

**A (New) Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion:  
Rediscovering the Radical and Transnational Nature of the Anglican  
Communion**

Guillermo René Caviezes Araya

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

Faculty of Arts

School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science

February 2019

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from this thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

© 2019 The University of Leeds and Guillermo René Cavieses Araya

The right of Guillermo René Cavieses Araya to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by Guillermo René Cavieses Araya in accordance with the Copyright, Design and Patents Act 1988.

## **Acknowledgements**

No man is an island, and neither is his work. This thesis would not have been possible without the contribution of a lot of people, going a long way back. So, let's start at the beginning. Mum, thank you for teaching me that it was OK for me to dream of working for a circus when I was little, so long as I first went to University to get a degree on it. Dad, thanks for teaching me the value of books and a solid right hook. To my other Dad, thank you for teaching me the virtue of patience (yes, I know, I am still working on that one). To Helena, I owe you a debts of gratitude for all the long hours spent talking over the concepts of this thesis and teaching me the fine art of word-processing, without you, I doubt I would have made it. To my daughter, for teaching me that the only true defeat is giving up.

I would also like to acknowledge the invaluable tutelage I have received from my supervisor's Dr Alistair McFadyen and Dr Kevin Ward. You have been great help and source of inspiration. Furthermore, I would like to thank Professor S. Lukas, Dr Casserstedt and Dr Purkys. Together we have ventured beyond the veil of possibilities and explored unknown skies, all in honour of the queen of sciences.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Professor Sacha King and his research assistant Joshua Taylor Esq, for all the long hours spent exchanging ideas and rolling in the deep. Where there is no way, we make one.

Finally, to all those who have supported me throughout this lengthy process: Not bad for a high school dropout, huh?

## **Abstract**

In the wake of the conflict about same-sex relationships, the Anglican Communion is under great pressure to reflect upon its own purpose and nature. Most of the proposed solutions to the current impasse seem to go in one of two directions: Legislating a way to unity within the Communion, or through a federalist approach where the solution seems to be to create enough distance between its members, so that their different practices and beliefs will not affect each other's integrity. Unfortunately, both these tendencies could cause severe damage to Anglian legacy in that they abandon the original Anglican claim that it is possible to be part of the universal Church, without having to submit to a centralised magisterium or to embrace confessionalism. Consequently, there is a compelling need to venture beyond the familiar path, and set out on a journey of rediscovery of the radical and transnational origins of the Anglican Communion. The aim of which is to formulate an ecclesiology, which is rooted in the life of the Anglican churches around the world, and establishes the Anglican Communion as a particular and contemporary embodiment of the vision and comprehension of the Church (and the potential Communion of Churches) which the Apostles and the fathers of the Church envisioned; before either the ecclesiastical monarchism of Rome or the confessionalism of the Reformation had sprung into the centre stage of western Christianity. One of the main arguments behind this thesis is that a solution to the current impasse requires a reembracing of the radical theology that once laid the foundation of the Anglican Communion. Hence, the thesis endeavours beyond the classic view of the Anglican Communion as mainly a product of British Imperialism, and explores another side of The Anglican Communion, namely that of non-Anglo-Saxon Anglican Churches, and their unique perspectives on what it means to be a Church member of the Anglican Communion. For it is only through listening to these experiences that an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, which aspires to transcend the current threat of schism, may be able to incorporate both the pluralism of global Anglicanism and bring cohesion to a church which is facing its greatest challenge in centuries.

## Contents

Acknowledgements .....	2
Abstract .....	3
Contents .....	4
Abbreviations .....	9
<b>Chapter I:.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>A (New) Ecclesiology of The Anglican Communion?.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Introduction .....	10
(New), Radical and Transnational.....	12
(New): .....	12
Radical: .....	13
Transnational:.....	13
The Question at Issue .....	14
Main Hypothesis and Research Plan.....	15
Thesis Outline .....	18
Choice of Material.....	21
On the Methodology of the Thesis.....	21
The Three Case Studies of Chile, Japan and Malawi.....	23
Key Theoretical Concepts and Notions Within the Thesis .....	26
The Local and Universal Church in Anglican Terms.....	26
A Definition of Nation states.....	29
The Anglican Church and the Notion of Nation states .....	30
The Tip of The Iceberg:	
The Anglican Communion and the Debate on Human Sexuality .....	38
The Origins of the Current Crisis.....	40
<b>Chapter II: .....</b>	<b>48</b>

