘how to contain diversity within a more rigid national structure’. According to Kaye, both patterns have their inherent strengths and weaknesses.
216 As Kaye notes, ibid., 175-176, its strong regional sense places Australian Anglicanism at odds with the pattern of Australian political life.
217 Avis, The Anglican Understanding, 63; also above, n. 7.
Admittedly, on a global level it is hard to apply this principle with absolute consistency. There are many variations and patterns. In some cases, for example, provinces are made up of dioceses from more than one nation. This suggests to Philip Thomas that, ‘while national identity is an important factor it is not the fundamental unit of Anglican ecclesiology’. Clearly, however, in such cases churches have been drawn together into a province in order to enable them to function more effectively within their own cultural contexts, where the principle of inculturation would still apply. Thomas, in fact, acknowledges this, admitting that, in this sense, the Anglican Communion remains ‘a fellowship of national churches’, even when provinces are formed across national boundaries. Such variations in the Anglican pattern of ‘national or particular churches’ can hardly be used to defend the fragmentation of the Australian church.

I am not discounting the importance of regional identity in Australian society, but I do wish to emphasise that, from the perspective of global Anglicanism, inculturation is a national, not a regional principle. This, surely, is what lies behind the notion of autonomous provinces. The provincial understanding that has evolved in Australian Anglicanism, based on the premise of diocesan separatism, can only weaken the sense of a national Anglican vocation and justify continued resistance to it. A vision of national unity is required. Broughton’s broader provincial vision sits in the wings, waiting to be rediscovered. It remains a prophetic call to remember the consequences of belonging to a global Communion of ‘particular or national churches’.

**CONCLUSION**

Global Anglicanism is both universal and particular – the product, in the first instance, of the transportation of the faith of the English church into new contexts through colonialism and missionary expansion, and the subsequent emergence of a global network of particular or national churches shaped by those contexts. The
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219 ibid.

220 ibid., 135.

Anglican Communion emerged out of this global experience of holding fast to Anglican faith while digging roots into new soil. The tension, in each case, between preservation of the tradition and adaptation to a new culture has been unavoidable. Bishop Broughton, as we saw earlier, found this out the hard way in colonial New South Wales as far back as 1836, but the importance of his discovery appears to have been overlooked by subsequent generations of Australian Anglicans. It is important to grasp, even so, that the process of inculturation has long been an integral part of Anglican experience, both within Britain and beyond.

As this survey of global Anglicanism has shown, it is clearly no longer possible to claim membership of the Anglican Communion at an international level while avoiding the cultural consequences of being a ‘particular or national church’. Cultural factors lie at the heart of the Anglican ethos. The case studies we have explored, both within Great Britain and in America, indicate that adaptation is unavoidable. Indeed, in the case of the Episcopal Church of the United States, the attempt to avoid the issues polarising American society during the decades leading up to the Civil War in order to protect the church’s apostolicity could be seen as a betrayal, not just of black Americans, but of the integrity and vocation of Anglicanism itself. As it is, the Anglican Communion is still struggling to release itself from ‘Anglo-Saxon captivity’. In spite of the shift in the centre of gravity in the Anglican Communion, powerfully symbolised by the predominance of black bishops at the 1998 Lambeth Conference, letting go of its colonial legacy is easier said than done. As Jacob comments in the conclusion of his insightful book:

The embodiment of Anglicanism is still largely Anglo-Saxon. Despite the emphasis of the English Reformation documents on providing a local and national expression of the faith, order and worship of the Catholic Church, many Anglican dioceses have clung to English expressions of their faith long after expatriates have departed … Much more important for the Communion than issues like the ordination of women as deacons, priests and bishops is the embodiment of the Christian faith in cultures other than Western European cultures. Indigenous theologies, spiritualities and worship are needed. An incarnational faith must require that people engage with that faith, and work it out in their own contexts.223

Jacob’s words apply equally to the Australian church which, as we have seen, has been slow to embrace the difficult challenges of inculturation, assuming instead that Englishness and Anglican faith go hand in hand. This, however, is an unacceptable way of being Anglican in the contemporary world. Australian Anglicanism can no longer simply see itself as an extension of the English church, somehow cushioned from the complications of its existence as an Australian church. The challenges of Article 34 remain, inviting this ‘particular or national church’ to embrace its national vocation. Australian Anglicans, because of their peculiar history with its extended fixation on being English, need to look again at what being ‘Anglican’ means in the light of the global Anglican experience. Fragmentation will continue as long as cultural issues are pushed to the margins. Even ‘incarnation’ can be interpreted in an ‘in house’ way, rather than confronting the church with the radical implications of contextuality.

It is now time to focus more intentionally on an Anglican theological approach that is willing to embrace contextual issues, living with the tension between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’, and seeking to be a mediating presence in the life of the nation. It will not be prepared to settle for the preservation of doctrine while refusing to engage with the tensions and contradictions tearing at the fabric of the wider society. I will begin the next chapter by focussing once again on how the notion of inculturation shapes our understanding of the terms ‘comprehensiveness’ and via media. Once these are understood contextually a theology of engagement cannot be avoided. This must include the added difficulty of facing squarely the legacy of colonialism. Without such a critique, Anglican theology can far too easily lapse back into an ‘establishment’ mindset, endorsing the status quo rather than being a transformative presence in society. Anglican theology, in the tradition of F.D. Maurice and the like, will seek to play a prophetic, mediating role in the life of the nation. I will discuss the theological themes that lie at the heart of such a mediating tradition. Drawing on the insights of Paul Avis, I will argue that there is a difference between a ‘static’ approach to the Anglican via media and a more intuitive, ‘mystical’ approach which seeks to draw together Anglican faith and the issues confronting society. A mediating theology will above all reject fragmentation as a premise of both national and ecclesial life. It will seek unity in diversity.
CHAPTER 6  THE SHAPE OF A MEDIATING THEOLOGY

We have now explored the transformation in Anglican self-understanding that has taken place as a consequence of transporting Anglican faith from England to other parts of the world. An unavoidable process of adaptation has occurred in a variety of cultural contexts. The Lambeth journey since 1867 has involved a gradual growth in awareness of the indelible link between the Anglican tradition and its many locations. The departure from English shores has resulted in the formation of a culturally diverse Anglican Communion that is no longer predominantly English, resulting in immense difficulties for this global fellowship of Anglican churches.

Yet diversity need not mean fragmentation. In 1995, Sehon Goodridge, Bishop of the Windward Islands in the West Indies, celebrated the pluriformity of the Anglican Communion. ‘Cultural diversity in Anglicanism’, he wrote, ‘is, to my mind, the greatest strength which it possesses, and the strongest link in its chain of integrity’.1 The present struggles within the worldwide Communion over authority and identity are a natural consequence of this diversity. Catholicity does not mean uniformity. Rather, to quote Avis, it is ‘a mandate for cultural hospitality’.

Catholicity refers to the universal scope of the Church as a society instituted by God in which all sorts and conditions of humanity, all races, nations and cultures, can find a welcome and a home. The catholicity of the Church denotes its potential to fulfil the aspirations of all people. Catholicity therefore points towards inculturation.2

As I have argued, the concerns expressed in *The Virginia Report* must not be allowed to overshadow the profound insights of the earlier report, *For the Sake of the Kingdom*. The former rightly notes the threats to unity created by diversity within
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Anglicanism; the latter demonstrates the fact that only in diversity is unity possible. It also presses home another painful aspect of the Anglican story that remains part of the present debate: the colonial legacy of Anglicanism.

The Anglican Communion is struggling with the pain of migration. In a post-colonial world, the churches of this worldwide fellowship are now ‘writing back’ to the metropolitan centre,3 questioning former assumptions and reshaping the way ‘Anglicanism’ is understood. This heightened sensitivity to cultural factors, to a plethora of ‘vernacular moments’, to the experience of ‘belonging’, is now an integral part of contemporary Anglicanism. The national idea in Anglicanism, once limited in scope to Britain and her colonies, is now expressed globally in a fellowship of ‘particular or national churches’. The international potential of Article 34 is now being realised. From a centralist point of view, this creates enormous problems for Anglican identity. Yet, as I have argued, identity is only one aspect of the theological equation. Anglican identity cannot be formulated in isolation from Anglican vocation.

Once the cultural factor is seen as an integral dimension of Anglican faith, what theological implications follow? A response to this question is the task of the present chapter. Essentially we are talking about doing theology contextually. Doctrine does not exist in a vacuum; it is always culturally shaped and expressed. Fragmentation within the Anglican Church, whether locally (as in the Australian context), or globally (as in the present struggles polarising the Anglican Communion), is at least in part the result of a failure (or refusal) to recognise the integral relationship between theology and culture. First, I wish to comment on how inculturation shapes the way we understand critical aspects of the Anglican ethos like ‘comprehensiveness’ and the Anglican via media. I will then look more closely at the way Anglicanism’s post-colonial experience impacts on its theology. A more prophetic Anglican response is required to the way Anglican faith is both understood and practised. I will seek to show that such a response is actually implicit within Anglicanism itself; it is more than capable of radical engagement with society. A more conservative approach is also possible, of course, but it is not the only option. I

will draw on Paul Avis’ distinction between the ‘static’ and ‘mystical’ via media as well as contemporary contextual theological models to argue that Anglicanism must take seriously its role as a mediating tradition in society. Such insights mould the way central doctrines like Incarnation and Trinity are understood and how they, in turn, contribute to the broader national conversation in each unique cultural location. Ultimately, I will argue, it is a question of integrity: whether Anglicanism is really committed to wholeness, truthfulness and unity, or whether it is content to settle for a more fragmented, mediocre understanding of its own theological and ecclesial tradition. My own preference is to opt for the former, in keeping with the insights of F.D. Maurice, who believed that Anglicanism was called to be a mediating presence in the life of the nation.

INCULTURATION AND THE VIA MEDIA

We begin with a discussion of how inculturation shapes Anglican understanding. Traditionally, Anglican theological method has been based on scripture, tradition and reason: in Hooker’s terms, the ‘threefold cord not quickly broken’. To these three strands we must now add a fourth – culture. In other words, Hooker’s classic model of authority has now been contextualised. Another strand, we might say, has been added to the cord. Culture has become an integral part of Anglican theological method. In the words of Keith Rayner: ‘Truths of the faith and theological principle do not simply exist in the abstract. They are embodied in particular forms and practices appropriate to culture’.

As we have seen, this insight is now common knowledge, part of the atmosphere of contemporary Anglican thought. The discovery has been liberating rather than
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4 See Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church (1989), 63.
5 See Goodridge, ‘The Integrity of Anglicanism’, 475.
6 Cf. Avis, ‘What is Anglicanism’, 471. Avis places Scripture, tradition and reason ‘in the acknowledged context of our modern pluralistic situation’. In consequence, he argues, ‘these three sources or criteria [act] in dialogue with the Church’s cultural and ideological context’.
7 To use the familiar image of the three-legged stool, we might say that the stool has been grounded.
8 Keith Rayner, ‘Authority in the Church: An Anglican Perspective’, in Moses, From Oxford to the Bush, 278. Cf. H. R. McAdoo, Anglican Heritage: Theology and Spirituality (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1991), 1: ‘Thus, the faith as received, understood and proclaimed by Anglicanism is propounded in what one might call an idiom which reflects its historical and cultural background as well as its present situation’.
9 ‘The Virginia Report’, paragraph 3.9, draws particular attention to the role of reason. ‘The appeal to reason … refers to what can be called “the mind of a particular culture”, with its characteristic ways of seeing things, asking about them, and explaining them. If tradition is the mind that Christians share as believers and members of the Church, reason is the mind they share as participants in a particular
restrictive. The Englishness of classical Anglicanism has now been recognised,\(^\text{10}\) the ‘Anglo-Saxon captivity’ of the Anglican Communion acknowledged, and the principle of inculturation more readily accepted as an Anglican imperative.\(^\text{11}\) The non-Anglo-Saxon Anglican world has adopted the role of teacher in this process. Pobee, for example, writing from an African perspective, insists that context is an essential aspect of the Anglican \textit{via media}. African Anglicanism is African. He questions the wisdom of simply translating the \textit{Book of Common Prayer} into other languages, or of giving more weight to the writings of Cranmer, Hooker, Maurice and Gore, the ‘giants of Anglican theological reflection’, than to African theologies. ‘If Anglicanism is a communion’ he says, ‘then there is room for other etches into the mosaics of colours, spiritualities, and races’, without, in any sense, betraying ‘the true spirit of Anglicanism’.\(^\text{12}\)

It is important to grasp the significance of what Pobee is saying. Through a growing acceptance of the principle of inculturation the true spirit of Anglicanism is finally being realised. It is a discovery that has emerged from within Anglican experience itself. It expresses the global potential of Article 34. It fulfils the visions of missionary strategists like Henry Venn and Roland Allen, who warned of the dangers of Western superiority and called, in different ways, for the establishment of local, indigenous churches.\(^\text{13}\) It vindicates the cultural sensitivity of a Henry Callaway

\(^{10}\) Classic Anglicanism, according to Sykes and Booty, is ‘unquestionably English in character, accent and idiom. Constructed in seventeenth-century England and strongly revived in the nineteenth century by the Tractarians, it was disseminated throughout the world by the rapid growth of the Anglican Communion’. Sykes et al., \textit{The Study of Anglicanism}, xi. Cf. Harris, \textit{The Challenge of Change}, 19: ‘Authoritative doctrine has been derived by reference to scripture, tradition, and reason, \textit{in the context of the experience of the English people}’ (Harris’ emphasis).

\(^{11}\) Consider, for example, this statement by Las Newman from within the post-colonial Caribbean context: ‘As the Mission Church began to develop and search for its own identity, soon the need for indigenous theology to deal with issues of Gospel-as-brought-by-European-missionaries versus local traditional culture, contextualization, indigenisation, and inculturation began to give a new face to the Church’. Las Newman, ‘The Church as a Source of Identity: Reflection from the Caribbean’, in Wingate, \textit{Anglicanism: A Global Communion}, 241.

\(^{12}\) Pobee, ‘Mission, Paternalism, and the Peter Pan Syndrome’, 96; also ‘Non-Anglo-Saxon-Anglicanism’, 452-454. Cf. Sedgwick, ‘The New Shape of Anglican Identity’, 197: ‘The strength and opportunity of Anglicanism is given in that it is a world communion. The sources of a vital Christian way may arise from the English past but may bear fruit only as they are planted and fed by indigenous communities’.

\(^{13}\) Venn (1796-1873), secretary of the Church Missionary Society from 1841-1872, saw the purpose of missions as establishing self-supporting, indigenous churches that aspired to be national churches.
amongst the Zulus, or a John Patteson in Melanesia. It justifies Archbishop E.W. Benson’s belief in the importance of developing autonomous provinces throughout the Anglican Communion, not ruled from England, but rather ‘churches truly native’. We have already traced the development of this idea in successive Lambeth Conferences, and have noted the tensions that have arisen as a consequence. Cultural diversity is here to stay, not as a threat to the Anglican spirit, but rather as an embodiment of it, an expression of its capacity to adapt, to belong, to a wide range of locations. To quote For the Sake of the Kingdom once again:

‘Belonging’ and pluralism: these are centuries-old, correlative marks of the Anglican spirit, which has always sought to speak in ‘a tongue understood of the people’, and which still seeks to do so even when ‘the people’ speaks, much more obviously than in the past, in many tongues. It is natural and appropriate, therefore, that the Anglican Communion today should take the form of a fellowship that encourages local and regional initiative and nourishes styles of church life which fit— and address— particular societies and cultures.

Anglicanism, the document argues, has always been diverse and has always related to a particular place and time. ‘From the beginning’, writes Neill, ‘the Church of England has tried to be comprehensive: its aim was to gather into one all


For the Sake of the Kingdom, 59, paragraph 95. See also Louis Weil, ‘The Gospel in Anglicanism’, in Sykes et al., The Study of Anglicanism, 80-81.

See also Sykes et al., ibid., xii.
those whom God had united as members of a single nation’. 18 This was essentially Hooker’s agenda in Elizabethan England: while forging a via media between Catholicism and Puritanism, his deeper purpose was to articulate, not just a doctrinal middle path, but rather the faith of the English nation. In Kaye’s words, the via media was an attempt to ‘meet the broad spectrum of requirements in English society’. 19 Doctrine remained fundamentally important, but always in partnership with the societal context. 20 This created an ongoing tension, but Anglicanism has always lived with this tension. It is implicit in the term via media. It is evident in the distinction, made by the English Reformers, between the essentials of the tradition and the adiaphora, or ‘things indifferent’. 21 It is also part of the current debates over authority and identity within global Anglicanism. The issue has always been finding a proper balance ‘between respect for tradition and alignment with culture’. 22 It will always be tempting to treat doctrinal matters as an internal affair, as though the church is somehow separate from its cultural context. The via media then becomes a balancing act between church parties, endorsing fragmentation rather than unity. But this is to misunderstand the creative centripetal force lying at the heart of the Anglican spirit. As Sedgwick argues:

*Anglicanism is a mediating tradition. It mediates between a received tradition and the formation of a people of faith … As Christian faith is mediated in terms of forming a people, the constructive task before the church not only requires formation but indigenisation. The disciplines or practices that lead to and from the worship of God must reflect the language and culture of a people.* 23
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18 Neill, Anglicanism, 426.
19 See Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 83.
20 “Particular or national Churches” hold the responsibility for shaping their corporate existence in accordance with the precepts of Scripture but within the context of their own local environment. The universal Church must take on a particular identity’. Thomas, ‘Doctrine of the Church’, 252.
21 For a comprehensive discussion of this distinction, see Stephen W. Sykes, ‘The Fundamentals of Christianity’, in Sykes et al., The Study of Anglicanism, 262-277. Paul Avis makes a similar distinction, when he says: “[I]t remains the case that the political, social and cultural context can only provide the occasion for a church and contribute to the shaping of its outward form. It cannot provide the definition of a church or its raison d’être. Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’ , 460. In another work, Church, State and Establishment, 88, Avis seems to contradict this statement, when he says: ‘Anglicanism’s raison d’être is given by reference to the environing human community wherever it is placed’. However, a careful reading of these two statements suggests that Avis is highlighting the very point I am trying to make: the integral relationship between theology and cultural context. Culture is not the source of theology, but without it theology is incapable of expression. Avis is also emphasising that Anglicanism, by its very nature, is inescapably contextual. In Kaye’s terms, it is a ‘church in society’ tradition (as Avis himself acknowledges on the same page).
22 Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, 8.
Anglican faith, in other words, has to be incarnated in particular societal contexts. This is more than a matter of mere translation, of finding ways of interpreting theological truths in language that can be understood in a particular culture. That is only the first step. I want to push Sedgwick’s insight further. Incarnation involves entering into the life of a people, living on the inside, as it were. The church takes root in a particular society, and shares its life. In the words of the 1988 Lambeth report, it ‘enters deeply into a people’s soul’, carrying within itself ‘the most profound hopes and values of a nation’. In Sedgwick’s terms, it stands as a mediating tradition within the life of the nation. Within Anglicanism, society itself is an integral part of the theological equation.

There is always a creative tension between the experiences of ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’. This is what happens when inculturation is taken seriously. A mediating tradition must live with the pain of its own vocation. It must search for creative ways of holding the nation together, challenging its injustices and healing its wounds. Withdrawal from engagement in society is not an acceptable alternative. When treated in isolation from society, the church’s ecclesial and theological resources easily become opportunities for division. The via media then becomes part of the internal conversation of a private religious world. When it is placed at the service of society, however, the via media broadens in meaning to incorporate the life of the nation.

On the global level of the Anglican Communion, with its concerns about authority and identity, it becomes clear that the unity (comprehensiveness) of Anglicanism is

---


25 See Chapter 5, n.170.

26 There are, of course, dangers in ‘over-adaptation’, as both the *Virginia* and *Windsor* reports suggest. Philip Turner regards this propensity as the Achilles’ heel of the Episcopal Church in the United States, and perhaps of Anglicanism in general. Radner and Turner, *The Fate of Communion*, 2. Later (23), he says: ‘[T]he internal life of ECUSA may well lack a transcendent point of reference – one that can serve as a counterbalance to the social forces that play upon it’. The essays prepared by Radner and Turner in this thoughtful book about the future of both the American church and the Anglican Communion require deep and attentive reflection. Even so, I am arguing that the way to deal with over-identification is not by withdrawing from society or treating it as somehow separate from the life of the church, but by careful and prophetic engagement. Turner is right about the need for a transcendent point of reference: the church must look beyond itself. But outward directedness is both vertical (transcendent) and horizontal (contextual). Transcendence must go hand in hand with incarnation. The tension cannot be avoided.
dependent on its willingness to embrace and celebrate its cultural diversity and particularity, living with the tension implicit in the *via media*. Without this tension, unity would become uniformity, and the vocation of Anglicanism within each place and time would be surrendered. To quote Philip Thomas:

> It is because the Anglican view of the church seeks to do justice both to a vision of the Church in its universal dimension and to the reality of the Church in its local manifestations, that it is difficult to envisage a systematic treatment of its teaching. Yet to promote a dogma which resolved the Anglican dilemma at the expense of one or the other aspect of it would be to take from Anglicanism its vocation and its ecumenical and missionary opportunity.\(^{27}\)

The implications for Australian Anglicanism cannot be underestimated. As we have seen, the principle of comprehensiveness could hardly be considered to be a high priority in the Australian context. It is therefore important to note that the fragmentation and diocesan separatism of the church in Australia are not necessarily a true expression of the Anglican ethos,\(^{28}\) but hold the church back from realising its vocation as a national church. The church is in danger of talking only to itself,\(^{29}\) excluding the nation from its internal conversation. But this is to misunderstand the true meaning of the *via media*, which is integrally related to the cultural context to which the church belongs.

**A POST-COLONIAL COMMUNION**

When considering the Anglican *via media*, the colonial legacy of the Anglican Communion also needs to be considered. Without it, any consideration of Anglican identity or the mission of Anglicanism will be a distortion. Enough has been said already to indicate that a large number of Anglican voices are calling for a reappraisal of the ‘cultural hegemony’\(^{30}\) that has shaped contemporary Anglicanism. Both *For the Sake of the Kingdom* and the 1988 Lambeth Conference Report have

\(^{27}\) Thomas, ‘Doctrine of the Church’, 261.

\(^{28}\) As noted in the Introduction (n.12), George Shaw describes Australian Anglicanism as a ‘caricature’, too given over to ‘conservatism and factionalism and diocesan distrust (or rivalry)’ to realise its true vocation ‘as a *Via Media* in the work of reconciliation’ in Australian society. Shaw, ‘Australia’s Anglicanism: A *Via Media*?’, 256-262. See also Roe, *Quest for Authority*, 125.


\(^{30}\) See Kwok, ‘The Legacy of Cultural Hegemony in the Anglican Church’.
exposed the links between church and empire during the period of British colonial expansion. Mark Harris expresses the matter quite bluntly:

Anglicanism took shape while the European powers, including England, were attempting world conquest. Several critics of our history are happy to point out that Anglicanism’s adherents colluded in, or acquiesced to, the grab for land and power and kingdom-building. These factors contributed to the disparity of the distribution of wealth in Europe and reinforced the commerce in, and dependence on, slave labour. The self-giving of many missionaries is not at issue here, nor is their faithfulness. Whether or not the gospel of peace was spread by peaceful servants of God, the difficult fact remains that Anglicans mostly went where there was conquest to be had or business to be done by English-speaking peoples. The separation of the missionary church and the mercantile state was not at all clearly defined. If being Anglican is bound to a separate historical identity, then that identity is sin, and in particular the sins of greed and racism.31

Harris’ statement suggests that, by and large, Anglicans were well-meaning participants in the political and economic processes of empire building. The Church of England in British colonies assumed its established status, at least at first, and willingly cooperated with colonial authorities. White superiority was assumed by both church and state. In ‘mission churches’, missionaries often resisted relinquishing control over indigenous churches, in spite of official mission policies calling for this very thing.32 Nevertheless, as Harris suggests, the relationship between church and empire was not one of all-out collusion; the situation was more complex than that. While bishops or missionaries often cooperated closely with colonial authorities, there was always a tension between them, a pull towards detachment and separation.33 Indeed, in the Pacific, as W.N. Gunson has argued, an ‘isolationist ideal’ permeated the attitudes of British missionaries during the first half of the nineteenth century, although this was quickly compromised by the need for

31 Harris, The Challenge of Change, 18.
32 Cf. Ward, ‘The development of Anglicanism’, 18: ‘The “effortless” superiority of whites, their efficiency and judgment, the need to run complex institutions such as schools and seminaries and hospitals, all put an emphasis on the idea that native Churches were in “leading strings”, firmly under the direction of their missionary nannies. These combined with evolutionary theories of racial difference, which invariably disadvantaged native peoples. The theories of Henry Venn ... about “euthanasia of the mission”, and the fostering of self-governing, self-propagating and self-financing Churches, were re-interpreted in a tortuously gradualist and restrictive way, or forgotten altogether’. See also Sachs, The Transformation of Anglicanism, Chapter 5: ‘The Church and Empire’.
British protection against competing European interests. Overall, however, the nineteenth century missionary, often willingly, invariably became identified with British imperialism, in spite of dissident voices – those ‘missionaries whose ethos and spirit’ drove them to critique colonialism.

Colonialism is part of the Anglican story. Without the British Empire, the Anglican Communion as we know it would not exist. Even so, it is now recognised that the legacy of colonialism must be addressed. We have already noted the call of the 1988 Lambeth Conference to free the church ‘from the “Babylonish captivity” of colonial culture’, with all its hidden assumptions.

Thus when Anglicanism was exported to other continents, it came not only with the ‘Englishness’ of certain styles of clothing, music and worship, but with certain assumptions about who made decisions, who had authority in social life, who had ultimate control in economic affairs, markets, production, land ownership. The dominance of English styles – neo-Gothic churches, English church music, a concern with European church history, western clerical dress, and so on – could be seen as a reflection of the plain facts of political and economic dominance.

Addressing these issues in any penetrating way will, of course, be painful. What was done in innocence appears with the benefit of hindsight to have been presumptuous, to say the least. A return to some pristine pre-colonial condition is impossible. The churches of the Anglican Communion have been shaped in irreversible ways by the history of colonial expansion, and they must each wrestle with the consequences of this history. While, from a chronological perspective, the colonial age has passed, it is quite clear that its impact remains. We breathe its unsettling atmosphere, and we live with its hidden assumptions and unresolved injustices.

---

35 ibid., 307. Gunson notes, however, the subtle difference between being a patriot and being an empire-builder (301).
38 *The Truth Shall Make You Free*, 90, paragraph 36.
39 ibid., 88, paragraph 28.
40 For this reason, Douglas and Kwok, *Beyond Colonial Anglicanism*, 15, as the title of their book indicates, prefer the word ‘beyond’ to the prefix ‘post’, which can be interpreted as ‘having gone
Kwok Pui-lan argues that, in the light of such a realisation, ‘it is imperative for Anglicans to face the challenges of postcolonial realities’. She draws on postcolonial theorists like Stuart Hall, Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak to assist in the process of exposing the cultural assumptions that were part of the baggage of colonialism: the myth of ‘the West’, with its accompanying negation of ‘others’ (Hall), the implicit link between liberal humanism and racism, the adjustments the colonised were forced to make in order to live within the imposed world of the colonisers (Bhabha), the alternative histories needing to emerge from the voices of those on the margins (Bhabha and Spivak), and, finally, the theory of ‘cultural hybridity’, which exposes ‘the myths of purity of cultural lineage, homogeneity of identity, and monolithic understandings of national cultures’ (Bhabha). These are powerful themes, requiring deep soul-searching and intelligent reflection, especially wherever the importation of Anglican faith, coated in the vestments of Anglo-Saxon superiority has, however inadvertently, been a party to the displacement or marginalisation of indigenous peoples, and the destruction of their way of life.

---


43 Note, for example, John Harris’ comments on the failed Anglican mission in the mid-nineteenth century to the Aboriginal settlement at Yelta, at the junction of the Murray and Darling Rivers: “[T]he missionaries in their brief ten years there were spectators of but not participants in the destruction of Aboriginal society. Their observations are all the more telling for the fact that they did not really understand what they were observing’. John Harris, *One Blood: 200 Years of Aboriginal Encounter with Christianity: A Story of Hope* (Sydney: Albatross Books, 1990), 165. Harris records many instances of the dilemma Christian missionaries faced: protesting against violence and genocide while feeling unable to stop it; living and working amongst Aboriginal people while operating with the mindset of the European. See also John Harris, *We Wish We’d Done More: Ninety years of CMS*
The ‘postcolonial’ debate, argues Kwok, is still waiting to happen in the theological academy.\textsuperscript{45} The time has come for Anglicanism to go beyond its English ‘point of origin’ when discussing issues of identity, integrity and authority. Anglicanism, she claims, is a ‘living church with traditions of the living’.\textsuperscript{46} Of course, as Avis argues, tradition is only living if a community is connected to its roots. It must maintain its corporate memory if it is to avoid both ‘religious amnesia’ and losing touch with ‘the hermeneutical categories by which the community reconstructs and interprets its identity’.\textsuperscript{47} Yet it is precisely the issue of hermeneutics that is at stake here: what is one’s point of reference? Avis, for example, writes from the British context, with all the history and cultural assumptions that this entails. It is only from this standpoint that he is able to be Anglican at all.\textsuperscript{48} The same principle applies in every cultural corner of the Anglican Communion, Australia included.\textsuperscript{49}

Kwok is aware of all this. Drawing on postcolonial theory, she notes that ‘Anglicanism’ is, in fact, a cultural hybrid and always has been, as the terms ‘comprehensiveness’ and \textit{via media} imply. During the period of British colonial expansion, however, the integral relationship between religion and culture was forgotten. The church, transported to other places, sought to make the world in its own image. As a consequence, ‘instead of continuing the process of hybridity, Anglican churches were formed during the imperialistic period as mimicries of

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{and Aboriginal issues in north Australia} (Adelaide: Openbook Publishers, 1998); Henry Reynolds, \textit{This Whispering In Our Hearts} (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1998). \textsuperscript{44} The seminal work on this topic was by C.D. Rowley, \textit{The Destruction of Aboriginal Society} (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1970). I will return to this issue in Chapter 8. \textsuperscript{45} ibid., 55: ‘Although postcolonial theory constitutes one of the most significant and controversial discourses in academia today, theologians and church historians have not yet fully engaged this body of literature’; also Kwok, \textit{Postcolonial Imagination and Feminist Theology}, 6-7. The word ‘postcolonial’, without the hyphen, refers to this particular area of discourse. \textsuperscript{46} Kwok, ‘The Legacy of Cultural Hegemony’, 55. By ‘point of origin’, Kwok means ‘the writings of Richard Hooker, the liturgy of Cranmer, the institution of episcopacy, and the religious establishment of England’, as well as Michael Ramsey, Stephen Sykes, Paul Avis, and Lambeth documents since 1948. In a joint essay, Douglas and Kwok, \textit{Beyond Colonial Anglicanism}, 12-13, also critique the Western assumptions permeating important works on Anglicanism by Sykes, William Sachs, Alister McGrath and Mark Harris. This, of course, means that this study is also subject to such a critique. I believe this is unavoidable because Australian Anglicanism, while needing to be sensitive to its colonial origins, must also acknowledge its British roots. Having done so, however, the insights of writers like Kwok must be faced squarely. \textsuperscript{47} See Avis, \textit{Anglicanism and the Christian Church} (1989), 2. \textsuperscript{48} Of course, being English is now multifaceted. Cultures intermingle in England just as much as they do anywhere else in the world. Cultural hybridity is both international and intranational. \textsuperscript{49} Cf. Douglas, ‘The Exigency of Times and Occasions’, 41: ‘Becoming more Maori does not mean becoming \textit{less} Anglican, it means becoming \textit{more} Anglican’.
\end{flushleft}
churches from the metropolitan centre’. This, as we have noted, is what Pobee has called ‘the Anglo-Saxon captivity of Ecclesia Anglicana’.

To rescue itself from this captivity, Kwok argues, the hybridity of the Anglican Communion must be embraced. Churches must see themselves as being Anglican and African, Asian, Latin American, West Indian and (I would add) Australian. Only ‘a multicultural reading of the history of Anglicanism’ can do justice to its cultural complexity, respecting the life of each church in its specific location, and then, from a global perspective, incorporating this rich diversity into our understanding of what ‘Anglicanism’ means. A deep listening to each other will be required, especially as voices from the margins in former British colonies speak back to the churches from the West, challenging their power and control over the way the Anglican tradition is understood and practised. Anglicanism faces a daunting future, but it has resources within its own life – the via media in particular – capable of enabling it to face the past and embrace the future.

The principle of via media, long cherished by Anglicans, can offer tremendous insights in navigating through the treacherous waters of cultural politics today, if understood in a new light. Via media debunks the myth that there is one, absolute foundation or source of truth, thus opening up possibilities for dialogue between people on different sides of the fence. The via media entertains the thought that decisions about right or wrong, truth or falsehood, are not predetermined or prepackaged, but negotiated in the grayish, ambivalent space of ‘in-between’. While honouring the cultural experiences of peoples, via media is not complete relativism or moral chaos. It is a kind of disciplined reasoning, seasoned with humility, and sustained by compassion and empathy for oneself and others.

Here Kwok has outlined for us the theological and spiritual qualities required of Anglicanism if it is to be true to its vocation as a mediating tradition within a global Communion of ‘particular or national churches’. Half-measures are clearly not enough: only by facing the legacy of colonialism is mutual responsibility and

---

50 Kwok, ‘The Legacy of Cultural Hegemony’, 56. Cf. Douglas, ibid., 39: ‘It is only with the rise of the British empire and its political and economic hegemony that the unique experience of Anglo-Saxon contextualization became codified and was made normative for Anglican churches the world over, thus betraying the genius of the original English Reformation’.
51 ibid., 57-58.
52 Kwok includes issues like the ‘cultural translation of liturgy’, Biblical interpretation, the struggles of Third World women, and different approaches to human sexuality. ibid., 59-65.
53 ibid., 65-66 (my emphasis).
Churches in settler cultures like Australia are not excluded from engagement with such issues. ‘A kind of disciplined reasoning’ is required, according to Kwok, seasoned with humility, compassion and empathy. Disciplined reasoning, of course, includes rigorous honesty, a willingness to critique presuppositions and assumptions in the light of subsequent experience. This is particularly relevant in the case of the Australian church, where internal fragmentation threatens a sense of national vocation. The church will never have the courage or imagination to stand in the ‘in-between’ spaces within the wider culture if it refuses to do so within its own life. It is important to hear what Kwok is saying. To be a church for the nation in the Australian context may very well involve being willing to recognise the thick layer of colonial dust that has settled on both church and society.

THE ‘STATIC’ AND ‘MYSTICAL’ VIA MEDIA

Everything depends on the way the Anglican via media is interpreted. If the views of theologians like Kwok are to be taken seriously, there is clearly a need for the via media to be understood contextually. In particular, a hermeneutics of suspicion needs to be applied, in order to expose once and for all the ways in which Anglicanism has benefited from an imperial mindset. As Rowan Williams has written, ‘Religious discourse must articulate and confront its own temptations, its own falsehoods. It is, in other words, essential to theology that theologians become aware of how theology has worked and continues to work in the interests of this or that system of power’. It is certainly convenient for the church to limit the via media to matters of internal doctrinal dispute while sidestepping the broader political and cultural consequences that inevitably follow from being a church in society. Theologically, however, this is both short-sighted and dishonest. It is no longer an adequate or acceptable response.

Paul Avis has distinguished between ‘static’ and ‘mystical’ views of the Anglican via media. It is a helpful distinction. The static view, exemplified in the very English qualities of ‘love of balance, restraint, moderation, measure’, tries to hold things together for the sake of harmony. Essentially it aims at compromise between differing parties within the church, whether expressed as High, Low and Broad, or

55 Rowan Williams, On Christian Theology, 8.
56 Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”?’, 469.
Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal. From one perspective this traditional understanding of Anglican comprehensiveness may appear to be a remarkable achievement, but Avis is not content to settle for such a soft level of ‘internal ecumenism’. It is, says Avis, a conservative tendency; it uses the language of compromise, we might say, while presupposing division. But a more radical understanding of the via media is also possible. Avis draws attention to the conclusions expressed in the 1947 Anglo-Catholic document Catholicity: ‘The history of Anglican theology shows that it possesses a power of construction which has made for synthesis rather than for division’.57

There is a profound difference between synthesis and compromise. Compromise leaves differences intact; it remains on the surface of things. Synthesis requires a deeper engagement, a genuinely ‘intellectual catholicity’.58 It goes below the surface, working creatively with Scripture, tradition and reason (including culture) in an innovative, open and fluid way. Instead of remaining on parallel tracks, these essential ingredients of Anglican faith are ‘fused creatively, reacting on one another, modifying one another and generating new combinations’. This is a dynamic rather than ‘static’ approach to the via media.59 Avis describes it as ‘a mystical view of the Anglican synthesis’, endeavouring to ‘reconcile opposites’ and to ‘transcend conflicts’. It involves ‘vision, passion and risk’. This reconciling method, Avis suggests, is the real vocation of Anglicanism.60

Avis’ distinction between the ‘mystical’ and the ‘static’ via media provides another way of approaching the issues raised in this study. Australian Anglicanism, for example, has been plagued by factionalism. The 1962 national constitution was a compromise proposal. This was achievable because the debate took place in a cultural vacuum; it was hardly ‘national’. It was really designed to protect sectional

57 ibid., 463.
58 ibid., 464.
59 Carlos Calvani’s critique of the via media is not unlike that of Avis. See ‘The Myth of Anglican Communion’, 141. Calvani describes the via media as ‘dangerous and pretentious’, because it gives the impression that Anglicanism has achieved a balance that has eluded other churches. He notes that via media comes from the Latin word for mediocrity. ‘The danger for Anglican theology’, he argues, ‘lies in the ambiguity of the concept of “via media”; the risk of becoming average or mediocre’. Later (147) Calvani describes The Virginia Report as the via media ‘in the worst sense’, endeavouring to establish how limits to diversity can be established, rather than accepting diversity in an inclusive way.
60 Avis, ‘What is “Anglicanism”’?, 469.
interests, rather than to become a church for the nation. To apply Avis’ typology, Australian Anglicanism in 1962 applied the *via media* in a ‘static’ way. A ‘mystical’ approach would have involved struggling towards a new synthesis. The national vocation of the church would have been placed before the preservation of the church institution. Using Avis’ terminology, ‘polarization’ would have made way for a new creative synthesis of Anglican faith and Australian context.\(^{61}\) The future of Australian society would have been a central ingredient in the debate about the formation of a national church. ‘Internal ecumenism’ of a radical kind would have taken place for the sake of engagement with the wider society.