<b>Ecclesiology (ies) Of the Anglican Minority .....</b>	<b>48</b>
Purpose of this Chapter .....	50
Outline.....	52
Contextualisation, Indigenisation and Mission.....	53
Contextualisation .....	54
Indigenisation.....	55
Mission.....	57
The English Reformation as Contextualisation of the Church .....	59
Church of England: Never Only an English Church.....	65
The Other Side of the Coin: Anglicanism of the Fringes.....	66
Japan: Anglican Ecclesiology Beyond the British Empire .....	68
Mission to The Ainu: A non-national(-ist) Anglican contextualisation .....	69
Malawi: Anglican Ecclesiological Ambivalence Towards the State.....	76
Reflection on the early Ecclesiology of the Anglican Church in Japan and Malawi .....	82
<b>Chapter III: .....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Anglican Models of the Church -.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>A Latin American Perspective .....</b>	<b>84</b>
Introduction: The Case for Latin America .....	84
Purpose of this chapter.....	85
Latin American Models of the Church.....	86
The South Cone and The Ecclesiology of God’s People .....	87
Brazilian Anglicanism and Trinitarian Ecclesiology .....	94
Liberation Theology and Latin American Anglican Ecclesiology .....	96
A Distinctively Anglican Ecclesiology .....	103
Reflection on Anglican, Latin American Models of the Church.....	107

<b>Chapter IV:</b> .....	<b>109</b>
<b>The Theological and Transnational Origins of The Anglican Communion</b> .....	<b>109</b>
The Early Conceptualisation of The Anglican Communion .....	111
Church vs Crown: The rebellious origins of the Anglican Communion.....	114
High Church Transnationality and the Origins of the Communion .....	120
The Origins of an Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion .....	122
Palmer and the Concept of a Proto-Anglican Communion.....	124
The non-fundamentals of Palmer and the current Anglican divide .....	126
Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi (and Lex Vivendi?).....	128
The Japanese Anglicanism and the Supersession of National Identities .....	131
Anglican Conflict and Postmodernity .....	136
The Perichoretic Samba of God	
Continuing in his train of thought, .....	140
Inclusive Roots.....	141
<b>Chapter V:</b> .....	<b>143</b>
<b>The Anglican Covenant and Surpassing the National Boundaries of The Anglican Communion</b> .....	<b>143</b>
Introduction .....	143
Anglican Ecclesiological Identity and the Link to Nation states .....	144
The Anglican Covenant and Anglican Ecclesiological Identity.....	145
The Anglican Covenant and Anglican Ecclesiology .....	146
Outline.....	146
The Making of a Covenant.....	147
The Origins of the Covenant.....	147
The “Other” Origins of the Covenant .....	150
Nassau Draft.....	152

St Andrew's Draft .....	152
The Ridley-Cambridge Draft .....	153
Review of Content: What is in it? .....	154
Section 1.....	154
Section 2.....	155
Section 3.....	155
Section 4.....	156
Arguments For and Against the Covenant .....	156
Theological Arguments Against the Covenant.....	157
Ecclesiology of the Covenant: Autonomy vs Interdependence .....	165
Grievance Procedure: Section 4.....	165
Post-Colonial Tensions and the Political Backdrop of The Covenant .....	170
The Covenant and the Anglo-Saxon Inheritance .....	173
Anglican Ecclesiology and The So Called North vs South Cultural War.....	175
Anglican Ecclesiology and the Theological Roots of the Covenant.....	177
The Covenant, Anglican Realignment .....	180
<b>Chapter VI:.....</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>Anglican National Ecclesiological Identities,.....</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>The Covenant and the Mythos of the Modern State.....</b>	<b>188</b>
Homosexuality as a marker of Ecclesiological Identity.....	190
Human Sexuality and The Anglican Link to Nation states.....	193
The ties that bind:	
The debate on homosexuality and Anglican unity .....	197
Anglicanism versus the Modern Myth of Secularisation.....	199
Hooker and the National, Ecclesiological Identity of Anglicanism.....	203
The Leviathan: Salvation by State .....	208



The Church, Covenant and A True <i>Religio</i> .....	211
Church, Sacrament and Eucharistic Anarchy .....	213
An Ecclesiological Outlook on the Issue of Same-Sex Relationships.....	215
National Identities, The Covenant and the Future of the Communion .....	218
<b>Chapter VII: .....</b>	<b>221</b>
<b>When Anglican Ecclesiological Identities Transcend Nation states.....</b>	<b>221</b>
Introduction .....	221
Origins of Anglicanism in Chile .....	221
The Ecclesiological Identity of the IACH and the Military Coup in Chile in 1973 .....	223
Reflection on the Ecclesiological Identity of the IACH .....	230
Malawi.....	232
Anglican Ecclesiological Identity in Independent Malawi .....	238
A Paralysed Ecclesiology .....	241
Zasintha: The Radicalisation of Malawian Anglican Ecclesiology .....	242
Reflection on the Development of Anglican Identity in Malawi .....	247
Japan: The Development of Anglican Ecclesiology vs Nationalism .....	248
Anglican Ecclesiological Identity and the Modern-Day Japanese State.....	253
The Missiology of The NSKK and the Japanese State .....	256
Reflection on the Ecclesiological Identity of the NSKK .....	258
The Future of Anglican Ecclesiological Identities and Nation states .....	261
<b>Chapter VIII:.....</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>Thesis Conclusion.....</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>285</b>

## **Abbreviations**

ACNA: Anglican Church of North America

ACNS: Anglican Communion News Service

ACO: Anglican Communion Office

ACC: Anglican Consultative Council (ACC)

CANiC: Anglican Network in Canada

C of E: Church of England

BBC: British Broadcasting Corporation

GAFCON: Global Anglican Future Conference

FCA: Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans

IACH: La Iglesia Anglicana de Chile (Anglican Church of Chile)

IARCA: Anglican Church of the Central Region of America

IASCER: The Inter Anglican Standing Committee on Ecumenical Relations

IEAB: Igreja Episcopal Anglicana do Brasil (Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil)

NSKK: Nippon Sei Ko Kai (The Japanese Anglican Church/The Holy Catholic Church of Japan/The Anglican Communion in Japan)

TEC: The Episcopal Church of The United States

UN: United Nations

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

WCC: World Council of Churches

## **Chapter I:**

### **A (New) Ecclesiology of The Anglican Communion?**

#### **Introduction**

As the 21<sup>st</sup> century moves towards its third decade, the Anglican Communion is in turmoil and under great pressure to reflect upon its own purpose and nature. Following the collapse of most forms of dialogue between the dissenting parties concerning sexual ethics, it seems the Anglican Communion lacks a natural underpinning upon which to base its ecclesiological self-understanding. In the wake of the conflict about same-sex relationships, there have arisen two strong and opposing ecclesiological tendencies within Anglicanism. One is a model, with strong legislative connotations, which seeks to legislate a way to unity within the Communion (e.g. The Anglican Covenant). For many Anglicans, such legalism seems anathema to the pluralistic reality of the Communion. At the other end of the ecclesiological spectrum exists its counterpart, a “federalist model” which proposes that member churches stick together only as a loose federation of independent, national churches, where the solution seems to be to create enough distance between its members, so that their different practices and beliefs will not affect each other's integrity. This model runs the risk of diluting the unifying bonds between Churches to the point where they may become pointless. Thus, both these models put the unique ecclesiological legacy of the Anglican Communion in jeopardy. They both deny (or at least seemingly give up on) the Anglican claim that it is possible to be part of the universal Church, without having to submit to a centralised magisterium such as that of Roman Catholicism, nor having to embrace the confessionalism of some of the reformed traditions of western Christianity (e.g. Calvinism and Zwinglianism). Hence, the current fault line has moved beyond the area of sexual ethics and has developed into a crisis of identity, an all-out battle for the hegemony of the Anglican soul, at the epicentre of which lies the conception of what it means to be a Communion of Churches. This thesis proposes that for the Communion to survive the current threat of schism, what it needs is neither increased regulation nor

further dilution of the links between those members who are in disagreement. What the Communion lacks is the formulation (and embracing) of an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion which makes explicit to all its members the value of Anglican Churches staying together, not just for the sake of the Communion itself, but as a unique contribution and witness to Christianity.