I am reminded of Maurice’s search for the living principles hidden beneath the competing systems in any society, an expression, as we saw earlier, of Maurice’s lifelong quest for unity.\(^{62}\) He was not so much seeking for some kind of rational synthesis, some kind of new construction (which would have simply been a larger system, requiring further digging) but rather, in Stephen Prickett’s words, a ‘sense or feeling of unity-in-tension’.\(^{63}\) For Maurice, the Kingdom of Christ is at the root of everything, the source of all unity. We do not build the Kingdom, but look for it, hidden beneath the structures and systems of our divided world. For Maurice, writes Norris, ‘systems are affairs of human devising whose effect – and indeed, whose purpose – is to mark out boundaries, to divide and so to exclude. They aspire to universality, but are inevitably particularistic’.\(^{64}\) They are partial truths purporting to be the whole truth. Maurice is effectively calling for a process of deconstruction that peels away the layers of distortion in different systems. Behind them all, not dependent on any human contrivance, there is a divine order, ‘an established and given relationship of God and humanity’, waiting to be uncovered.\(^{65}\) It is the ultimate

\(^{61}\) ibid., 463.

\(^{62}\) Avis, ibid., 469, presents Maurice as a classic exponent of the ‘mystical’ *via media*.

\(^{63}\) Prickett, *Romanticism and Religion*, 151. Norris, *F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority*, 41, writes about Maurice’s ‘dialectical methodology … an exploratory pattern of argument, in which contrasting positions were probed again and again to discover their hidden presuppositions: truth was produced spirally’. Later (113), Norris comments on Maurice’s ‘mystical’ search for ‘an inner dynamic of development towards unity’. While on the surface of things, human systems may appear to be ‘static’, their inner life reveals an underlying movement towards unity in Christ.

\(^{64}\) Norris, ‘Maurice on Theology’, 13. For example, Maurice criticizes the Benthamites for basing their understanding of society on ‘the hypothesis that mankind is an aggregate of individual atoms’. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, Vol.1, 199. See also Norris, ibid., 39.

\(^{65}\) Norris, ibid., 17. So, according to Maurice’s vision, the work of the theologian, writes Norris (19), is not to build systems, but to criticize them. ‘[T]his means in turn an attentive search for the living principles to which systems bear witness even as they distort them. Theology is the attempt to uncover the foundation of human existence’.
mystery, to which the Scriptures and the life and witness of the church bear witness, behind human life and all its concerns.66

Maurice’s theological vision of the Kingdom of Christ encompassed the whole of society rather than just the religious institutions within it. Similarly, Huntington in America distinguished between the ‘Anglican system’ and the ‘Anglican principle’. The former, he argued, threatened to turn the Episcopal Church into ‘a Church in name and a sect in deed’; the latter impelled Anglicanism to become a ‘church of the reconciliation’, giving itself to the larger cause of national unity. Decades before, as we have seen, Bishop Hobart had adopted a different stance, shoring up the inner integrity of the Episcopal Church at the expense of engagement with society. The Hobartian party, however, could not sustain forever a policy of detachment from the divisive political debates taking place in antebellum America.

When Anglicanism is seen as a closed system, detached from the life of the society to which it belongs, comprehensiveness and the via media become the instruments of an internal conversation. They become ‘static’. It is far easier to believe in ‘pure’ doctrine when the burden of inculturation is removed.67 The challenges presented by the document, For the Sake of the Kingdom, as well as writers like Kwok Pui-lan, indicate that there is still unfinished business within the Anglican Communion, not so much in terms of questions like authority and identity (the present preoccupation) as in vocational issues like colonialism and inculturation. These issues will not go away. Nor will they be settled by remaining in a static condition. A much more courageous and adventurous approach is needed. It is a question of how terms like ‘comprehensiveness’ and via media are understood. Do they apply to the church only, or do they have to do with the church’s engagement with the wider culture?

In her book, The Theories of Culture, theologian Kathryn Tanner claims that it is no longer possible to see nations, cultures or social groups as ‘sharply bounded, self-contained units’.68 She describes such a perspective as ‘the fallacy of internalism’.69

---

66 ibid., 19. The subtlety of Maurice’s argument will require further elucidation. I will attempt to do so later in the chapter, in the section ‘Beyond Fragmentation’.
67 Hall, Thinking the Faith, 143, argues that during the modern period Christian theology has far too readily presupposed ‘a certain rather static cultural matrix’.
68 Kathryn Tanner, Theories of Culture: A New Agenda for Theology (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 53.
Like Avis, Tanner regards a static view of cultural forms as inadequate. Cultures are ‘dynamic, interactive phenomena’, she argues, not closed systems. Cultural identity is therefore ‘a hybrid, relational affair, something that lives between as much as within cultures’. This also means that conflicts and internal contestations within a culture should not be seen as problems to be solved by achieving some kind of artificial homogeneity. How a society or social group deals with such dynamic hybridity is, of course, the key question.

Moving from anthropological theory to a consideration of ecclesiology, Tanner likewise rejects the view that Christianity lives within a self-contained cultural world. Instead, she argues, ‘the distinctiveness of a Christian way of life is not so much formed by the boundary as at it’, using cultural materials shared by those who live within the broader culture. There is, in other words, an internal relationship between theological statements and the wider culture. The church, after all, is a ‘humanity-comprehensive society’. It cannot, we might say, avoid the tension between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’ that is intrinsic to what it means to be a church in the first place.

Relations with the wider culture are not … an at best secondary or at worst optional matter of apologetics. Nor are relations with the wider culture merely part of a subsequent task of application, in which one works out the implications of an already-established Christian perspective by reenvisioning other world-views in its terms … The boundary has already been crossed in and through the very processes by which Christians come to believe anything at all.
As we have seen, Avis emphasises the ‘reconciling method’ at work in Anglicanism from Hooker onwards as each generation has sought its own synthesis between Scripture, tradition, reason and culture. He encourages a ‘mystical’ rather than a ‘static’ approach to the way the Anglican via media is understood and practised, a creative synthesis resulting from a dynamic engagement between church and society. In a similar vein, Bruce Kaye, we may recall, considers Anglicanism to be a ‘church in society’ tradition, ‘porous in its social boundaries’. It is a particular expression of Christian faith with a strong emphasis on providence and incarnation. ‘Because of that sense of God’s providential presence in society, this religious faith is a faith of engagement with society and mission to it’.77 Needless to say, Kaye is trying to push Australian Anglicanism into the ‘mystical’ territory of Hooker, Maurice and Temple. Unless such a step is taken, Anglicanism operates with the illusion that the church is a closed system. The via media then loses its prophetic, cutting edge.78

What a religious community does with such realisations will vary. There are a number of possibilities. In H.R Niebuhr’s classic typology, for example, the relationship between church and society may fit into one of the following categories: Christ against culture, the Christ of culture, Christ above culture, Christ and culture in paradox and Christ the transformer of culture.79 Niebuhr’s specific inclusion of F.D. Maurice in the last category has already been noted,80 although it is possible to identify traces of all of these ideal types in Maurice’s thought. As Tanner says in commenting on Niebuhr’s typology, relations between the Christian tradition and the wider culture ‘are never simply ones of either accommodation on the one hand, or opposition and radical critical revision, on the other, but always some mixture’.81

77 Kaye, A Church Without walls, 198.
78 In the midst of World War II, Bishop Burgmann wrote about the need for the church to present the world with a vision of ‘universal comradeship’, which, he argued, ‘is exactly what the world needs to heal the tragic wounds of the present suicidal struggle’. He lamented, however, the fact that the church did not seem capable of rising to the occasion at such a crucial moment in human history. ‘In spite of the fact that the Church is entrusted with a universal gospel, and that the vision of unity is fundamental in her teaching, she has not been able to resist the temptation to form closed societies’. Burgmann, The Regeneration of Civilization, 31. Tanner, Theories of Culture, 54, claims that the ‘closed system’ anthropological approach to cultures was blind to the realities of colonialism. It was essentially imperialistic.
79 Niebuhr, Christ and Culture.
80 See Chapter 4, n.69.
81 Tanner, Theories of Culture, 119. See also James H. Cone, God of the Oppressed (London: SPCK, 1977), 85-91. Cone argues that Niebuhr’s typology ‘should not be understood rigidly but should be viewed with flexibility and openness’ (88). He concludes by arguing that Christ’s relation to culture transcends all five categories (91).
This has certainly been the case throughout the history of Anglicanism. In this study, however, in emphasising the notion of a ‘mystical’ as opposed to ‘static’ via media, I am suggesting that contemporary Anglicanism must move out of its internal comfort zone to embrace the creative tension between church and society. Niebuhr’s reading of Maurice is in keeping with the prophetic calling of a church seeking to find its way forward as a mediating tradition in the life of the nation.

**DOING THEOLOGY CONTEXTUALLY**

Enough has been said to indicate that context is a fundamental aspect of theology. The church participates in the life of the host society to which it belongs. Without participation there is no communication. As Colin Gunton has written: ‘We shall not understand our place in the world unless we face up to the way in which we are internally related to the rest of the world’. Theology must lead to engagement, just as engagement in society shapes theological reflection.

This means, as already noted, that doctrine is not an in-house religious conversation. Rather, it is part of a broader conversation between church and society. The relationship between theology and culture will always be dynamic. The church will acknowledge its sense of ‘belonging’ to society while also living with the tension of ‘not belonging’ that is intrinsic to its vocation and mission. A mediating tradition does not just conform to the values of the host culture. Sometimes it is forced to engage in a prophetic critique that will also be directed, at least in part, at itself. ‘Theology will probe those aspects of religious practice which pull in the direction of ideological distortion’, writes Rowan Williams. Some distortions will arise from an uncritical immersion in the wider culture; others will be the product of assuming that the church has access to some secret knowledge ‘beyond the risks of conversation’, to use Williams’ telling phrase.

---

82 Cf. Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, 21: ‘Contextualization … is the sine qua non of all genuine theological thought, and always has been’.
83 Tillich, *Theology of Culture*, 204.
84 Gunton, *The One, the Three and the Many*, 15. He continues: ‘Without a philosophy of engagement we are lost’.
85 ‘In its prophetic role the Church is the guardian who reveals dynamic structures in society and undercuts their demonic power by revealing them, even within the Church itself, judging both the culture and the Church in so far as it is a part of a culture’. Tillich, *Theology of Culture*, 50.
87 ibid.

192
But engagement will not all be negative. As the 1988 Lambeth Report suggests, the church will also be part of the life of a nation, entering deeply into the nation’s soul, carrying its ‘most profound hopes and values’. This will require deep reflection and careful evaluation, but from the standpoint of living within the society. This is where the Anglican via media comes into its own, as Kwok Pui-lan has said. It lives in the ‘in-between’ spaces, mediating between gospel and culture. It requires ‘a kind of disciplined reasoning, seasoned with humility, and sustained by compassion and empathy for oneself and others’. Only a ‘mystical’ approach to the via media, willing to take the risks of engagement, will be able to live with the creative challenges and tensions of such a vocation.

It is helpful to consider the various theological models available to those who endeavour to do theology contextually. These reflect the different ways of exploring the tension intrinsic to a theology of engagement. We have already noted Niebuhr’s typology. Stephen Bevans has more recently discerned six different contextual models in contemporary theology. He begins with the ‘translation model’, in which the ‘unchanging message’ of the Christian gospel is adapted or accommodated to a particular culture. An ‘essential content’ is presupposed. The starting point ‘is always the supracultural, supracontextual essential doctrine’. On the opposite end of the spectrum is the ‘anthropological model’. In this model, the theologian is a participant, or at least possesses ‘genuine sympathy’ for the culture. The key word for this model is ‘indigenisation’. There are dangers in both extremes, argues Bevans. While the former model tends to lose sight of inculturation, the latter may easily lean towards the romanticisation of a particular culture. Either way, the doctrine of Incarnation is distorted.

The ‘mystical’ via media will, by nature, search for a synthesis, or at least, as in Maurice’s approach, for unity-in-tension. Bevans now moves into the middle ground. Here he locates the ‘praxis model’. This is a model of historical engagement:

88 Bevans, Models of Contextual Theology, 37.
89 ibid., 40.
90 ibid., 58.
91 ibid., 55.
92 ibid., 56.
93 ibid., 42, 60.
94 See above, n. 61.
God is revealed in the healing, reconciling and liberating work of social transformation.95 The ‘transcendental model’ is another option. Its emphasis is on the human subject, beginning with personal experience and moving outwards into the interpersonal and communal.96 The fifth model is the ‘countercultural model’ or ‘prophetic model’. Here the church lives over against society, challenging the status quo and calling culture to account.97 If there is a danger in this powerful model, says Bevans, it is the movement towards sectarianism.98 In one way or another, each of these models reflects the creative tension of ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’, with all the possibilities and dangers that follow from each stance.

The sixth model sits in the ‘middle-of-the-road’. Bevans calls it the ‘synthetic model’ ‘It tries’, he argues, ‘to walk a theological path between mere adaptation on the one hand and a broad culturalism on the other’.99 In a sense, this model operates at all points of the theological spectrum at once, seeking not compromise but a creative synthesis. Not surprisingly, Bevans also calls it the ‘dialectical model’, the ‘dialogical model, the ‘conversation model’, and even the ‘analogue model’. This process, he believes, is what is really meant by inculturation, as gospel and culture interact in a dynamic relationship.100 The process is never completed because the conversation is always on the move.101 This approach blends theory and praxis, careful listening and prophetic engagement, the particular and the universal. There is a danger of ‘selling out’ to culture, or of having nothing to say because of trying to say too much. On the other hand, Bevans regards this model, at its best, as a powerful and creative work of art that not only leads to communication and understanding of the Christian message but also sharpens one’s sense of cultural identity.102

Bevans cites Robert Schreiter as one exponent of the synthetic model.103 Schreiter prefers the phrase ‘local theology’ to describe his contextual model.104 It begins with
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95 Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology*, 75.
96 ibid., 104.
97 ibid., 124.
98 ibid., 125.
99 ibid., 89.
100 ibid., 90.
101 ibid., 94.
102 ibid., 94-95.
103 ibid., 92-93.
‘long and careful listening to a culture to discover its principal values, needs, interests, directions, and symbols’. Culture is viewed holistically and with an appreciation of its complexity. Out of this deep reflection a theological response emerges specifically related to the local context, one that is both respectful of the culture and aware of its need for transformation. Schreiter believes that viewing culture christologically provides a safeguard against falling prey to cultural romanticism. ‘The Christian message, after all, is about change: repentance, salvation, and an eschatological reality to be realized. To think that Christianity will not change a situation is to rob the Christian message of its most important part’.105 In this theological model, community remains a central motif alongside concepts like creation and redemption.106 Theology is rooted in the life of the culture.

The contextual models of writers like Bevans and Schreiter enhance our understanding of the dynamic nature of the Anglican via media. The vocation of a mediating tradition is an intricate process of participation in the life of a culture while also belonging to a faith tradition that will always tug against cultural containment. A dialogue takes place as spiritual tradition and context interact in an internal conversation. There is a danger, of course, of over-emphasising the local or particular to the detriment of a global perspective on the one hand or a careful listening to the gospel on the other. In a sense, it is the tension between space and time, which Paul Tillich called ‘the most fundamental tension of existence’.107 He saw modern nationalism as the manifestation of ‘space ruling over time’, with ‘beside-each-otherness’ changing into ‘against-each-otherness’.108 In Tillich’s view, ‘the gods of space’ lead to the destruction of justice.109 This is always the danger in closed systems.

Douglas Hall also expresses concern about the dangers of ‘the religious sanctioning of narrow, parochial loyalties’. The world can no longer afford an emphasis on the
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105 ibid., 28-29.
106 ibid., 40.
107 Tillich, Theology of Culture, 30.
108 ibid., 33.
109 ibid., 38.
local that leads to estrangement between peoples and worlds. But the gulf, in his view, is not between ‘regionalist and universalist orientations’; it is between unreflective theory (leading, for example, to unhealthy nationalism) and ethical praxis. ‘Thought is never ethically neutral’, he argues. Hall calls for an ‘ecumenical praxis-theology’ which repairs relationships between peoples. The true purpose of a contextual approach to theology is to engage with the real issues tearing at society as a prophetic and mediating presence. Hall’s description of the church’s vocation bears a striking resemblance to the ‘mystical’ via media.

**BEYOND FRAGMENTATION**

The issue of fragmentation is not peculiar to Australian Anglicanism; in the present, it is part of a broader cultural malaise. Postmodernism, writes Gunton, is an expression of the fracture of human relations in Western culture, the embodiment of ‘a dissipated and fragmented cultural pluralism’. There is a difference, he argues, between ‘genuine human plurality’ and fragmentation. On the surface of things, cultural relativism seems remarkably open to diversity and tolerant of difference. In reality, as Anthony Bloom has argued, it reflects a dangerous closed-mindedness – an indifference to difference, we might say. Yet ironically, cultural and religious difference is tearing our world apart, even as we pretend that everything is of equal value (or perhaps equally meaningless).

For Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, the ‘greatest single antidote to violence is conversation’. He presents a model of the world, not as a ‘single machine’, but as ‘a complex, interactive ecology in which diversity – biological, personal, cultural and religious – is of the essence’. All attempts to impose a single truth on a plural
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110 Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, 125. Later (161), Hall comments: ‘If the disciple community probes its own context deeply enough, it will be moved towards the totality by the internal logic of its own existence and calling’.

111 ibid., 124.
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world (imperialism, fundamentalism, relativism) are counterproductive.\textsuperscript{119} If
difference is ignored because of some kind of theoretical sameness, it results in
unresolved conflict and social disintegration.\textsuperscript{120} Sacks finds the solution to this
problem in an understanding of God as the creator of a world of difference.\textsuperscript{121} From a
theological perspective, diversity results in fragmentation only if it is seen to be a
threat to community rather than being regarded as its natural expression.

This is the issue Maurice grappled with amidst the theological diversity of Victorian
England. To settle for sectarianism (fragmentation) was a denial of the Kingdom of
Christ present in national and international life. As Avis has argued, Maurice
provided a ‘dynamic, personalist, relational theology … as an antidote to theological
polemic and polarisation’.\textsuperscript{122} He could not even begin to contemplate the church as
an entity separate from the created universe, nor limit the Kingdom of God to a
private religious world cut off from the concerns of national life.\textsuperscript{123} As we have
noted, Maurice was searching for the divine order hidden beneath competing
systems. Without the tension between church and state, for example, there will be
tyranny of one kind or another. The tension is an unavoidable part of life itself,
unless human relationships are to be eliminated.

The fact is undoubted: the Nation has tried to usurp the prerogatives of
the Church, the Church has tried to usurp the prerogatives of the Nation.
All history is full of such records; so also it is full of disputes between
parents and children, brothers and sisters, kings and subjects.
Undoubtedly, if we could get rid of relationships, we should not have to
read continual accounts of their being violated. But can you get rid of
them unless you unmake God’s world, and turn it into a wilderness? Can
you cause that that which speaks to man’s inner life should not stand in
some connexion with that which speaks to him as an inhabitant of this
earth? Has he not both a spirit and a body? Does the fact that they are
continually at variance, prove that there is no law of fellowship between
them?\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{119} ibid., 201.
\textsuperscript{120} ‘The problem’, writes Sacks, ‘is that pluralism gives rise to deep and intractable conflicts while at
the same time undermining the principles by which they may be resolved’. Jonathan Sacks, \textit{The
Persistence of Faith: Religion, Morality and Society in a Secular Age} (London, Continuum, 2005), 64.
\textsuperscript{121} Sacks, \textit{The Dignity of Difference}, 23.
\textsuperscript{122} Avis, \textit{Anglicanism and the Christian Church}. Rev. edn. (2002), 164.
\textsuperscript{123} Woodhouse-Hawkins, ‘Maurice, Huntington, and the Quadrilateral’, 63.
\textsuperscript{124} Maurice, \textit{The Kingdom of Christ}, Vol. 2, 230. See also Vol. 1, 240: ‘That there is a God related
to men and made known to men through their human relations, this was the faith of Abraham, the
beginner of the Church on earth’ (Maurice’s emphasis).
Hidden beneath this outward polarity of church and state an even deeper tension may be found: between the demands of law and the demands of love. ‘[T]here must be some distinct Divine scheme for asserting the dignity and glory of each’, wrote Maurice, ‘for upholding love in its fullness lest law should perish; for upholding law in its fullness lest love should perish’.125 Maurice does not seek a compromise between love and law, but the divine order that unites the tension between them.126 His method is exploratory and intuitive, a search for understanding, grounded in a fundamental belief in the unity of all things in Christ. Prickett comments:

This, indeed, is what the Kingdom of Christ is all about. It is, for Maurice, the paradigm of the inescapable and irresolvable polarity of all human experience. The universal spiritual society, as yet existing in potential rather than actuality, is of a piece with the rest of our existence, but immanent in it, shaping and organising it into an organic whole.127

Rowan Williams expresses concern about Maurice’s approach, especially his understanding of the Incarnation. In Maurice’s thought, Williams argues, the Incarnation operates as a kind of natural bridge between the ‘divine society’ (the Trinity) and human society. The uniqueness of the church as a ‘special’ system of human relations is downplayed. Instead, the church is regarded as ‘the place where the rationale of all other relations is made plain and their deepening and securing made possible’.128 In Williams’ view, this position can easily lead to an uncritical sanctioning of existing social institutions like ‘family’ and ‘nation’, thus binding the Incarnation to ‘a particular social order’. If this happens, he argues, any criticisms of family or society also implicate the doctrine, and any changes to the existing social pattern undermine the doctrine’s credibility.129 The church, Williams insists, must not become a guardian of ‘the Christian character of the nation’.130 He calls instead for a prophetic re-imagining of the church and its role in society by distinguishing more carefully between the divine and the human.131

126 ‘By acting in concert with each of them’, writes Maurice, ‘a man shall find that the feeling of God’s universal love in himself does not clash with the feeling of God’s eternal and unchangeable law; that his perception of his own duties, inward and external, and of the perfect compatibleness of those which seem most opposed, waxes clearer and clearer’. ibid., 217-218.
129 ibid., 228.
130 ibid., 234.
131 ibid., 238.
As already mentioned, there were both conservative and radical tendencies in Maurice’s thought. Williams has rightly exposed the danger, in Maurice’s approach, of endorsing rather than transforming social systems. But others, including Niebuhr and Avis, have pointed to the prophetic, mystical dimension in Maurice’s theology, grounded in his belief in the essential relatedness of all humanity under God. To quote David Young:

[Maurice] was convinced that there must be social solidarity and reconciliation because that was humanity’s true constitution according to the will of God … He believed that separation could be equated with sin, communion with God was man’s true end, Christ was the central fact of the universe, and human unity depended on the eternal unity of God.  

We are talking here about the tension between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’. Williams is concerned about the danger of an unquestioning acceptance of existing social systems as they are. In his view, the ‘social realities of belonging’ should be subjected to theological critique based on the ‘rather fundamental Christian vocation of not belonging, in families, nations [or] patriarchal “organic” states’. Williams recognises how easily the language of incarnation can slip into ideology, collapsing the divine into the human, emphasising ‘the fusion of heaven and earth, the spiritualising of matter’, while forgetting the ‘radical testing of human “sense” before the tribunal of Jesus’. On the other hand, the ‘complex, interactive ecology’ of a Sacks or a Maurice enables us to view the world in relational and communal terms. For Bruce Kaye, as well, key doctrines like Incarnation and Providence are essential aspects of a ‘church in society’ tradition like Anglicanism. It may also be worth recalling that Hooker, the quintessential Anglican theologian, while espousing an organic view of society, was not locked into a defence of Tudor imperialism. Like Maurice (and Williams), Hooker was an exponent of the ‘mystical’ via media.

132 Young, F.D. Maurice and Unitarianism, 208. Human relationships, Maurice wrote, ‘are actually the means and the only means, through which man ascends to any knowledge of the divine; and that every breach of a human relation, as it implies a violation of the higher law, so also is a hindrance and barrier to the perception of that higher law – the drawing of a veil between the spirit of a man and his God’. Maurice, The Kingdom of Christ, Vol.1, 245.

133 Williams, On Christian Theology, 228.

134 ibid., 85. Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority, 189, notes with interest that Maurice always seemed cautious about using language about God and the created order in such a way that the one was confused with the other. ‘This is ironic’, says Morris, ‘given [his] contemporaries’ belief that compromising the distinction between creator and creatures was precisely what he was doing’.
In spite of negative comments about *The Windsor Report* made earlier in this discussion, it is important to highlight the report’s strong emphasis on communion and unity, which are rooted in God’s life and in God’s purposes for creation. Recognising this emphasis on ‘relationship and mission’ rather than on ‘structure and instruments’, Ian Douglas makes the following comment:

Communion is a gift of God that is lived out as Anglicans, empowered by the Holy Spirit, come together across different incarnational realities to serve and advance God’s mission of reconciliation and restoration. Communion is thus primarily based upon relationships of mutual responsibility and interdependence in the body of Christ across the differences of culture, location, ethnicity, and even theological perspective to serve God’s mission in the world.

The church exists, in other words, for the purpose of reversing all forms of estrangement in the human community. It embodies this unity in its own life across national and cultural barriers, not in order to preserve its own identity, but in order to carry out its vocation as a mediating tradition. Unity is not achieved through enforcing some kind of artificial homogeneity. But it is possible when ‘otherness-in-relation’ is accepted as an essential aspect of our humanity. The alternative is a collapse into fragmentation. Eliminating the ‘other-in-relation’ results in a world of isolated individuals or social units, turning ‘un-relationality’ into a primary category of existence.

This is what writers like Hooker and Maurice have vigorously opposed, seeking instead a creative *via media* which interpenetrates both church and society. Colin Gunton’s perspective is also worth noting. Gunton is strongly drawn to the ‘theology of sociality’ in the thought of Coleridge. As far as the church is concerned, Gunton
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135 *The Windsor Report*, paragraph 3. The report continues: ‘They are designed not for their own sake (as though the church’s in-house business were an end in itself) but to serve and signify God’s mission to the world, that mission whereby God brings to men and women, to human societies and to the whole world, real signs and foretastes of that healing love which will one day put all things to rights’.
137 Gunton, *The One, the Three and the Many*, 49. Earlier (45), Gunton argues that homogeneity is the result of ‘an inadequate conception of relationality’. We are ‘each distinctive and different’ because and not despite the fact ‘that we are related to each other’.
139 Gunton, *The One, the Three and the Many*, 221. Earlier, Gunton calls Coleridge ‘the most comprehensive of Anglican minds’ (15).
expresses regret that so much of Christian history has focused on the church as institution rather than as community. But his vision, like that of Maurice, goes beyond the church to include the wider human community in a broad ‘ecclesiology’ as human beings ‘together under God’.

[E]cclesiology, in the general sense of the word, is the basis of human being. That does not entail an authoritarian view, sometimes entertained in the history of Christianity, that all should be ‘compelled to come in’ to the ecclesiastical institution – and it should be noticed that it is no part of Coleridge’s view – but that social being, of the kind embodied in a true ecclesia, is the deepest expression of human reality.

Gunton uses the biblical idea of covenant as the model for all true social relationships, ‘the calling of the human race into free and joyful partnership with God, and so with each other’. Even more foundational is the doctrine of the Trinity, which provides Gunton with the theological framework for this ecclesial understanding of human community. He highlights two fundamental aspects of Trinitarian doctrine: ‘perichoresis’ and ‘particularity’. The former emphasises the interdependent and reciprocal relationship between the three persons of the Trinity, ‘a unity derived from a dynamic plurality of persons’, while the latter focuses on
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140 ibid., 217.
141 ibid., 215. Cf. Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority, 154: ‘For Maurice, human being was intrinsically social, but also intrinsically ecclesial. Maurice’s language left no place for the view that sociality was secondary and derivative. Human society was not a mere “aggregation” of individuals, but mutually dependent. The interdependence of all human beings was a primary theological truth’.
142 ibid., 222.
143 ibid. In this his thought parallels that of Jonathan Sacks in The Dignity of Difference, 202-209.
144 Cf. Stephen Pickard, ‘The Trinitarian Dynamics of Belief’, in Ford and Stamps, Essentials of Christian Community, 72: ‘Insofar as the dynamics of belief are Trinitarian they are necessarily ecclesial. What is being identified here is a fundamental axiom of Trinitarian theology: communion generates communion. This arises from the fact that faithful response to the God identified in the economy of salvation as the God constituted eternally as a communion of persons ought ideally to be a response that finds embodiment in a new communion of persons in society and the wider creation’ (author’s emphasis).
145 ibid., 152. Cf. Catherine Mowry Lacugna, God For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 271: ‘Perichoresis provides a dynamic model of persons in communion based on mutuality and interdependence’. LaCugna also highlights the dynamism of the concept: the image of “the divine dance”. In a similar vein, Calvani, ‘The Myth of Anglican Communion’, 147, argues that The Virginia Report suffers from a lack of appreciation of the perichoretic nature of the Trinity, which would enable Anglican diversity to be seen as ‘a fountain of joy and enchantment’ rather than as ‘a threat of dissolution’. ‘Harmony reveals itself to those who contemplate with the eyes of faith as the perichoretic dance of the churches, not the rigidity and immobilization of those who, aged by the weight of orthodoxy, listen to the sound of the flute but refuse to dance’. See also Kaye, Reinventing Anglicanism, 177-178.
the distinctiveness of each person. Together they provide a model of human sociality, a ‘mediating concept’ that is neither fragmentary on the one hand (emphasising the separateness of human beings), nor homogeneous on the other (emphasising sameness). Human beings are both unique and interdependent. The Trinity ceases to be an abstract doctrine about God, instead shaping our understanding of the way human beings are meant to live both as individuals and as members of the wider community. In the words of Catherine LaCugna:

The life of God is not something that belongs to God alone. Trinitarian life is also our life ... To conceive Trinitarian life as something belonging only to God, or belonging to God apart from the creature, is to miss the point entirely. The doctrine of the Trinity is not ultimately a teaching about ‘God’ but a teaching about God’s life with us and our life with each other.

In the light of this dynamic understanding of the Trinity, the church cannot remain separate from the wider concerns of humanity, nor can society exist as a ‘self-referential system’ independent of its creator. The sociality of God is the key to understanding all forms of human community, and shapes the church’s missional vocation as a healing and reconciling presence within each society and, indeed, within the global community. As Daniel Hardy writes:

The Anglican churches are unique in their missionary calling to mediate God’s life and purposes in the realities of differing situations throughout the world ... Anglican polity is based on a humble confidence in Anglican Christianity as a mediation of the engagement of the triune God with the world.

Such a mediating perspective is crucially important for understanding the Anglican vocation in the life of Australian society. It is the sort of view, I believe, that Maurice
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146 ibid., 153.
147 ibid., 213.
148 LaCugna, God For Us, 228 (her emphasis). It is important to note the relationship between F. D. Maurice’s sense of the divine order hidden beneath competing systems and his belief in the Trinity. The following passage from Maurice’s Life is instructive: ‘The desire for Unity has haunted me all my life through; I have never been able to substitute any desire for that, or to accept any of the different schemes for satisfying it which men have devised’. He continues: ‘I not only believe in the Trinity in Unity, but I find it in the centre of all my beliefs’. The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice, I, 4. See also Morris, F.D. Maurice and the Crisis of Christian Authority, 186-192, for a discussion of the relationship between Maurice’s theological anthropology and his understanding of God as Trinity.
149 Hardy, Finding the Church, 35.
150 ibid., 158.
was endeavouring to articulate. I certainly understand Williams’ concern that theology may too easily sanction rather than challenge the status quo. This is why the insights of writers like Kwok Pui-lan must be integrated into Anglican self-understanding. We must courageously apply a hermeneutics of suspicion to the theological task. The social sciences have produced many tools to assist in such an endeavour, as Kwok has shown through her careful dialogue with postcolonial and feminist studies. Williams reminds us, however, not to forget that the church ultimately uses ‘a theological idiom’; it emerges from a theological centre. The church’s reflections on society, he continues, must ‘be related afresh to the fundamental story of belief, rather than staying at the level of reductionist secular suspicion, however crucial a tool this is in alerting us to the problem’. Kwok would not disagree, nor Maurice, nor Hooker. They are all, with Williams, essentially concerned to engage in a theological task which impacts on society, interpreting it, shaping it, challenging it or changing it, as the case may be. Even so, it would be foolish to dismiss too readily Williams’ suspicion of an uncritical sense of ‘belonging’. Theology, after all, as Williams suggests, is not merely a subtext of social analysis or cultural studies. It goes to the heart of the human condition, calling society to embrace the highest standards of freedom and responsibility ‘under God’.

One need only consider what might have happened in South Africa had Archbishop Desmond Tutu not spoken out against the evils of apartheid, and then, when the collapse of the old regime had taken place, had not presented the nation with a way forward based on confession and forgiveness. Tutu’s political stance was unmistakably theological, and his theology was profoundly contextual. To quote Philip Turner:
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152 Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 8. Cf Hardy, *Finding the Church*, 151: ‘The Church must summon itself to identify, order and proceed with the tasks associated with developing the intensity of its understanding and following of the gospel and mediating it in the closest affinity to the widest range of people and situations. Not to do so is to drop into a laissez-faire disposition far from the urgency of God’s purposes’.

153 Tutu was quite clear that theology was the basis of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa, providing a way of facing the evils and injustices of the past and transforming them through love and forgiveness. See his *No Future Without Forgiveness* (London: Rider, 1999), 76, especially his moving theological reflection on the movement towards unity in creation centred in the Incarnation and the Cross (212-215).
His opposition to racial segregation, which combined a remarkable combination of compassion, truth telling, and mercy called the peoples of South Africa to the highest standards of human behavior and the churches of South Africa to the highest standards of Christian conduct. In making the witness he did, Bishop Tutu spoke both for the church and the nation.  

Williams is right to warn of the dangers of using the doctrine of the Incarnation uncritically. The experience of ‘not belonging’, he reminds us, provides the theological cutting-edge of the Anglican tradition. In short, creation and redemption exist side by side. To talk about the Trinity and Incarnation without engaging in a theology of the Cross is to weaken the foundations of Christian belief. In Pauline terms, the cross of Christ is the means whereby the world (and indeed, the whole creation) is reconciled both to God and to each other. ‘We must hear the gospel of the incarnation’, writes Williams, ‘as a summons to self-abandonment of the best we can humanly do’. There is some validity, as I have noted, in Williams’ suspicion of Maurice, whose preoccupation with the institutions of nation, family (and church) may seem at odds with a theology of the Cross. I believe, however, that this may be doing Maurice an injustice. As we have seen, Maurice was critical of all systems (including theological and ecclesiastical ones), and ultimately saw the Kingdom of Christ as the key to unity both within and between human beings and their systems. Rather than endeavouring to resolve differences by compromise proposals which leave systems, parties and opinions unquestioned and unchanged, he chose instead to search for the hidden principles beneath competing systems which, while inevitably distorted, nevertheless bear the divine imprint.
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155 Similar criticisms of the doctrine of Incarnation from an Evangelical perspective have recently been made by Peter Adam, ‘Incarnational Theology for a Missionary Church?’, St Mark’s Review 200 (1) (2006): 14-21.
156 Williams, Anglican Identities, 90. Williams argues elsewhere that, while the doctrine of Incarnation is an unavoidable aspect of Christian reflection, it is nevertheless ‘a secondary move’ in theological discourse rather than the basis of dogma. On Christian Theology, 92.
157 Maurice and Michael Ramsey, Williams argues, place more emphasis on the church as ‘epiphany’ (what it shows) than on the doctrines or structures that would otherwise provide the church with its authority (91). I am reminded of the classic distinction made by David Tracy between theologies of ‘proclamation’ and ‘manifestation’ in The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism (London: SCM Press, 1981).
158 ‘This system-building is not natural to us’, wrote Maurice in The Kingdom of Christ, Vol.2, 314. ‘These systems, Protestant, Romish, English, seem to me each to bear witness of the existence of the Divine Order; each to be a miserable, partial, human substitute for it’. Here, it seems to me, is the fundamental difference between Maurice and Williams, and the reason for William’s discomfort with Maurice’s approach to the doctrine of Incarnation. Maurice was, like Williams, acutely aware of the
Many of Maurice’s contemporaries were frustrated by this approach, finding it puzzling. But what does this mean, they asked, in practical terms? What proposal is he offering? What does humanity do, unless it attempts to find solutions, to build rather than to dig? According to Prickett, Maurice’s response to this question contains two distinct elements: obedience and feeling. Fragmentation remains when we are locked into our own opinions. But when we engage the tensions brought about by conflicting systems, thoughtfully, critically, and sensitively, we move into deeper understanding of the real issues beneath. We recognise the spiritual principles at stake, and are open to the divine mind beckoning us towards resolution. This...
requires obedience and feeling, action and passionate reflection, and a willingness to be confronted by the deeper spiritual issues involved in any area of contestation. It is, in a sense, a form of prayer. And at the heart of everything is the Living God.\textsuperscript{161}

It is helpful to compare Maurice’s approach to the insights of international peacemaker and conciliator, John Paul Lederach. His book, \textit{The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace},\textsuperscript{162} is a contemporary demonstration of how a mediating methodology, based on digging and discernment, can make a difference in a dangerous world of increasing violence. The art of peacemaking, according to Lederach, is not about clever negotiation, but rather careful listening and the building of trust between competing parties. He calls for ‘moral imagination’ rather than technique or compromise as a way of healing division.

Stated simply, the moral imagination requires the capacity to imagine ourselves in a web of relationships that includes our enemies; the ability to sustain a paradoxical curiosity that embraces complexity without reliance on dualistic polarity; the fundamental belief in and pursuit of the creative act; and the acceptance of the inherent risk of stepping into the mystery of the unknown that lies beyond the far too familiar landscape of violence.\textsuperscript{163}

The moral imagination, Lederach argues, involves, first of all, ‘a capacity to perceive things beyond and at a deeper level than what initially meets the eye’. It requires \textit{attentiveness} to the way things \textit{really} are, rather than how they appear to be on the surface of things. It then requires \textit{transcendence}, breaking through the confines of limited definitions to imagine new possibilities: ‘to move beyond what exists while still living in it’.\textsuperscript{164} Lederach insists that true mediation cannot be manufactured; it must simply emerge out of the imaginative process of listening, seeking understanding, and exploring connections. In the end reconciliation happens, not

\textsuperscript{161} Consider this statement from Maurice’s \textit{Life}: ‘The one thought which possesses me most of the time and, I may say, has always possessed me, is that we have been dosing our people with religion when what they want is not this but the Living God. We are threatened now not with the loss of religious feelings, so-called, or of religious notions, or of religious observances, but with Atheism. Everywhere I seem to perceive this peril. The battle within, the battle without is against this; the heart and flesh of our countrymen are crying out for God. We give them a stone for bread, systems for realities’. \textit{The Life of Frederick Denison Maurice}, I, 369.


\textsuperscript{163} ibid., 5.

\textsuperscript{164} ibid., 26-28.
through ‘the rote application of a recipe or technique’, but intuitively, artistically, through ‘creativity, skill, serendipity, and craftsmanship’, rooted in a fundamental belief in *relationship* as the fundamental reality.166

The moral imagination understands relationships as the center and horizon of the human community. It therefore develops a *vocation* based on an unconditional commitment to build authentic relationships. In practical terms for deeply divided societies, this view requires the capacity to imagine a relationship with the other that transcends the cycles of violence while the other and the patterns of violence are still present. To put it bluntly, the moral imagination has a capacity, even in moments of greatest pain, to understand that the welfare of my community is directly related to the welfare of your community.167

Like Maurice, Lederach refuses to take the views expounded by competing ideologies and systems at face value. His approach is to ‘hold’ competing views together, no matter how complex or contradictory. It is possible, he argues, to be friends with complexity.168 Certain spiritual qualities are required in order to discern ‘the patterns hidden beneath the presenting symptoms’ – stillness, humility and sensuous perception.169 Together these qualities, remarkably like Maurice’s *obedience* and *feeling*, enable new insights and possibilities to emerge, not through logic and cognition, but artistically and intuitively, reaching across divides of conflict and separation. Peace and reconciliation cannot be engineered, writes Lederach, one can only ‘think, feel, and follow relationships’.171

Lederach’s vision of what can happen when the moral imagination is put to work – what he calls ‘an *imaginative mediative capacity*’172 – provides added weight to the views I have been expounding in this study. It is a classic example of the importance of the ‘mystical’ *via media* – a way of living creatively in a world of difference, placing trust before fear, community before competition, giving birth to hope in

165 *ibid.*, 29.
166 *ibid.*, 35.
167 *ibid.*, 61-62 (my emphasis).
168 *ibid.*, 62.
169 *ibid.*, 103. Lederach calls them ‘soul-based disciplines’ that enable us to operate on a ‘deeper plane’.
170 *ibid.*, 69.
171 *ibid.*, 86.
172 *ibid.*, 95 (author’s emphasis).
others, because of a deeper unity that transcends humanity and binds us together. Desmond Tutu presented his nation with a similar challenge, using repentance and forgiveness as the means by which personal and societal healing and unity might become possible. My sense is that this was also Maurice’s desire, and, I believe, the reason why Williams also is calling for prophetic engagement with society, but with an eye turned towards the cross. Indeed, the conversation that Williams is having with Maurice over these very issues is a classic example of the ‘mystical’ via media at work. Both writers, I believe, endeavour to dig below the surface of culture and society, critically evaluating them using a ‘theological idiom’.

One thing is clear: fragmentation of any variety is a theologically unacceptable expression of social life for both church and society. The Anglican Church of Australia must face this problem squarely if it is to be a healing and mediating presence in the life of the Australian nation. The doctrine of the Trinity, properly understood, cuts across Anglican factionalism. The doctrine of the Incarnation requires prophetic engagement with society. The theology of the Cross reminds us that behind all reality there is a theological centre. The ‘mystical’ via media is, after all, a creative work of art, drawing together scripture, tradition, reason and culture in a new and transformative synthesis, to enable both church and nation to live with wholeness and integrity.

A MATTER OF INTEGRITY
The notion of integrity is central to this study. It is the opposite of fragmentation, and applies at all levels of society. It is important, we say, to be a person of integrity, but we could also talk about integrity in a corporate sense, with reference to a church, for example, or a nation. As Stephen Carter has written, integrity has to do with a sense

\[\text{ibid., 168.}\]

\[\text{Indeed, it is interesting to read William’s book, Lost Icons, in the light of Maurice’s theological method. In this work, Williams critically evaluates many different facets of contemporary society and culture, gradually leading the discussion towards the theological. In the preface (ix), Williams invites his readers to ‘try to discern behind the surface a continuing story of reaction to the strange decade that has closed the twentieth century’. He encourages an approach to differences involving ‘thought’ rather than simply being ‘thrown against each other’ in a violent confrontation (5). He encourages a deeper level of engagement with cultural phenomena, reworking them in order to rediscover ‘lost icons’, using the ‘language of the soul’ (6), a language which, by Williams’ own admission, is highly intuitive – see his response to Peter Singer’s thought (42). Maurice’s approach is very similar, it seems to me. It is not inappropriate to wonder whether this is the sort of book Maurice might have written had he lived a century and a half later. See Rowan Williams, Lost Icons: Reflections on Cultural Bereavement (London: T& T Clark, 2000).}\]
of wholeness, with being ‘undivided’. It is more than honesty. A person can be honest within the framework of a system of values that are themselves morally questionable. Integrity, on the other hand, requires a deeper level of awareness. It involves discerning the difference between right and wrong, acting in the light of that discernment, and speaking openly about it.\textsuperscript{175} Carter is writing about the way people think and behave as citizens, at both the micro and macro level of social relations. In this sense, it is perfectly proper to speak of national integrity: not just what a nation is, but what it stands for.

Carter writes in the American context, both as a lawyer and an Episcopalian. Like Bishop Broughton in colonial New South Wales, he believes that the Christian religion carries within itself the resources needed by the nation in order to live the integral life, for all life is lived under God.\textsuperscript{176} He respects civil society and all that it stands for, but he is also acutely aware of how legal, political and religious institutions can become the playthings of those motivated by self-interest rather than a concern for the common good. He warns how easily evil can come to the fore in a society when its citizens become lax in their pursuit of the integral life. Integrity, he argues, consists ‘of our belief in the existence of principles that transcend our self-interest and of our willingness to act consistently with those principles’.\textsuperscript{177} It is for this reason that discernment remains the first principle of a free society.\textsuperscript{178} Carter is talking about moral reflectiveness. He places a high value on a certain kind of thoughtfulness or reason, which involves careful listening to those with different opinions, an openness to dialogue, and a willingness to test our views ‘to be sure that we are right’.\textsuperscript{179} It makes no difference if there are a number of competing views. ‘All should be welcome’, he writes, ‘provided only that they seek to be morally reflective and to listen generously to the counsels of their opponents’.\textsuperscript{180}

\textsuperscript{176} ibid., 8. Carter does not press this point; he merely testifies to it from his own experience. In this he is quintessentially Anglican. He believes that religion does have a place in the public square, and that without that voice democratic society is impoverished. See also his works, \textit{The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion} (New York: BasicBooks, 1993), and \textit{God’s Name in Vain: The Wrongs and Rights of Religion in Politics} (New York: BasicBooks, 2000).
\textsuperscript{177} ibid., 241.
\textsuperscript{178} ibid., 233.
\textsuperscript{179} ibid., 222.
\textsuperscript{180} ibid., 186-187.
Carter is not even against civil disobedience, provided it is part of a public moral conversation and involves the discernment of morally reflective individuals.\textsuperscript{181} He cites the case of Martin Luther King, Jr., who engaged openly in disobedience to the law in order to serve the common good. ‘In his vision’, Carter writes, ‘a just society was one that could be inspired by the open and loving defiance of others to change the objectionable laws’.\textsuperscript{182} King’s approach was not violent or iconoclastic; his civil stance, theologically driven, was an attempt to present the nation with a vision of the Kingdom of God which, on the issue of race relations, ran counter to the way the society was functioning. As we have seen, similar civil protests in South Africa by Desmond Tutu and the like enabled the nation, finally, to move from being an unjust to a just society. ‘A society’, writes Carter, ‘ought to have public moral dialogue as the preferred means for resolving difficult questions of policy … The rationality requirement is in theory a mediating force’. He especially emphasises the importance of religious views in facilitating the kind of moral reflection required of a nation seeking integrity.\textsuperscript{183}

While Carter is hardly a revolutionary, his moral reflections on American society are designed to provoke change in the thought patterns and behaviour of his fellow citizens. The same might be said of Anglican divines like Richard Hooker in Tudor England. We have already noted his approach to the Elizabethan Settlement – a combination of apology and subtle critique. Bruce Kaye has recently written about ‘Richard Hooker’s dangerously subversive analysis of the royal supremacy’. On the one hand he accepts it, while on the other ‘he so qualifies the understanding of it that he quite undermines its practical political intention’.\textsuperscript{184} The Anglican via media, as expressed in the writings of this quintessential Anglican theologian, was theologically astute, morally discerning and politically engaged. In fact, as the editors to the recently published anthology of Anglican devotion, \textit{Love’s Redeeming Work}, have pointed out, right up to the nineteenth century Anglicans affirmed the ideal of ‘passive obedience’ to unjust laws: that is, non-violent non-compliance rather than revolution. They also note that the ‘Prayer for Unity’ in the 1662 Prayer

\textsuperscript{181} ibid., Chapter 11: ‘Coda: The Integrity of Civil Disobedience’.
\textsuperscript{182} ibid., 184. See also Jeffrey C. Alexander’s extended reflection on the Civil Rights Movement in \textit{The Civil Sphere} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), Chapters 11-14.
\textsuperscript{183} ibid., 186-187.
\textsuperscript{184} Bruce Kaye, ‘An Appreciative Response’, in Frame and Treloar, \textit{Agendas for Australian Anglicans}, 295.
Book, often used these days as a prayer for unity between Christians was, in its original context, really a prayer for the resolution of social conflict. ‘It is directed against acts that would fracture the good order and mutual charity of the commonwealth as a whole’.185

Interestingly, the central theme of this collection of Anglican writings, as the subtitle indicates, is ‘the Anglican quest for holiness’. This is not an unimportant issue. The Windsor Report emphasises three essential aspects of the church, if it is to be true to its calling ‘to serve and signify God’s mission to the world’: unity, communion, and ‘radical holiness’. The first two are meaningless, the report indicates, without holiness of life, ‘worked out in severely practical contexts, through which the church indicates to the world that a new way of being human, over against corrupt and dehumanising patterns of life, has been launched upon the world’. Holiness is defined in relation to the Pauline emphasis on sanctification which, while describing the quality of Christian life lived in koinonia, is nevertheless outwardly directed: the church is ‘an anticipatory sign of God’s healing and restorative future for the world’.186 It has to do, we might say, with the integrity, not just of the church, but of the whole creation.

To use Daniel Hardy’s words, holiness is ‘inherently relational’ – integrally related to the life of the world. In fact, the task of the church is that of ‘mediating holiness in the world’.187 This begins in worship and works outwards. Worship, writes Hardy, ‘enacts holy trust as the basis of society’. Drawing on the poetry of George Herbert, Hardy demonstrates that this vision of worldly holiness is intrinsically Anglican.188 It is a vision of God at the centre of all aspects of life, both sacred and secular. Holiness, properly understood, is the central ingredient of the integral life. It should lead the church not to withdrawal from the world but to engagement with it, challenging injustices and seeking to heal the wounds brought about by all forms of estrangement and fragmentation.

186 See The Windsor Report, paragraphs 1-4
187 Hardy, Finding the Church, 13-19.
188 ibid., 19-23.
Anglican writers like Hooker, Coleridge and Maurice held a vision of society in which the spiritual and the secular coexisted to form a community of ‘graced sociality’ for the common good. This is the way Anglican polity works, writes Peter Sedgwick, placing the Anglican church within society in such a way that theology and politics inevitably intersect.\textsuperscript{189} Its purpose is to bring about ‘a full expression of freedom in society, which enables that society to form more satisfying and dynamic relationships’.\textsuperscript{190}

Within the society, the church can seek to transform particular relationships … In particular, the alleviation of destructive and damaging relationships is a clear priority arising from the Christian witness to reconciliation and healing … the church has no option but to engage in this task. At the same time, the church can also seek to nurture moral values by paying attention to the conditions in which moral development will take place. The strong emphasis in English ecclesiology in this century on \textit{koinonia} … enables a link to be made between the development of a community – in which moral values might be discerned – and the sacramental life of that community. Such a community would need to be open to its society and to seek to facilitate questioning and debate.\textsuperscript{191}

In Carter’s terms, \textit{discernment} is the key. This is one of the great gifts that Anglicanism has to offer the society of which it is a part.\textsuperscript{192} F.D. Maurice wrote about this very thing: the need to dig beneath competing systems to discern the hidden principles beneath. These, though inevitably distorted, would nevertheless reflect in some way the divine order. Anglicans like Coleridge and Maurice, as we saw in Chapter 4, found it impossible to live Christianly in a private world cut off from the affairs of national life. Their legacy has not been readily embraced by Australian Anglicanism, with its strong historical roots in Evangelicalism and Tractarianism. But we have caught glimpses of their Broad Anglican perspective in Australian leaders like Ernest Burgmann, with his uniquely Australian expression of Christian faith and his passionate commitment to the future of the Australian nation, and Bruce Kaye, with his vision of Anglicanism as a ‘church in society’ tradition.

\textsuperscript{190} ibid., 207
\textsuperscript{191} ibid., 208.
\textsuperscript{192} Patrick O’Farrell (writing from the Roman Catholic perspective) uses the phrase ‘the promptings of self-awareness’ to describe this capacity to think, from within the experience of living in society, with spiritual and ethical sensitivities, rather than simply adopting external patterns of thought and behaviour. \textit{Vanished Kingdoms}, 132.
The spiritual and political sensitivities of Anglican thinkers like Coleridge, Maurice, Burgmann and Kaye are worth pondering. More recently, Keith Rayner has also reminded the Anglican Church of Australia of its responsibility to live as a church for the nation:

This sense of responsibility to develop and express the values of the kingdom of God in the national life has been and continues to be the goal of the most representative Anglicans. It must be done with integrity, humility and sweet reason. It is an integral part of the Anglican tradition which still has its place in the different circumstances of this nation.  

Kwok Pui-lan, we might recall, also called for ‘a kind of disciplined reasoning, seasoned with humility, and sustained by compassion and empathy for oneself and others’. For Kwok, this could not be a private, internal conversation, but a dialogue between people ‘on different sides of the fence’. The Anglican via media, she reminded us, belongs in ‘the grayish, ambivalent space of “in-between”’. For Kwok, such a conversation would involve, amongst other things, the painful discovery of the church’s colonial legacy, a topic not out of place within the Australian context. Nor, indeed, is Ghassan Hage’s reminder, in his penetrating study of Australian nationalism, of ways in which the politics of fear can easily shape national life. He calls instead for the ‘social distribution of hope’: for discernment in the way hope is interpreted, and justice in the way it is distributed. There is a difference, he notes, ‘between the hope that induces an active engagement with reality and the hope that breeds passivity and disengagement’. Anglicanism belongs in this national conversation. Carter is correct: the Christian gospel has plenty to say about the human condition, particularly as it is expressed in the changes and chances of national life.

**CONCLUSION**

Thus far we have been considering Anglicanism ‘from the inside’, as it were. We have noted the importance of the national idea in Anglicanism, and have come to recognise the principle of inculturation as an Anglican imperative, even for the church in Australia. The principle of comprehensiveness, so central to the Anglican

194 See above, n. 53.
ethos, has been seen to be, not just an internal doctrinal matter, but integrally related to the sense of belonging to a place and a people. Again, the realisation that Anglicanism is a post-colonial church raises important issues for Anglican communities in societies like Australia, who settled in new lands as though nothing had changed and no one was dislocated. If such issues are avoided the vocation of the Australian church as a church for the nation is surrendered, and the fragmentation of Anglicanism in Australia continues to be accepted as the norm. Such an option is unacceptable. I have argued for a creative, prophetic theological approach that embraces the life of the nation while also seeking to transform it. Both ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’ are part of the theological equation.

Earlier in the discussion I quoted Bishop Ernest Burgmann. ‘Australian Anglicanism is at the crossroads’, he wrote in 1960. ‘It is fighting for possession of its own soul … It has remained too long with the colonial mentality and now the inadequacy of that mentality leaves it enfeebled when the struggle is most intense’.196 This is the challenge facing the Australian church. It will be true to itself only by accepting its national vocation as central rather than peripheral. To do so a change of mindset is required – the mental ‘relocation’ of the church,197 we might say; an acceptance of Australia as ‘home’, and a willingness to grapple with what this means.198

This will require some serious theological reflection, a willingness to dig in soil that until quite recently remained unprepared and largely unturned.199 As George Shaw has argued, Oxford and Cambridge may not be the most helpful environments in which to prepare the next generation of church leaders ‘to understand the unique mission of the Anglican Church in Australia’. This understanding, he writes, can best come ‘from those centres of learning in Australia where scholars of many disciplines and traditions are thrown together in a debate about Australia’.200 Instead of simply

196 See Chapter 2, n.123.
197 Cf. Sykes et al., The Study of Anglicanism, xii.
198 See For the Sake of the Kingdom, 42, paragraph 66.
199 Lawton notes, ‘Australian Anglican Theology’, 177-178, that as far back as the 1950s, Leicester Webb, Professor of Political Science at the Australian National University, commented on the church’s uncertainty about its role in Australian society, and explained this uncertainty by the ‘lack of a native Australian scholarship within the Church’. I have already noted Kaye’s disappointment ‘about the way the Anglican theological tradition has failed to grow in any local sense in Australia’. A Church Without Walls, 113. See Introduction, n. 24.
200 Shaw, ‘Australia’s Anglican: A Via Media?’, 260 (Shaw’s emphasis).
engaging in factionalism, the church needs to understand why it is doing so; otherwise it will continue to behave inappropriately, failing to understand the historical forces that have shaped its life and oblivious to the negative impact this has on Australian society. In Maurice’s terms, there is digging to do, motivated by a search for understanding and a willingness to go beneath the surface of the systems and ideologies that cause fragmentation in both church and society. Shaw notes the theological leadership coming out of ‘the one-time colonial churches of Rome, Canterbury and Geneva’, especially in South America and South Africa, where the voices of the churches reflect the struggles of their own societies. ‘In similar fashion’, he writes, ‘there is a theology “hid in the bosom of the Church” in Australia, awaiting discovery and exposition by those with an intellect trained to understand Australia’. Shaw is right: it will require trained intellect, but also the ‘obedience’ and ‘feeling’ required of a church willing to follow the path of the ‘mystical’ via media within an Australian context.

As we have seen, there are promising signs of a new and courageous openness to the questions facing Australian Anglicanism. Bill Lawton, for example, comments that Anglicans will of necessity become immersed in national issues like the republic, the flag, multiculturalism, and ethical and justice issues. In a similar vein, Kaye has argued that Anglicanism, by its very nature, challenges ‘Anglicans in this land to be completely Australian, and to shape Australian Anglican institutions in a way which enables them to serve the Australian people and nation’. Tom Frame takes an optimistic view. If there is a ‘persistent element’ in the history of Anglicanism in Australia, he says, ‘it is the openness of Anglicans to their society and political life and a willingness to participate in a broad debate about the kind of nation Australia can and ought to be’.

A rich and complex debate about Australian identity has been taking place in recent decades. It is still in process, and there are many viewpoints. Australian Anglicanism, in my view, has both the right and the responsibility to be an active

---

201 ibid., 261; also George Shaw, ‘Beyond Discipline: The Historical Context of Theological Thought in Australia’, St. Mark’s Review 111 (March 1988): 15: ‘Hitherto, the Australian experience has been considered culturally inconsequential, and too trivial to import into theological discussion’.
203 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 100.
participant in this conversation, regardless of its reluctance to do so in the past or its uncontrollable tendency to deny its national vocation in favour of its own internal conversation, and in spite of the views, shared by many, that it is an irrelevant presence in Australian life. I wish, in a sense, to give the church permission to accept its place of belonging, and to wrestle with the consequences, embracing its vocation as a mediating or reconciling tradition. The first step, as Shaw has suggested, involves an intellectual understanding of Australia, its history and literature, political and social life. The digging process then needs to begin in earnest. Drawing on the theological method of F. D. Maurice in particular, Australian Anglicanism should be especially sensitive to the points of contradiction within both society and church, going beneath the surface in order to comprehend the hidden issues beneath: the principles and values which cause conflict and division within society.\(^205\) In Part 3 of this study I will begin to map out some of the factors that have shaped Australian life, searching in particular for the ‘in-between’ spaces which need to be engaged at a deeper theological and spiritual level. This will, I hope, then enable us to dig behind this surface layer, to engage some of the rawer aspects of the Australian ‘soul’: the hopes, dreams, and deceptions of national life. I do so out of the conviction that Anglicanism needs to be fully Australian as the principle of inculturation demands, and that Australian society needs to receive from this Australian church the unique insights it has to share as a mediating presence, a church for the nation.

\(^{205}\) As noted earlier in this study, these sensitive points in social life generate a great deal of anxiety. See Introduction, n. 48.
PART 3  BEING ANGLICAN AND AUSTRALIAN

CHAPTER 7  JOINING THE AUSTRALIAN CONVERSATION

In Part 2 of this study, I have argued, through an extensive survey of the Anglican tradition, that contextual issues cannot be avoided if Anglicanism is to stay true to itself. As I have indicated, with or without its consent Anglicanism has always been integrally related to its societal context. The process of adaptation, demonstrated so clearly by the experience of Bishop Broughton in colonial New South Wales, has been typical of worldwide Anglicanism over the past century and a half. But the issue is even more complex than one of adaptation, which could be interpreted as a kind of passive accommodation to outside forces. The word ‘inculturation’ is a stronger word, reflecting a more intentional process of engagement. Inculturation, as we have seen, is an Anglican imperative. It involves both ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’. A creative tension exists between the Anglican tradition and the host society to which it belongs. The image of a root system reaching both backwards in time and outwards in space is an apt metaphor for this process.

The Anglican Communion, as we have seen, is now acutely aware of the danger of ‘Anglo-Saxon captivity’, and the need to shed itself of its colonial legacy. This applies equally to the Australian church. How to achieve this is an important question. A change of mindset is required, it seems, if Australian Anglicanism is to embrace such difficult issues in a creative way. Yet, as I have endeavoured to show, the resources are there within the Anglican tradition itself. In the last chapter, for example, I noted the difference between a ‘static’ and a ‘mystical’ approach to the Anglican via media. The one is more accommodating in its relationship with wider society; the other more transformative. I have also sought to identify a creative Broad Church strand within the history of Anglicanism which signals a way through the fragmentation so characteristic of Australian Anglicanism. F.D. Maurice’s phrase, a
‘church for the nation’, has been used to reflect one of the central tenets of this Anglican strand. Bruce Kaye’s description of Anglicanism as a ‘church in society’ tradition is another way of expressing this fundamental characteristic of the Anglican ethos.

My purpose, in Part 3 of this study, is to situate Australian Anglicanism within the broader Australian context: to begin to carve out, in a sense, a creative role for Anglicanism within the life of the nation. A shift is required from self-preoccupation with Anglican identity to a concern for the Anglican vocation within Australian society. It will be hard for the Australian church to embrace such a vocation, but it must if it is to be true to its own charter as a member of the Anglican Communion. There are many forces working against such a creative response – historical, cultural and theological. These need to be named and discarded to enable the Anglican tradition in Australia to realise its potential as a creative, prophetic presence in the life of the nation.¹ As I suggested in the Introduction to this study, Australian Anglicanism must face its own demons: ignorance of its own tradition, its struggle with factionalism and its concern for self-preservation if it is to become a broad, mediating tradition within the wider national context.²

External factors also need to be considered: in particular, the tendency within Australian society to treat religion as peripheral or irrelevant, or to dismiss it out of hand as a negative force in Australian history. I will begin this chapter by exploring this negative reading of the religious dimension in Australian life. In part, it is the result of the ‘gentry and sentry’ religion of the convict era,³ an immediate clash between Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism which developed into wave upon wave of bitter sectarian struggle. This, combined with the widespread distaste for the ‘wowserism’ of the churches’ repeated moral crusades, has left religion in Australia with a difficult reputation to overcome. Even so I will argue that Christianity, whether negatively or positively, has been an integral part of the Australian experience. Anglicanism is no exception to this rule. By virtue of its participation in

---

² See Introduction, 5-6.
the life of the nation from the beginning of European settlement, the Anglican community has every right to take its place around the table as an equal player in the debate about ‘the kind of nation Australia can and ought to be’.  

A second external factor holding Anglicanism back is the ongoing legacy of the ‘Australian Settlement’, of which, as Bruce Kaye has argued, Anglicanism was an ‘invisible partner’. The social ethos pervading Australian society from Federation through to the end of the Menzies era was the hidden subtext of the national Anglican constitution. The constitution, that is, presupposed that things would remain as they were. In the early 1960s, Anglicanism in Australia still profited from an ‘Anglo-Saxon ascendancy’ which served its interests well. According to Tom Frame, Australian Anglicanism remained entangled in a web consisting of three strands: ‘middle-class conservatism, British imperialism and English cultural hegemony’. I will spell out in more detail the presuppositions of this era. In many ways, these continue to shape the mindset of Australian Anglicanism.

I will include in the discussion the counter-views of radical nationalists like Vance Palmer, Ian Turner and Russel Ward, who argued for a uniquely Australian (non-British) sense of nationalism based on the values of the Australian bush and the radical republicanism of the 1890s. G.A. Wilkes uses the images of ‘the stockyard’ and ‘the croquet lawn’ to describe the clash between those who argued for a distinctly Australian perspective and those who settled for a broader European one. Within the ranks of Australian Anglicanism, strong nationalist leanings were often expressed. Bishop Burgmann is a case in point, although, in keeping with his times, he also continued to look to England out of the corner of one eye. As an ‘independent Australian Briton’, although with a radical bent, Burgmann straddled two sides of a

---

4 See Introduction, n. 51.
5 I have already drawn attention to the term ‘Australian Settlement’ used by Paul Kelly to describe the society created at Federation. See Introduction, 11. The phrase, ‘Deakinite Settlement’, is also sometimes used. See Judith Brett, Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class: From Alfred Deakin to John Howard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 21.
7 Frame, ‘Local Differences’, 122.
debate about what constituted the real Australia. In a sense it was a matter of choosing between two completely different ways of understanding Australia – or, perhaps, as in Burgmann’s case, a matter of choosing both at once.

Ironically, even as the General Synod met to make its historic decision, the ground was moving beneath its feet. The Menzies government, staunch supporter of the British connection, was starting to struggle with the implications of Britain’s decision to seek membership of the European Economic Community. It was the beginning of the end for the Australian Settlement. ‘The church seemed trapped in an increasingly irrelevant past’, notes Frame, ‘determined to preserve what remained of its privilege and position, and unable to make confident and positive steps into an uncharted future’. Interestingly, Burgmann said much the same thing back in 1960, right when the winds of change were beginning to blow. Anglicanism has lost its way, he said. ‘It has remained too long with the colonial mentality and now the inadequacy of that mentality leaves it enfeebled when the struggle is most intense’.

It was clearly going to be difficult for the Church of England in Australia to adjust to the collapse of Empire and to live into its vocation as an Australian church. A new generation of Australians would grow up without any knowledge of the emotional ties with Britain espoused by Menzies. The radical nationalist view of Australia’s future, popular in its own way, would be debunked by wave after wave of critical writers, but without being replaced by an alternative mythology. Instead, a postmodern Australia would reject the notion that there can be any one way of understanding the nation, substituting instead a plethora of possible ‘imaginings’. As we will see, at least in intellectual circles the quest for an Australian identity has, by and large, given way to the idea of ‘multiple identities’, a range of different perspectives on Australia arising from a wide variety of starting points. A key question is whether such a kaleidoscopic reading of Australia leads to fragmentation – the collapse of a sense of community and national purpose.
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12 Frame, ‘Local Differences’, 123.
13 See Chapter 2, n.123 above.
14 The seminal work was Richard White’s *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688-1980* (Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1981).
15 Hudson and Bolton, *Creating Australia.*
It is here, I think, that Anglicanism must be careful to enter the debate, offering, out of its own deep well of resources, theological and ecclesial perspectives on what Australia means and what it stands for. A precedent has already been set by that most enigmatic Australian historian, Manning Clark, whose passionate opposition to the Anglican tradition was, in a sense, an attempt to dig below the surface of things, trying to understand the Australian ‘soul’. But his historical tools could only take him so far; having jettisoned his theological roots, his ‘quest for grace’ fell short of its objective. Nevertheless, the quest itself was an amazingly intuitive expression of the ‘mystical’ via media, albeit from an anti-Anglican perspective. I will consider Clark’s writings and experience in the latter part of the chapter. Anglicanism, it seems to me, must find a way of engaging, in both thought and action, as an equal player in the debate about Australia. As one of many Australian imaginings it has every right to be there. As a tradition committed to inculturation, it has no choice. In the next chapter I will engage more intentionally in this theological dialogue. The purpose of this chapter is to clear the way for this conversation.

RELIGION IN AUSTRALIA

It is no easy matter for a religious tradition in Australia to be taken seriously, especially one that has been associated in the popular mind with intolerance, repressiveness and privilege. A lot of debris has to be cleared out of the way before Anglicanism can either accept its place in the Australian conversation or be accepted by other ‘secular’ participants. ‘A disparaging, derisory tone characterises much writing on Australian religion’, historian David Bollen wrote in 1973. ‘The churches, so ignorant of their true relation to Australian life, have been unable to reply and have lost self-respect’.16 There has certainly been a ‘perceptual separation’ in the popular mindset between religion and political life in Australia.17 Perhaps for some it has simply been a case of not noticing the obvious.18 Other writers treat religion as at

---


18 ‘[The] formative influence of religion, especially the Christian churches, on national life and citizenship has been largely taken for granted or poorly articulated and recognised’. Brian Galligan and Winsome Roberts, Australian Citizenship (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2004), 201.
best peripheral to the main currents of Australian history, either by making it a subset of political and social history or by ignoring it completely. In any case, for one reason or another religion in Australia has, until quite recently, been a neglected or disputed part of the Australian story.

It all goes back to the early years of European Settlement. Paul Bourke has argued that the mainline churches in Australia have never really lost the air of ‘tolerated chaplaincies’ that they had in the colonial era. In an earlier chapter I wrote about the struggle of Bishop Broughton in early New South Wales to come to terms with the dismissive attitudes of the native-born to organised religion, and the Church of England in particular. Patrick O’Farrell has written about the ‘cultural ambivalence of Australian religion’, noting the views of the ‘lower orders’ about Anglicanism in colonial Australia. ‘Religion’, he writes, ‘was seen as the preserve of the respectable, and a weapon of an authoritarian status quo. From this angle tradition in religion meant things inherently un-Australian – the Church of England’. Ken Inglis makes a similar observation. ‘Among colonists who did not go to church on any particular

---

19 Note, for example, Alan Gilbert’s summation of the ten volume Bicentennial history: ‘The writers of Australians have not avoided entirely the temptation to overemphasize the social functions of religion, or to concentrate on the secular objectives and motives underlying religious behaviour and religious ritual at the expense of the spiritual dimension of religious commitment. In places they seem patronising or ill at ease in dealing with the supernatural beliefs and assumptions which evidently pervaded significant areas of colonial life’. ‘Religion and the Bicentenary’, Journal of Religious History 15 (1) (June 1988): 17. A similar comment is made by Breward, Australia, 90. Note the complete absence of religion from such a major work on Australian citizenship as Wayne Hudson and John Jane (eds.), Rethinking Australian Citizenship (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). The same silence can also be noticed in many other texts, including the seminal work of W.K. Hancock, Australia (1930) – in spite of his passing comment (244) that nationality consists, not just in political unity, but in ‘spiritual achievement’ (but see Anne O’Brien’s discussion of the positive role of Christianity in Hancock’s life in ‘A Little Lower than the Angels’: WK Hancock and Professing History in Australia, in Frame and Treloar, Agendas for Australian Anglicans, 171-191). See also Gregory Melleuish, ‘Universal Obligations: Liberalism, Religion and National Identity’, in Stokes, The Politics of Identity in Australia, 59, as well as the comprehensive survey by Hilary M. Carey et al., ‘Australian Religion Review, 1980-2000, Part 1: Surveys, Bibliographies and Religions Other Than Christianity’, The Journal of Religious History 24 (3) (October 2000): 304-5.


21 See Chapter 2, n.12.

Sunday between 1840 and 1870’, he writes, ‘most would have said if asked that it was the Church of England that they were staying away from’. There was clearly a clash of values and expectations between the religious denominations – Anglicanism in particular – and those prevailing in the wider society.

In many ways humanism has been the prevailing current in Australian history. A movement away from traditional religion towards a ‘religion of humanity’ can be seen in late nineteenth century Australian literature, reflecting a growing belief in the capacity of human beings to create a better world. This growing liberal spirit undermined the claims to authority made by traditional religion. In one sense a clash of ‘theologies’ was taking place, with competing views on the nature of reality and what was most important. George Shaw writes about the ‘evangelical goal’ of a whole tradition of Australian historical writing: ‘the creation of a new society founded on social justice’, pointing in particular to the later writings of Manning Clark. There were no grounds for such a belief, argues Shaw. ‘Nothing in the world’s history up until then justified it, and nothing since has confirmed it’. It was, and continues to be, founded on sentiment.

This utopian humanism was, we might say, an alternative religious impulse: in Vincent Buckley’s words, ‘an insistence on the soul’s radical innocence’. While officially ‘secular’ in expression, it was really another form of ‘sacralisation’.

---

25 Wilkes, *The Stockyard and the Croquet Lawn*, 73; also Moore, ibid., 308.
29 Wilkes, *The Stockyard and the Croquet Lawn*, 75: ‘[T]he ideal of “the most democratic and progressive society” had almost the value of a religion for the generally non-religious who espoused it’. Galligan, ‘A Role for Religious Citizenship’, 31, argues that liberalism tends to undermine religion and morality. He sees it as ‘an incomplete political doctrine’. See also Tom Frame’s criticism of humanism in *Church and State: Australia’s Imaginary Wall* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2006), 81-84. ‘Humanism’, writes Frame (84), ‘upholds certain convictions about the way things ought to be and, indeed, will be when secularism holds sway. Given its presumption to determine right and wrong, and to discern good from evil, humanism accurses to itself all the prerogatives and privileges of divinity’.
Richard Ely’s reflections on various ‘heroic-progressive’ versions of Australian history (liberal democratic, social-democratic and nationalistic) are worth noting:

I have in mind the familiar conceptions of Australia progressing linearly, dialectically, or by a kind of intuitive, slap-dash lunge, towards classlessness, or equality of opportunity, or prosperity, or religious and civil liberty, or national maturity, or the socialist millennium. These progressive conceptions largely have endured in popular and scholarly consciousness because, and insofar as, the elements which narratively compose them are seen as sacred moments in a sacred story … The alleged great secularisations of Australian history have merely been the negative side, or obverse, of some of these sacralizations’. 31

Ely’s insight offers a counter-view to the widespread tendency to discredit religion because of its negative impact on Australian life. Two issues in particular come to mind: ‘wowserism’ and sectarianism. The former, described by Russel Ward as ‘this gloomy, puritanical attitude to life’ was not restricted to Anglicans, 32 although Anglicanism has received its fair share of criticism, especially from Manning Clark. 33 Clark’s aversion to Protestantism appeared repeatedly in his writings, 34 although he could also be critical of Roman Catholic clergy. In an essay in Daedalus in 1985, for example, he railed against the ‘priests and the parsons’, whose teachings ‘were alien both to the spirit of the age and the spirit of place in Australia’. He contrasted the ‘that-sidedness’ of the clergy with the ‘this-sidedness’ of the people.

The priests and the parsons frowned on pleasure, and the equation of material well-being with happiness: Australians were committed to the pursuit of happiness. The priests and the parsons preached the laws of God few human beings could observe: they asked human beings to love a Being who sentenced the transgressors against such laws to eternal torment … The parsons alienated themselves from the spirit of the age by denouncing travel on Sundays, drinking, gambling, dancing, and mixed

---

33 See also David Marr’s more recent sustained (and rather vitriolic) attack on the wowserism of Christianity in Australia, in The High Price of Heaven (Sydney: Allan & Unwin, 1999).
34 See, for example, his autobiographical work, The Quest for Grace (Ringwood, Vic.: Viking, 1990), 32: ‘The Protestant churches have been captured by the Pharisees. Church of England worshippers appear so confident of their virtues, so smug, have such a cocksure air’. At one stage Clark admitted that the first volume of his Australian history ‘was undoubtedly unkind and lacking in all charity to Protestants’ who, he felt, had ‘lost touch with the Christ figure’. ‘Themes in A History of Australia’, in Occasional Writings and Speeches, ed. Manning Clark (Melbourne: Fontana, 1980), 80.
bathing ... The heroes of the people were those who, unknown to the pages of history, liberated Australia from the straiteners and the life deniers.35

In spite of Clark’s evident distaste for wowserism, he admits that Christianity, in both its Protestant and Catholic expressions, has left ‘an indelible mark on our national conscience’. There is a strong puritan strain in the Australian psyche, he claims.36 Admittedly, he views this in negative terms, reflecting, no doubt, his own personal experience.37 Donald Horne makes a similar point in his influential book, *The Lucky Country*. Religion only matters to Australians, he writes, ‘when it stops them from doing something they want to do’.38 Like Clark, Horne was no lover of the ‘puritan ascendancy’.39 He had little respect for Protestantism, seeing it as a bastion of respectability, rather than part of a spiritual quest. As such, he saw little possibility of its survival into the future without some change in direction.40

Perhaps more damaging to Christianity in Australia, and particularly to Anglicanism, has been the sectarian rivalry between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. In the nineteenth century battles were fought over education. The University of Sydney was established in 1850 as ‘an institution merely for secular education’ because of fear of the divisiveness of theology.41 The establishment of a secular education system during the nineteenth century is another significant example of state intervention in

36 Manning Clark, *A Discovery of Australia*. The 1976 Boyer Lectures. (Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Commission, 1976), 30. ‘Australians who prided themselves on their love of liberty’, writes Clark, ‘on their admiration for the fearless, the free and the bold, were also great wowsers. The great libertarians were also the great puritans’.
38 Donald Horne, *The Lucky Country* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1964), 63-64. He goes on: ‘[I]n the mind of even the most libertarian Australian there often lingers a little of the conscience of the “wowser”’. Gregory Melleuish makes a similar comment, noting the popular perception of Christianity in Australia as ‘a series of “thou shalt nots” learnt either dogmatically at a Catholic school or non-dogmatically at a state school’. ‘Universal Obligations’, 59-60.
the battle between different religious traditions in Australia for ascendancy. As John Rickard has noted, ‘moral enlightenment’ in colonial Australia gained momentum more because of bickering between churches than because of the triumph of secularism. Later, during the First World War, the topic changed from education to conscription. In both cases the nation at large was polarised by the controversies.

Religious difference has shaped the way Australian political and social institutions developed, often in quite profound ways. The natural alliance between Catholicism and the Labor Party on the one hand and Protestantism and Liberalism on the other is a case in point. There is no doubt that sectarianism reflected a battle for political influence or control. But to dismiss the churches out of hand because of the bitterness of such rivalry is to trivialise what is a profoundly complex issue. As Judith Brett argues, the battle lines were really much more deeply rooted.