To understand what such an ecclesiology could look like, this thesis will journey beyond the current and frequent view of the Communion as a fellowship of Churches brought about by a common historical ancestry, held together only by a loose composite of common doctrinal elements (e.g. Chicago, Lambeth Quadrilateral, the 39 Articles of Religion) and the operation of Instruments of Communion. Instead, it will seek to rediscover, from within the life of the Communion itself, an ecclesiological identity that makes it explicit that the Anglican Communion is not a mere accident of history, but rather constitutes a particular and contemporary embodiment of the vision and comprehension of the Church (and the potential Communion of separate Churches) which the Apostles and the earliest fathers of the Church envisioned; before either the ecclesiastical monarchism of Rome or the confessionalism of the Reformation had sprung into the centre stage of Christianity.

One of the main arguments of this thesis will be that such an ecclesiology is not an external “add-on” to the current life and legacy of the Anglican Communion, nor a revisionist attempt to reconstruct its origins. What this thesis proposes is that such an ecclesiological identity has always existed within the life and theology of the Communion, and that it is a matter of rediscovering it, of making the implicit explicit, if you will. In my research, I have found that this “hidden” legacy is much more evident and explicit within the life of minority Anglican Churches that have developed on the “fringes” of the Communion. These are the Anglican Churches that have developed in parts of the world where English is not the main language and the propagation of the British Empire has not been a major characteristic of their culture and development. For these churches, which are often small in number and not strong on financial resources, the matter of being clearly defined and having a distinct ecclesiological identity is both vital and acute, because failing in this way could very well mean extinction. In addition, the legacy of these churches demonstrates that while it is true that Anglicanism, historically, has been used as a tool to legitimate the power of strong national entities

such as the British Empire and the English Crown, there is also another side to the story, where the Anglican Church, in several parts of the world, has been marginalised and for centuries been the church of the little people. In other words, these “fringe” churches represent contexts where Anglican churches that have had to survive as relatively small communities, fiercely fighting to stay alive in order to fulfil their role as a prophetic voice of salvation and liberation for God's people; often in the face of oppressive and dictatorial regimes. Hence, these churches provide a unique voice within the Communion, bringing with them a wealth of experience to the formulation of a (new) Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion.

### **(New), Radical and Transnational**

This thesis proposes that if the Anglican Communion is to survive the current divisions and move beyond partisan squabbles, the question of how to formulate a realistic and sustainable ecclesiology of the Communion is a matter of great importance. In other words, there needs to be an ecclesiological praxis capable of transcending the current divisions by way of clarifying the imperative need and purpose of staying in Communion. An important tenet of this proposal is that such an ecclesiology is not something alien to the life of the Communion, but rather something that already exists within it, as a palpable reality, even if not always explicitly so. Thus, this thesis embarks on a journey of rediscovery of the radical nature of the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, hence the title of the thesis:

*A (New) Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion:*

*Rediscovering the Radical and Transnational Nature of The Anglican Communion.*

### **(New):**

In the title, the word “New” is set in parentheses to illustrate the fact that, although some of the ideas put forward may seem to radically diverge from the mainstream, contemporary conceptions of the Anglican Communion (e.g. a fellowship of independent Churches and/or a loose federation of Churches with a common historical legacy), the theology of the Anglican Communion proposed in this thesis is, in fact, not

so new. I will endeavour to demonstrate that the ecclesiology advanced within these pages does not constitute a kind of ecclesiological science fiction, but in fact is underpinned by a theology that is (or at least was) innate and fundamental to the origins of the Anglican Communion.

### **Radical:**

The next word that stands out in the title is “Radical” (Lat. *radix*, “root”). I have chosen this word because it emphasises an ethos of returning to, or reviving, the original vision and comprehension of the Anglican Communion. In addition, the word also has connotations of being *thoroughgoing* or *extreme*, especially regarding change from accepted or traditional forms – a radical change in the comprehension and self-understanding of the Anglican Communion. *Radical* also has an undertone of favouring drastic political, economic, or social reforms: *radical ideas* which tie in to the nature of some of the arguments put forward in this thesis.