We are dealing with fundamental historic differences between the Protestant and Catholic religious imagination, between the way the two faiths imagine the relationship between God, the individual and the world … These differences are embedded in the deep narrative structures of people’s self-understandings, whether they are consciously religious or even regular church-goers, and they affect the way they understand the relationship between individuals and other non-religious groups and organisations. To see Protestantism and Catholicism as only about doctrine and institutional religion is to miss the pervasiveness of their cultural influence, particularly in the first half of the twentieth century when religion’s influence was much greater than today.

---

42 See Hogan, ibid., Chapter 4; also A.G. Austin, *Australian Education 1788-1900: Church, State and Public Education in Colonial Australia*. 2nd edn. (Melbourne: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1965).
44 For the conscription debates, see Brett, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class*, Chapter 3.
46 For example, in 1961 John Douglas Pringle described sectarianism as ‘one of the curses of Australia, but the Protestants are the more to blame. The stupidity and ferocity of their hatred is often beyond belief’. *Australian Accent* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961), 87. As Bollen says, *Religion in Australian Society*, 52: ‘Christians should bear in mind the superficiality of much that the social critics have said about them’.
47 Brett, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class*, 55.
For the real contribution of the churches to be understood an alternative interpretation of the Australian story is clearly required. As already noted, Richard Ely calls for a ‘massive conceptual reconstruction’, so that the central place of ‘sacralisation’ in Australian history can be seen for what it is.\footnote{Ely, ‘Secularisation and the Sacred’, 556.} Brett’s insights provide a way of understanding what was really happening behind the ‘tribalism’ of denominational rivalry. Essentially the home churches of England, Ireland and Scotland, along with Methodists and Independents, were thrust together in a new land.\footnote{Hilary Carey, Believing in Australia: A Cultural History of Religions (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1996), 93.} Anglicanism in particular assumed an ascendancy that was quickly withdrawn, though it still found it difficult to let go of the central position it had occupied in England.\footnote{Bollen, Religion in Australian Society, 57.} This explains its religious intolerance during the early decades of European settlement.\footnote{Strong, ‘An Antipodean Establishment’, 65.} It is important to note, however, that Anglican opposition to Roman Catholicism was not invented by Bishop Broughton, but rather migrated with the First Fleet. In fact, it was less aggressive in Australia than it was back in England.\footnote{ibid., 85-86.}

For Roman Catholic historian, Patrick O’Farrell, who has thought more deeply about religion in Australia than most, sectarianism is a measure of the vibrancy of religion in Australia.\footnote{See O’Farrell, ‘The Cultural Ambivalence of Australian Religion’, 10.} Indeed, he sees the ‘contest’ between Protestant and Catholic, English and Irish as ‘the main unifying principle of Australian history’.\footnote{Patrick O’Farrell, The Irish in Australia (Sydney: New South Wales University Press, 1987), 11-12.}

What held this country’s people together, in a constructive and productive social and political relationship, was a continuing debate, always vigorous, often bitter, and sometimes even violent, about what kind of country this should be. The tension and conflict between minority and majority was not, in its essence of effects, a fundamentally destructive one, but a creative exchange which compelled Australia’s inhabitants, of all kinds and persuasions, to take stock of the nature of their society.\footnote{ibid., 70.}

Michael Hogan reaches a similar conclusion. Conflict is part of any society, he argues. What is perhaps not understood clearly, however, is that religious conflict is...
‘in some way fundamental for an understanding of the general cultural and political history of a society’. 56

Here, then, is the counter-argument to those secular historians and commentators who dismiss religion in Australia as divisive and un-Australian. Without the contribution of the churches, including Anglicanism, Australia as we know it would not exist. In fact, the churches exercised a profound formative influence on the cultural and political development of Australian society. 57 The 1836 Church Act, for example, was not meant to hold back the civilising influence of the churches on colonial society, but to expand it. 58 To quote Galligan and Roberts:

From 1836, the state provided grants-in-aid to all of the various denominations for establishing churches and schools as the nucleus of an ordered social existence and community life. The Christian churches played a major role in civilising ‘the masses’. They inculcated ideals of morality and character that promoted civic responsibility and respect for others. They contributed to education and the formation of youth, and their social activities fostered the fellowship and civic literacy that were essential to basic democratic participation. 59

Religion remained at the heart of things, not just at the civic level, but also, as O’Farrell says, at the ‘unspoken’ level, where its influence has been more ‘private, subterranean, elusive, complex, ambiguous, mysterious’. 60 In saying this I do not intend to endorse the privatised form of religion that has developed in response to secularism in all its forms, cut off from the currents of Australian intellectual and cultural life, 61 although the personal influence of religion on a wide range of public figures – politicians, writers, educational and civic leaders, to name just a few – certainly needs to be recognised. 62 In short, it appears that the religious dimension is

56 Hogan The Sectarian Strand, 4-5.
58 ibid., 31; also Winsome Roberts, ‘The Churches’ Role in Constitution an Australian Citizenry’, in Howe and Hughes, Spirit of Australia II, 57.
62 The influence of conservative evangelicalism on the conservative political parties during the 2004 election also needs to be noted. See Marion Maddox, God Under Howard: The Rise of the Religious
not as ‘un-Australian’ as it seems, and that those who neglect its ongoing importance within Australian society are guilty of a serious omission. As O’Farrell writes:

Whether we like it or not, our cultural heritage is Christian and we ignore this at the peril of falsifying ourselves … Many Australian historians, in common with many historians elsewhere, seem to be ‘outsiders’, not merely in regard to religion, or general philosophies of man, but in consequence, outsiders in regard to the comprehension of reality … They proceed in apparently unperturbed ignorance of a major (if not the major) element in the Australian cultural – again I stress cultural, not religious – heritage, that is, the Christian religion. They depict the historical individual, the historical society, neither in the fullness of humanity nor in cultural context.63

The wonder is that the age of sectarianism passed so quickly.64 It is at least a little mystifying that so few intellectuals have grasped the significance of this achievement for the life of the nation.65 The churches were, in fact, grappling with Australian experience, finding their way in a new society. They began, like everyone else, as a ‘homesick people’,66 and are still struggling to dig roots in the Australian soil. This is the challenge facing Anglicanism in Australia. What must be avoided at all costs is the tendency to go inwards, to try to be an Australian church without the pain of engagement. This was the dilemma facing Anglicanism in Australia in 1962, and continues to haunt it. But, as Patrick O’Farrell has rightly said, Australian religion

---

64 Stuart Macintyre, A Concise History of Australia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 258, comments on the divisions of nationality, religion and civic status in colonial Australia. ‘The remarkable feature of colonial history’, he writes, ‘was how quickly these divisions were reconciled’. John Hirst comments that, unlike what happened in Canada and the United States, ‘the English, Scots and Irish did not form separate enclaves’. He makes the point that the ‘public feuding’ between Protestant and Catholic in Australia was completely unlike the sectarian battles in places like Belfast. It ‘did not lead to polarization at community level or to residential segregation, and it encouraged people of goodwill on both sides to redouble their efforts to neutralize the conflict. The commitment to avoid old world divisions was much stronger than the desire to perpetuate them’. J.B. Hirst, ‘Multiculturalism: Australia’s Absurd History’, in Carroll, Intruders in the Bush: The Australian Quest for Identity, ed. John Carroll. 2nd edn. (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992), 196. Michael Hogan argues that sectarianism still exists in Australia, but it has ‘been redirected and softened’. ‘Whatever Happened to Australian Sectarianism?’ Journal of Religious History 13 (1) (June 1984): 90.
65 In Australian historical writing in general, sectarianism has figured as an explanatory device. The sectarian dog-fight has been self-evident proof of the illiberal and irrational in religion. Sectarianism has been a reassurance of the secular mind. J.D. Bollen et al., ‘Australian Religious History, 1960-80’, Journal of Religious History 11 (1) (June 1980): 35.
should be approached in the first instance ‘not according to its own internal
character, but from the direction of its environment’. It is helpful to know how
integral a role the churches have played in the life of the nation. Anglicanism belongs
to the Australian story. Its future lies, not in detachment from society, but in
connectedness, making its own unique contribution to the life of the nation.

THE AUSTRALIAN SETTLEMENT

The role of the churches in Australian society has now been established. I have not
yet moved past 1962, when Anglicanism adopted a national constitution. There is a
good reason for this. It is important to understand just how much the Anglican
Church depended on the political and social atmosphere of the Australian Settlement.
Anglicanism in Australia was quite comfortable with the maintenance of the British
connection and in no hurry to change the status quo. The vote in favour of a national
constitution was not a referendum on social change, or an endeavour to take
seriously the cultural implications of Article 34. The *via media* operating from
Federation through to the end of the Menzies era was, we might say, ‘static’ rather
than ‘mystical’. Inculturation was not an agenda item for the Australian church. Then
again, by and large this was also the case for the majority of Australians at that time.

In the previous chapter I drew attention to Kathryn Tanner’s discussion of societies
as closed systems. Within a closed system it is easy to assume homogeneity in both
thought and behaviour. It is important to realise that, to a large extent, such an ethos
pervaded Australian society for the first half of the twentieth century. The debate
about the future of Anglicanism took place within a kind of cultural bubble that was
both protectionist and British. At the time of Federation in 1901, Australia was an
integral part of the British Empire. To be Australian was to be part of the British
race. For some, notably Irish Catholics, it was an uncomfortable partnership.
Aboriginal Australians did not even rate as members of the Australian

---

67 Patrick O’Farrell, ‘Writing the General History of Australian Religion’, *Journal of Religious
68 Lyn Spillman, *Nation and Commemoration: Creating national identities in the United States and
Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 27-28: ‘Culturally … few Australians saw
any contradiction between their British attachment and their developing “Australian” identity, and
frequently, the former was an implicit premise of the latter’. At this stage, of course, most Australians
were of British descent, and almost one fifth of the population had been born in Britain. See Andrews,
The Anzac Illusion, 12. Andrews also comments (39) that at this stage most of the Australian middle
classes ‘were living basically British lives in the cities, and increasingly strove to do the “British”
thing – hence the very real sense of “dual loyalty” in many Australians at the time’. 230
Commonwealth. But for the vast majority, Anglicans included, a strong sense of connection to England was an integral part of what it meant to be Australian. To quote Brian Fletcher:

The dominant element was drawn from those loosely described as Anglo-Saxon. Members of this group were Anglican or Protestant, had a strong attachment to Australia, and took great pride in their English heritage. For them Britain was the homeland and mother country and they sought to preserve and strengthen the links which bound them to that country. As the distinguished constitutional lawyer, Professor K.H. Bailey, observed, ‘Australian life is like the Australian penny. It has the King’s head on one side, and the kangaroo on the other’.69

The new nation formed in 1901 was therefore both Australian and British.70 Just how ‘British’ Australia was is a matter of debate amongst historians. One view is that imperial sentiment far outweighed any developing sense of Australian nationalism.71 It could also be argued that the pioneers of Federation were simultaneously both passionately Australian and loyal to the Empire. In 1890, for example, at the same time as the Bulletin writers were espousing radical republicanism, Alfred Deakin declared to his fellow native-born Australians:

[We] have sprung from one stock and are one people, and whatever the barriers between us may be they are of our own creation … This sentiment of nationality is one which, I believe, we shall see increasing in its intensity year by year, and it will count for much more than it now does when the people of these colonies become a people sprung from the soil, a people the vast majority of whom will know no other home than the soil of Australia.72

According to Birrell, those who treat the Federation era as imperialistic and derivative fail to understand the national spirit present in people like Deakin.73 The

70 Spillman, Nation and Commemoration, 31, 86. Cf. Partington, The Australian Nation, xx: ‘It was shared Britishness as much as shared Australianness which enabled a federal Australian Commonwealth incorporating the entire land mass of the continent, together with Tasmania, to be created peacefully’.
71 See Bob Birrell, Federation: The Secret Story (Sydney: Duffy and Snellgrove, 2001), 185-190, for a summary of the debate.
72 ibid., 152.
73 ibid., 186-187. On the other hand, Andrews, The Anzac Illusion, 31, contends that the word ‘nation’ for Deakin sometimes referred to Australia and sometimes to Britain. During his 1905 ‘Imperial Federation’ speech, for example, Deakin referred to the nation seven times, but only once with reference to Australia.
political settlement championed by the Deakin government, he argues, was a distinctly Australian one.\textsuperscript{74} Its purpose was to build ‘a shared sense of peoplehood’ based on race, social equality and common aspirations and ideals, but in a uniquely Australian way, avoiding the class divisions of the old world (Britain) and the racial divisions of the new (the United States).\textsuperscript{75} In other words, it was primarily about nation-building.\textsuperscript{76} This is no doubt a fair interpretation of the motives of the Founders of Federation. More recently, of course, the Australian Settlement has been subject to critique, not least of all for its implicit atmosphere of racism and xenophobia.\textsuperscript{77} Birrell counters such arguments on the grounds that the assumptions of the Federation era should not be judged in the light of later values.\textsuperscript{78} Melleuish presents an alternative view, criticising strongly the protectionist philosophy that underpinned the Australian Settlement following the uncertainties and anxieties of the 1890s. While accepting that the intention was to create a society emphasising equality and the dignity of the ‘common man’, Melleuish claims that the political settlement was founded on cultural and racial uniformity and fear of the outside world.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{74} ibid., 294. Cf. Helen Irving, \textit{To Constitute a Nation: A Cultural History of Australia’s Constitution} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), ibid., 30-31: ‘If Alfred Deakin called himself an “independent Australian Briton”, he did not really believe he lived or thought just as the Englishman did in Britain. Deakin, indeed, scorned much he found in England, in particular the “class-feeling” and “snobbishness” that “pervades English society from top to bottom”. The “Australian Briton” did not share in this English culture, but had a new type of identity, its shape already emerging the moment white people began to occupy Australian soil’ (see also 119-120).


\textsuperscript{76} Birrell, ibid., 290-291. Cf. Stuart Macintyre, \textit{A Concise History of Australia}, 152: ‘[T]he principal object of national reconstruction was not the economy, nor social justice, but the nation … [I]t was an affirmative and dynamic one’.

\textsuperscript{77} To quote Aboriginal scholar Anne Pattel-Gray: ‘Genocidal Aboriginal Assimilation policies, coupled with racist immigration policies, combined to build an almost impenetrable wall around “Fortress White Australia”’. \textit{The Great White Flood: Racism in Australia} (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 38. In his \textit{Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Colored Immigrants in the British Self-Governing Colonies 1830-1910} (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1976), Robert A. Huttonback demonstrates that discrimination against Asians in Australia based on a belief in white superiority was widespread throughout the nineteenth century, and was enshrined in the White Australia policy after Federation. The Japanese in particular protested strongly against the blatant racism of Australia’s immigration policy. See also David Day, \textit{Claiming a Continent: A History of Australia} (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1996), 209-229, for similar discussion.

\textsuperscript{78} Birrell, \textit{Federation}, 304-305. In \textit{Australian Liberals}, 78, Judith Brett provides some support for Birrell’s more positive reading of the motives of the founders of Federation. She contrasts the ‘tolerant, open-minded liberalism’ of Alfred Deakin with the narrow conservativism of later Liberal governments.

\textsuperscript{79} Melleuish, \textit{The Packaging of Australia}, 16-27. See also Melleuish’s essay, “‘Keeping the Shutters Firmly Closed’: The Social Laboratory, Liberal Intellectuals and the Growth of the “Protectionist Mentality”, in \textit{Australia as a Social and Cultural Laboratory}? ed. Gregory Melleuish (Brisbane:
It was not a nationalism that had grown out of a secure sense of belonging and of possessing roots, a nationalism which viewed other nations as equal partners in the common tasks of humanity. Australian nationalism had been poisoned by a fear and resentment of the wider world, which was seen as a threat to be held at arm’s length. This resentment linked up with the insecurity that comes from the knowledge that one’s roots do not reach below the surface.\(^{80}\)

Its long-term legacy, Melleuish argues, is a ‘mean-spirited’ streak deeply embedded within the Australian psyche.\(^{81}\)

That Anglicanism was comfortable with such an arrangement, and secretly pines for a return to the certainties and privileges this era provided, is reason enough to raise the questions central to this study. As already noted, Anglicanism was a hidden partner in this political settlement, so much so that when its pillars toppled one by one at the end of the Menzies era Anglicanism found itself in unfamiliar territory. It knew of no other way of being Anglican in Australian society. Anglicanism was operating with an imperial mindset from which it has never quite escaped.\(^{82}\) It is important for the present generation to reflect back critically on this formative period of Australian national life. We cannot chart the way ahead without an understanding of the past. Certainly the Anglican Church needs to be aware of the environment in which the debate about its own identity took place. If, as Melleuish claims, Australia was a closed system in which the church felt a strong sense of belonging, this needs to be acknowledged and its long-term legacy understood.

\(^{80}\) Melleuish, \textit{The Packaging of Australia}, 36.

\(^{82}\) ‘The lessons of the education system were supported by the churches, especially the Anglican Church, which linked itself closely to State and Empire … Churchmen linked loyalty to the British Empire with Christian virtue and “acted as if they were the official guardians of patriotism”’. Andrews, \textit{The Anzac Illusion}, 35. Cf. Robert S.M. Withycombe, ‘Australian Anglicans and Imperial Identity, 1900-1914’, \textit{Journal of Religious History} 25 (3) (October 2001): 287: ‘It soon becomes clear that both before and after 1914, Anglicans resident in Australia apparently did not easily distinguish Australian nationalism from an Anglo-Saxon imperialism (and white racialism)’.
According to Melleuish, much of Australian culture became frozen in ‘an Edwardian mould’ that permeated the Australian atmosphere from the end of the First World War until the early 1960s. Prime Minister Robert Menzies became the embodiment of an air of nostalgia for a lost past, even as the British Empire began to crumble around him.\textsuperscript{83} It would be misleading, however, to suggest that Menzies was an anachronism in a society moving progressively away from its British roots. As Stuart Ward has argued, most Australians held on tenaciously to the ‘apron strings’ even as Britain was itself changing priorities.\textsuperscript{84} Menzies’ views about the British connection were, in fact, ‘a broadly representative, if somewhat extravagant, rendering of the instincts and outlook of Australian society in the 1950s’.\textsuperscript{85}

School children continued to ponder over maps of the world decorated in swaths of imperial red, despite the recent independence of India and Pakistan, and the oaths of loyalty in private schools were intrinsically British in sentiment. Similarly, the established churches were deeply conformist politically, and in the 1950s conformism implied an unquestioning allegiance to the British sovereign.

This applied especially to the Church of England. Indeed, Ward argues, Anglicanism in Australia was a major force in keeping alive the British connection,\textsuperscript{86} as well as sustaining the societal values embodied in the Australian Settlement. As already mentioned, in Tom Frame’s view, the Anglican Church, based as it was around the combined values of ‘middle-class conservatism, British imperialism and English cultural hegemony’,\textsuperscript{87} was complacent and politically compliant, ‘preoccupied with reinforcing expressions of passive citizenship and the desire for personal contentment within nuclear family life and suburban domesticity’\textsuperscript{88}.

This was the situation prevailing in 1962, when Anglicanism in Australia took upon itself the semblance of a national identity. By this stage, however, the Menzies government was being forced to reckon with the collapse of Empire. Thereafter, the

\textsuperscript{83} Melleuish, \textit{The Packaging of Australia}, 30-31.
\textsuperscript{84} Ward, \textit{Australia and the British Embrace}, 12.
\textsuperscript{85} \textit{ibid.}, 21.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{ibid.}, 25.
\textsuperscript{87} Frame, ‘Local Differences’, 122 (see above, n.8).
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{ibid.}, 123. Melleuish, \textit{The Packaging of Australia}, 23-24, argues that the institutions of both family and church ‘acted as dampeners on expressions of egoistic individualism’. Social conformity was essential for the maintenance of the paradigm. It was, he claims, ‘the triumph of the protected self over the assertive self’.
cultural paradigm put in place during the first decade of the twentieth century progressively fell apart, leaving Anglicanism unprepared to deal with the challenges of a different Australia. To use Frame’s words, thereafter the church would struggle ‘to find a place for itself in a society that was no longer British and no longer Christian’.

THE RADICAL NATIONALISTS
There were, as I have mentioned, alternative voices to those of ‘independent Australian Britons’ like Alfred Deakin during the Federation era. Australian Anglicans certainly heard them and could have heeded them had they been so inclined. The voices were anti-British and radically republican. Essentially they were coming at the Australian experience from a different perspective. By the end of the nineteenth century ‘the bush’ had already emerged as a fundamental Australian archetype, its accompanying themes of mateship, endurance and sacrifice providing a counter to Australia’s British heritage. The ‘nationalist-reformist’ theme coming through writers like Henry Lawson held that the future of Australian nationalism lay in a complete disentanglement from Britain. In the 1950s, radical nationalist writers like Russel Ward and Vance Palmer turned the clock back to the age of Lawson, claiming that the myth of the Australia bushman held the key to Australia’s future. At the same time, A.A. Phillips’ called for an end to the ‘cultural cringe’. ‘The core

89 Brett, Australian Liberals, 127: ‘The disintegration of the unifying symbolic structures of Crown and race are familiar stories. By the 1980s they had left the Liberals high and dry, struggling to find a language of social cohesion to bind the millions of individuals who inhabited Australia’.
90 O’Farrell, ‘Spurious Divorce?’, 523, argues that this was the same for both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism: ‘When Ireland shrank to insignificance and the British Empire was no more, religion in Australia was left without a meaningful cultural base, without an integral place in secular affairs’.
91 Frame, ‘Local Differences’, 122-123.
93 Judith Wright, Preoccupations in Australian Poetry (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), 47-58. According to Serle, From Deserts the Prophets Come, 60-61, the Bulletin, under the editorship of J.F. Archibald, turned the ‘folk undercurrent’ of colonial Australia into a ‘group myth about Australians’ centred on the Australian bushman.
94 Wright, ibid., 71-82.
95 Stephen Alomes, A Nation at Last: The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism 1880-1988 (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1988), 166: ‘Their radical dreaming saw in the Australian past and in the indigenous literary 1890s, Australian social qualities which promised a better future’. Alomes describes their position as ‘romantic Left nationalism’.
of the difficulty’, he wrote, ‘is the fact that, in the back of the Australian mind, there sits a minatory Englishman’.96

From the beginning of European settlement, transplanted Europeans had struggled to make sense of their new place of belonging.97 A clash between British ‘race’ and Australian ‘place’ became fundamental to the Australian experience.98 Two ‘strains of feeling’ quickly emerged in Australian literature, according to Judith Wright. She describes this as ‘Australia’s double aspect’, or alternatively, ‘the Australian split-consciousness’.99 On the conservative side, says Wright, a ‘sense of exile’ is expressed; on the radical side, a ‘sense of liberty, of a new chance’.100 The one looks back to Britain with nostalgia; the other looks to Australia with hope for a new society. David Walker’s use of the term ‘two Australias’101 is an apt description of the difference between these two contrasting visions of Australia that have appeared in a variety of ways throughout Australian history.102

Back in 1887, the Bulletin had described an Australian as any man who has left behind ‘the memory of the class-distinctions and the religious differences of the old world’ and who seeks ‘freedom of speech and right of personal liberty’.103 It was

96 Phillips, The Australian Tradition, 94.
97 Judith Wright, Preoccupations in Australian Poetry, xiv.
98 Melleuish, The Packaging of Australia, 22. Cf. Moore, Social Patterns in Australian Literature, 49-50: ‘The endeavours to transplant the English modes of life and thought gradually met with increasing opposition as the native-born, shaped by the land, developed their own modes of thought and their own national pride. So the clash of cultures entered on its long career’.
99 Wright, Preoccupations in Australian Poetry, xi-xxii. See also Serle, From Deserts the Prophets Come, 32. Peter Goodall, High Culture, Popular Culture: The Long Debate (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1995), 79-80, describes the same phenomenon as ‘the Great Dividing Range’.
101 See David Walker, Dream and Disillusion: A Search for Australian Cultural Identity (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1976), 265, index entry: ‘Australia’. Walker credits Frederick Sinclaire with inventing the phrase. In a paper of that title written during the conscription debates in 1916, Sinclaire argued that the supporters of conscription, ‘the Protestant Churches, the Universities, the Capitalist press and generally the comfortable classes’ were out of touch ‘with any of the vital elements in the life of Australia’. They looked to England and Europe for their ideas and values instead of standing for Australian independence. Sinclaire looked for ‘a new, more fully “Australian” character and community’ (98-99). Manning Clark also uses the idea of ‘two Australias’ in the opening chapter of A History of Australia. VI: ‘The Old Dead Tree and the Young Tree Green’ 1916-1935 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1988). Note also the comment by Rowse, Australian Liberalism and National Culture, 196, n.7.
102 Ian Turner, Room for Manoeuvre, 5, contrasts the views of William Charles Wentworth and John Dunmore Lang in the early years of the colony, the former hoping for ‘a new Britannia in another land’, and the latter, ‘freedom and independence for the golden lands of Australia’.
103 See Irving, To Constitute a Nation, 132.
here, in the Bulletin, that Henry Lawson made his mark, writing about the harshness of the bush and preaching a gospel of mateship and egalitarianism. In the bush, he wrote, could be found the true Australia. There was ‘an almost monastic, even a semi-religious, quality’ in writers like Lawson, writes Judith Wright. They were really rejecting the city and all that it stood for – even ‘civilization’ itself. Wright is not the only writer to point to the irony that the bush legend was produced by a group of alienated urban intellectuals.

Somehow this utopian dream of a better world was always beyond arm’s reach. Dream and disillusionment were two sides of the same coin. In the first half of the twentieth century, the British connection was too strong for an autonomous Australia to emerge. In the 1930s, P.R. Stephensen’s vision of a ‘new human type’ being formed in Australia largely fell on deaf ears. ‘A hemisphere’, he wrote, ‘separates us from “home” – we are Antipodeans; a gum tree is not a branch of an oak; our Australian culture will evolve distinctively’. So too, Rex Ingamells and the Jindyworobak movement believed that the development of an Australian culture, the ‘birth of a new soul’, required a complete break with European culture and a radical openness to Aboriginal culture and the Australian landscape. Nettie Palmer, who also believed in the dream of writers like Henry Lawson, nevertheless expressed misgivings about the capacity of white Australians to become truly at home in this land. ‘Three or four generations have not been enough’, she wrote, ‘to allow us to get thoroughly rooted in the soil. Waves of uncertainty sweep over us. Is this continent

104 Wright, Preoccupations in Australian Poetry, 53-57.
105 See Birrell, Federation, 127-128; White, Inventing Australia, 102. Elleke Boehmer, Colonial and Postcolonial Literature (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 110, draws attention to Lawson’s admission that to some extent his depiction of bush life was an invention, screening out much of the harshness and desolation. She adds: ‘Nostalgic evocations of rural locale were in the main city-based creations’. In a similar vein, Graeme Davison, ‘Sydney and the Bush: An Urban Context for the Australian Legend’, in Intruders in the Bush, 116, notes Lawson’s ‘marginal urban situation’ and his ‘legacy of loneliness’, and sees the dream of the bush that emerged in the late 1880s as an ‘anti-type of the city’ (124). Spillman, Nation and Commemoration, 27, notes that by the 1880s, Australia was already more urbanised than America. Bruce Clunies Ross, ‘Australian Literature and Australian Culture’, in The Penguin New Literary History of Australia, ed. Bruce Bennett et al. (Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1988), 15, views the argument about the city and the bush in the Bulletin as ‘a variant of an ancient opposition in European culture, which became the focus of a complex and unresolved debate in Australia’. In Ross’s view, it would have been more unusual had an urban legend emerged out of the Australian experience.
107 Rex Ingamells, ‘Conditional Culture’, in Barnes, ibid., 251. See also Serle, From Deserts the Prophets Come, 132-133. The movement lasted about ten years.
really our home, or are we just migrants from another civilisation?" Her husband, Vance Palmer, a major exponent of the radical nationalist position, held on to his version of the dream despite his growing sense of foreboding about the growth of suburbia and the widespread preoccupation with bourgeois values.

But the dream was not to be. Palmer, argues Walker, became ‘a spokesman for an ossified tradition’. The world was changing even as he wrote. In this sense the radical nationalists were no better off than those who held on for dear life to the Empire while it was disintegrating around them. Indeed, both views presupposed both the existence of the British Empire and the closed world of the Australian Settlement. Russel Ward’s thesis about the Australian legend can be seen, in fact, as ‘an essay in imperial history’.

The legend did not disappear with the passing of ties with Britain. It has enjoyed periods of resurgence and remains part of Australian popular culture, and it continues to impact on the way Australian history is understood. It has never been

---

109 Walker, Dream and Disillusion, 196-197. ‘Palmer could not reconcile himself to urban Australia nor rid himself of the legend of the 1890s. It was disconcerting for a man who wanted to deal with a simple down-to-earth world to remain troubled by the ambiguities of being Australian and haunted by notions of a lost past’. John Docker makes the interesting observation that Palmer presented the ‘legend of the nineties’ as both myth and reality: as both a description of the ‘true’ national character and as a dream of what Palmer wanted to be true. Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual Traditions in Sydney and Melbourne (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1974), 94. See also Rowe, Australian Liberalism and National Culture, 116-117.
110 ibid., 201; also Alomes, A Nation at Last, 166; Macintyre, A Concise History of Australia, 220; Melleuish, Cultural Liberalism, 2-3. Barnes, The Writer in Australia, 162, describes Palmer’s commitment to a vision of Australia derived from the 1890s as ‘a kind of inhibition of his imagination’.
111 Melleuish, The Packaging of Australia, 30, argues that the commitment to an outmoded Edwardian vision was shared by radical nationalists and imperialists alike – by both Palmer and Menzies, we might say. Both were based on nostalgia for a lost past. George Nadel, Australia’s Colonial Culture, 109, describes The Bulletin and Furphy’s Such Is Life as ‘literature in revolt’. In other words, the whole frame of reference of the radical nationalists presupposed the existence of British imperialism. See also Ashcroft and Salter, ‘Australian Voices: A Bakhtinian Reading of the Australian Nationalist Debate’, in Fuery (ed.), Representation, Discourse and Desire, 77: ‘The crucial point about [the] nationalist stereotype is that it is constructed within the prescriptions of imperial history’. They also write about the collusion rather than opposition between the ‘two contradictory guises’ (72).
113 As Judith Brett points out, Australian Liberals, 203, during the 1980s the Australian legend underwent ‘a revival in Australian popular culture, with films, clothes and country music reflecting the mood of the times. See also Partington, The Australian Nation, xxii.
114 Ward, Australia and the British Embrace, 5-6. Ward argues that the radical nationalists’ presentation of Australia’s ‘thwarted nationalism’, based on antagonism towards Britain, has
fully embraced by Australian governments, although in more recent times Prime Minister Paul Keating incorporated the radical nationalist myth into his vision of a distinct Australian nation. As Paul Curran has argued, for Keating, Robert Menzies embodied a ‘compromised nationalism’ which held back the development of a ‘distinctive Australian outlook on the world’. He abhorred the idea of dual loyalty, rejecting the possibility that former ‘British-Australian’ leaders were really working for Australia and its place in the world.  

Keating’s ultimate rejection by the electorate indicates that the majority of Australians were less enthusiastic about his vision of a distinct Australia. The irony is that Keating’s Liberal successor, John Howard, has claimed the Australian legend for the conservative side of Australian politics, albeit in a more moderate form. Howard has constantly referred to what is distinctively Australian, including the Anzac legend and mateship. Howard’s rhetoric, whether sincere or contrived, is a political masterstroke. As Brett notes, ‘Howard has planted the Liberals’ flag firmly in Labor’s territory of vernacular egalitarianism’.  

In a sense, the Australian legend was an integral aspect of the Australian Settlement. While approaching nationalism from a completely different viewpoint from ‘independent Australian Britons’ like Alfred Deakin, it nevertheless endorsed the racial assumptions of the time. As we have seen, the White Australia policy was one of the pillars of the Australian Settlement, receiving support from all sides of the political divide. White racial superiority was also a key aspect of the bush legend, continued to shape the kind of historical questions that are posed. ‘Successive generations of historians have set out to identify the earliest sprouting of youthful, assertive, nationalist behaviour and, having done so, to explain why these signs of early promise failed to achieve the full bloom of national independence … Conversely, those Australian political or cultural figures deemed to have identified too closely with the British connection are looked upon as a national disgrace’.  

As Don Watson notes in his reflections on Keating’s years as Prime Minister: ‘Always a doubt seemed to linger in a corner of the public mind that his efforts were a part of a broader assault on those intangible things which tend to go under the aegis of the Australian Way of Life’. Recollections of a Bleeding Heart: A Portrait of Paul Keating PM (Sydney: Knopf, 2002), 172. Nevertheless, Keating was enormously popular with intellectuals. See Brett, Australian Liberals, 183.  

Brett, ibid., 196.  

ibid., 205. Brett continues: ‘Howard’s opponents have been misled by his description of himself as a social conservative and so missed his takeover of the symbolic repertoire of Australia’s radical nationalist past to reconnect Australian Liberalism with ordinary Australian experience’.  

Birrell, Federation, 291: ‘Few Australians were prepared to contest either the centrality of White Australia to Australia’s nation-building objectives or the egalitarian ideals on which the policy rested’.  
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and as such has come under extended criticism in recent decades, along with its sexism and the violent expressions in some of its writings.

Peter Coleman launched one of the earliest attacks in 1962, when, in the introduction to *Australian Civilization*, he accused the legend of being ‘radical, populist, nationalist [and] racialist’.\(^{120}\) It was, he claimed, a mixture of ‘humanism and nihilism, democracy and violence, the open smile and the broken bottle’.\(^{121}\) Humphrey McQueen’s description of the radical nationalist tradition as ‘the chauvinism of British imperialism’ followed in 1970. At no time, McQueen wrote, did the legend either reject the British people or shed ‘race patriotism’\(^{122}\). In fact, he argued, racism was its single most significant aspect.\(^{123}\) Similarly, Hodge and Mishra’s postcolonial study, *Dark Side of the Dream*, has pointed to the racism, sexism, and xenophobia of the legend, the product of the ‘schizoid consciousness’ in the Australian psyche. As a result, the ‘typical’ Australian ‘encodes a class, race and gender identity which classifies women, Aborigines and new migrants as “unAustralian”.’\(^{124}\) The worst fears of Australians are thereby suppressed, but in such a way as to regard their projections as normal.\(^{125}\)

These powerful criticisms must be born in mind when considering an adequate Anglican response to issues like race and national identity. Hodge and Mishra are justified in drawing attention to the ‘dark side’ of the Australian legend. It was always full of inconsistencies and flaws that should have no place in the contemporary world. Even as a democratic tradition the legend was limited and

---

\(^{120}\) Peter Coleman (ed.), *Australian Civilization* (Melbourne: F.W. Cheshire, 1963), 2.

\(^{121}\) ibid., 3.

\(^{122}\) Humphrey McQueen, *A New Britannia: An argument concerning the social origins of Australian radicalism and nationalism*. Rev. edn. (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1970), 21-22. John Docker, *Australian Cultural Elites*, 93, argues that Vance Palmer was not a racist. ‘But he still believed that ‘an ethnocentric exclusion of other races and cultures’ was necessary ‘in order to establish a white Australian cultural identity’.

\(^{123}\) ibid., 42. ‘What is doubly tragic about [Russel] Ward’s position is that he is genuinely concerned to combat the racism he sees in contemporary Australia; yet he cannot bring himself to accept that it is the linchpin of his precious nationalism’. Later, Henry Lawson, who is singled out as one of Ward’s ‘Trinity of nationalist authors’, is described as fascist, racist, anti-democratic, anti-intellectual, militaristic and anti-Semitic (104).


\(^{125}\) ibid., 217-218. Cf. Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia*, 219: ‘[T]he radical nationalists reworked the past (they passed quickly over the militarism and xenophobia in the national experience) to assist them in their present struggles’. 
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exclusive and was never going to speak for all Australians. At the same time, it would be foolish to dismiss the legend out of hand. Ideas like mateship and egalitarianism, as we have seen, remain an integral part of the Australian experience and cannot be ignored, even by Anglicans.

Perhaps the greatest irony of the radical nationalist tradition, and indeed of the Australian Settlement, was that it was not possible to sustain indefinitely the hope of building a new society on the basis of racial ‘purity’ and protection from the rest of the world. There were, of course, differences of opinion within Australian society about the British connection and the role of Australia in the British Empire. But each in its own way shunned difference for the sake of the new nation. Australia, however, has never lived in complete isolation. Like all societies, it has developed its own unique aspects, as one would only expect. But its ideas, institutions, literature and culture are all derivative to some extent. As the Menzies era drew to a close, the challenge was to discover what it meant to be Australian while remaining connected internationally. For Australian Anglicans, this would involve entering

126 Cf. Wilkes, *The Stockyard and the Croquet Lawn*, 45: ‘What has been taken as a democratic tradition is more probably the expression of a tribal solidarity by the workforce of the outback … The structure of the tribal group is hierarchic’.

127 The ‘typical’ Australian of the legend was not typical at all. Hodge and Mishra, *Dark Side of the Dream*, xv, regard an optimistic estimate as no more than fifteen per cent of the population. Cf. Geoffrey Serle, ‘The Digger Tradition and Australian Nationalism’, *Meanjin Quarterly* 24 (2) (1965): 150: ‘[I]t may be argued that the nationalists – those who felt their first loyalty to Australia and not to Britain or the Empire – amounted to little more than a fairly small minority movement involving some of the native-born, Irish Australians and the working-class … Most Australians – migrants and their children – were still basically colonial in outlook [and] looked primarily still to the mother-country’.

128 Consider, for example, the prevalence of these themes, along with multiculturalism, in the speeches of highly respected Governor General, Sir William Deane. See Tony Stephens, *Sir William Deane: The Things That Matter* (Sydney: Hodder, 2000).


130 Serle, *From Deserts the Prophets Come*, 230, writes: ‘In a sense nearly all Australian literature and culture is an extension of European civilization (bar American influences). Forms and techniques are nearly all internationally derived’. He goes on to talk about how these have interacted with the experience of living in a new land. Walker, *Dream and Disillusion*, 209-211, discusses the debate between Michael Roe and Russel Ward over ‘the degree of Australian indebtedness to European ideas’. He concludes that even ‘the strength of national sentiment among radical nationalists was intimately related to the strength or otherwise of radical dissent within English society’. David Frost argues that ‘Australia’ can only really be understood through comparison with its British and American counterparts. ‘On Finding “Australia”: Mirages, Mythic Images, Historical Circumstances’, *Australian Literary Studies* 12 (4) (October 1986): 498. See also Shirley Hazzard’s presentation of these themes in her 1984 Boyer Lectures, *Coming of Age in Australia* (Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 1985).

131 Brian Head calls for ‘an intelligent middle ground’ between those who argue for distinctiveness and discontinuity, and those who argue for continuity with our British and European heritage. ‘Introduction: Intellectuals in Australian Society’, in *Intellectual Movements and Australian Society*, ed. Brian Head and James Walter (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1988), 11-12; also Shaw,
uncharted waters as the ties that bound Australia to England became increasingly loosened, misty and irrelevant.\textsuperscript{132}

**THE AGE OF UNCERTAINTY**

The collapse of the British Empire brought unforeseen cultural consequences for Australia. For a start, it was no longer possible to sustain the enclosed, homogeneous world of White Australia.\textsuperscript{133} The term ‘multiculturalism’ entered the language, quickly replacing the myth of ‘mono-identity’ that had prevailed since Federation.\textsuperscript{134} In 1967, Australians accepted a referendum proposal to allow indigenous Australians to be included as citizens for the first time since Federation. In the 1960s Asian cultures also began to be accepted in a way not previously imagined. The ‘tyranny of distance’, as Geoffrey Blainey had so aptly described it, was shrinking. Jet travel and satellite communication were making the rest of the world more accessible, sweeping away the assumptions of a ‘more isolated era’.\textsuperscript{135} In the decades ahead, globalisation would force Australia to become part of the world, representing a complete reversal of the protectionist policies of the Australian Settlement era.

Previously Britishness had provided Australians with a sense of common identity. Now Australia moved forward into an uncertain future, without the familiar signposts to guide the way.\textsuperscript{136} The term ‘national identity’ began to be used in the

\textsuperscript{132} Geoffrey Blainey, *The Tyranny of Distance: How Distance Shaped Australia’s History*. Rev. edn. (Melbourne: Sun Books, 1983), 336-337: ‘Much of our history has been shaped by the contradiction that we depended intimately and comprehensively on a country which was further away than almost any other country in the world. Now the dependence had faded’.

\textsuperscript{133} Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace*, 243, argues that the White Australia policy lasted as long as it did ‘because of the extraordinary resilience of the British civic myth on which it was based’.

\textsuperscript{134} Richard Nile, *Australian Civilisation*, ix-x, uses the term ‘uncontested mono-identity’ to describe the hidden assumptions in Coleman’s 1962 book, *Australian Civilization*. Nile rejects the idea of a ‘master-narrative’, proposing instead an acknowledgment of Australia as a plural society. In comparing the two books of similar title edited by Coleman (1962) and Nile (1994), Melleuish, ‘Narrow Horizons’, 54-56, notes the absence from the later book of a range of important themes: science, education, the media, religion, business and commerce, architecture and the arts. Somewhat ironically, he regards Nile’s book as less pluralistic than the earlier volume. ‘In reality its pluralism is that of political correctness’.

\textsuperscript{135} Blainey, *The Tyranny of Distance*, 333-343. There is, of course, an interesting correlation between distance and the basic presuppositions of the Australian Settlement. See also Elaine Thompson, ‘Cringers’, in Nile, *Australian Civilisation*, 194-195.

\textsuperscript{136} Curran, ‘The “Thin Dividing Line”’, 471-472, argues that neither the British myth nor the bush myth were able to provide the nation with a sense of common purpose or identity.
1970s. By 1981, Richard White described the quest for an Australian identity as a national obsession. Thereafter a shift took place, from focus on a single Australian identity to the recognition of plural identities. At the time of the Bicentennial in 1988, there was no clear idea of ‘the nation’. The difficulty was portraying a sense of national unity in the midst of competing versions of Australian identity. The celebration of cultural diversity conflicted with the views of those who still believed in a British Australia, while indigenous Australians refused to see the founding moment of Australia in 1788 as anything other than an invasion. The Bicentennial presented Australians with a different picture of the nation from the one operating during the years of the Australian Settlement. In Graeme Turner’s view, it ‘leaked alternative possibilities’ for genuine unity, for reconciliation and for embracing issues of justice and equity, but these were rarely taken up.

By now national history was being rewritten from a wide range of perspectives, reflecting differences of race, gender and sexuality in the Australian community. Indigenous Australians wrote about their dispossession, forcing the nation to take Aboriginal history and culture seriously in a new and profound way. For many writers, an acknowledgment of diversity rather than homogeneity was seen to hold the key to the future. There were, it was argued, many ways of being Australian. Hudson and Bolton used the term ‘multiple identities’ to describe this pluralistic approach to Australian identity. ‘Old stereotypes of Australian identity will no longer serve’, they argued. ‘Admitting multiple identities undermines monolithic notions of

---

139 Andrew Taylor argues that, beginning in the 1960s, a (largely unconscious) ‘retreat from the psychological and political imperative of an essential Australianness’ began to take place. The search for an Australian character began to give way to perceptions of a plural Australia. Andrew Taylor, “From Sea to Air: The Impact of Jet Travel on Australia’s “Australia””, in *The Making of a Pluralist Australia 1950-1990*, ed. Werner Senn and Giovanna Capone (Berne: Peter Lang, 1992), 14.
141 ibid., 92. Cf. Stephen Castles et al., *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*, 3rd edn. (Sydney: Pluto Press, 1992), 148: ‘The Bicentenary could have been an occasion for celebration. The opportunity was thrown away by Australian political leaders’ unwillingness to face up to the real issues and problems. Once the decision was taken to ignore Aboriginal demands for real expiation, the Bicentenary became a lost cause. It changed from something with potential social meaning to a public relations exercise’.
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what we mean by “Australia”. From this perspective, each individual was seen to relate to a variety of different cultural traditions, even within the context of a single family. ‘Hybridity’ was now regarded as a normal part of contemporary Australian experience.\(^{144}\)

The atmosphere of postmodernism was making its presence felt in Australian life. In 1981 Richard White had redirected the debate about Australian identity when he wrote, ‘There was no moment when, for the first time, Australia was seen “as it really was”’. There is no “real Australia” waiting to be uncovered. A national identity is an invention’. To further complicate the matter, White went on to argue that, because each ‘invention’ is an intellectual construct, they are all equally ‘true’, because all are ‘necessarily false’.\(^{145}\) Inevitable criticisms have been made of the cultural relativism of writers like White and Donald Horne.\(^{146}\) What sense, for example, can we make of the nation if it is just a collection of multiple

---

\(^{143}\) Hudson and Bolton, *Creating Australia*, 2-3. Greg Melleuish makes the same point regarding Australian culture. ‘There is no such simple thing called “culture” or “Australian culture”; there is only a multiplicity of cultural traditions. Every individual is the heir of a number of such traditions’. ‘Beyond Inventing Australia: Cultural History in the 1990s’, *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 59-60 (August/November 1989): 65.


\(^{145}\) White, *Inventing Australia*, viii. Historian K.S. Inglis comments: ‘Necessarily false and neither true nor false? White does not resolve this confusion’. K. S. Inglis, *Observing Australia 1959 to 1999* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1999), 196. In a later essay, White qualified what he had written in 1981, explaining that he was really referring to ‘multiple identities’. ‘If the idea of “Australia” is an invention’, he wrote, ‘an active and creative process rather than something that has a prior existence and simply needs to be discovered, then it follows that it will be invented and embroidered in different ways by different people for different reasons’. White, *Inventing Australia revisited*, 13, 17.

\(^{146}\) Donald Horne, *Ideas for A Nation*, 11, claims that ‘objectively, existence is meaningless’. We create reality, or different versions of it, in our imaginations. Miriam Dixson, *The Imaginary Australian*, 20-21, 128-138, questions why ‘imaginary’ must necessarily mean false or contrived. She discusses the influence of Lacan on contemporary writers and theorists. She wonders why the word ‘invented’ should mean ‘wholly invented’. She believes that Horne ‘overstates the role of intellectuals in “inventing” or “constructing” nation-ness and national identity’. Rather, with Anthony Smith, she insists that intellectuals have ‘rediscovered’ rather than ‘invented’ national identity (37). Greg Melleuish, *Cultural Liberalism in Australia*, 7-12, opposes the view that the important thing about ideas is their function, not whether they are true or false. He argues that culture is really about ‘purposeful human activity’ rather than the product of ‘whim and fancy’. For White’s rejoinder to Melleuish, see ‘Inventing Australia revisited’, 16. See also Melleuish’s critique of Horne’s approach in ‘Donald Horne and the Idea of a Public Culture’, *Quadrant* 36 (6) (June 1992): 46-52. In Melleuish’s view, Horne provides no way of deciding between competing ‘myths’. He concludes the article by comparing Horne to his friend James McAuley, who argued that genuine rationality flourishes ‘when it is rooted in the solid ground of faith’.
subjectivities? In many ways the debate about Australia has been plunged into a sea of uncertainty. As Jeff Archer writes:

[W]e must ask whether national identities are merely ammunition for rival ideological certainties, or utopian quests for authenticity, or webs of postmodern and postcolonial textual interpretation. If any of these characterisations are true, then we can trust no version of national or cultural unity.

On one level this debate has taken place within the ranks of Australian intellectuals. But it was not limited to the ivory towers of academia. John Howard’s attack on the ‘black armband’ view of Australian history, building on the views earlier espoused by historian Geofffrey Blainey, lifted the debate out of the universities and into the media spotlight, where it remains to this day. The Howard government’s response to issues like Mabo and Wik reflected this tension between competing interpretations of Australian history. The rise and fall of the One Nation Party under Pauline Hanson was also a living example of interpretative tensions within the Australian community. Historical memory can certainly be awkward and contradictory.

---

147 On the issue of subjectivity and multiple identities, see Joy Damousi, ‘Multiple political identities’, in Hudson and Bolton, Creating Australia, 79-85.


151 Both Paul Keating and Pauline Hanson used the term ‘one nation’, but in completely different senses. In the process the very meaning of the word ‘Australia’ was being contested. See Ralph Humphries, ‘The Two “One Nations” and the Question of Australia, Journal of Australian Studies (1999): 30-34, 241. Paul Kelly, Paradise Divided: The Changes, the Challenges, the Choices for Australia (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2000), 142-143, describes One Nation as a ‘throwback’, with its focus on ‘isolation and xenophobia’. He sees Hanson as a reaction against the ‘political revolution’ taking place in Australia following the demise of the Australian Settlement (148), expressed as ‘a synthesis between economic protection and monoculturalism’ (151). See also Michael Leach, ‘Hansonism, Political Discourse and Australian Identity’, in The Rise and Fall of One Nation, ed. Michael Leach et al. (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 2000), 42-56.

152 See John Murphy, ‘Conscripting the Past: The Bicentenary and Everyday Life’. Australian Historical Studies 23 (91) (October 1988): 47.
When the narrative of the nation is contested, uncertainty and anxiety are the natural consequences.\(^{153}\)

Whether this should result in fragmentation is the critical issue. As Bruce Bennett writes: ‘The underlying question is whether a new pluralist conception of Australia, associated with a multiplication of myths, is leading to a breakdown of a sense of community or a reformulation of it’.\(^{155}\) What, then, holds the nation together? Is it an Anglo-Celtic ethnic core, as Miriam Dixson asserts?\(^{156}\) Is it the ‘civic faith’ espoused by Donald Horne?\(^{157}\) Is it a sense of tolerance that effectively neutralises difference by declaring everything to be of equal value?\(^{158}\) In a sense, all these solutions are veiled attempts at a new form of homogeneity. This may be unavoidable; perhaps diversity is only possible within an overall framework of stability. But who determines the framework? I would argue that the story of Australia must include the ‘dark side of the dream’; the legacy of White Australia cannot and must not simply be laid aside.\(^{159}\) Following Desmond Tutu’s example in South Africa, truth-telling must be the basis of exploring both the past and the future of Australia. On the other hand, it would be unrealistic and falsely utopian to dismiss the positive aspects of Australia’s British heritage, without which Australian democracy as we know it would not exist. This means that all aspects of Australia’s diversity must be regarded as part of the story. In such a situation, contestation is

\(^{153}\) Graeme Turner, \textit{Making It National}, 10, cites Philip Schlesinger: ‘National cultures are not simple repositories of shared symbols to which the entire population stands in identical relation. Rather, they are to be approached as sites of contestation in which competition over definitions takes place’.

\(^{154}\) In the case of Pauline Hanson and One Nation, this anxiety was experienced as a sense of abandonment. See Geoffrey Stokes, ‘One Nation and Australian Populism’, in Leach, \textit{The Rise and Fall of One Nation}, 33; also James Jupp, ‘An Anxious Society Fears the Worst’, \textit{Journal of Australian Studies} 54-55 (1997): 1-11. Suvendrini Perera, ‘The level playing field: Hansonism, globalisation, racism’, \textit{Race and Class} (1998), 205, describes Hansonism’s ‘most frightening characteristic’ as the ability ‘to enlist a range of discourses and representations that resonate with Anglo-Australia’s historical as well as current anxieties’. Melleuish, \textit{The Packaging of Australia}, 50-51, argues that, in the wake of the demise of the Australian Settlement, the ‘proliferation of packages has been one of the dominating characteristics of the age of uncertainty’. See also Hugh Mackay’s discussion of the ‘age of anxiety’ in \textit{Reinventing Australia: The Mind and Mood of Australia in the 90s}. Rev. edn. (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1993).

\(^{155}\) Bruce Bennett, ‘Myth’, in Nile, \textit{Australian Civilisation}, 60.

\(^{156}\) Dixson, \textit{The Imaginary Australian}.

\(^{157}\) For example, Horne has commented: ‘[W]e have a chance to show the world a tolerant nation-state in which there is no ethnic definition of nationality. Instead there could be a civic definition of an Australian’. See Hudson and Carter, \textit{The Republicanism Debate}, 218.

\(^{158}\) See Curthoys, ‘History and Identity’, 34-35; also Kelly, \textit{Paradise Divided}, 54-56.

\(^{159}\) In 1968 W.E.H. Stanner wrote about ‘the great Australian silence’ in his Boyer Lectures, \textit{After the Dreaming} (Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Commission, 1969). Historians like Henry Reynolds have subsequently rewritten Australian history in terms that have accommodated the Aboriginal experience.
unavoidable, though it need not necessarily lead to fragmentation. What is required is a vision of ‘comprehensiveness’, a ‘mystical’ *via media* capable of penetrating beneath competing systems to discern the divine order at work within the life of the nation. Such a perspective is clearly not just political; it is theological and ecclesial.

It is at this point that I wish to reintroduce the Anglican presence in Australian society. Throughout this section, it has been waiting in the wings. As Frame points out, the collapse of the Australian Settlement era led to the marginalisation of Anglicanism and its own feelings of anxiety. It was certainly ill prepared to deal with the complexity of contemporary Australia in which it was only one voice amongst many. Ironically, this may be a blessing in disguise, for as an equal player Anglicanism has every right to enter the ‘broad debate about the kind of nation Australia can and ought to be’. Many questions, both theological and ethical, need to be asked, and answers need to be given. Australia needs to be regarded as a ‘moral community’, and relationship, rather than fragmentation, needs to be seen as the norm. Anglicanism can, and must, contribute to this conversation from its own unique perspective as a mediating tradition. It need not feel reticent, because a precedent has already been set by none other than historian Manning Clark. It is instructive to reflect on his life and work, especially his long quest to understand Australia without ever really letting go of his theological (Anglican) roots. It can be argued that his six volume work, *A History of Australia* was an intuitive expression of the ‘mystical’ *via media*, an attempt at a theological interpretation of Australia.

**THE ENIGMA OF MANNING CLARK**

Earlier in this study I noted Bruce Kaye’s considered opinion about the failure of Anglicanism in Australia to offer any more than a ‘thin’ theological account of Australian society. By default, Kaye argues, this has been left to other Australian voices such as historian Manning Clark. While Kaye is critical of Clark’s account,
he also acknowledges the challenges Clark’s thought presents to those endeavouring to reflect theologically on the Australian experience.\textsuperscript{164} The themes of faith and unbelief permeate his work. He tells the tragic story of how European religion was not able to survive in this new land, and of how Australia ended up as a ‘Kingdom of Nothingness’.

The first volume of Clark’s \textit{History of Australia} appeared in 1962, the year of the Anglican national constitution. There is something ironical about this. On the one hand, Anglicanism in Australia was trying to chart a new course into the future, while on the other, one of Australia’s leading historians was about to tell the Australian people that Anglicanism in Australia was no longer relevant. Clark wanted to write about the conflict present in Australian society from the beginning of European settlement.

I suddenly realised … that there was a story to tell – a story about the coming of a great civilization, a civilization which had produced Bach’s Mass in B Minor, to an ancient, barbaric continent, and what that continent did to that civilization and its people, and what those people did to each other. I wanted to tell the story of how three quite different visions of the nature of God and man – Catholic Christendom, Protestant Christianity, and the Enlightenment – confronted each other in Australia.\textsuperscript{165}

All three visions appear in the first chapter of the first volume of his history. But it soon becomes apparent that Protestantism is the villain in the piece. I have already highlighted Clark’s intense dislike of Protestantism, by which he meant the Anglicanism that shaped his childhood and haunted him for the remainder of his life.\textsuperscript{166} It was a subject, he wrote late in life, which ‘made a man tremble with rage and indignation’.\textsuperscript{167} He rejected entirely the faith of his upbringing, but the ‘quest for grace’ continued. Clark could not decide between Catholicism and the

\textsuperscript{164} See Bruce N. Kaye, ‘Manning Clark’s Interpretation of Religion in Australia’. In Withycombe, \textit{Australian and New Zealand Religious History 1788-1988}, 93-95.

\textsuperscript{165} Clark, \textit{A Discovery of Australia}, 47.

\textsuperscript{166} The formative influence of Anglicanism on Clark was a central theme of his autobiographical work, \textit{The Puzzles of Childhood} (Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1989). For specific instances of the equation of Protestantism with Anglicanism in Clark’s writings, see, for example, ‘Rewriting Australian History’ in Clark, \textit{Occasional Writings and Speeches}, 8-9; also ‘Faith’, in Coleman, \textit{Australian Civilization}, 81.

\textsuperscript{167} Manning Clark, \textit{A Historian’s Apprenticeship} (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1992), 74.
Enlightenment. Both dreamed of ‘the perfectibility of man’, the one placing it in the life of the world to come, and the other placing it in the here and now. ‘I will go on wanting the Marxists to discover the image of Christ’, he wrote, ‘and the Catholics to see the need to destroy our corrupt society, that being the essential condition for us all if we are to have life and have it more abundantly.’ The tension remained unresolved. Where did the answer lie? Clark often commented on the words of Ivan Karamazov: ‘I want to be there when everyone suddenly understands what it’s all been for. All the religions of the world are based on this longing, and I am a believer’. He saw his life as a ‘pilgrimage’, a search for understanding. Above all, he wanted to understand Australia.

Clark’s rejection of Protestantism became interwoven with his attitude to Britain. As he grew older, he moved progressively towards the radical nationalist end of the spectrum. He saw the presence of ‘Englishmanism’ in Australia as an anachronism. ‘They were a group of people’, he wrote, ‘who had lost their way. They were like a boat which had once ridden proudly on the bosom of the great river of life but had drifted into a billabong’.

In his poem, ‘Song of the Republic’, Henry Lawson had distinguished between ‘the Old Dead Tree and the Young Tree Green’. Clark chose the latter, embracing the spiritual quest of Lawson and Furphy, and the dream that it might be possible to build a better world based on egalitarianism and mateship. This was something, Clark believed, that champions of the Old World

---


171 See Clark, ‘What Newman Means to Me’, in *Speaking Out of Turn*, ibid., 199; also Clark, *The Quest for Grace*, 221. The last sentence of the book reads: ‘I have not reached that level of understanding, but during the long quest I experienced moments of grace’.

172 Clark, *The Quest for Grace*, 140-141. Clark used the same imagery in 1979 when presenting the James Duhig memorial lecture at the University of Queensland. See ‘The Quest for an Australian Identity’, 230.

173 This is the title Clark chose for Volume 6 of *A History of Australia*.


like William Grant Broughton could never understand. Broughton’s Anglicanism represented all that stood in the way of the Australian dream.

But there was something else as well. Like Vance Palmer, Clark became increasingly disillusioned with the widespread Australian preoccupation with bourgeois values. It was as though Clark lived on the edge of despair as he looked around at the spectacle Australia had become. As he wrote on the last page of his long history of Australia:

Of all the dreams of those Europeans of what Australia might be – the south land of the Holy Spirit, or the land where the great dream of the Enlightenment would be fulfilled, or the land where blood would never stain the wattle, or a new Britannia in another world – all that seemed to survive was the idea of Australia as a place of “uncommonly large profit”. History has blurred the vision of Eden, allowing Mammon to infest the land. A turbulent emptiness seized the people as they moved into a post-Christian, post-Enlightenment era. No one any longer knew the direction of the river of life. No one had anything to say.  

Clark, it seems, was plagued by the decline of faith and the loss of the dream of human perfectibility. Even so, in the final paragraph of his history he appealed to the prophets ‘to tell the story of what might be’. He believed that his history had cleared the way for the ‘enlargers of life’. There was still a chance that it might all be true.

Manning Clark is an enigmatic figure, not just for Australian historians, but also for the Anglican community he rejected. His life was a prolonged spiritual crisis. ‘He was a non-believer who wanted to believe’, writes Stephen Holt. ‘He did not know if it were possible to live without God’. Holt sees him as a person ‘torn between

---

177 Manning Clark, A History of Australia VI, 500. Cf. Clark, ‘Australia: Whose Country Is It?’ in Speaking Out of Turn, 143. See also Clark, A Short History of Australia. 4th rev. edn. (Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1995), 327: ‘Mammon had won: Mammon had infected the ancient continent of Australia. The dreams of humanity had ended in an age of ruins’. His first edition had ended on similar lines (299): [W]as this generation, stripped bare of all faith, to be left comfortless on Bondi Beach?’
178 Clark made the comment in 1967 that he could not imagine anyone ‘writing any history of stature who has not been touched by the death of God’ or by the revolution of 1917. See Clark, ‘The Writing of History’, in Clark, Speaking Out of Turn, 74-75.
179 Clark, A History of Australia VI, 500.
180 Stephen Holt, A Short History of Manning Clark (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1999), 18.
rival versions of salvation’, but also desperately afraid that Alexis de Tocqueville might be right: that mass society might collapse into spiritual mediocrity and conformity. At the end of the day, writes Holt, the only discovery he had to offer was his own unbelief. John Carroll regards him as a Puritan who has lost his faith. He searches for a replacement to his childhood faith, says Carroll, but finally has to turn despair itself into an ideal. Patrick O’Farrell makes a similar comment. Referring to the final volume of Clark’s A History of Australia, published in 1987, O’Farrell writes: ‘Prodigious achievement that it was, this masterwork remains a highly idiosyncratic testament from a once dominant Protestant elite, lamenting its own demise, and taken up with its own present confusions and torments’. It seems that Clark could not entirely detach himself from his cultural and religious past.

As far back as 1962, Clark expressed surprise that Protestantism had survived ‘long after the historical forces it served disappeared’. This did not alter his dismissal of his Anglican past, or cause him to ask whether the Anglican tradition was capable of a new direction. Clark, in fact, had a narrow understanding of Anglicanism. Melleuish’s description of Clark as ‘an evangelical historian who hated Evangelicals’ points to Clark’s Anglican blind spot. He was not versed sufficiently in other branches of Anglicanism. Yet, as Bruce Wearne has argued in an insightful article, there was, in fact, something remarkably Anglican about Clark’s quest for a *via media* between Catholicism and the Enlightenment. In Wearne’s view, Clark’s ‘adoption of the historical classification of “narrowers and straighteners” versus liberty has echoes of “broad church” tolerationism’.

It may be that Clark was instinctively feeling after a ‘mystical’ *via media*, searching for a broader expression of Anglican faith than he had thus far encountered. He could

---

181 ibid., 23.
182 ibid., 29.
183 ibid., 52-53.
186 Clark, ‘Faith’, 80.
not achieve this because he had no knowledge of the revolution taking place within worldwide Anglicanism or the radical implications of Article 34. He mentions Bishop Burgmann only once in the final volume of his history, hinting at a more radical way of being Anglican, but unable to pick up the clues. In this sense he was quite right to pass the baton, at the end of his massive work, from the historians to the prophets.

This generation has a chance to be wiser than previous generations. They can make their own history. With the end of the domination by the straiteners, the enlargers of life now have their chance. They have the chance to lavish on each other the love the previous generations had given to God, and to bestow on the here and now the hopes and dreams they had once entertained for some future human harmony. It is the task of the historian and the myth-maker to tell the story of how the world came to be as it is. It is the task of the prophet to tell the story of what might be. The historian presents the choice: history is a book of wisdom for those making that choice.

Bruce Kaye argues that ‘a more rigorous scholarship of Australia’s religious history’ is required than that provided by Clark. As we have seen, Kaye has led by example through his writings on Anglicanism and Australian society. Nevertheless, Clark has courageously presented us with a ‘theological’ interpretation of Australia perhaps only matched by fellow historian Patrick O’Farrell. His work, as Ian Turner has recognised, is a quest for reconciliation between the two great faiths of Australian history, ‘two tremendous Utopias – the Enlightenment, as expressed in the Communist Manifesto, and the Apostles’ Creed. He held them in tension, searching unsuccessfully for a resolution between them. He refused compromise,

---

189 Clark, *A History of Australia VI*, 467. ‘Bishop E.H. Burgmann of Goulburn’, Clark writes, ‘said a political system which feared public criticism had no healthy future’. Earlier in the paragraph, Clark refers to ‘some writers and clergymen who believed Christ, if He were to come back to earth, would be on the side of the people’.

190 *ibid.*, 500.

191 Kaye, ‘Manning Clark’s Interpretation of Australian Religion’, 110.

192 Mark Hutchinson, ‘Manning Clark and the Limits of Prophet-ability’, *Lucas: An Evangelical History Review* 4 (September 1988): 28-36, argues that Clark’s work is humanist, not Christian. This is similar to the criticism by Bollen et. al., ‘Australian Religious History’, 29, that those who find a ‘religious’ quality in Clark’s work fail to understand what religion is about. I do not dispute these claims. I am saying, however, that there is an unresolved ‘theological’ aspect to Clark’s humanism. He is an unconvincing humanist in the end and was never reconciled to the death of God.

193 Turner also notes that the theme of redemption is central to Clark’s thought. See Turner, *Room for Manoeuvre*, 230-231. Clark’s comments can be found in ‘Rewriting Australian History’, 7. Shaw, ‘A Sentimental Humanist’, argues that ‘Clark’s bid for a reconciliation fell apart’, although he continued to hope against hope to the end.
choosing instead to live with the contradiction. Clark lived in hope for a better world, but could not find within the religion of his childhood any way of engaging with the issues which drove his lifelong quest for grace. It may be that a more prophetic and socially engaged form of Anglicanism – a mediating theology, we might say – might have enabled Clark to bridge ‘the great gap between God’s world and man’s world’\(^ {194} \) which plagued him throughout his life.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter has, in a sense, been a ground-clearing exercise: exploring some of the main currents of Australian life, those forces that have shaped Australian society since the beginning of European settlement. We have caught a glimpse of the pervading ethos of the Australian Settlement, which continues to shape the lives of many Australians, not least of all Anglican Australians, many of whom continue to cast one eye towards Britain. The counter-current coming through the bush tradition struggled to articulate what it means to be Australian while holding on firmly to the prevailing assumptions of White Australia. The hidden presuppositions of a colonial culture remained, even while Australia moved forward as a new nation. The voices of Aboriginal Australians remained silent until the myth of homogeneity became impossible to sustain. Even after achieving citizenship they discovered that white Australians were reluctant to acknowledge that they too belonged to this nation continent. This battle to articulate an Australian identity lives on in the present, even while cultural diversity has been on the increase. To a large extent the debate is controlled by whichever government is in office at any one time, but the contest remains, even while unresolved tensions continue to simmer beneath the surface. So how is the contest resolved? How are reconciliation and unity achieved? This is the challenge confronting the Anglican tradition in Australia, which arrived under the banner of privilege and now finds itself at a crossroad: whether to seek self-preservation or to seek to be a mediating presence in the life of the nation. If so, the work of digging must begin; of assessing the principles and values underlying competing visions within Australian life, and offering careful theological leadership. There is, I would argue, another way of interpreting Australia. It cannot be done without a theology. Humanism is not enough, even though the human quest for a

---

\(^ {194} \) Clark, ‘A Long Time Ago’, 82.
better world needs to be included. It must be post-colonial, letting go of the divisions and vested interests of empire for the sake of a more overtly pluralistic world full of contested meanings. It requires an imaginative comprehensiveness, an ability to embrace and hold together a wide range of imaginings while presenting a vision for the future. It needs to be a mediating tradition with a prophetic sense of justice and an innate inclusiveness. It will offer a new vision of national identity, with both democratic, multicultural and environmental sensitivities, an appreciation of what is Australian while preserving its British and European heritage, and, above all, a genuine sense of a spiritual calling or vocation within the family of nations. It will emerge out of a more creative via media than has previously been attempted, as Anglicans reflect on both their religious tradition as well as their strong sense of Australian belonging. It is a dream, of course, an interpretation of a church and a nation worth reaching for. It is not a fabrication, a mere flight of the imagination, although it is, I would contend, a form of imagining. Imagining does not necessarily lead to relativism. It can be transformative.

Manning Clark, in his own idiosyncratic way, presented the history of Australia as a story of unrealised dreams. His critics have been quick to dismiss his vision as eccentric or historically suspect. What interests me about Manning Clark was his lifelong struggle with Anglicanism. He jettisoned it without ever letting it go. He preached the death of God without letting go of God. He preached the ‘perfectibility of man’ while accepting that all human strivings are inevitably flawed. He saw all around him a Kingdom of Nothingness, but had nothing to offer to fill the void. Had he looked back at the baggage clinging so annoyingly to him from his Anglican past he may have discovered a thread of hope; he may have seen a glimmer of possibility. He may also have offered both church and society another way of uniting the nation he loved, without dispensing entirely with the God of his ancestors. Yet, in a sense, what he offered was sufficient. When combined with the views of other visionaries like E.H. Burgmann, there is more than enough to go on.

195 Compare with the description of ‘the most desirable national identities’ presented by Jupp, ‘Identity’, 91.
196 See Humphrey McQueen’s sustained discussion of these issues, in Suspect History: Manning Clark and the Future of Australia’s Past (Kent Town, SA: Wakefield Press, 1997).
197 Clark was, of course, a descendant of Samuel Marsden, the ‘flogging parson’.
It is time for a meeting to take place between the Broad Anglican tradition and the ongoing debate about Australia. Anglicanism belongs within the national conversation. Removed from that conversation, operating within an enclosed religious world, it cannot remain true to itself. Its theological and ecclesial resources really belong to the wider Australian community. It is only that context that enables the Anglican Church of Australia to be authentically Anglican. It must live with the tension of ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’. Only by embracing this tension can it be true to its vocation within the Australian nation.

As we have seen, religious communities in Australia are an integral part of the Australian story. Their struggles to ‘belong’ have been as much a part of the fabric of the Australian nation as any other. Anglicanism is one of those religious communities, transported from another time and place and seeking to find its way in a new land. To a large extent it has followed a path of fragmentation on its Australian journey. Even more striking, this has been accepted as a normal expression of what being Anglican means and stands for. Yet the opposite is the case. Australian Anglicans have a poor understanding of their own tradition. They are also unfamiliar with the revolution that has been taking place at an international level in the Anglican Communion. Manning Clark’s ignorance of the Anglican tradition was no different from that of many other Australian Anglicans. What set him apart from his contemporary Anglicans (lapsed or otherwise) was an instinct about the spiritual roots of the Australian nation, as well as the sort of spirituality required to move the nation down a path of authenticity. He wanted to bring together the sacred and the secular, believing that somehow they were dealing with the same reality, but he did not know how. He had spent restless nights with the radical Newman, but he was not conversant with the thought of F.D. Maurice. He had not encountered the ‘mystical’ via media.

In the remainder of this study, I will explore the possibility that the Anglican tradition, while battling its own demons and desperately endeavouring to come to terms with this new land, contains within itself the resources of wisdom and experience to become a mediating tradition in the life of the nation. This will involve some tensions, for, as we have seen, Anglicanism relates to its host society with both a sense of ‘belonging’ and of ‘not belonging’. Inculturation requires nothing less than
the willingness to struggle with that tension for the sake of the nation. Anglicanism is, after all, a ‘church in society’ tradition. It has the ability to adapt while preserving what is fundamental. Now that establishment has gone forever, Anglicanism in Australia cannot and must not try to settle comfortably into the social fabric as it did during the years of the Australian Settlement. Anglicanism is capable of a ‘mystical’ via media, a way of living creatively and prophetically as a church for the nation.

In the next chapter I will start to explore what it might mean for Anglicanism to accept its vocation as a mediating tradition. The nation, I will argue, must be seen first and foremost as a community, and an open community at that. There is no place for closed systems in the future Australia, at least from an Anglican perspective. I will also endeavour to analyse three ‘mythical’ areas of Australian life: the Anzac tradition, White Australia, and terra nullius. While officially the latter two no longer exist, it is clear that their influence lives on. They are particularly relevant to Australian Anglicanism, with its roots in England and its history of exclusivism and elitism. My purpose is to view the myths by which Australians make sense of their national life in the light of a broad Anglican vision of church and society. In particular, I will ask what, from an Anglican perspective, it means to be an Australian nation. Such questions are an integral part of the vocation of Anglicanism as it moves into the future as an equal participant in the life of the Australian nation.
CHAPTER 8 IN SEARCH OF THE NATION’S SOUL

As the previous chapter demonstrated, a debate about Australian identity has been going on for a long time in Australia. It began in a past era. For a time it operated in a protected world, a world of whiteness and sameness. Now it belongs to an era of international travel, global economics and the movement of displaced peoples. Australia is now culturally diverse and trying to find its way in a new world. The issue of Australian identity is still important, but this can no longer be debated apart from a broader vocational issue: not just what being Australian is, but what Australia stands for, ‘the kind of nation Australia can and ought to be’. Confronting this question requires ethical and spiritual sensitivities, and a willingness to let Australia’s religious traditions speak, perhaps as never before. Our particular focus in this study has been Anglicanism, with its heritage of broad theological and spiritual resources. The Anglican Church of Australia is, of course, battling with its own internal crisis, but this can only be dealt with by sharing the broader question of what it means to be Australian. It is an essential rather than peripheral question for Australian Anglicanism. Doctrinal differences are important, but so is the question of Australia’s future. The two go hand in hand.

Manning Clark’s instincts, then, were correct. The story of Australia is not just economic or political. It is not just about a battle between classes or races. There is a spiritual dimension that needs to be embraced rather than avoided. At various times throughout this study, this has been referred to as the nation’s ‘soul’. It has to do with the nation’s deepest aspirations, its hopes and dreams, as well as its tragedies and failures. It is the unspoken subtext of the Australian story. It has been manifested in a variety of ways throughout Australian history: in the first encounter with the ‘place’, this Antipodean land, its native inhabitants, flora and fauna; in the thrusting together of disparate British ‘tribes’, forced to inhabit the same geographical, political and spiritual space; in the attempt to create a new homogeneous nation and to hold it for a time, until global forces made the national experiment called ‘The
Commonwealth of Australia’ impossible to sustain without adjustment. The adjustment was the recognition of difference in a larger world. For many people, this has been a painful recognition, and an attempt has been made to blot out the changes, to return to an earlier, mythical time of comfortable sameness.

The Hanson phenomenon revealed a nation divided below the surface of things. Keating gave way to Howard. It was a battle of interpretations. Each party adopted the great Australian myths – Anzac, mateship, the nation of the ‘fair go’ – but applied them in different ways. The conversation is still in progress, but what is it really about? Is it about who we are, or what we might become? The utopian dreams of a century ago have not been realised. Meanwhile white Australia remains ambivalent, forced to share the nation, not only with indigenous Australians, but also with a variety of new arrivals. What, then, constitutes the ‘real’ Australia? How do we determine the way forward in a nation of such diversity? It is easier to pretend that a return to the simplicity of a former age is possible. But the world has moved on, and so must Australia. In many ways the real issue is how to deal with fragmentation. What holds a people together? This is, of course, a very political question. But it is also theological and ecclesial.

There are many perspectives on what constitutes a nation. In keeping with the theological insights of previous chapters, I wish to argue that a nation is above all a community; it is made for relationship, not fragmentation. Diversity within the life of a nation can be interpreted as a threat or it can be accepted and embraced. In short, political decisions will be based on how the ‘other’ is understood. To borrow an aphorism from Jeffrey Alexander’s remarkable book, *The Civil Sphere*, ‘brotherhood and otherhood must always exist side by side’.¹ The Australian Settlement adopted a strategy that promised maximum social cohesion (belonging) by minimising difference. Some of the strongest rhetoric on what constitutes the real Australia was formed in that era. The Anzac myth especially comes to mind, an extension of the bush legend later championed by the radical nationalists. I wish to discuss this central Australian myth, exploring, from an Anglican perspective, what it needs to be or to become. Another dimension of Australian life, already mentioned, is that of...

race, whether expressed as uniform (British) or pluriform (multicultural). This is a particular challenge for Anglicanism, with its strong British heritage. It is important for this theological tradition to enter the conversation about cultural diversity in Australia, and quite consciously to situate itself at the margins rather than at the centre of society where it is so easy to be Anglophile rather than Anglican. Only by this means will Anglicanism be true to its vocation as a national church. Finally, there is the myth of *terra nullius*, which presumably disappeared with the Mabo case, but in fact continues to shape the way ‘belonging’ is understood in Australia.

All these issues (nation, race and place) are both political and theological. It is important that they be channelled along the contour lines carved out by the Broad Anglican tradition. What perspectives can Anglicanism throw on these fundamental aspects of Australian life? How is the Australian nation to be understood? To whom does it belong, and what does it stand for? In responding to such questions as an Anglican Australian, I will assume, with Anglican thinkers from Hooker to Broughton to Kaye, that there is a place for Providence in the way Australia is understood. I will also embrace the belief, discussed already, that the divine purpose for creation (including Australia) is for reconciliation and unity rather than fragmentation and estrangement. The journey of Australia thus far has been a spiritual pilgrimage, but there is a long way to go. Kwok Pui-lan has reminded us that the painful journey beyond colonialism has only just begun. Theological astuteness is required; prophetic critique combined with healing engagement. This is the work of a mediating tradition. The Anglican Church of Australia is still discovering its vocation, and desperately needs to live into it, not just for its own sake, but for the sake of the Australian nation.