### **Transnational:**

The third noticeable word in the title is “Transnational”, which implies reaching beyond and/or transcending national boundaries, as well as relating to or involving several nations or nationalities. This word refers to the radically transnational character of the theology which once gave birth to the idea of an Anglican Communion. The Church, with its unique life and model of Communion, provides a certain way of being in community which is *essential* to the Christian faith. In ecclesiological terms, it is a matter of the Anglican Communion assimilating into its own ecclesiological identity the notion that in Jesus Christ – in his incarnation, life, death and resurrection – “something happened” through which he brought down the divisions between Gentiles and Jews, and razed all racial, cultural, political and religious boundaries: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:29). Anthropologically, the Church ties the human person to the salvific body of Christ through participation in God and imbues humanity with an identity that looks beyond the Eschaton and manifests the boundary-less kingdom of God in the here-and-now. Consequently, the Church transcends and ultimately overrides the artificial political boundaries of any man-made nation state. Thus, it becomes essentially

antithetical for a Church to claim a national identity. It follows then, as I will attempt to demonstrate in this thesis, that a move towards the dissolution of its national identities (and the limitations these impose on the universality of the Church) is favourable for the Communion's future as an ecclesiastical reality.

## **The Question at Issue**

The main question posed in the thesis is:

*How to formulate an Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion which endows the Communion with a clearly formulated reason for being, and thus contributes towards healing the current threat of schism?*

Of course, an endeavour to formulate the ecclesiological underpinnings of the Anglican Communion's reason for being, faces several challenges, especially in light of the so called Anglican Crisis. Therefore I have formulated the three following sub-questions.

First:

- *How can such an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion embrace the pluralism of global Anglicanism, and yet provide enough cohesion in order for the need to stay in Communion to be clearly formulated and theologically attractive to its churches?*

The second sub-question is:

- *Is it possible to formulate an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion which allows the churches of the Communion to shed their individual national identities and yet retain the Anglican legacy of ecclesiological contextualisation, inculturation and indigenisation?*

This leads to the third sub-question:

- *Can such an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion exist as a genuine expression of the theological legacy of Anglicanism, firmly rooted in the actual life and praxis of its churches, and thus avoid becoming an external 'add on' or 'superficial fix'?*

## **Main Hypothesis and Research Plan**

The main hypothesis of this thesis upholds the notion that while the subject of sexuality may seem central to the current tensions within the Anglican Communion, this is more of a symptom than the actual cause of the current threat of schism. The difficulties which the Anglican Communion faces regarding its ability to maintain the bonds of Communion between some of its member churches, do not stem solely, nor perhaps even mainly, from the current disagreement over sexual ethics. The disunity which the Communion is currently facing might well have occurred even without the current debate on human sexuality, due to the effects of post-colonial legacy in an era of globalisation. Beneath the surface of these collapsing relationships lies a complex matrix of causes and issues. These range from an effort among some of the members of the Anglican Communion to preserve their national and provincial independence in the face of what they perceive to be foreign attempts to influence “their church”, in a post-colonial world where the majority of Anglicans now live in the global south. Other factors include the implementation of mutually exclusive world views and interpretations of reality (e.g. a static moral universe versus a dynamic one), with radically different conclusions about what constitutes human nature and what the essentials of Christian obedience might be. All these factors point towards a lack of underpinning upon which to base the ecclesiological self-understanding of the Anglican Communion.

Consequently, the research plan is to be carried out in the following stages:

- First, I will conduct an investigation into the ecclesiology of the Anglican churches from areas where Anglicanism has been a marginal and small movement, fighting for its survival, far from the well-established and relatively affluent existence of some other churches in the Communion. I will begin with an analysis of the ecclesiology of these so called “fringe” churches and their comprehension of Communion. The goal of which is to bring that wealth of experience into the conversation on how to formulate a (new) ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, capable of usurping the current view of global Anglicanism as an accident of history, loosely bound by a common ancestry. To keep this research soundly grounded in reality, I will include three “real life cases” in the thesis, in order to show how the ecclesiology put forward in this



thesis has been implemented within the life of the Communion. The three cases are The Anglican Churches of Japan, Malawi and Chile, the first two will be discussed at this stage and third will be introduced in the following parts of the thesis. These particular churches provide three examples of Anglican ecclesiological identities that have developed outside the main sphere of influence of the British Empire, and in areas where the spread of the English language did not play a major role in their development and growth. Initially it may seem that the Anglican Church in Malawi does not fit these criteria. However, during the colonial era, Nyasaland (modern day Malawi) was known as “an imperial slum”.<sup>1</sup> The area was considered a backwater of the empire, with very little financial or strategic value. Thus, the Anglican Church’s link to the colonial government seldom resulted in any obvious privileges, financial or otherwise. In fact, to this day the largest Christian traditions in Malawi are Presbyterianism (with roots in the missionary activity of Church of Scotland) and Roman Catholicism. Hence, the Malawian case represents an interesting scenario where, although there was a British Colonial presence, the Anglican Church's ties to British imperialism did not result in it becoming an established or even privileged institution. Hence the Anglican Church of Malawi makes an apt subject for the study conducted in this thesis.