### NATION AND COMMUNITY

There is a strong precedent within the Anglican tradition for viewing a nation in organic terms. Earlier in this study, I traced a strand in Anglican thought reaching from Hooker through the likes of Coleridge, Maurice and Temple. The *via media* they espoused was not limited to doctrine, but included the whole society. It was essentially a vision of unity in which the political and spiritual aspects of society were seen to be interdependent, working together for the common good. The nation, in other words, was understood in communal terms, as an *ecclesia*. Maurice believed
in the essential relatedness of human and social life, regarding fragmentation as a distortion of the fundamental unity of the created order. We have noted Rowan Williams’ concerns about such an approach. He calls for greater discernment, for a more prophetic reading of social systems. Williams is right, of course. As William Temple discovered, nationalism can be destructive. There are times when the state must be opposed; when the morality of political systems must be challenged. Such moments arise when homogeneity is imposed; when minorities are excluded or oppressed; when (in Tillich’s terms), ‘beside-each-otherness gives way to against-each-otherness’. In keeping with Maurice’s remarkable intuition, the Kingdom of Christ is unitive rather than divisive. A nation is held together by relationships. This was also Tutu’s belief in South Africa when, having stood in opposition to the apartheid system, he then called for reconciliation between classes and races who had previously been estranged. Indeed, as contemporary writers like Colin Gunton have shown, once the Trinity is seen to be foundational to both divinity and humanity, an ecclesial understanding of society becomes possible without giving way to either extreme of homogeneity or fragmentation. Such a theological perspective also guards against unhealthy nationalism, either internally through forms of injustice and inequality, or externally through sealing the borders, as it were, becoming a defensive, closed society within an increasingly global community.

Such a theologically based approach to the nation is not inconsistent with the perspectives of more secular writers. For example, early in Benedict Anderson’s highly influential book on nationalism, *Imagined Communities*, the following statement appears: ‘[The nation] is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’. Anderson’s choice of words is interesting. At the very least, the word ‘communion’ in this statement conveys a common sense of belonging to a nation or community. For Anderson, this is a work of the creative imagination. The nation, while being a political entity, is also imagined into being by its members. This process of shared
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2 Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6 (author’s emphasis).
3 This insight has long been part of the Sociology of Knowledge. See, for example, the classic work by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, Books 1966), which distinguishes between society as objective and as subjective reality. See also Berger’s distinction in an earlier work
imagining is what binds the nation together, even between people who have never met each other. The word ‘communion’ is a strong word; in another context, it has sacral overtones. It certainly expresses more than simply some sense of civic participation; it is relational.\(^4\)

But there is a tension inherent in this sense of belonging and commitment. On the one hand, the nation provides individuals with a sense of personal identity; it is part of who we are.\(^5\) It has, as Miriam Dixson has written, ‘sources in the self which refuse to be denied’.\(^6\) At the same time, the nation is always subject to ideological distortion, especially when it becomes a means of enforcing a doctrine of ‘cultural purity’ over against difference.\(^7\) It can play on the emotions of its members, leading them into a way of thinking that is morally questionable. This is why any attempt to define national identity is insufficient in itself; it is also necessary to penetrate beneath this surface level to embrace the issue of national vocation – to articulate, in other words, not just what the nation is but also what it stands for. Thus, while being a key aspect of personal identity, the nation also requires careful critique lest it ask of its citizens what they should not, from a moral point of view, be required to give.

Ethical questions are paramount. Nations are, after all, ethical communities.\(^8\) This has to be the starting point. Too much blood has been shed in the name of nationalism to allow any nation to do whatever it likes within a global community.\(^9\) Citizens must be more astute. In David Miller’s view, if moral obligations are seen to begin and end at national borders, sentiment has been allowed to triumph over genuine morality. There is always some sense, he claims, in which ethics must break

---


\(^5\) Liah Greenfeld, ‘Nationalism and Modernity’, *Social Research* 63 (1) (1996): 10, regards national identity as the ‘fundamental identity’, defining ‘the very essence of the individual’. Ross Poole, *Nation and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1999), 16, holds a similar view: ‘The very means by which individuals form a conception of who they are defines them as members of a specific nation’. See also David Miller, *On Nationality* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 11: ‘[I]dentifying with a nation, feeling yourself inextricably part of it, is a legitimate way of understanding your place in the world’.

\(^6\) Dixson, *The Imaginary Australian*, 45.

\(^7\) Miller, *On Nationality*, 11. Nations are, he continues, ‘contour lines in the ethical landscape’. This insight is also central to the Broad Anglican tradition discussed in this study.

\(^8\) See Poole, *Nation and Identity*, 67.
through the confines of national identity to embrace humanity.\textsuperscript{10} What is at stake is the difference between open and closed societies, between healthy and unhealthy nationalism.\textsuperscript{11} The word ‘communion’ can be understood either exclusively or expansively. It all depends on how the boundaries are understood.

A geographical border is a boundary. So also is an exclusionary policy like White Australia, which defines who belongs and who doesn’t. Either way we are talking about forms of ‘imagining’ the nation. The question of boundaries is all about how a nation deals with the ‘other’, whether inside or outside its borders. As happened in Australia in the period after Federation, nations tend to exclude those who are different or to demand of them integration into the accepted way of life of the national majority.\textsuperscript{12} Zygmunt Bauman makes this point very well in an insightful essay, ‘The Making and Unmaking of Strangers’:

\begin{quote}
All societies produce strangers; but each kind of society produces its own kind of strangers, and produces them in its own inimitable way … While drawing its borders and charting its cognitive, aesthetic and moral maps, it cannot but gestate people who conceal borderlines deemed crucial to its orderly and/or meaningful life and so are accused of causing the discomfort …\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

But the ‘other’, according to Homi Bhabha, ‘is never outside or beyond us’, just as boundaries are always ‘in-between’.\textsuperscript{14} In recent decades Australia has been struggling towards this realisation. It is no longer possible to maintain the myths of monoculture in a world in which the boundaries both between and within nations are becoming increasingly fuzzy.\textsuperscript{15} The response to this awareness is the critical issue. In Bhabha’s view, ‘the boundary becomes the place from which something begins its

\textsuperscript{10} Miller \textit{On Nationality}, 12. Melleuish, ‘The Case for Civilization’, 156, argues along similar lines, distinguishing between ‘culture’, and ‘civilization’. The former, he argues, is more concerned with ‘a particular people in opposition to other peoples’, while the latter always tends towards universal values.

\textsuperscript{11} Melleuish, ibid., 158.

\textsuperscript{12} Ashcroft and Salter, ‘Australian Voices’, 74: ‘From its inception, nationalism fails to “fit” the dynamic range of experience present in a nation and must assert itself by continually excluding anything beyond its defined boundaries’.

\textsuperscript{13} Zygmunt Bauman, \textit{Postmodernity and its Discontents} (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 17. The stranger, Bauman argues (18), is either banished (excluded) or forced to become the same (assimilated). Either way the status quo remains unchallenged.

\textsuperscript{14} Homi Bhabha, ‘Introduction: narrating the nation’, in Bhabha, \textit{Nation and Narration}, 4. See also Bhabha, \textit{The Location of Culture}, 13.

presencing, a place of meeting rather than a line of separation. It is important to recognise that the impetus for excluding the ‘other’ comes from within the excluding group or nation, not from outside. Moreover, if the boundaries are tightly closed, so that interaction with otherness rarely takes place, the principle of exclusion will be based on ignorance. As Jeffrey Alexander writes, ‘It is more in response to untested beliefs, to fantasies, hopes, and fears that [people] place members of outsider groups at different points along the continuum of citizen and enemy’.

The views of Ghassan Hage are especially relevant at this point. He distinguishes between worrying and caring citizenship. The former he regards as ‘a form of symbolic violence over the field of national belonging’. It is the opposite of the spirit of care one might expect from a healthy society.

Societies are mechanisms for the distribution of hope, and … the kind of affective attachment (worrying or caring) that a society creates among its citizens is intimately connected to its capacity to distribute hope. The caring society is essentially an embracing society that generates hope among its citizens and induces them to care for it. The defensive society, such as the one we have in Australia today, suffers from a scarcity of hope and creates citizens who see threats everywhere. It generates worrying citizens and paranoid nationalism.

These issues remain a struggle for Australia. If Australian national identity can only be sustained through locking out difference, we are clearly at a crossroad in the nation’s history. The ghost of the White Australia policy continues to haunt us even while people move across the planet as never before. Greg Melleuish argues that there has been a long-standing conflict in Australia between the national and the universal. Australians, he writes, have preferred ‘to invest in their nationality at the expense of their humanity’. This surely goes to the heart of what a nation means and what it is for. It does not hurt to be aware of the difference between healthy and
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16 Bhabha, The Location of Culture, 5 (Bhabha’s emphasis).
17 ‘It is not the existence of a group per se, even if the associating it spawns is enthusiastic and face-to-face. It is whether the group is oriented to issues outside of itself, and whether in relation to these it displays a communicative intent’. Alexander, The Civil Sphere, 98-99.
18 ibid., 411.
19 ibid., 421.
20 Hage, Against Paranoid Nationalism, 6.
21 ibid., 2-3.
unhealthy nationalism. Does it lead to fragmentation, or to community? Even then, what sort of community are we talking about? Does ‘communion’ reflect a spirit of cultural defensiveness or of cross-cultural hospitality? 23 Clearly such questions are not just political; they are ethical and spiritual.

In terms of the Anglican vocation in Australian society, it may be worth noting Peter Sedgwick’s observation that ‘a common language of hope and penitence’ is central to the Anglican ethos, and that the Anglican presence in the life of the nation effectively provides symbols for limiting the propensity of nationalism to run away with itself.24 An Anglican approach to being Australian will not shrink from confronting issues like fear and hope, nor will it be afraid to call the nation to penitence if this is required. It will also take to heart Bhabha’s challenge about ‘presencing’ that takes place at the boundaries. Moreover, if some of those boundaries are found to exist within the life of the church itself, it will, if it is to be true to its vocation as a mediating tradition, accept the ethical and spiritual responsibility of getting its own house in order for the sake of the nation. It is all a question of integrity.

I am not denying that there may be national characteristics that distinguish one nation from another, provided these are regarded as contingent and subject to debate.25 Australians are no different from any other national group in focussing on the uniqueness of their homeland, their myths and memories, symbols and traditions, and the shared public culture with its legal rights and duties that provides them with a sense of mutual recognition.26 But there are problems that need to be faced. The idea of what is shared raises the question of who belongs and who is excluded from the nation, who is considered to be a worthy custodian of the myths and stories of the people, and, indeed, which stories belong to the nation’s canon of sacred memories.27

---

23 ‘The chance of human togetherness depends on the rights of the stranger, not on the question who – the state or the tribe – is entitled to decide who the strangers are’. Bauman, Postmodernity and its Discontents, 33.
25 Poole, Nation and Identity, 140. Cf. Alexander, The Civil Sphere, 38: ‘Justice is possible if there is civil solidarity, which itself depends on the vitality of a fluid and provocative moral discourse’.
27 Poole, Nation and Identity, 140-141: ‘The responsibility to come to terms with the Australian past is a morally inescapable component of what it is to be an Australian’.
Australian Anglicanism is part of this conversation. It shares the myths and stories of Australia, but it must also seek to appraise them in the light of Anglican faith, and perhaps even suggest alternative ways of understanding them. This is the work of a mediating tradition.

**NATIONAL MYTHS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

Myths are a central aspect of national identity. As Manning Clark once wrote in his own inimitable way: ‘Without myths, without beliefs, a people perishes, decays, disappears off the face of the earth’. Clark was reflecting on the importance of the great painters and writers who ‘place myths between themselves and death’, endeavouring to understand the meaning of life ‘in the ancient continent’. In a less dramatic though not dissimilar way, Anthony Smith sees myths and symbols as part of a nation’s quest for meaning. The willingness of people to sacrifice their lives for the sake of the nation comes out of a sense of emotional attachment to the nation that begins in childhood. To quote Ross Poole:

> We discover our nation – as we discover ourselves – in the bed-time stories we are told, the songs which put us to sleep, the games we play as children, the heroes we are taught to admire and the enemies we come to fear and detest. Our national identity comes to us in the language in which we learn to articulate our most primitive demands.

While the myths and stories of the nation may very well be full of inconsistencies and contradictions, they nevertheless play a central role in the life of the nation. They will always, of course, be interpreted in a variety of ways. They are forms of imagining, after all, reflecting a wide range of values and interests, often political. The need for open debate and discussion about the unifying myths of the nation is
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29 Manning Clark, ‘Myths of the Kingdom of Nothingness’, in *Speaking Out of Turn*, 123.
31 Poole, *Nation and Identity*, 104-105. Miriam Dixson, *The Imaginary Australian*, rejects the view that the process of ‘imagining’ the nation is a form of false consciousness, arguing instead that personal and national identity are interwoven, providing opportunities for integration and growth rather than fragmentation and illusion.
32 According to Miller, *National Identity*, 35-36, the purpose of national myths is to pass the national story from one generation to another and to extol the virtues of the nation’s ancestors.
33 Miller, ibid., 35, uses the phrase ‘artificial inventions’. One need only consider, for example, some of Australia’s central myths – the Eureka stockade, for example, or the limitless versions of the Ned Kelly story. See Chris Healy, *From the Ruins of Colonialism: History as Social Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), for a comprehensive discussion of the way Australian myths are shaped and reshaped according to historical circumstances.
apparent, including who has the right to interpret them and who is excluded from the conversation. Anglicanism needs to engage with Australia’s myths, which provide a kind of kaleidoscopic glimpse of the nation’s soul. In the remainder of this chapter, I will consider in turn three aspects of Australian mythology: the Anzac legend (nationalism), the myth of White Australia (race), and the myth of *terra nullius* (the land). They are all part of what Australia means. They both unify and divide. It is not possible to be Australian without being caught up in the way they are interpreted and handed down to the next generation. Australian Anglicanism is part of this process. It has, consciously or inadvertently as the case may be, benefited from the cultural assumptions we live by. It needs to understand and face these assumptions and to be an active participant in the way the future of Australia unfolds.

**The Spiritual Meaning of Anzac**

The Anzac legend must rank as the primary myth of Australian identity. ‘It is a myth’, writes Graham Seal, ‘but it is a necessary myth with which all Australians are required to have a relationship, positive or negative’. The presence of an increasing number of young people at the annual Anzac Day dawn service at Gallipoli is testimony to the power of this central Australian myth to shape generation after generation of Australians. What lies behind this intensity, what does the myth tell us about being Australian, and how should this powerful myth be evaluated? Moreover, what do we make of the deep religious overtones of the Anzac legend, and how should Anglicans respond?

According to E.M. Andrews, the Anzac legend created by its original author, C.E.W. Bean, was based on a ‘double myth’. Bean saw a direct correlation between the legend of the Australian bushman and the fighting qualities of the soldiers at Anzac Cove. This was the first layer of myth, which fitted uncomfortably with the second layer (also espoused by Bean): the idea that Australia and Britain shared a special relationship. The former had to do with Australian character; the latter served imperial interests. It was an artful creation, or illusion, depending on one’s point of
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34 Miller, ibid., 40.
37 Andrews, *The Anzac Illusion*, 60; also Seal, ibid., 1.
Either way, it suited all parties in one way or another. It did not seem to matter that the Gallipoli campaign was a disaster. In writing the official history of the war, the central question Bean and his colleagues sought to answer was this: how did the Australian people and character come through ‘their first great war’. Bean’s real interest was the distinctiveness of the Australian character and the development of Australian nationalism. In many ways he stood in the tradition leading from the Bulletin writers of the 1890s to the radical nationalists of the 1950s. But he was still an empire man, and he insisted that the Australian diggers were as well. For Bean, everything hinged on the twin myths of mateship and empire.

But the reality for the returned soldiers was more complex. It was hard for them to return home after the war, where there was little understanding of what they had been through. They had fought with a deep belief in brotherhood, but came back to a divided society. As it turned out, the war overpowered the left-wing radicalism of the bush legend, feeding the Anzac myth into the hands of the conservatives. On the surface of things, it appeared that Anzac was really about the qualities of the real Australian. In reality, according to Bill Gammage, ‘the Anzac tradition derived its impetus from a sense of national insecurity, its strength from its A.I.F. origins, and
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38 Seal, ibid., 116, refers to Bean as ‘the great inventor’, and describes Anzac as ‘an invented tradition’ (4). For Andrews, as the title of his book suggests, the Anzac legend was an illusion.


40 ibid., 86.


43 ibid., 28-29.

44 ibid., 35.

45 Andrews, The Anzac Illusion, 59: ‘The Australian public was in fact isolated from the war. The men at the front might have been on another planet as far as the Australian people were concerned’.


47 ‘[T]he most extreme Empire men were conservatives, and so the bush lost its hold on Australian national emotion, and became conservative, middle-class dominated, and urban. By 1916 these influences were deciding what Australian nationalism was, and who the real Australians were, and bush radicals opposed to the war were being abused publicly as un-Australian’. Bill Gammage, ‘Anzac’, in Carroll, Intruders in the Bush, 62. Farrell, Themes in Australian History, 90, comments: ‘The Anzac legend fused the social myths of egalitarianism with what soon became a quietist and conservative inheritance of ideas that had pervaded the formation of the Australian Commonwealth’. See also Serle, ‘The Digger Tradition’, 156.
its form from a conservative Australian hierarchy’. There was a tension from the beginning between soldiers’ perceptions and that of the officials who saw the legend’s national and imperial potential.

By the mid-1920s, Anzac Day had become a national day. Children were told the story of Simpson and his donkey and the heroic deeds of the Anzac warriors, and the RSL ensured that the myth served imperial interests. War Memorials and shrines became sacred sites in towns and cities all over the continent, commemorating the loyalty and sacrifice of those who died for the sake of the nation. The diggers themselves remembered what the official view of Anzac chose to forget. The ‘double myth’ of Anzac – mateship and patriotism – became embodied in the way Anzac Day came to be celebrated, the official commemorations of the morning giving way to drinking and camaraderie in the afternoon. Both aspects were a proper part of Anzac observance. By allowing them to coexist, the tension between ‘the folklore of the digger’ and ‘the national-military Anzac myth’ reached a point of resolution. Anzac Day became the means by which the stories of sacrifice, duty and nationhood were passed down from one generation to another. But the ambivalence built into this most sacred of days in the Australian calendar remained.

The Anzac legend was clearly complex and multi-layered. It ‘meant different things to different people’, Manning Clark once wrote. It spoke of heroes, of failure, of sacrifice, of the follies of capitalism. It is certainly possible to analyse and dissect the Anzac tradition, pointing out its flaws and weaknesses: the inherent racism of Australian soldiers, for example, the maleness of the Anzac tradition, or the
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48 ibid., 64.
49 Manning Clark, A History of Australia, VI, 17: ‘Australians now had a religion: they now needed shrines at which to conduct their worship. In the presence of the mighty dead, Australians should dedicate themselves to their nation, their Empire and their liberties’. Donald Horne makes similar comments in The Australian People: Biography of a Nation (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1972), 186. The definitive text on this theme is Inglis, Sacred Places.
52 Clark, ‘The Quest for an Australian Identity’, 223-224.
53 For example, McQueen, A New Britannia, 89: ‘Racism, democracy, nationalism, imperial loyalty, formed the ranks to storm the parapets at Gallipoli. For only with their reconciliation could Australia become a nation’.
54 Andrews, The Anzac Illusion, 150-151, points to the way Social Darwinism had shaped diggers’ attitudes towards other races, including the British, in spite of the fact that a large percentage of the AIF were, in fact, British born. He also highlights the xenophobic nationalism of many returned
strange irony that ‘the defining event of nationhood did not take place on the nation’s own soil but in an unknown land on the other side of the world’. For Adam Jamrozik, while Anzac Day continues to celebrate Australian nationhood, it does so by concealing the historical truth about the failure of the campaign, the incompetence of politicians and generals, and the dependence of Australia within the Empire.

Nevertheless, whatever criticisms may be made of the Anzac tradition – and there are many – Anzac Day continues to draw the nation together with a power and intensity unequalled by any other event in the Australian calendar. To quote Manning Clark:

‘Whatever people saw in this one day of the year they all paused to mourn, finding in the act of commemoration a feeling of exaltation, of being lifted up – even though they would have difficulty in saying what it was they were being lifted towards’.

As Graham Seal puts it, the coming together ‘of folk tradition and nationalistic mystique’ produced a new sacred day in Australia, Australia’s ‘Fifty-third Sunday’. In many ways, Anzac Day has become ‘the substitute religion’ in Australia.

soldiers after the war (218-219), largely caused by homesickness, and directed mostly against things British or European. Such anti-British sentiment, the product of war experience, can hardly be linked to the White Australia policy, although it could be seen to reflect a growing sense of Australian nationalism within the protectionist environment of the Australian Settlement. Andrews admits that the extent of anti-British sentiment amongst the diggers is hard to determine, given the fact that, despite their bush rhetoric, most of them came from towns or cities (151). Seal, Inventing Anzac, points to racist tendencies amongst the diggers combined with anti-British sentiment: ‘Elements of the digger tradition that were quietly ignored in the official construction of Anzac were the diggers’ vehement racism and prejudices against allies. While prejudice against non-white “races” was characteristic of the broader Australian society at this time, the expressions of dislike and contempt for British officers and the class they were perceived by many diggers to represent was an embarrassment, as was (if to a lesser degree) the diggers’ expressed antagonisms towards the Tommy, the poilu and other allied troops’. Later, Seal notes that, as early as 1921, the rhetoric of Anzac Day speeches already displayed ‘the language of Empire jingoism and racism’ (126-127).


Seal, ibid., 135; also Horne, The Australian People, 188; Inglis, ‘The Anzac Tradition’, 44.


Clark, ‘The Quest for an Australian Identity’, 224.

Seal, Inventing Anzac, 104.

Inglis, Observing Australia, 61-70. Melleuish, ‘Universal Obligations’, 60, notes how ‘essentially secular acts, like heroism in war’ have been turned into ‘sacred ones’, imbuing them ‘with spiritual qualities and respect previously reserved for religion’. 269
There is a strange irony in this, for Anglican clergy had played a major role in organising the first Anzac ceremonies. Anzac Day, as the original Anglican designers intended it, was ‘to be an intensely solemn national requiem’, essentially spiritual in character. Very quickly, however, clergy from a variety of denominations felt uneasy about the way the Anzac tradition was developing – that somehow they were being enlisted into the service of the state. The tension between Anzac Day and Christianity remains an unresolved aspect of Australian culture. It is as though two competing definitions of the sacred are being forced to coexist. But the contest is both unequal and unnecessary: unequal because the church cannot compete with the extraordinary emotional power generated by the liturgy of Anzac which strikes such a chord with the Australian people; unnecessary because the true role of Christian traditions like Anglicanism is not to compete with the Anzac myth but to seek to understand it and to interpret it to the Australian people, mediating between Christian faith and Australian experience.

It is little wonder that the churches are confused about their part in this civil religion. As already mentioned, it is hardly Christian. Ronald Conway uses the phrase ‘stoic remembrances of the unheeding dead’ to describe what happens on Anzac Day: a substitute, he says, for ‘a genuine spiritual faith’. Conway is not unsympathetic to the importance of the Anzac tradition. He praises the ‘near-sacred kinship’ experienced by the diggers, ‘probably the nearest to true brotherly love the inhibited Australian male has ever permitted himself to express’, but feels that, in keeping with the Australian way of life, Anzac Day lacks spiritual depth. Conway’s views on Anzac reflect the ambivalence of many Australian Christians. But the ambivalence is on both sides. Anzac commemorations are secular and religious all at once. It is as
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63 Inglis, Sacred Places, 465; also Kapferer, Legends of People, Myths of State, 137.
64 K. Inglis, ‘Anzac and Christian – Two Traditions or One?’ St Mark’s Review 42 (November 1965): 3-12.
65 Kapferer, Legends of People, Myths of State, 136.
67 Clark, A History of Australia, VI, 16: ‘The poets were using the language of religion to describe a secular experience. Anzac Day was becoming a secular religion’. Horne, The Australian People, 187, describes Anzac Day as ‘Australia’s secular Easter’. 
though Australians are confused about how the sacred should be embodied and expressed. As David Tacey comments:

[E]ven though Australia is a basically secular society, it freely recognises and salutes the religious dimension of war sacrifice. It is astonishing, actually, how freely and willingly the secular nation engages in the religious dimension of war experience, although it is questionable whether this religiousness is Christian … This folk or civic religion is martial, secular, heroic, sacrificial, and deeply embedded in the national psyche of Australia, especially in the culture of masculinity.68

Inglis observes that Australian war memorials are Greek, not Hebrew, and hence inherently in conflict with Christianity.69 This appraisal is in keeping with Conway’s comment on the stoicism of Anzac, and also with the views of Bill Gammage. Commenting on the secular nature of Australian society, Gammage raises the question whether, while Australians may have chosen to live without God, it was possible for them to live without faith. Both the bush and Anzac legends stemmed from a belief in ‘the brotherhood of man’. While this belief did not include all men as brothers, it was nevertheless, in its own way, a quest for faith, even if this faith was in essence anti-religious.

[I]t was part of the essence of both traditions to be hostile to any notion of a faith which tried to inspire men in any direction spiritually, for both believed that man was not master of his destiny, but a victim of chance … For both there was no better way, there was no faith, there was only acceptance and endurance’.70

Like Conway, Gammage concludes by highlighting the inspiring legacy of the Anzac tradition, and its celebration of the human spirit.71 Such is the power of the Anzac myth in Australian society. But we should not dismiss too quickly their critique of the spiritual aspects of the Anzac tradition. The secular nature of Anzac Day has been generally assumed throughout Australian society, without rigorous questioning. Is it, as Conway has said, a substitute for genuine spiritual faith? Why is it assumed
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68 Tacey, ReEnchantment, 49. Cf. White, Inventing Australia, 136: ‘In time [Anzac Day] developed a common form of observance, complete with a semi-religious ritual, liturgy and hymnal, perhaps filling a spiritual need in a secularised society’.
69 Inglis, ‘The Anzac Tradition’, 42.
71 ibid., 66.
that the churches must accept such a standard without question? Why do the churches themselves accept this? After all, the sectarian battles against which so many Australians reacted are, as we have seen, a thing of the past. It could be argued that it is dishonest to employ religious language and symbols in a secular way, divesting them of their power in order to stop them from saying what they really mean. In spite of Bean’s distaste for formal religion, there were Christians in the Australian armed forces, including chaplains. If Christians are pushed to the margins on the one day of the year when Australians ponder issues of war and peace, life and death; if their voice is ‘muted’, preventing them from sharing this sacred Australian experience from the perspective of genuine spiritual faith, then the ‘soul’ of Australia will be permanently impoverished.

It may be that this is an issue Australians simply do not wish to think about. As Inglis says, any misgivings clergy may have on Anzac Day about the way Christianity is enlisted in the service of the state is probably overshadowed by a general ‘she’ll-be-right’ assumption by most people that Christianity and Anzac are ‘consistent and complementary’. My intention in saying this is not to denigrate Anzac, but to encourage Australians to go deeper, to search for a genuine spiritual understanding of what they are remembering and celebrating. If, as Lindner has written, ‘the ANZAC tradition comes closest of any element in modern Australian national life to providing the universally recognised symbols and rituals to enshrine the transcendent elements of the nation’s historical experience’, it is clear that the churches have work to do in coming to a deeper understanding of the real meaning of the Anzac tradition and conveying this depth of understanding to the nation. Australian Anglicanism, as a mediating tradition, must lead by example.

72 C.E.W. Bean found almost nothing to say about religion in the AIF, and believed that his own scepticism towards ecclesiastical Christianity was widely shared by Australian soldiers’. Inglis, Sacred Places, 214.
73 McKernan, ‘Turning the heart to stone’, 21, makes the point that those chaplains who were respected by the troops were those who ‘worked with all and for all’, with a practical spirit of service as their central tenet. These chaplains, in turn, admired this same quality in the diggers they served.
74 ‘The participation of the clergy in public Anzac ceremonial, now as at all times in the past, is noticeably muted. The clergy perform as the representatives of the state, and the order of prayers and songs is selected to give as little denominational or sectarian offence as possible’. Kapferer, Legends of People, Myths of State, 137.
75 Inglis, Sacred Places, 465.
76 Lindner, ‘Civil Religion’, 16.
It will not be easy to work against the current without being misunderstood. The Anzac tradition is, as we have seen, a central expression of Australian nationalism with a double aspect: it is both official and popular, from above and from below. ‘Anzac Day’ writes Graham Seal, ‘is the most significant expression of the national-military myth [when] the public mythology of Anzac and the private, esoteric folklore of the diggers combine, collude and collide’. Even so, the raw materials for a rethinking of Anzac are present within the tradition itself. Anzac Day is, in its own way, a form of pilgrimage. It is not necessarily a celebration of war, but nor is it primarily a celebration of peace, although this may be closer to the original intention. In one sense it is about redemptive suffering, and most certainly about sacrifice: the laying down of one’s life for one’s friends and (by extension) one’s nation. It is a peculiarly Australian form of ‘the cult of nationalism’, expressed as common sense and practical egalitarianism, semi-religious but without the complexity of transcendence. Its ethos permeates Australian society – as Kapferer says: ‘Few stand outside it’. Anglicanism will need to be seen to be respectful of the Anzac tradition even while seeking to transform it. This should not be too much to ask. After all, Anglicans are Australian too.

As we have seen, Lambeth 1988 called for an expression of Anglican faith that is sensitive to ‘how nations and peoples are actually becoming themselves’. While warning of the dangers of over-identification, it nevertheless encouraged engagement with society, entering deeply ‘into a nation’s soul’, sharing, from the inside, ‘the most profound hopes and values of a nation’. As Australians, Anglicans understand
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77 Seal, *Inventing Anzac*, 120.
78 See Jamrozik, *The Chains of Colonial Inheritance*, 14. Later, Jamrozik comments (28): ‘It would be logical to argue, as Helen Irving does, that the nation’s identity should be related to Federation, not Gallipoli. It should express pride for not spilling blood’.
79 Kapferer, *Legends of People, Myths of State*, 145: ‘It should be stressed that an important motivation behind the support for Anzac was a concern to celebrate peace rather than war and to record the shocking degradation and waste of humanity entailed by war. This is a message inscribed in the traditional Anzac memorial service and is made starkly apparent in the long lists of the dead at the memorials. It was an idea held by the Anzacs themselves and is fervently reiterated by many of those who march today. Compassionate reasons such as these seem to be important forces behind the establishment of the Anzac tradition’.
82 ibid., 139.
83 Seal, *Inventing Anzac*, 171, comments: ‘One explanatory fact of [its] power is its ability to fill a profound emptiness at the centre of the Australian experience’.
84 Kapferer, *Legends of People, Myths of State*, 144.
85 See Chapter 5, n. 170, 172.
innately the emotive power of the Anzac tradition. Anglican clergy are caught up in the ambivalence of it all, invited to participate in Anzac Day commemorations, but expected to downplay their Christian faith on this most sacred of all days. Intellectual critique has no place at the shrine of Australian egalitarianism, but it is unavoidable for those who seek understanding. Anglicans do have a part to play on Anzac Day, not as small-time quasi-religious dignitaries, but as Australians with an alternative perspective to present on the future of the nation’s soul. An added ingredient is needed, something more than the dawn service and the Anzac parade, a rekindling, perhaps, of the vision of those who first saw the need for a way of drawing the nation together in a form of sacred remembering.

It is important to reiterate Canon David John Garland’s original intentions in helping to shape those first Anzac rites. Garland’s contribution, argues John Moses, is really as significant as C.E.W. Bean’s, ‘though in an emphatically spiritual way’. They were, both, of course, supporters of the British Empire. Unlike Bean, however, Garland was not out to create a national myth; his vision for Australia was Christ-centred. At the time of the first Anzac commemoration, the nation was experiencing shock and grief. As Kapferer argues, there was ‘a general feeling and demand for rites of national mourning, not only to commemorate the dead but to assuage the remorse of those families and communities devastated by the ravages of war’. Mourning, thanksgiving, repentance, and a yearning for peace, not war, were central to the first Anzac ceremonies. Garland intended it to be a holy day, a kind of national Good Friday. He favoured a commemoration that included ‘the minute’s reverent silence’, as well as requiem or memorial services in the churches throughout the day and short services around the graves of the fallen. Garland and his

86 Garland was the honorary secretary of the first ANZAC Day Commemoration Committee convened in January 1916 in Brisbane. The heads of all the mainstream churches were involved, including (later) the local Rabbi, as well as local and state politicians and former army officers, ‘but it was emphatically not a creation of the Returned Soldiers and Sailors Imperial League of Australia. (RSSILA, later RSL). It was a citizens’ initiative in which clergymen dominated. If these facts are disregarded by Australian historians they will scarcely ever be in a position to explain the phenomenon of ANZAC’. Moses, ‘Anzac Day as Religious Revivalism’, 171.
88 Frappell, ‘Imperial Fervour’, 79: ‘For Anglicans in particular, the sacrifices of war and the celebration of the peace strengthened the imperial connection’. Also Andrews, The Anzac Illusion, 42, 125; Manning Clark, A History of Australia, VI, 16.
89 Kapferer, Legend of People, Myths of State, 145.
91 Seal, Inventing Anzac, 112-113.
contemporaries saw Anzac commemorations as a way of renewing the life of the nation as a spiritual community. This vision did influence the way Anzac Day came to be celebrated, although the forces of officialdom ‘captured’ the day and reshaped it along more secular lines.92

There is no doubt that the Anzac tradition is one of those ambivalent spaces of ‘in-between’ mentioned earlier by Kwok. It is tailor-made for the ‘mystical’ via media. If Anglicanism sits uncomfortably with the Anzac cult, then it needs, as an Australian church, to revitalise the tradition along spiritual lines. The RSL is not the only body with a patriotic investment in Anzac Day. The vision of Canon Garland is also an intrinsic part of this tradition, although admittedly just as open to critique. While, for example, as Moses has convincingly argued, there were sound reasons for Anglican support for the Empire during the First World War in the face of the aggressive designs of German imperialism (and Garland, as we have seen, was an Empire man),93 we must now, in another age, be more suspicious of the imperial designs of either church or nation. The churches have been, perhaps rightly, dismissed to the margins of Australian life, and no longer have the right (if they ever did) to turn the nation into an overtly Christian (especially Anglican) nation.94 On the other hand, the resources that the churches might bring to Anzac Day have been muted for too long, even while the nation engages in a purportedly secular ‘act of prayer’.95 Garland was right: Christ has something to offer the Anzac tradition, especially in terms of understanding the true meaning of sacrifice, not to mention loving one’s enemy.96

92 ibid., 114.
93 Moses, ‘Australian Anglican Leaders’, 309: ‘There was a history of Anglican interest in German Protestant theology that obviously was not shared by Roman Catholics. It is this that gave the Anglican leaders a critical edge in being able to assess the war as essentially a struggle between two contrasting understandings of the nature of world history. In short, the Anglican leaders came to comprehend Prussianism as a threatening form of state religion that was inspired by a unique sense of mission to impose its hegemony by force over the world … the bishops were aware of the real political fact that in the end Australia’s future, as a secure dominion of British political culture, stood or fell with the fate of the empire’. See also John A. Moses, with Greg Munro, Australia and the ‘Kaiser’s War’ 1914-1918: On Understanding the ANZAC Tradition: Argument and Theses (Brisbane: Broughton Press, 1993).
94 This was, of course, an emotive issue during the debates leading up to Federation, especially whether God should be mentioned in the Australian constitution. See Richard Ely, Unto God and Caesar: Religious Issues in the Emerging Commonwealth 1891-1906 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1976).
95 Kapferer, Legends of People, Myths of State, 136-137.
96 McKernan, ‘Turning the heart to stone’, 21, makes this telling comment: ‘The ‘Anzac religion’ did not demand adherence to Christ but it did not proscribe it either’.
There is much of spiritual significance in Anzac Day which needs to be drawn out, celebrated and renewed by those who interpret life in Christian terms, especially with a broad Anglican understanding. In the spirit of F.D. Maurice, there is a need to dig beneath the Anzac tradition to discover the living principles which may have become systematized and distorted but which also show signs of an encounter with the divine order. What sort of nationalism is being espoused and celebrated on Anzac Day? Does it build community and encourage an inclusive society? Does it ignite fear or hope? Does it provide children with a strong sense of the sanctity of life and the need for peace in a world of difference? Does it perpetuate a cult of whiteness or maleness, or has Australia moved beyond that into a more open future? Does it propagate the view of human perfectibility that led Australians like Vance Palmer and Manning Clark down the path of disillusionment, or does it lead to genuine faith and ‘a heightened understanding of the mysterious complexity of Being’. Anglicans owe it to Garland to build on his initial vision, to honour the Anzac tradition while seeking to transform it. It is not unreasonable to expect this of a church that purports to be both Anglican and Australian.

The Question of Race

The Anzac legend could not have developed without the supporting ethos of White Australia. Bruce Kapferer notes that the eagerness with which Australians signed up for active war service during the early years of World War I reflected a widespread identification throughout the Australian community with the issues confronting England and Europe. But this, in turn, was motivated ‘from within an ideological consciousness that white Australians were isolated within a sea of alien, mainly Asian, peoples and cultures’. In keeping with the people of his generation, C.E.W. Bean, the Anzac chronicler, believed in the superiority of the British race and was suspicious of ‘Orientals’. The Immigration Restriction Act of 1901 did not happen in a vacuum. Chinese immigration restriction acts had, in fact, been passed as far back as 1854 (Victoria) and 1861 (New South Wales). Antagonism towards Asians

97 Edmund Campion, for example, has referred to the laying of Anzac wreaths as ‘a secular sacramental presence … an outward sign of natural grace.’ See Inglis, Sacred Places, 471.
99 Kapferer, Legends of People, Myths of State, 184. See also Chapter 7, n.77 above for comments on the subliminal fear of Asians implicit in the ethos of White Australia.
100 ibid., 184-185.
had therefore been part of the atmosphere for several decades.\textsuperscript{101} During the 1890s, the decade before Federation, there was a growing sense of Australia as a white community.\textsuperscript{102} Fear of the Chinese was especially intense, even paranoid,\textsuperscript{103} they simply did not belong within the cultural universe of white Australians.\textsuperscript{104} Little wonder then that ‘immigration restriction’ was one of the first priorities of the new parliament after Federation. As for the Aborigines, they were simply excluded from citizenship. They were, after all, considered to be a dying race.\textsuperscript{105}

The previous chapter traced the demise of the Australian Settlement and the collapse of White Australia. It was a slow process. Even when immigration increased after World War II, it did so within the cultural framework set in place at Federation.\textsuperscript{106} To quote Stephen Castles and his colleagues:

For the entire period from the later 1940s to the mid-1960s migrants were allowed to present no threat whatsoever to a concept of national identity based firmly upon the supposedly shared British roots of the bulk of the population. Indeed, in a curious, even paradoxical, way the doctrine of assimilation, so vigorously espoused by the government of the period, did much to reinforce both the sense of homogeneity and the sense of superiority of the Anglophone population.\textsuperscript{107}

The irony is that the Britishness of Australia was used as the criterion for the homogeneity of Australian society, at the very time when the ties that bound Australia to Britain were starting to unravel.\textsuperscript{108} As we saw earlier, Anglicanism was an integral part of this homogeneous world, and benefited from its assumptions. It readily accepted the indelible connections between Christian faith and Englishness. The sectarian battles of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were related to the struggle for dominance between English and Irish, between Protestant and
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Catholic Australia. But sectarianism also belonged within the assumptions of White Australia. The fact that the term ‘Anglo-Celtic’ is now used to describe a combined ethnicity reflects the demise of a British Australia cut off from the rest of the world. As noted earlier, the passing of the White Australia policy presented Anglicanism in Australia with a new challenge: ‘to find a place for itself in a society that was no longer British and no longer Christian’. 109

By the 1970s, Australia had moved into a different phase of its history. The word ‘multiculturalism’ reflected a new approach to racial and cultural diversity in Australia. Change was at first quite slow. During the Whitlam era there was certainly no great push for an increase in Asian immigration. The Australian way of life remained intact even while the rhetoric was changing. 110 Following Whitlam’s dismissal, the Fraser Government opened the doors to Asian migrants and encouraged cultural pluralism, 111 the result, in part, of an influx of Indochinese refugees. Australia’s longstanding image ‘as a transplanted piece of Europe’ was being completely refashioned. The majority of Australians, however, were uncertain about the changes that were taking place. 112

With the publication of Geoffrey Blainey’s book *All for Australia*, in 1984, the battle lines were drawn, preparing the way for the later rise of Hansonism and the ‘paranoid nationalism’ of the Howard government after 1996. Blainey was highly critical of the direction in which he saw Australia moving under the banner of ‘multiculturalism’.

The multicultural policy and its emphasis on what is different and on the rights of the new minority rather than the old majority, gnaws at that sense of solidarity that many people crave for. The policy of governments since 1978 to turn Australia into a land of all nations runs across the present yearning for stability and social cohesion. 113

Blainey rejected the view that ‘all immigrants are equal’. 114 He berated multiculturalism for its anti-British mindset, emphasising the powerful emotional
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attachment that most ‘European-Australians’ have for the land. He then recalled the words of Sir Henry Parkes in 1890: ‘The crimson thread of kinship runs through us all’. That thread has now been cut, wrote Blainey, by a combination of retrograde policies and attitudes: the ‘cult of immigration’, the separateness of ethnic groups, the ‘wooing of Asia’ and the ‘shunning of Britain’, with the ‘disowning of our past’ included for good measure.

Blainey’s ideas reflected an undercurrent of dissatisfaction shared by many Australians. This is not surprising. Changes of policy reversing decades of societal attitudes were unlikely to result in fundamental change overnight. Blainey was appealing for a reconsideration of the values of White Australia, of all that had previously been considered part of the nation. His argument, according to Kapferer, shares a lot with the Anzac tradition, coming ‘from the standpoint of a Eurocentric view, seeing Australia isolated in a region of cultural difference and otherness’. For Blainey, national unity can only be maintained through sameness, not the multiplication of difference, and Australians (meaning ‘old Australians’) are united in their suspicion of difference. The result is what Kapferer calls ‘inegalitarian equality’. It is White Australia revisited.

Blainey’s tragedy is that he refuses to question the prison of his own logic, which is deeply part of that historical world into which he was born. He fails, in other words, to pursue the truly liberating possibility of the great ideals of freedom and human dignity that are a vital part of egalitarian thought. He destroys them in a logic of interpretation and practice forged in the conditions of political nationalism harnessed too often to the manufacture and reproduction of inequality and injustice.
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I have dwelt on Blainey’s ideas because of their relevance to more recent debates within Australian society, especially with regard to the plight of refugees from Asia and the Middle East. Admittedly, Blainey’s concern about the ethnic separateness of multiculturalism needs careful consideration for, perhaps ironically, multicultural difference may be another way of excluding the ‘other’, this time by highlighting separateness rather than sameness. If this is what multiculturalism means, then little has been achieved in moving out of the homogeneity of the Australian Settlement into an era of multiple identities.

Blainey’s voice is one of many insisting on the ongoing importance of Australia’s British heritage. More recently, Miriam Dixson has tried to acknowledge the reality of ethnic diversity while also emphasising the importance of the Anglo-Celtic ‘core culture’ in holding Australian society together. In her view, the former is actually dependent on the latter.

Over the long haul, if the Australia of the future is to live with this astonishing new degree of difference, live with its riches, pleasures and challenges, one thing is clear. At least over a period of consolidation, the core culture needs to keep on imparting its steadying sameness and cohesion to institutional patterns and broad values.

Dixson believes that the debate about Australian identity following the collapse of the Australian Settlement was really an expression of the ‘displaced grief’ of many ‘old-identity’ Australians: they felt a deep sense of loss, while also being ‘forbidden to mourn’. The ‘host culture’, she argues (meaning ethnically British), has been experiencing a deep sense of ‘uprootedness’. Unless this is acknowledged, Australia will be unable to move forward into a more culturally diverse future. John Hirst argues along similar lines, distinguishing between two meanings of multiculturalism. The ‘soft’ version, which Hirst himself favours, is just ‘a new name for traditional

123 ibid., 205. Cf. Melleuish, The Packaging of Australia, 107. In spite of what people might think, Melleuish argues, multiculturalism is not a form of pluralism, but rather treats different ethnic groups as closed systems. The truth is somewhat different. People move across cultural and racial boundaries quite naturally through intermarriage and in a variety of other ways. He regards the term ‘cultural diversity’ as a more appropriate way of describing contemporary Australia. Galligan and Roberts have argued that multiculturalism actually ‘fails as citizenship policy’, because it merely reinforces ethnic difference without affirming what holds Australia together. Galligan and Roberts, Australian Citizenship, 75, 86.
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toleration of difference’, the assimilation of migrants into a homogeneous Australian society. The stronger, more separatist version of multiculturalism celebrates ethnic difference at the expense of the ‘superior legitimacy’ of the host culture.\textsuperscript{126} The Howard Government favours the ‘soft’ interpretation. In the view of Galligan and Roberts, multiculturalism under Howard is really an updated expression of the assimilation era: ‘a more pluralistic national culture’ that is predominantly Anglo-Celtic in its cultural origins.\textsuperscript{127} These days, they argue, the word ‘multiculturalism’ really means nothing more than ‘community relations that aim at social cohesion’. As such, it would perhaps be better to eliminate the term entirely.\textsuperscript{128}

This is an extremely complex issue. Australian society is clearly evolving into something new. It cannot deny its Anglo-Celtic history, but at the same time it is now more culturally diverse than ever before.\textsuperscript{129} We have noted a strong and successful rearguard action from exponents of ‘old Australia’. This requires careful assessment from both an ethical and a theological perspective. Australia’s British heritage cannot be denied, and, indeed, it is true that the values of this heritage – educational, political, legal, and even religious – provide Australian society with remarkable stability and cohesion. On the other hand, there needs to be a willingness to face up to the racism and xenophobia of so much of Australian history. Attempts to deal with cultural diversity by a return to old attitudes will do nothing to heal old wounds. Nor will settling for a separatist, fragmented view of cultural difference, rather than moving towards a completely different Australian future. Roman Catholic theologian Tony Kelly puts the matter this way:

The most problematic situation occurs when Australian culture is being conceived as a collage of snap-frozen cultures as though each of these were a timeless accomplishment or the exclusive possession of a particular, ethnic, or religious group. The impression can be given that,

\textsuperscript{126} Hirst, ‘Multiculturalism’, 205-207. The stronger version, represented by Sneja Gunew, ‘Denaturalizing cultural nationalisms: multicultural readings of “Australia”’, in Bhabha, Nation and Narration, 115, argues for an Australia in which Anglo-Celts are seen as merely one ethnic group amongst many.
\textsuperscript{127} Galligan and Roberts, Australian Citizenship, 94. See also Jamrozik, The Chains of Colonial Inheritance, 91.
\textsuperscript{128} ibid., 95-96. In Jamrozik’s view, ibid., 100, the policy of multiculturalism is effectively dead, even while cultural diversity in Australia continues.
\textsuperscript{129} It would, however, be misleading to suggest that there has ever been a time when Australia was without cultural diversity. See Curthoys, ‘History and identity’, 26-28; also Hudson and Bolton, Creating Australia, 4.
by the mere fact of being here, cultures enter into a timeless immutability, locked in a past in which history has stopped and frozen in a present in which openness to the new is regarded as undesirable … the emphasis on multiculturalism can be so strong that it obscures the fact that the future is the only thing we really have in common. How each cultural tradition amongst us can contribute to the making of that future is a more hopeful and reconciling consideration.130

It could be argued that Australia must simply be a tolerant society.131 This is certainly the position of Donald Horne, who argues that, regardless of ethnic background, all Australians are united by citizenship. One objection to Horne’s ‘civic’ proposal is that it effectively denies all Australians (including those of British heritage) an ethnic identity.132 Dixson takes this further. The civic view, she claims, is ‘an impoverished, surface concept of the self’ which actually presupposes, if we are honest about it, an emotional attachment to the nation based on ethnic roots. For Horne, writes Dixson, tolerance is the product of a more detached approach to social unity, a rational commitment on the part of individual members of society to democratic institutions.133 But this leads to further objections, for then ‘tolerance’ can be seen, as Ann Curthoys has said, as a way of ensuring that society works to the advantage of the dominant majority. ‘Tolerance’, she argues, ‘may be better than intolerance, but it does not guarantee equality’.134

There must be a middle way. As Wayne Hudson suggests, surely it is possible to emphasise a strong sense of civic identity without returning to ‘a hegemonic monoculturalism’.135 After all, even acknowledging Australia’s rich British heritage does not alter the fact that the British Empire no longer exists and that Australians now come from a wide variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds, including Asia.136

131 Hirst, ‘Multiculturalism’, 201, claims that even before World War II, Australia, while being strongly intolerant of non-British migration, nevertheless practised ‘the modes of toleration’.
132 See Birrell, Federation, 320-322.
133 Dixson, The Imaginary Australian, 9.
134 Curthoys, ‘History and identity’, 35. White, ‘Inventing Australia Revisited’, 18, makes the point that much of the debate about multiculturalism overlooks ‘the contest for dominance in the public discourse of nation’. He continues: ‘All multiple identities are seen as equal, when in fact some are more equal than others’. Ghassan Hage, ‘Locating Multiculturalism’s Other: A Critique of Practical Tolerance’, New Formations 24 (Winter 1994): 19-34, argues that tolerance is, in fact, another form of racism, ‘because, like “intolerant racism”, it reproduces, but in a different way, the same racist ethnic/racial relations of power that constitute its condition of possibility’ (33).
Of course, for those who depend on old securities, this realisation often leads to fear and resentment,\(^{137}\) communal worrying and ‘paranoid nationalism’.\(^{138}\) But fear can be felt on both sides: by those with something to lose and those with something to gain. The challenge is to turn this apparent contest into some kind of mutual partnership for the good of all. No doubt this is what Kelly has in mind when he talks about sharing a common future.

Australians are currently living through a major period of transition. According to Docker and Fischer, Australia is both colonial and post-colonial at the same time, both a settler and an immigrant society all at once. Australian society is in a state of flux, ‘a plethora of overlapping, competing and unresolved contradictions’.\(^{139}\) Homi Bhabha describes this as ‘the liminality of the nation-space’, in which what was previously regarded as ‘outside’ the boundary of the nation is now situated ‘within’.\(^{140}\) All Australians must be encouraged and enabled to face this reality.\(^{141}\) It is regrettable when fear and anxiety become the basis for political decision making about issues like the treatment of refugees,\(^{142}\) although this has been the Australian pattern since the first Immigration Restriction Act following Federation. There has to be a way of embracing diversity in a society in which forty per cent of Australians have at least one parent who was born overseas.\(^{143}\) There also has to be an acceptance of the extraordinary movement of peoples around the globe.\(^{144}\) The issue will not go away by simply avoiding or denying it, or by trying to turn the clock back to an earlier time of (apparent) security.\(^{145}\)
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\(^{144}\) As Curthoys says, ‘History and identity’, 36, ‘what we have to understand now is how present-day Australians of all ethnicities fit into a larger world history’.
\(^{145}\) As Stuart Hall has written: ‘The capacity to \textit{live with difference} is, in my view, the coming question of the twenty-first century. New national movements that, in their struggle against old closures, reach
Perhaps the key is to see Australian as a migrant society, regardless of ethnic background. As Kevin Robbins has written of the British experience, ‘In the experience of migration, difference is confronted: boundaries are crossed; cultures are mingled; identities become blurred’. There is something about the freshness – and uncertainty – of migrant experience that opens up the possibility of new perceptions. This is certainly the view of David Tacey, who sees Australia as ‘a basically migrant society, which is still involved in the ongoing psychodynamic problems wrought by migration’. Paul Collins makes the interesting suggestion that ‘a genuine white culture is only just starting to emerge’ in Australia. Migrant experience, he writes, is really all about conversion, moving from being transplanted Europeans or Asians to something else, still in the making. From this perspective, Australia may be seen as a meeting place. As Bhabha says, the nations of Europe and Asia meet in Australia.

This does not mean that Australia’s British heritage must be put aside, but it does mean that new stories must also be heard. The way to address the reality of cultural diversity is not to insist on a return to a secure pattern of some former golden age. It is to move forward, perhaps tentatively, digging beneath the surface of things,

for too closed, unitary, homogeneous and essentialist a reading of “culture” and “community” will have succeeded in overcoming one terrible historical hurdle only to fall at the second’. ‘Culture, Community, Nation’, Cultural Studies 7 (3) (1993): 361 (author’s emphasis).

146 To quote Paul Carter, ‘Baroque Identities: Migration and Mimicry’, in Dobrez, Identifying Australia in Postmodern Times, 1: ‘Australia is constitutionally a migrant society. It is not a question of new migrants contributing to, or assimilating with, a core Australian society. Those who are already here live as migrants in this country and the social fabric they have woven is a characteristically migrant one’.

147 Robbins, ‘Tradition and Translation’, 42. Stuart Hall, ‘Culture, Community, Nation’, 356, argues that Western nation states have already been ‘“diaspora-ized” beyond repair’, with an inextricable interweaving of peoples across ethnic, religious, cultural and linguistic boundaries.

148 To quote Brian Penton: ‘People don’t immigrate in despair. They immigrate in hope’. See Moore, Social Patterns in Australian Literature, 165. Writing about postcolonial theory, John McLeod comments: [T]he “in-between” position of the migrant, and his or her errant, impartial perceptions of the world, have been used as the starting point for creating new, dynamic ways of thinking about identity which go beyond older static models, such as national identity and the notion of “rootedness”. McLeod, Beginning Postcolonialism, 216.


150 From this perspective, Australia may be seen as a meeting place. As Bhabha says, the nations of Europe and Asia meet in Australia.

151 Writing in the American context, Jeffrey Alexander writes: ‘Conservatives are deeply mistaken in their suggestion that today’s demands for multiculturalism threaten to sidetrack a great success story and that such demands introduce divisive particularities, polarizing a society that has exhibited high levels of solidarity and integration hithertofore’. The Civil Sphere, 406.
conversing, listening, groping towards a new and different society called ‘Australia’. The emergence of multiculturalism, writes Jeffrey Alexander, may, after all, be the emergence of something completely different and unprecedented.153 ‘Multiculturalism is a project of hope, not despair’, he writes. ‘It can be launched only amid widespread feelings of common humanity, of solidary sympathies’ with people who are completely different.154 This is similar, we may recall, to what Kwok Pui-lan wrote about the Anglican via media. It is worth quoting her again in the context of cultural pluralism in Australia.

The principle of via media, long cherished by Anglicans, can offer tremendous insights in navigating through the treacherous waters of cultural politics today, if understood in a new light. Via media debunks the myth that there is one, absolute foundation or source of truth, thus opening up possibilities for dialogue between people on different sides of the fence. The via media entertains the thought that decisions about right or wrong, truth or falsehood, are not predetermined or prepackaged, but negotiated in the grayish, ambivalent space of ‘in-between’. While honouring the cultural experiences of peoples, via media is not complete relativism or moral chaos. It is a kind of disciplined reasoning, seasoned with humility, and sustained by compassion and empathy for oneself and others.155

During the decades of the Australian Settlement, Australia was a homogeneous society, sustaining a policy of unity through exclusion of difference. Australia is now a diverse society. This reality is inescapable and the resultant tensions are unavoidable. Anglicanism is no doubt over-represented amongst those who belong to ‘old Australia’. The challenge is to move beyond fear into openness, to value the rich English heritage of Anglicanism while simultaneously letting go of the presumption of sameness.

It is, as Kwok suggests, permissible to express grief and confusion, to be uncertain and anxious, provided meetings in the ‘in-between’ spaces are taking place. This is what ‘old Australia’ needs to see and hear, and no institution in Australia is better placed to deal with this tension than the Anglican Church. Anglican communities – churches, schools, colleges, institutions of all kinds – need to be places of meeting,

153 ibid., 407.
154 ibid., 457.
155 See Chapter 6, n. 53.
of cross-cultural hospitality and conversation, where stories are shared, where fear of difference is put aside, where the retreat into racism is seen as unnecessary, and where the freedom and human dignity of all peoples is celebrated. It may be ironic to suggest that the Anglican tradition, historically regarded as suspect by many Australians because of its elitism, may actually be able to assist Australians to rediscover and extend the meaning of mateship. Anglican comprehensiveness makes this a distinct possibility, a way of combining the rich insights of the Anglican theological tradition with the Australian commitment to a ‘fair go’ for all.

The Land and its People

I have not yet addressed the issue of the place of indigenous Australians in the life of the Australian nation. The relationship between black and white races in Australia goes back to the beginning of European settlement. It has always been a relationship of contested meanings. For example, was what happened at Sydney Cove in 1788 ‘settlement’ or ‘invasion’? In spite of objections to the ‘black armband’ view of Australian history by Blainey, Howard and the like, it is not possible, from an ethical point of view, to erase from the story of modern Australia the violence against Australia’s original inhabitants. While I do not intend, in this study, to attempt a solution to such a vast and complex theme, I will focus on how our understanding of words like ‘possession’ and ‘ownership’ shape historical memory. These words are about attitudes to the land: the assumption that one must ‘own’ it in order to belong to it, and that in order for this to happen the rights of the ‘other’ must be completely invalidated. It was the myth of *terra nullius*, after all, that provided Britain with its

---

156 Of course, there are many examples, in Anglican churches throughout the country, of the establishment of multicultural ministries, refugee support groups, welfare ministries and the like. This is apart from synod motions and committee reports exploring these very issues. Nor is the Anglican Church alone in this. My point, however, is that there is still a residual English mindset in Australian Anglicanism that needs to be faced in the midst of increasing cultural diversity. See Fletcher, ‘Anglicanism and Australian National Identity’, 334-337; Hilliard, ‘Pluralism and new Alignments’, 142-148 for related discussions.

157 See the remarkable discussion of Joseph Furphy’s understanding of Australian egalitarianism in Veronica Brady, *Can These Bones Live?* (Sydney: The Federation Press, 1996), 96-98. Brady argues that while much of the rhetoric of democratic egalitarianism in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Australia had racist overtones, there is also, in Furphy’s writings, another thread: the equality of all people, regardless of racial origin. This ‘at present submerged Australian tradition’, she argues, needs to be rediscovered and released. It is part of a strand of Christian tradition that ‘was particularly strong in England at least up to the time of Locke. Deriving ultimately from Thomas Aquinas and flowing though Hooker and writers like Swift and Johnson, it puts emphasis on the common good and common responsibility to one another’.
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legal (and moral) justification for claiming the continent. The lack of (perceived) spiritual values amongst Australia’s indigenous people, evidenced by the absence of churches, religious structures and clergy, was one pivotal ingredient in the construction of the myth and the confiscation of the land. The first Anglicans in Australia shared this assumption, or should I say, presumption. Property rights were, and continue to be, part and parcel of the church’s self-understanding. The Anglican Church has a moral obligation to wrestle with the question of ‘possession’. It cannot avoid the ethical and ecclesial consequences of ‘belonging’ to the Australian nation.

Alan Atkinson has convincingly demonstrated the links between the English idea of liberty and property ownership. Rights attached to property went hand in hand with membership of a commonwealth. This assumption was transported to New South Wales with the First Fleet. In a sense, the Aborigines had been dispossessed even before the fleet set sail. As Atkinson points out, the Home Office in London did not deal with the question of Aboriginal land rights. The land rights of Englishmen were their real concern. ‘[T]here could be no households worthy of the name without secure individual possession of the soil’. The hope was that even convicts would become honest citizens through the cultivation and ownership of land. The original inhabitants were not treated with the same courtesy. Sir Joseph Banks, who had accompanied Captain Cook on his voyage of ‘discovery’ in 1770, advised the authorities in London that the Blacks were wanderers with no real attachment to the land. By October 1786 the government had already decided on the principle of sovereignty, confiscating the territory of New South Wales on the basis of the principle of terra nullius, unowned by anyone, especially those with prior occupation – ‘a blank page’, writes Atkinson, ‘ready for the pen of empire’. Dispossession

158 From the beginning, the notion of terra nullius was legally and morally suspect. See Henry Reynolds, Aboriginal Sovereignty: Reflections on Race, State and Nation (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1996), 1-15. Reynolds then shows how this fabrication shaped the subsequent history of Australia.
159 Carey, Believing in Australia, 27.
161 ibid., 66.
162 ibid., 67-68.
163 ibid., 71; also Day, Claiming a Continent, 87-89.
became a *fait accompli*. In such circumstances, a clash was inevitable. The writings of historians like Henry Reynolds document the subsequent tragedy that unfolded on this land of dual occupancy.

The White Australia policy, central to the Federation settlement, was not just about race; it was also about land ownership. It defined who was entitled to live in Australia, and, of those who did, who was entitled to citizenship. Implicit in this statement of power ‘was a sense of territorial entitlement, a self-declared authority to appropriate and own the land’. There was little appreciation of the sacredness of the land for Australia’s indigenous people. For the settlers, the nation had been formed out of working the land. The writings of the poets, balladists and storytellers reveal how the land shaped the growing sense of what it meant to be Australian. The bush was a central motif of both the Anzac and radical nationalist traditions, as well as the pioneer legend immortalised in Frederick McCubbin’s triptych painting, ‘The Pioneers’. Attachment to Australian soil was also a central theme of the Australian Natives’ Association (ANA), a major nationalist movement of (white) native-born Australians in the years before Federation. War memorials and shrines erected all over the Australian continent were linked with the land. Over time the land worked its way into the ‘soul’ of indigenous and non-indigenous Australians alike. To quote Galligan and Roberts:

---


165 Reynolds notes how land ownership determined the life and death of most human beings during this period. What happened in Australia was really part of what was happening throughout Europe. ‘Men struggled to determine who would own the land, under what tenure it would be held and how it would be used’. In this sense, he argues, the explorers, overlanders and pioneers were not just settlers: they were part of a pattern of ‘revolutionary violence’. Henry Reynolds, *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers and the Land* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1996), 193-194.


169 See Birrell, *Federation*, for a comprehensive discussion of the ANA. Irving, *To Constitute a Nation*, 124, comments that the word ‘native’ at this time referred not to Aborigines but to white Australians. The ANA (perhaps inappropriately) used Aboriginal rather than British symbols to express this sense of belonging. Meetings were called corroborees and boomerangs were used as the insignia for membership. The ANA also promoted environmentalism and encouraged conservation of native bushland. See Galligan and Roberts, *Australian Citizenship*, 104-105.

170 Galligan and Roberts, ibid., 110.
The colonial project had declared the land to be *terra nullius*, but that understanding has now shifted. Instead, there is a growing recognition that the land is a palimpsest on which can be recorded multiple poetics. Places can be sacred according to indigenous traditions and experience as well as to European traditions and experience.\(^{171}\)

The importance of sacred place is central to the Anglican ethos. All over the globe, in former British colonies, the landscape is covered with churches. In state capitals, cathedrals have pride of place in the city. Architecturally they reflect, by and large, the religion of England.\(^{172}\) Just as explorers – Sturt, Mitchell, Stuart, Eyre and the like – used European words and concepts to make the land a familiar place,\(^{173}\) so the churches assumed that God must be introduced into Australia, a fellow passenger perhaps, replete with all the religious paraphernalia of ‘home’. Meanwhile the Australian Aborigines had their own sense of the sacred, rooted in the land. From an Aboriginal perspective, words like ‘possession’ or ‘ownership’ could not really do justice to the relationship between the land and its people.

How can such parallel responses to the land be reconciled? According to Paul Carter, conversations between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians need to be conducted within a framework of assumptions other than ownership, which does not necessarily constitute a sense of belonging. After all, Carter argues, colonialism was the consequence of ‘a people without a dreaming, without an attachment to the land’. If the terms of the debate are constantly determined by those who hold the card of *terra nullius*, it is no wonder that the conversation is always unequal, putting the indigenous people of Australia at a disadvantage. But what good does this achieve? Australia thereby remains a divided society. How then, he asks, can there be a meeting point between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples? What will those of European origin bring to the negotiating table with the nation’s first inhabitants? Carter then presents this challenge:

\(^{171}\) ibid., 118.

\(^{172}\) See Colin Holden, ‘Anglicanism, the Visual Arts and Architecture’, in Kaye, *Anglicanism in Australia*, 247-269, for a consideration of the way, from an architectural and aesthetic point of view, Anglican church buildings have developed within the Australian context.

\(^{173}\) Simon Ryan, *The Cartographic Eye: How Explorers Saw Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1996, 23: ‘We still commonly speak of explorers having “discovered” new lands … Some argue that “discovery” means nothing more than inclusion of the land within a European sphere of knowledge, yet it still carries the implication that the land was not previously known. Certainly, the self-constitution of the explorer depends upon the assumption that he will be the “first” to see “new” land. For discovery to be possible, all knowledge of the land must be denied, including prior Aboriginal knowledge’.
In particular, we will need to have to hand a different conception of the land and our relationship to it. Until we can overcome our obsession with exclusive ownership, it is not only the others but we who have nowhere defensible to stand. We cannot expect those across the table to furnish us with these concepts; we need to locate them within the neglected counter-traditions of our own culture.  

There are a number of overlapping issues here, each an immense topic in its own right, and each revolving around the question of belonging, of being ‘at home’ in this land. There is much to learn from indigenous Australians about land and spirituality, as well as from environmentalists about care of the land, its soil, trees and waterways, its flora and fauna. There is no need to idealise Australia’s indigenous people or to adopt a utopian ‘quasi-religious’ approach to environmentalism, although some are more sensitive to the ‘mystical immanence’ of the land than others. There does need, however, to be careful listening to those with a different approach to the land, driven by values other than ownership. David Tacey comments:

A dialogue is needed, both with the land and with the Aboriginal people, who are themselves the symbolic continuum of the landscape, in the sense that they are wedded emotionally and spiritually with the land. A conquering people, we are not particularly good at initiating dialogue … [W]e can plunder, rape, and pillage, all in the name of development and civilisation, but we do not know how to give back to the land, how to forge a spiritual connection with it.

---

174 Paul Carter, *The Lie of the Land* (London: Faber and Faber, 1996), 364-365. See also poet Les Murray’s statement that ‘the land does not finally permit of imported attitudes that would make it simply a resource, a thing’. Murray is discussing how the Western ‘solitary ego’ has been unable to impose its assumptions, to tame the land with fences which fail to keep hold. ‘We still punish the Aborigines’, he comments, ‘for the fear and the temptation this sets up in us’. Les Murray, ‘Some Religious Stuff I Know About Australia’, in *The Shape of Belief: Christianity in Australia Today*, ed. Dorothy Harris, Douglas Hynd and David Millikan (Sydney: Lancer Books, 1982), 18-19. As is well known, many of Australia’s myths and legends revolve around the theme of struggles against the land, and of attempts to conquer it. See Ross Gibson, *South of the West: Postcolonialism and the Narrative Construction of Australia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 17.

175 ‘The accepted belief is that the early white settlers did not understand that their imported land management practices were seriously damaging the natural environment. This may be true; perhaps they did not understand what they were doing. The notion of *terra nullius* did not appear to mean to them only the absence of human inhabitants but included also the absence of the local fauna and flora. By trying to supplant the natural environment, the settlers contributed towards a real *terra nullius* of a land in the process of destruction’. Jamrozik, *The Chains of Colonial Inheritance*, 134.


177 The phrase is Frank Fletcher’s, in ‘Imagination for the Australian Spiritual Journey’, in Malone, *Developing an Australian Theology*, 275.

178 I have in mind Roman Catholic writers like Fletcher and Eugene Stockton, *The Aboriginal Gift: Spirituality for a Nation* (Sydney: Millenium Books, 1995), as well as the writings of David Tacey.

179 Tacey, *Edge of the Sacred*, 70-71.
It may be that some will be able to ‘cross over’ to the other side of the table, as David Tacey seeks to do, listening to and learning about what it is like to ‘belong’ in a non-materialistic way. But Tacey also cautions against the notion that non-indigenous Australia can be revived ‘by stealing the sacred contents of Aboriginal religions or by filling our appalling emptiness with their fullness’. He challenges white Australians to develop their own spiritual life in response to the Australian experience. There is work of the ‘soul’ to do, it appears, on all sides of the table, if we are to learn not only how to live together with our differences but also how to ‘belong’ together in this land.

Stuart Macintyre makes the interesting observation that, for European Australians, the desire for emotional attachment to the land has always been frustrated by a feeling of ‘rootlessness, of novelty without depth’. Perhaps this is because the sense of ‘rootedness’ in Australia, as Ien Ang suggests, cannot be based on ownership; it can really only be shared, and this means, in turn, that it will only ever be a ‘partial sharing’, since there is no exclusive possession. Is it possible, as Poole says, for the land to be seen as a ‘common possession, something all members of the nation share’? In the wake of Mabo, it is no longer possible to defend the myth of terra nullius, a land unoccupied and belonging to no one, perhaps it is now possible to accept that all ‘belong’ to the land; to see the land, that is, not just as property, but as home for all its citizens.

The issue of possession or ownership is, in truth, not simply economic; it is spiritual and ecclesial. Tony Kelly makes the point that Aboriginal Christians have demonstrated forgiveness much more powerfully than their white Australian

---


181 ibid., 150.


184 Ien Ang, ‘Asians in Australia’, 128. Macintyre, ibid., 276, makes the same point. Regardless of government attempts to limit the effects of Mabo and Wik, he writes, ‘[t]he colonisers are confronted with the fact that they share the land with the colonised’.

185 Poole, *Nation and Identity*, 16-17.
counterparts. As such, they need to be embraced as partners in a dialogue about Australia’s common future. This is already happening, of course, to some extent. While the Anglican Church of Australia, as John Harris’ writings have demonstrated, has shared in the long history of the marginalisation of the Aboriginal people, it is nevertheless committed to working in partnership with them. As far back as 1905, in the early years of the White Australia policy, the General Synod passed a motion rejecting the notion of white racial superiority. Nine decades later, in response to the 1997 report, Bringing Them Home, the General Synod apologised for past injustices to Aboriginal people, as well as its complicity and silence. There is a will in Australian Anglicanism to be a church of reconciliation between races. As Harris argues, the Church of England is finally becoming the Anglican Church of Australia, but – and here is his qualification – it ‘will forever remain the colonial church while Indigenous people are not a valued and integral part of its life’. The work of reconciliation and partnership clearly must continue if Anglicanism is to take its place as a mediating tradition in Australian society.

The ‘neglected counter-traditions’ of Australia described by Carter are also a matter of great importance for those who are interested in Australia’s ‘soul’. Perhaps there is space for a ‘poet’s corner’ in our cathedrals. Why should all the ‘soul’ work of Australian poets, writers and artists be seen as separate from the concerns of Christianity in Australia? Perhaps there is also room for understanding the spirituality of suburbanites, their love of verandas and open spaces, of beaches

186 Kelly, ‘From Cultural Images to Historical Reality’, 78.
187 See, for example, the collection of papers prepared for the Martung Upah Indigenous Conference held at Sydney University in December, 1993, sponsored by the Australian Council of Churches, and published in Anne Pattel-Gray (ed.), Martung Upah: Black and White Australians Seeking Partnership (Blackburn, Vic.: HarperCollins, 1996). See also Pattel-Gray’s courageous exploration of racism in Australian church and society, in The Great White Flood: Racism in Australia, a major work of historical and social analysis and theological reflection from an indigenous Australian theologian.
188 I have already cited Harris’ writings in an earlier chapter. See Chapter 6, n.43.
189 Rayner, ‘The idea of a National Church’, 38; also Fletcher, ‘Anglicanism and Nationalism in Australia’, 224.
191 I am not suggesting that Australian artists should be turned into unwitting or unwilling servants of the churches. Such a tendency in Australian theology has been suitably critiqued by Noel Rowe, ‘Are There Really Angels in Carlton? Australian Literature and Theology’, Pacifica 6 (1993): 141-163. I am, however, suggesting that the themes of Australian literature need to be taken into the life of the churches, even when they tend to subvert or contradict what the churches purportedly stand for.
192 The negative readings of Australian suburbia are legion. For D.H. Lawrence’s description of Sydney suburbia as a place with no inner meaning, all ‘formlessness and chaos’, see his seminal novel, Kangaroo (Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1950). 33. David Walker, as previously noted, traces the growing sense of disillusionment of Vance Palmer and his colleagues as Australia became
and barbecues. The ‘dark side of the dream’ in Australian life also needs to be understood, whether in the past or the present, especially in attitudes to the ‘other’ in all its forms, the ways fear and hope are expressed and the truthfulness of our historical memory. Indigenous Australians have a special part to play in this exploration, but all Australians, regardless of cultural or ethnic origin, need to be part of the conversation.

CONCLUSION

This chapter, as its title indicates, was intended to involve a search for the nation’s ‘soul’. In pursuing this quest, an attempt has been made to dig below the surface of things, especially in relation to some of the key myths and assumptions that provide the nation with its sense of identity. We discovered that the Anzac myth, so powerfully unifying in Australian life, is actually permeated with spiritual ambiguity. We also discovered that the issues of race and land, so fundamental to the Australian story, are full of tensions and contradictions. There is much to admire in the way Australia has developed since 1788, but there is also a dark side. Fear, anxiety and violence have played their part in Australian political and social life, alongside courage and ingenuity. Both sides are aspects of the nation’s soul. The question is whether it is possible for Australia to move forward into the future without reverting to the divisive patterns of yesteryear, based on the politics of fear and exclusion and


193 ‘The message of the English house’, writes Philip Drew, ‘is that of the closed boundary, a topography of separate rooms not of open verandas, with restrictions and class differences. An interior that is divided into isolated cells that do not communicate with one another. The essence of Australian space is the open boundary. Loose and open … the veranda and the beach’. The veranda, Drew argues, served both as protection and as a way of connecting people with the landscape. Philip Drew, The Coast Dwellers: Australians Living on the Edge (Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin, 1994), 122-123. There is room for a great deal of theological reflection on the architectural aspects of Australian life. Why must a nation have to choose between being an ‘open’ and a ‘closed’ society? Is it not possible to be ‘at home’ while also keeping a sense of openness at the boundaries? Stephen Pickard argues along similar lines in ‘Many Verandahs, Same House?’, 193-197.

194 See Hage’s discussion of Australia’s distorted national memory in Against Paranoid Nationalism, 79-103; and also Reynold’s telling comment, in Aboriginal Sovereignty, 96, that Australians seem to need to believe in ‘the idea of peaceful occupation both for the security of the legal system and the legitimacy of their civilization’.

195 Paul Carter, ‘Baroque Identities’, 12, argues that Australian identity cannot be defined narrowly ‘in terms of the rhetoric of place, ethnicity, biographical and cultural heritage’. It is more organic and interactive than that, the achievement of a ‘living environment’ involving many perspectives and many players. He urges a more provisional approach to such a pluralistic conversation, which is not a contest needing a winner, but an open exploration of our common sense of being at home in Australia.
the suppression of historical memory. There is no doubt that a fundamental change of heart and mind would be required for such a transformation in the national consciousness to take place, a willingness to live with the ‘moral imagination’ (to recall Lederach’s term), believing that relationships and community are more characteristic of human life than estrangement, hostility and separation.

Towards the end of his book, *Lost Icons*, Rowan Williams argues that the ‘soul’ is something that happens within human beings whenever they experience ‘the psychological pain of contradiction’.196 This is a telling phrase. If Williams is correct, there is a need for deep reflection on those aspects of Australian life in which conflict is either avoided or suppressed using power rather than conversation. In many cases, it is the ‘other’ who suffers, whether Chinese, or Aborigines, or ‘illegal’ asylum seekers. In many ways all this is an exercise in pain avoidance. It will not do to deny that this happens at both an interpersonal, corporate or national level. As Jacob Needleman says in his book, *The American Soul*, a nation is not just a sociopolitical entity: it is ‘a community of souls’.197 The soul of a person or a nation does not grow either through avoidance or aggression, but through careful reflection and personal discipline.198 It is important that when digging below the surface takes place in a society, especially in relation to the retrieval of historical memory, every effort should be made to avoid distortion. As Desmond Tutu demonstrated in the South African context, this is not possible without a commitment to truthfulness.199 Commenting on the end of apartheid, Williams notes that for many white South Africans the struggle was really about defending the white ‘myth of innocence’; about holding on to ‘a particular kind of moral self-image’.200 He then comments:

If a significant proportion of the white population remains privately wedded to the self-perceptions that reinforced apartheid, even when the structures have begun to shift, what real political conversation, what
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196 Williams, *Lost Icons*, 149. Williams is drawing on the insights of Joseph Needleman at this point.
198 Williams, *Lost Icons*, 150.
199 Simone Weil regarded ‘truth’ as one of the essential ‘needs of the soul’. *The Need for Roots: Prelude to a Declaration of Duties Toward Mankind* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), 37-40. She also writes about historical truth (232): uncovering the real past rather than the ‘historical wrapper of the past’. She admits that so much of what is transmitted ‘to the memory of posterity’ in national life is really ‘false greatness’. Thankfully, she writes, this is always mixed with ‘a little genuine greatness’. The task is to discern the difference between the one and the other.
200 Williams, *Lost Icons*, 119.
‘charity’, can emerge between former masters and former slaves? How far can the native African trust the former masters, now that their behaviour is – perforce – different? Is the past really named and dealt with? Because if it isn’t, the prospects for common ‘civility’ are poor … such refusals to confront the past deny the passage of time and the reality of vulnerability. 201

Indeed, Williams continues, structural change does not simply remove the histories and memories of either the dominant or oppressed groups in society. These remain, perhaps just below the surface, as ‘vulnerable, tense and mistrustful constructions to the extent that these histories are not thought and imagined afresh’. 202 Williams makes a plea for the rediscovery of remorse, for a willingness to embrace the ‘non-heroic’, the ‘vulnerable’ and even the ‘comic’ within the life of a culture; 203 even, one might dare to say, to acknowledge mistakes. 204 Unless this is done, of course, no new imaginings are possible: a nation is left with a repetition of past patterns that remain undisturbed just below the surface of things.