- The following stage of the research will further explore the Anglican “fringe” ecclesiologies through a study of Anglican ecclesiology in the Latin American context. Similar to the cases of Malawi and Japan, the Anglican Churches of Latin America have developed their own distinct perspective on what it means to be at once a genuinely local or regional Church, inculturated and indigenous, and at the same time part of a global Communion of Churches. Hence, the research will focus on the ecclesiological models born out of this context and how they can be applied within the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion put forward in this thesis. Also, this part of my research will investigate if and

---

<sup>1</sup> Vail, Leroy “The Making of an Imperial Slum: Nyasaland and Its Railways, 1895-1935 *The Journal of African History*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (1975), pp. 89-112 Cambridge:Cambridge University Press

how it would be possible for the Anglican Churches to shed their individual national identities without losing their inculturation and ability to be genuine and indigenous expressions of their own, various contexts.

- The next phase in the research will be to analyse the radical and transnational theological origins of the Anglican Communion. This is a theological examination of where the concept of the Anglican Communion was born. The purpose of which is to demonstrate that the ecclesiological concepts put forward in this thesis, for example the need for transnationalism and the shedding of national identities while still remaining indigenous and contextualised, are by no means something new. The claim is that these principals have existed within the Communion since its birth. In fact, I will argue that these theological and ecclesiological tendencies were the driving thrust behind the birth of the Anglican Communion.
- The subsequent stage of the research will cover the Anglican Covenant. The Covenant represents a very recent theological and ecclesiological grand-scale development within the Communion. In addition, my preliminary research into this subject has revealed that the document itself, and the worldwide Anglican debate that has accompanied it, constitutes an intricate synthesis of theology, political theory (independence vs interdependence) and ecclesiological comprehensions of the Church, as well as a series of different understandings of the nature of the Anglican Communion. Thus, it provides a good illustration of how intricately linked some aspects of Anglican ecclesiology are with the concept of nation states. Consequently, the research will concentrate on analysing the link between Anglican ecclesiological identities and the notion of nation states, and how this affects a potential ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion.
- Thereafter I dedicate a phase of the research to explore if the ecclesiology put forward in this thesis, and the radical change in the self-understanding of the Communion it proposes (albeit a change that may constitute more of redirection

towards something that is already there), can be considered a realistic expression of the theological legacy, praxis and life of the churches of the Anglican Communion. Because if not, it runs the risk of becoming a disembodied pipe dream, an external ‘add on’ or ‘fix’. Hence it is vital to show that the ecclesiology proposed by this thesis is in, in fact, legitimately grounded in the ecclesiological legacy of the Anglican Communion. To that end, I will conduct an examination of how the ecclesiology proposed in this thesis has, at times, been implemented within the life of the Communion. To that end, I will continue the analysis of three chosen “real-life cases” of Japan and Malawi and Chile.

- I intend to finalise the research by drawing conclusions on the investigations carried out within its framework, and attempt to answer the question: *How to formulate an Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion which endows the Communion with a clearly formulated reason for being, and thus contributes towards healing the current threat of schism?*

## **Thesis Outline**

This thesis is divided into eight chapters:

### **Chapter I:**

#### **A (New) Ecclesiology of The Anglican Communion?**

This chapter is an introduction to the thesis in which the main question and subquestions are formulated, and key concepts and methodology of the thesis are introduced and defined.

### **Chapter II:**

#### **Ecclesiology (ies) Of the Anglican Minority**

This chapter focuses on the first sub-question and constitutes a study of Anglican Ecclesiology from the perspective of minority or “fringe” Churches within the Communion. These are churches where neither the widespread use of the English language nor the presence of British imperialism has played a major role in their

formation. Hence their perspective on what it means to be Anglican does not hinge on a cultural or theological allegiance to Great Britain or the Commonwealth of Nations. This chapter seeks to establish how the unique perspective of “fringe” churches can inform an ecclesiology of The Anglican Communion in which the inculturation and indigenisation of the member churches can flourish, and yet is still capable of formulating the purpose of belonging to the Anglican Communion.

### **Chapter III:**

#### **Anglican Models of the Church - A Latin American Perspective**

This chapter further address the first subquestion of the thesis, but from the perspective of the simultaneous need for pluralism and cohesion. It seeks to deepen the analysis of the ecclesiology of “fringe churches” using the Latin American context, especially. Latin American Anglican churches have developed their own distinct perspective on what it means to be at once a genuinely local or regional Church, both inculturated and indigenous and at the same time part of a global Communion of Churches. The chapter will focus on the ecclesiological models born out of this context. Specially, on how they can help navigate the tension field between being part of a larger universal Church and remaining genuinely indigenous.

### **Chapter IV:**

#### **The Theological and Transnational Origins of The Anglican Communion**

This chapter ties in to second and third subquestions. It focuses on how the link between Anglican Ecclesiological identities and the notion of nation states affects the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion which is proposed in this thesis. Through an analysis the origins of the Anglican Communion, from an ecclesiological perspective, this chapter traces back the roots of the Communion to the first streams of thought that once gave birth to the idea of the Anglican Communion. The purpose of this study is to establish that the origins of the Anglican Communion are deeply transnational and radical in nature. Thus, demonstrating that the concepts put forward in this thesis are not alien to Anglican praxis.

**Chapter V:****The Anglican Covenant and Surpassing the National Boundaries of The Anglican Communion**

This chapter addresses the Anglican Covenant and its impact on Anglican ecclesiology. It constitutes an analysis of Anglican Covenant, both of its regulative and normative contents, as well as its theological subject matter. The purpose is to engage with the second sub-question, through an exploration of if and how the Covenant coheres with Anglican theology and identity, and how, in light of the tensions within Communion, the Covenant may contribute to transcend the national(ist) identities of Anglicanism; which, as I will attempt to establish in this chapter, may be a necessary step in overcoming the threat of schism within the Anglican Communion.

**Chapter VI:****Anglican National Ecclesiological Identities, The Covenant and The Mythos of the Modern State**

This chapter continues to engage with the second sub-question, through an analysis of the link between Anglican ecclesiological identities and the notion of nation states. The research is set against the backdrop of the global discussion that followed in the wake of the Anglican Covenant. In order to formulate an ecclesiology capable of dealing with this current divisions, it is crucial to understand where they stem from. Consequently, this is chapter explores the link between the Anglican ecclesiological identities and the notion of nation states.

**Chapter VII:****When Anglican Ecclesiological Identities Transcend Nation states**

This chapter addresses the third sub question and endeavors to show whether the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion proposed in this thesis, is legitimately grounded in the ecclesiological legacy of the Anglican churches. Consequently, this chapter returns to the three chosen “real-life cases” of Japan, Malawi and Chile. The purpose of which, is to show that the theoretical aspects put forward in this thesis, such as the ability to embrace non-national ecclesiological identities, are in fact grounded in the actual, applied reality of the Anglican Communion.

## **Chapter VIII:**

### **Thesis Conclusion**

This chapter finalizes the thesis by drawing conclusions on the research, and attempts to answer the question: *How to formulate an Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion which endows the Communion with a clearly formulated reason for being, and thus contributes towards healing the current threat of schism?*

### **Choice of Material**

My research will deal mainly with written materials – books, articles, and sources such as educational materials published by the Churches under examination, as well as written statements and other theological documents issued by the House of Bishops and other relevant institutions of the Churches studied in this thesis. My main sources for this investigation will be the works of a variety of Anglican theologians from different parts of the Communion, representing various theological tendencies and traditions. In addition to these sources, I intend to use online materials such as the web pages of Anglican Churches and forums, blogs etc, in which the theme of Anglicanism is frequently discussed. Many Anglican Churches in the developing world cannot afford to engage in print publication on anything like a regular basis. For these churches the internet provides an affordable means of publishing theological material ranging from debate on the current Anglican crisis to pastoral letters from Provincial primates and official House of Bishops' statements. In this day and age, it would be impossible to make an adequate study of contemporary Anglican thought without taking into account the vast amount of material available on the web.