Australians need to wrestle with similar challenges. It will not do simply to legislate away issues that continue to cause division. This is to misuse (and abuse) parliamentary democracy. Indeed, such policies simply pass the problem on to the next generation. A more reflective approach is required, a way of discussing national issues with truthfulness, justice and compassion. There is no need to deny the strong British heritage that continues to shape the Australian way of life, provided there is also room to discuss the negative aspects of colonialism. It is important, as this chapter has demonstrated, to acknowledge vested interests (imperial, racial, utilitarian) which so often provide the real agendas for political discussion. Who will

201 ibid., 120.
202 ibid., 121. Lederach, The Moral Imagination, also writes extensively about the healing of memory. ‘The past, it would appear, still lies before us’, he writes (134), in a chapter titled ‘On Time’. Out of his experience as an international mediator and peacemaker, Lederach claims that every local or national community contains ‘multiple ranges of lived history’ encompassing several generations. (141-142). In fact, early in his book (23), he uses the term, ‘the 200-year present’, to indicate the impossibility of escaping from the lingering effects of historical memory.
203 ibid., 131. I am reminded of the tragic heroes in Manning Clark’s History of Australia.
204 Henry Reynolds comments that the growth in knowledge and understanding of Aboriginal Australia across a range of disciplines over the past decades has presented white Australians with ‘a less flattering image of their past’, but one which is much more realistic. More importantly, he writes, in ‘coming face to face with black Australians they have at last come face to face with themselves’. ‘The Breaking of the Great Australian Silence: Aborigines in Australian Historiography 1955-1983, in Diversity Itself: Essays in Australian Arts and Culture, ed. Peter Quartermaine (Exeter: Exeter University Publications, 1986), 49.
admit the place of fear of the ‘other’ or the prevailing sense of (white) racial superiority in the Australian psyche? How can a genuine search for the ‘soul’ of Australia take place within a nation committed to spiritual impoverishment? Who will take the time to listen to the ‘counter-traditions’ within the Australian story, those whose spiritual imaginations have reached beyond the mediocre? Without such voices, how can we know what Australia is and what it stands for?

Australian Anglicanism, as a spiritual tradition with a ‘reconciling method’, has the capacity to be particularly sensitive to points of contradiction in Australian society, and to search for the truth (and untruths) hidden beneath competing systems, including its own. It is a mediating tradition that is capable of taking the life of the nation seriously, and of ‘comprehending’ the tensions within society in the light of a faith committed to both diversity and unity. It is also a realistic tradition, because it recognises, from long historical experience, how easily humanity chooses fragmentation over communion. I am encouraging Anglicans in Australia to reflect more deeply on Australian experience, to dig beneath the surface of things to uncover the hidden presuppositions driving the Australian conversation. The issues to be explored are many and various. They begin in conversations amongst ordinary Australians, in shops, schools, churches, workplaces and backyard barbecues. Australian Anglicanism has work of the ‘soul’ to do. It will need to learn to listen carefully both to its own heartbeat and to the heartbeats of others. This work of attentive listening is not foreign to Christian experience: quite simply, it is the work of theological reflection and prayer.

The Anglican tradition in Australia will need to search for a way forward that leads to healing and reconciliation. Sometimes this will result in a prophetic challenge to the status quo in both the church and the wider society, especially when the politics of fear and subtle forms of violence threaten to destroy the ‘communion’ for which the nation (purportedly) stands. At other times it will affirm and celebrate the

---

memories, values and aspirations of the nation. In the process the church itself will (and must) change. To employ its pastoral, theological, spiritual and ecclesial resources in a ‘static’ way, serving only its own interests, is to fail to understand what it means to be Anglican and also what it means to be Australian. The future direction of the Anglican Church of Australia must be shaped by this realisation.
CONCLUSION: A CHURCH FOR THE NATION

The Anglican tradition in Australia is at a crossroad. The trajectory on which this Australian church has been travelling thus far has probably exhausted itself. There may be traces of a pathway ahead, but it is not leading the church deeper into the nation to which it belongs, but rather skirts around the periphery. There needs to be a change in direction, but this can only be accomplished if the church becomes more attentive to its surroundings. The Anglican Church of Australia has thus far been very much focussed on the past, on its English heritage of theology, worship and pastoral practice, but it is still struggling to ‘belong’ to Australia. It has yet to discover its vocation as a ‘church for the nation’.

During the period of the Australian Settlement, church and nation were interwoven, both presupposing a link to the past, both assuming that the composition and values of Australian society were essentially an extension of a British world that was, in fact, passing away. While Britain was negotiating a different kind of future, Australia depended on a frozen image for its stability. Once this world began to unravel, however, essentially around the very time that the new national Anglican constitution was taking effect, the church found itself having to take account of its environment in a new way. Australian society was changing around it. What then happened was that Anglicanism in Australia and the world of ‘old Australia’ continued to move on parallel tracks. In terms of Australia as a whole, however, Anglicanism became increasingly marginalised. Meanwhile, the internal dissension that made it so hard to reach agreement on a constitution has continued. Diocesan separatism and ‘theological polarisation’, to use a phrase quoted earlier by Bill Lawton, remain as major obstacles to national unity. The tragedy is that the overt disunity of Australian Anglicanism is not just an in-house affair, even if Anglicans think it is. As Lawton has said, ‘this debate can only weaken the church in relationship to broader society, which does not understand its dialect and is baffled (and sometimes disgusted) by its
nuances’. The life of the church is indelibly linked to the nation to which it belongs. It impacts on the life of the wider society whether it likes it or not, and is, in turn, shaped by that society.

The evocative title of Bruce Kaye’s book, *A Church Without Walls*, was a call to the Anglican Church of Australia to recognise its vocation as a ‘church in society’. Kaye and his colleagues, as we have seen, have been engaged in retrieving the history of Anglicanism in Australia, especially in its relationship to Australian society. He has also expressed regret and disappointment about the way in which ‘the Anglican tradition has failed to grow in any local sense in Australia’. Stephen Pickard has recently made similar claims, noting the way in which imported local expressions of Anglicanism in Australia have become fixed in concrete rather than becoming indigenous. This has prevented a genuine national church from growing from within Australian experience. A great deal of energy is instead expended on ‘regional conflicts, fragmentation and diversity’.

What this means is that an Australian Anglican theology will require careful attention to the nature of the place in which the Church has had to take root and develop. A theology of place may be the way in which Australian Anglicans find a new theological maturity in the twenty-first century. Such a theology would have to take account of the strong incarnational theme in Anglicanism, its concomitant attention to challenges of enculturation and its critical perspective on society in relation to the Gospel.

I have been arguing throughout this study that the Anglican Church of Australia, in keeping with its name, must become both an Anglican and an Australian church. The change of name from ‘Church of England in Australia’ took place over a quarter of a century ago, yet, in a sense, the work of becoming what the new name implies has only just begun. A more penetrating understanding of the Anglican tradition is required, along with a deeper appreciation of the way Australian society has been formed, the values it espouses, and the role that its spiritual traditions have played in this unfolding story. I have dismissed at the outset the view that church and society are separate entities. This is not how I read the history of Anglicanism, and it is
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1 Bill Lawton, ‘Australian Anglican Theology, 199. See Chapter 1, n.90.
2 Kaye, *A Church Without Walls*, 113. See Chapter 4, n.143.
3 Pickard, ‘Theology as Power’, 119-120.
certainly not true of the history of Australia, as Kaye and his colleagues have been seeking to demonstrate. Before them came Manning Clark, with his profound theological reading of Australian history. If anything is to be gleaned from his long spiritual struggle, it must surely be that the human journey that has been taking place on this island continent since the beginning of British settlement must be read in spiritual terms. This is why Anglicanism has to do the ‘soul’ work required of it, not for its own survival, but for the sake of the nation of which it is a part. Earlier I quoted Bruce Kaye on this very issue:

Anglican Christianity still represents a particular and distinct kind of Christian faith. It emphasises a sense of the providence of God in human society and a focus upon the incarnation of the Son of God in the person of Jesus Christ. Because of that sense of God’s providential presence in society, this religious faith is a faith of engagement with society and mission to it.4

I have used the term ‘mediating tradition’ to express how this vocation of Anglicanism is to be understood. This is an appropriate term given the ‘reconciling method’ that lies at the heart of the Anglican ethos. Anglicanism mediates, as Peter Sedgwick reminded us, ‘between a received tradition and the formation of a people of faith’. Yet the people are also part of the life-world of a wider culture. Indigenisation is therefore also required. The disciplines or practices that lead to and from the worship of God must reflect the language and culture of a people’.5 I have, of course, extended this further. Because the church also ‘belongs’ to the society of which it is a part, it also finds itself sharing the struggles and contradictions of the world around it. It cannot avoid this. As I demonstrated in Part 3, Anglicans have been caught up, along with everyone else in Australia, in the politics of fear and exclusion. It is naïve and irresponsible to suggest that the church is separate from the issues confronting Australian society every day, whether at a local, national or global level. A ‘mediating’ approach to life in society is unavoidable once this dual citizenship is recognised. The root system of Anglicanism is not just backwards (rooted in a spiritual tradition); it is outwards (rooted in the life of the real world). The two are inseparable. What I have endeavoured to show, especially in Part 2, is that this mediating quality actually lies at the heart of the Anglican ethos.

4 Kaye, A Church Without Walls, 198. See Chapter 4, n.141.
Anglicanism cannot distance itself from the struggles of society. It is called to be a reconciling and prophetic presence in the life of the nation to which it belongs.

What is preventing Anglicanism in Australia from embracing this vocation? Earlier in this study I drew attention to three ‘demons’ needing to be faced if Anglicanism in Australia is to embrace its vocation as a church for the nation: ignorance of its own tradition, its struggle with factionalism, and its concern for self-preservation.6 Each of these is a formidable hurdle in its own right. I have been arguing, however, that part of the problem lies in perceptions: that is, the demons will remain formidable for as long as Australian Anglicanism fails to address its national context, which has always been, and remains, the hidden unitive factor in the life of this Australian church. The question is whether, to use Stephen Carter’s terminology, Australian Anglicanism is seeking the integral life, or whether it prefers to continue living with the delusion that integrity and division go hand in hand. It occurs to me that the demons haunting Anglicanism in Australia have become so familiar that they are accepted as an integral aspect of what Anglicanism means. But clearly this is a distortion. Our long survey of the Anglican tradition, both in England and throughout the world, has provided enough evidence for a broader understanding of the Anglican ethos. At the very least, Australian Anglicanism needs to be true to its name: to be both Anglican and Australian.

THE RECOVERY OF CORPORATE MEMORY

The first demon needing to be confronted is that of ignorance or forgetfulness. Australian Anglicans simply do not know a lot about their own tradition. How many would have wrestled with the centrality of the national idea in Anglicanism since the Reformation, or considered the radical implications of Article 34? In the first edition of his work, Anglicanism and the Christian Church, Paul Avis wrote:

Tradition is the corporate memory of a community. When Christian communities lose touch with their roots in tradition they suffer from a form of religious ‘amnesia’ leading to loss of identity, for ‘the tradition provides the hermeneutical categories by which the community reconstructs and reinterprets its identity.’ As Anglicans, our knowledge of our roots in the tradition is both impoverished and distorted.\(^7\)

---

6 See above, pages 5-6, 206.
Anglicanism in Australia was shaped from the very beginning by a combination of factors: the varieties of theology and churchmanship transported from England, the personalities of early bishops, the regional pattern of colonial life, the distance from England, the expectations of establishment which quickly turned into sectarian rivalry, and so on. Bishop Broughton was perhaps more sensitive than most to the need for adaptation, but his remarkable intuition was quickly swept aside and forgotten through the long decades leading up to the 1962 constitution. A century later, Bishop Ernest Burgmann also called for Anglicanism in Australia to realise its vocation as a church for the nation. At the time, Burgmann was considered to be a maverick. He did not seem to fit any of the accepted categories defining what it meant to be an Anglican in Australia. He was, in a sense, ahead of his time. But he was also tuned into another strand of Anglican tradition that has largely been overlooked in the life of the Australian church.⁸

It was for this reason that I embarked, in Part 2 of this study, on a review of the Anglican tradition, beginning with the Reformation Settlements under Henry and Elizabeth, through the turbulent years of reform associated with Evangelicalism and Tractarianism, and then, with the departure of Newman for Rome, suddenly laying hold of an alternative stream of Broad Church thinkers who held on tenaciously to Anglicanism’s national vocation. I have paid a lot of attention to F.D. Maurice, whose theological instincts, I believe, were correct, and whose legacy must not be forgotten. His influence on subsequent Anglicans like William Reed Huntington in America and Ernest Burgmann in Australia is apparent.⁹ His vision of the Kingdom of Christ challenged fragmentation in all its forms. In a sense, he was a profound deconstructionist, except that beneath all his digging beneath human systems (ecclesiastical or otherwise) lay the unifying presence of the divine purpose, without which communion is impossible.

⁸ In her survey of Australian Anglicanism, for example, ‘Tricia Blombery writes about ‘the two main theological traditions within Anglicanism’ – the ‘Evangelical strand’ and the ‘Anglo-Catholic strand’. She mentions in passing ‘the middle church tradition’ which embraces the majority of Australian Anglicans, without even mentioning the legacy of the Broad Church strand, of which Burgmann is such a striking expression. Blombery, The Anglicans in Australia, 21-24.
⁹ Of Burgmann, Hempenstall writes: ‘[H]e exemplified the right and obligation of the Christian Church to elbow its way into the affairs of the world, making social justice a live issue, throwing up leaders who would stubbornly address the whole condition of the whole people. The lineage stretches from F.D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley through Gore to William Temple’. The Meddlesome Priest, 244-245.
Maurice, in the English context, remained committed to establishment. This became irrelevant, however, once Anglicanism departed from England shores. Even so, the Anglican principle of ‘particular or national churches’ has lived on in a variety of cultural contexts. Once the establishment idea was discarded, it was possible to see more clearly what lay beneath it: the principle of inculturation. The document, *For the Sake of the Kingdom*, challenged the various churches of the Anglican Communion to enter more deeply into the life of their societies, living with the tension of ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’. It also expressed with great clarity the strong links between Anglicanism and colonialism. I have indicated that, in my judgment, this document needs to be revisited, especially in countries like Australia, where Anglicanism has been slow to peel away the ‘establishment’ coating that it carried from England, and so has not grasped as quickly as it might either the weight of its colonial baggage or the urgency of inculturation. This became apparent in Chapters 7 and 8, which demonstrated the comfortable fit between the Anglican ethos and the values of the Australian Settlement era. The internal fragmentation of the Church of England in Australia up to 1962 was possible only because outwardly the nation was so much like ‘home’ (meaning England), where establishment held everything together in spite of party differences. But this is no longer possible. Australia is an increasingly diverse society. A church which models fragmentation has nothing to offer a nation or world urgently in need of relationship and unity.

As I have said repeatedly, the root system of Anglicanism reaches both backwards and outwards. I have devoted a large part of this study to retrieving a neglected strand of the Anglican tradition. But it is also important to dig into the history of Australia, and of Anglicanism within Australia. This study has been an attempt to address this culture of neglect, but it is only one of many. The amount of scholarly reflection on Australian Anglicanism is blossoming even as I write. Bruce Kaye, for example, is continuing to write about Australian, and global, Anglican experience.10 Stephen Pickard has also provided, in a recent essay, a comprehensive overview of Australian Anglican theological writings.11 It is clear that the ground is very fertile at

10 The essays in Frame and Treloar, *Agendas for Australian Anglicanism*, provide a wealth of biographical material about Kaye’s past (and future) projects, as well as an extensive bibliography of his writings so far.
11 Pickard, ‘Theology as Power: Traditions and Challenges for Australian Anglicans’. Pickard includes scholars from all corners of the Australian Anglican church.
present. Perhaps this is a sign that Anglicanism is finally taking root in Australia, half a century after Burgmann made his appeal for the Church of England in Australia to embrace its vocation as an Australian church. As the writings of Kaye and his colleagues demonstrate, Burgmann’s plea has not been in vain. It appears that other minds have caught a vision of a church for the nation. Their writings disclose a broad knowledge of Australian history and culture, as well as deep reflection on the Anglican tradition.

Anglican writers are not alone in this. The present generation of theologically educated Australians, Anglicans included, have been formed, both intellectually and spiritually, within an ecumenical environment. Anglicans seeking to understand Christianity in Australia have a great deal to work with, both from the increasing number of historical writings and from attempts at a more reflective theological engagement with Australian society. As we have seen, Anglican writers like Frame and Kaye move comfortably between history and theology, intentionally seeking to address the question of what it means to be both Australian and Anglican. There is now a mountain of offerings from other Christian traditions in Australia, especially, though not exclusively, Roman Catholic writers. Contributors to journals like *Compass Theological Review* have grappled with these issues for more than two decades, much of it exploratory, working with issues like Aboriginal spirituality, the land, and Australian literature. Some of these writings developed into books which

---

12 See Introduction, n. 21.
14 For a comprehensive survey, see Gideon Goosen, *Australian Theologies: Themes and Methodologies into the New Millenium* (Sydney: St Paul’s Publications, 2000).
need to be considered carefully. Uniting Church scholars have also engaged in similar reflection, though admittedly from a different theological perspective. Reflecting on Australian experience is, after all, a recent art, basically coinciding with the quest for an Australian identity brought about by the demise of the Australian Settlement. Bishop Burgmann’s vision of an Australian Christianity, it seems, is slowly being realised. It is imperative that Anglicans should embrace the task of coming to understand what it means to be an Australian Christian in an Australian church, but also to become more conversant with the Anglican tradition itself which, as Avis has said, ‘provides the hermeneutical categories by which the community reconstructs and reinterprets its identity’. There is no excuse any longer for a failure of corporate memory. Pioneers like Bruce Kaye have set before both church and nation a challenge to face and resources with which to face it. John Gaden once wrote that

an authentic Australian theology will be the combined product of those who seek to embody their response to Jesus Christ in the realities of Australian culture, of those who interpret Australian history as the history of God in this land, and of those engaged in the particular issues to which the present situation in Australia gives rise.

It is a situation tailor-made for the ‘mystical’ via media. No one can now complain that they have nothing to work with.

In terms of understanding Australia, it is clear that the Australian context must be allowed to impact on the way the experience of God is shaped and expressed. This is

---

the work of both those who practise the art of theological reflection in seminaries or universities, and the majority of Anglicans who engage in praxis in their everyday vocations in Australian society. It belongs to both clergy and laity. It is the work of a mediating tradition, encompassing all aspects of Australian life, both inside the church and in the wider society. I have endeavoured to touch on three aspects of Australian experience in the previous chapter, but there are many more challenges requiring attention as well. To quote Stephen Pickard once more:

Enculturating the Gospel within the Australian environment and its cultures remains a project on the ecclesial drawing board and a major task for Australian theologians. The challenges here can be discerned in a number of areas: interfaith and indigenous relations, social and political engagements, liturgy, worship and church architecture. Beneath these lies the deeper issue for theology and the Church of finding an orientation and sympathy with the realities of Australian life at the intersections of continent, ocean and sky. The specific task is to nurture a theological outlook that attends to our local context and draws upon the givens of our existence.

These givens, according to Pickard, include the treatment of Australia’s indigenous people. Pain and violence, he argues, are part of the story. These cannot be sidestepped. What is required is a theology of creation and redemption which ‘honours the place of our habitation’. This is surely what one would expect from a mediating tradition.

LIVING WITH DIFFERENCE

The first chapter of this study focused on the fragmentation that characterises Australian Anglicanism. I have deliberately avoided entering into debate about the pros and cons of any one theological position or expression of churchmanship, concentrating instead on the broader vocation of Anglicanism in Australia. While I have drawn heavily on the theological insights of writers like F.D. Maurice, this has not been in order to argue that everyone must become members of a Broad Church party. Maurice himself, as we have seen, would caution against such a proposal. He was realistic enough to recognise that the way to deal with ‘sectarianism’ was not to

21 ibid., 120.
make everyone the same, or even to reach some kind of half-baked compromise. He believed in unity-in-tension. The real issue, for Maurice, was recognising both the flaws and the hidden potential within systems and institutions. He preferred to dig rather than to build, to search for understanding rather than to come up with some new system which somehow incorporated all the disparate parts and parties. Australian Christians, after all, need to trust that the Living God is at the heart of Australian experience.

The differences in Australian Anglicanism can easily seem insurmountable. Anglicans, as the world knows only too well, know how to disagree. 22 In an insightful article, Scott Cowdell recognises the ‘mutual antagonism’ present in Australian Anglican church life. It takes a certain spiritual maturity, he argues, to be able to ‘discern and acknowledge’ the spiritual treasures present in other expressions of Anglican faith. 23 He contrasts a ‘pneumatology of despair’ with a ‘pneumatology of hope’. Loving the actual Church becomes possible, he writes, when we recognise that the agendas of all human institutions, including religious ones, are ‘not ultimate’, but that God is nevertheless present in the life of the ‘flawed, actual Church’. In fact, it is in the actual struggles of living with difference within Christian community that the truth of God is encountered. 24 This was also the point Maurice was trying to make. His great insight was that, if people would just take the time to dig beneath the surface level of competing systems, they would begin to discern, even in the midst of the rubble, the divine order at the heart of all things.

Each party within the Anglican Church needs to understand the history of its own journey. It may be possible for Anglicans of various persuasions in Australia to admit, with a spirit of honesty and humility, that the way Anglican faith has been expressed in Australian history is a distortion of what it had been prior to its transportation from the other side of the world. As Bruce Kaye has shown, Australian Anglicanism is coated with layers of imperialism. One layer goes back to the

---

22 Recent disagreements between Archbishops Peter Carnley of Perth and Peter Jensen of Sydney are a case in point. As Tom Frame has pointed out, much of the energy in this discussion was misplaced, causing unnecessary hurt and bitterness on both sides. Frame appeals for a better way of engaging in future discussions. See ‘The Dynamics and Difficulties of Debate in Australian Anglicanism’.
24 ibid., 267-268.
Reformation; another comes from the history of British colonialism. Certainly the
golden age of Anglicanism in Australia was linked to British imperialism. These
things should be admitted and wrestled with. There are many ways, as Maurice
pointed out repeatedly, that we allow our systems to become substitutes for a genuine
encounter with the Living God. Manning Clark’s despair at not finding the face of
Christ in Australian Anglicanism may very well be worth listening to. It may be that
one of the things Anglicans of all persuasions have most in common is their
defensiveness: their unwillingness to face the fact that their loyalty to parties and
factions may have become a substitute for genuine spiritual experience. Bishop John
Moyes made this same point in his Moorhouse Lectures almost seven decades ago:

In her desire ‘ever to keep a mean between two extremes’ our Church is
like a bird, the central portion of her people the body and the parties
Anglo Catholic and Evangelical the wings. In Australian life the wings
rarely function together and so the Church is utterly pedestrian, never
rising from the ground, and inclined, through the disjointed action of its
wings, to move in circles. Worse still is her tragedy! Each wing tends to
consider itself ‘the Church’ and each tends to hold the truth committed to
it by God as the whole truth, indeed at times with a zeal not according to
knowledge. The extremes of these parties appear at least to worship the
form in which their truth or worship is expressed, rather than the content,
and to fight for this form as of simply primary significance, with a
resultant partisanship as fanatical as Manasseh’s, who passed his children
through the fire in the frenzy of his faith. There is a real danger that the
enthusiasm of partisanship may breed an idolatry which not only shuts
out others, but in the end hides God.25

I am not asking Australian Anglicans to surrender to the forces of historical
relativism. I am simply suggesting that, since our wisdom is always partial, seen
‘through a glass darkly’, it may be possible to become more reflective about our
certainties and begin to listen to those with different perspectives on the mystery of
God and creation. Anglicans need to show that this is possible: to move, in Tillich’s
terms, from ‘against-each-otherness’ to ‘beside-each-otherness’. This is more than a
doctrinal issue; it is vocational. In a divided world, it is imperative that the church
should display in word and action that careful, compassionate and humble
conversation is possible. Moreover, it needs to display rigorous self-appraisal, a

25 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, 95-96. Much can be gained from pondering Moyes’
reflections on the resolution of conflict. For example, his 1933 Presidential Address to Armidale
Synod, Conflict and Creativeness, is a strong exposition of the parallel themes of mediation and
reconciliation which I have been addressing in this study.
willingness to confront difficult issues that also face the life of the nation. Anglicanism, after all, is one component of a national story. The issues that polarise Australian society are also present within the Anglican community, crossing over doctrinal divides.

All Christian traditions in Australia need to be adventurous in their interpretation of what has been going on in Australia since 1788. As I argued in Chapter 7, the tribalism and sectarianism of former years have passed. The churches have demonstrated that Australia is, in fact, a place of meeting. The internal squabbles of Australian Anglicanism are, at least in part, a carry-over of differences that were transported from somewhere else. Meanwhile, all Australian Anglicans share anguish over the unresolved tensions in the body politic. Maurice would advise all parties to start digging, to understand what has really been going on in Australian history. It is a story still in the making. A large part of that story, however, has been about living with difference – or, at least, trying to deal with difference the wrong way through forced exclusion or assimilation. Careful and respectful listening to the ‘other’ has not been a great Australian attribute, either inside or outside the churches.

I have not addressed the issue of ecumenism in this study, but it may be appropriate to conclude this section by calling for a ‘broad ecumenism’, willing to work for reconciliation between all peoples. Internal church issues are one thing, as are the building of relations between different Christian denominations. But the broader contemporary issue is how human beings can coexist on planet earth. There are many barriers to cross, many margins and spaces of ‘in-between’. The global experience of Anglicanism should not be forgotten. Anglicanism is an international, culturally diverse Communion. It lives with the pain of this conversation, but this makes it even more significant a player in a world of unresolved conflict and widespread inequality.

AN AUSTRALIAN CHURCH
The third demon haunting Australian Anglicanism is closely related to the second: the concern for self-preservation. In the Introduction I described this as a tendency to look backwards, trying to hold onto securities (or perceived securities) of the past, including the Englishness of Anglicanism. The reverse side of the coin is becoming
an indigenous church, regarding inculturation as an Anglican imperative: to be an Australian church. Stephen Pickard calls for ‘contextual ecclesiology’, though with the added comment that Australian Anglicans ‘have barely begun to traverse this terrain’.26 It makes no sense to try to continue to be an English church in Australian society. Peter Carey’s image of a glass Anglican church disintegrating in the Australian bush is a fitting metaphor for one of Australian Anglicanism’s most lingering demons.27 Being Anglican and Australian is now the agenda of this national church. It is called to be a church for this nation. While treasuring its English heritage, Anglicanism in Australia must be astute enough to discern what needs to be preserved and what is an encumbrance. As we have noted, imperial assumptions must be jettisoned. Any traces of a colonial mindset must be recognised and discarded. It must also get beyond the limits of diocesanism and regionalism to grasp that it is a national church with a national vocation.

I am not suggesting that Anglicanism is able to solve all the problems in society. Such a view would be both arrogant and hopelessly utopian. My suggestion has been more modest, but also, I believe, far-reaching. Wherever there is a rupture in society, whether at the national level or in local communities, the Anglican tradition needs to be present, both as listener and discerner, digging and seeking understanding, and then finding a point of unity in our common humanity under God. If there is an injustice, the church must speak out. If there is a breakdown in relationships, and the church can do something to build bridges of understanding, it should do so. It will always be on the lookout for the way systems, whether local or global, escape into ideological self-justification, and it will name what it discovers, gently and honestly, with compassion and humility.

It is imperative, of course, that it should first practise reconciliation within its own life, whether at national, diocesan or parish level. The church is not immune from the very human tendency to sever relationships – this is called ‘sin’ – but it is called to practise confession, forgiveness and reconciliation, beginning in its own backyard. It is, by its very nature, a ‘mediating tradition’. Clearly fragmentation is a weak,

27 Peter Carey, *Oscar and Lucinda*, (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1988). See also Veronica Brady’s discussion of Carey’s work in Chapter 7 of *Can These Bones Live?* The chapter has the evocative title, ‘People in Glass Churches …’
unimaginative way to deal with difference. A spiritual tradition like Anglicanism should be both able and willing to pursue a different path, modelling in its own life what is needed in the wider national and international community. This applies at all levels of society, whether in national and diocesan synods and boards or within local communities. It is there, in the midst of Australian life, in its cities, towns and institutions, that Australian Anglicanism lives out its national vocation.
GLOSSARY

Adiaphora: The English Reformation was only able to happen, in a sense, because of the belief that, while there were certain fundamental truths in Christianity, there were also many other ‘things indifferent’, which allowed a certain amount of flexibility in the way church life was ordered. Article 34 is a case in point, allowing the English church to exercise freedom in ‘tradition’ and ‘ceremonies’. This became particularly important for the development of the Anglican Communion, with its wide variety of cultural expressions. The Anglican Communion is still grappling with this issue. Of course, there is also the question as to what is essential and what is ‘indifferent’, an issue which gets to the heart of Christian authority.

Broad Church: The term arose in the mid-nineteenth century Church of England as a way of distinguishing between those of an Evangelical or Anglo-Catholic persuasion and those who rejected such an association. It also tended to be applied to those who gave more ground to human reason in theology, rather than focussing more exclusively on scripture (in the case of the Evangelicals) or tradition (in the case of the Anglo-Catholics). This does not mean that those who are described as Broad Church occupied a kind of half-way position between extremes without espousing a position of their own. As I argue in this study, thinkers like F.D. Maurice (who himself shunned the ‘Broad Church’ label because of his dislike of parties of any description) were particularly concerned for the relationship between church and nation. They believed in a theology of engagement. The Broad Church tradition in Anglicanism is regarded by many as the natural descendent of the seventeenth-century Latitudinarians.

Comprehensiveness: The character of the Church of England prior to the reign of Charles I, whereby the refusal to define doctrine too restrictively enabled many dissident voices to remain within the church. As English society became increasingly pluralistic, it became necessary to allow dissenters more freedom to exist as distinct bodies separate from the established church: the Church of England was effectively
no longer able to ‘comprehend’ the whole of English society. Even so, there were many, especially within the Broad Church tradition, who still considered comprehensiveness to be the vocation of the national church, in that the church was called to embrace not just those who were able to subscribe to church doctrine, but (as far as it was possible) the people of the entire nation. In this sense, comprehensiveness is not only a reference to the internal workings of Anglicanism (the capacity to embrace doctrinal difference or varieties of churchmanship), but also the willingness to embrace the tensions and contradictions within the life of the nation. It refers, that is, to cultural and not just doctrinal inclusiveness. I am using the term in this broader sense.

**Contextualisation:** The recognition that context is a crucial dimension of theology, in so far as culture impacts on the way we interpret our experience. There is no ‘pure’ doctrine untouched by social context. Reason itself is shaped contextually. Contextualisation also refers to the issues pressing in on theology from outside – issues of social justice, for example, that are part of national history. These must also be taken into theology and ecclesiology. Global issues – the displacement of peoples in the contemporary world, for example – may also be seen to be part of the context that shapes theology.

**Erastianism:** The view that the state may interfere in the affairs of the church. There is a view that the English Reformation resulted in an Erastian church. Certainly this was how John Henry Newman saw things before his departure for Rome in the mid-nineteenth century. But the church in England was never totally Erastian, as though the state controlled the inner workings of its spiritual life. Nevertheless, there was certainly a tension between church and state which reached crisis point in the early nineteenth century, forcing the church to reconsider the relationship.

**Establishment:** In the context of the English Reformation, the Church of England became instituted by law as the church of the realm. Church and state coexisted in an organic relationship, with the people of the nation making up the church, and the people of the church making up the nation. The sovereign was declared to be the spiritual head of the church in England, thus overturning the hegemony of the
papacy. The Church of England is still the established church in England, though in much weakened form. In early colonial Australia the Church of England assumed establishment status, but by 1836, with the passing of the Church Act, this assumption was no longer possible to sustain. The Anglican tradition outside England has developed in a range of different cultures, but without the benefits (or restrictions) of establishment. Whether the Anglican Church of Australia is still operating with an establishment mindset is a key issue for a church purporting to be both Anglican and Australian.

**Evangelicals:** Within the established church in England, they were those who had been influenced by the seventeenth century Evangelical revival led by John Wesley and George Whitfield, but who nevertheless remained part of the established church. Evangelicals placed a heavy emphasis on personal conversion, the authority of Scripture, and the call to a serious and devout life. They saw themselves as true guardians of the Reformation. They also played a major role in social reform in England in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Evangelicalism was the original expression of Anglicanism in colonial Australia. The first Bishop of Melbourne, Charles Perry, and the second Bishop of Sydney, Frederick Barker, were staunch Evangelicals who profoundly shaped the future of their respective dioceses.

**High Church:** Those who emphasised the catholicity of the visible Church of England, the apostolic succession, and the importance of the sacramental. They were also staunch defenders of the English Reformation, and the relationship between church and state enshrined in the Reformation Settlements, but they rejected any form of Erastianism.

**Inculturation:** As used in this study, the view that the Christian faith, when transported to new contexts, must become part of the life of the people. It is more than translation. It carries the sense of coming to ‘belong’, living on the inside of a culture and speaking out from within its life and history. This does not mean that the Gospel is swallowed up by culture. A prophetic stance is also required. Inculturation presupposes an ongoing tension between ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’. The tension is itself the point of creativity.
**Indigenisation:** This word, closely linked to ‘inculturation’, carries the more general sense of needing to adapt the Gospel to the subtle nuances of a new society, realising that a foreign expression will not communicate the message or the intention of the religious tradition clearly. But it also carries the sense of ‘belonging’, of being part of a culture or a people.

**Lambeth documents:** As used in this study, a blanket term for documents emerging, not only from reports of the Lambeth Conferences of Anglican bishops, but also reports of other Anglican councils and conferences, together with papers prepared by bodies like the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission.

**Low Church:** These days this term tends to be applied to Evangelical Anglicans. In fact, Evangelicals in the Church of England tended to be more High Church before 1833. The Tractarians began to speak of Evangelicals as Low Churchmen, and so it has remained. Australian Evangelicalism as expressed in the Diocese of Sydney could be accurately described in our time as Low Church, the polar opposite of the ‘Catholic’ wing of the Anglican Church, with its heavy emphasis on the apostolic succession and the sacramental.

**Mediating Tradition:** The term, as I am using it, is complex and multilayered. On one level, it refers to the traditional understanding of Anglican comprehensiveness: Anglicanism mediates between competing views within the tradition itself. But the church is not a closed system: it ‘belongs’ to the society of which it is a part. It must therefore also ‘mediate’ between the received religious tradition and the culture of the people. In this sense it is closely linked to ‘inculturation’ and ‘indigenisation’, presupposing a contextual theological method. By extension, a mediating tradition also brings its reconciling method to bear on the anxieties, contradictions and tensions affecting the life of the nation. This latter sense is of particular importance in this study.

**Nation:** A nation is a political community, made up of people who share a common culture, a homeland, myths and memories. When linked with the word ‘nationalism’, the word ‘nation’ can be interpreted in a narrow, exclusive sense, with strong triumphalist overtones. If race is added to the equation, as in White Australia,
nation can lean towards xenophobia and racial injustice. But it is possible to think of a nation in a much softer way, in the sense of belonging to a land and its people. The emphasis is on relationships and community. There is overlap, of course, between ‘nation’ and ‘state’, yet the two are also separate. The nation of Australia is a political entity in that it is a democracy with its related institutions of law and government, but it is also ‘of the people’, a community with a shared life and history, still in the making. In this softer sense, a nation is also an open society, leaning towards the universal in a global community.

National Church: This term can be understood in a number of ways. (1) As the official church of the nation. Within England, for example, the Church of England is the national church, carrying special responsibility for the spiritual and moral life of the nation. (2) Within the context of the Anglican Communion, it refers to ‘particular or national churches’, each having its own unique culture and character. It roughly corresponds, in this sense, to an autonomous province within the global Anglican community. (3) Within the life of the church itself, the term can refer to its national ecclesiastical structures – the General Synod, for example. Within the Australian Anglican church, the national body is problematic because of the autonomy of separate dioceses. It exists nevertheless, with a General Secretary and secretariat seeking to provide the Anglican Church of Australia with a sense of national belonging. (4) In particular, I have used the term in a fourth sense which incorporates the others, but adds a vocational emphasis. A ‘national church’ does not have to be specially privileged or established to have the concerns of the nation at heart. It is simply a church with a national vision and vocation, not in the sense of turning the nation into a Christian society, but certainly in terms of living out its faith in the context of national life, and speaking to the issues affecting that common life. At times this will be a healing, encouraging word. At other times, it will be more prophetic. But always it will come from ‘within’ national experience, rather than speaking ‘at’ the nation from outside, or from a position of superiority. It is in this sense that I have repeatedly used the term, ‘a church for the nation’.

Nonjurors: In 1688 James II was deposed as the English monarch in favour William and Mary. The Nonjurors were those within the Church of England who refused to take the Oath of Allegiance.
Oxford Movement: A High Church protest movement, otherwise known as Tractarianism, commonly regarded as beginning with the famous Assize Sermon of John Keble in 1833. It was committed to the total reform of the English Church by returning it to pre-Reformation, apostolic principles. John Henry Newman, one of its most prominent members, eventually left for the Roman Catholic Church, determining that the Church of England was incapable of redemption. The Anglo-Catholic wing of Anglicanism developed out of this High Church movement.

Royal Supremacy: The Act of Supremacy in 1534 declared the English monarch, rather than the Pope, to be the supreme head of the Church of England.

Tractarians: Followers of the principles advocated by the Oxford Movement. The name stems from the Tracts for the Times, by means of which the ideas of the movement were widely disseminated. Tractarianism was one of the two major Anglican streams in colonial Australia (the other being Evangelicalism).

Via Media: The ‘mean between extremes’, or the middle way. This term has mostly been used within Anglicanism to refer to finding the balance between different church parties, especially where there are differences of doctrine. Within this study, it is much more complex. First, I have distinguished between ‘static’ and ‘mystical’ approaches to the via media. The former is really an institutional way of keeping everyone within the fold. The latter is suspicious of systems. When confronted with ‘difference’, it seeks not just compromise but a deeper level of understanding or unity, employing a ‘reconciling method’, a creative synthesis of scripture, tradition, and reason (which includes contemporary experience and culture). The ‘mystical’ via media leads the church outwards; it releases doctrine from a religious straitjacket and places it in society, where it belongs. This leads to a further sense in which the term via media is used in this study, referring to the Anglican vocation of seeking to be a mediating presence within a divided world. It is closely related to the broad sense in which I have used the term ‘comprehensiveness’, as well as to the term ‘mediating tradition’.
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