### **On the Methodology of the Thesis**

Having outlined the goal and purpose of this thesis, it is essential to highlight that there are certain methodological principles at work within the thesis which tend to manifest themselves implicitly rather than explicitly in the life and teaching of most Anglican churches. However, in the ecclesiology proposed in this thesis, these principles have been made explicit, brought to the forefront, and extrapolated from, in order to

demonstrate just how radical and ground-breaking the notion of an Anglican Communion actually is. These principles are the following:

- First: The formulation of an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion is, by its very nature, a work in progress. The emergence of the Anglican Communion was not driven by a predetermined ecclesiology. Rather, its origins are tied to the rise of the British Empire, which later became the Commonwealth of Nations. In many instances, ecclesiological and theological reflection followed, rather than preceded, these developments. However, as I will demonstrate, behind these theological cogitations and ecclesiological constructs lies the conception (and conviction) that the Anglican Communion represents not merely an accident of history, but an ecclesiastical reality with something significant to contribute to the Church universal.
  
- Second: There is an inherent, underlying catholicity to Anglican ecclesiology. Although Anglicanism has its roots in the Christian traditions of the British Isles, it has never surrendered its claim of continuity with the ancient and undivided Church of the Apostles and the Church Fathers, a Church whose faith appealed to a great diversity of peoples and nations throughout the ancient world, and whose followers spanned a vast plethora of cultural and social contexts. Thus, the Anglican Communion claims to stand as a continuation with, and to form part of, an institution that by its very nature is universal, and was from its very origins defined by its radical transcendence of national and ethnic boundaries.
  
- Third: There is an immanent and permanent tension between the local and the universal in Anglican ecclesiology. The quest of the Apostles, Church Fathers and all Christians who through the ages have endeavoured to understand their faith, has also been a quest to understand the nature of the community to which they belonged, a nature which is based on a Christian anthropology centred on Galatians 3:29. Consequently, the ecclesiology of the Church is an ecclesiology of universality, where contextualisation is of vital importance and must always function as a way of faithfully transmitting the gospel of Christ in a local context, whilst also maintaining the

universality of the community of believers. This is the paradoxical nature of Christian, ecclesiological contextualisation: while the Church endeavours to be a genuine and indigenous expression of its local context, if the local wants to claim to be part of the universal Church, then, ultimately, its ecclesiology must point towards a larger reality, a reality which not only transcends the context of the local community of believers, but surpasses all national, cultural and ethnic boundaries. That is what is meant by the universality of the Church. Consequently, the local, contextualised Church is in a relationship of incarnational reciprocity with the universal Church. The concept of incarnational reciprocity borrows from the doctrine of the Incarnation, and holds that Jesus, the preexistent divine Logos, took on a human body and human nature, "was made flesh", in order to illustrate how, in ecclesiological terms the local only exists as an incarnation of the universal, and the universal exists only (on this side of the Eschaton, at least) as a mosaic configuration of local realities which come together to form a larger reality, capable of transcending all individual and local contexts. In other words, such is the synergy of the Church that the universal is not only larger than the sum of its individual parts, but the new reality formed by such a mosaic composite transcends the old realities of the individual parts. Without this relation of incarnational reciprocity, the Church cannot remain faithful to the simultaneously universal and contextual claims of the gospel.

These principles *per se* are, perhaps, not unique to Anglican ecclesiology. However, put together, these ecclesiological principles are markedly relevant to the Anglican Communion, which has no central magisterium or set doctrines/confessions of faith (beyond those of the universal Church) to bind it together.

### **The Three Case Studies of Chile, Japan and Malawi**

A critical study and proposal of an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, such as the one conducted in this thesis, could easily run the risk of becoming too abstract and distanced from the actual reality of Church life in the Anglican Communion. Hence, I have chosen to complement the theoretical basis of this thesis with a more practical



examination of how the proposals within it, have been implemented within the life of the Anglican Communion (at least to a certain extent), and how they could continue to do so in the future, in a more explicit and perhaps grander scale. As a result, I will be intertwining the theoretical aspects of my work with real-life examples of how the ecclesiological principles put forward within the thesis, have been applied, both historically and contemporaneously, within the life of the Anglican Communion. The examples chosen for this purpose are the Anglican Churches of Japan, Malawi and Chile. These constitute three real-life cases of churches that have developed outside the main sphere of influence of the British Empire, and in areas where the spread of the English language did not play a key role in their birth and development. I have chosen these three churches because, in addition to providing three widely different examples of the geographical, cultural and social contexts in which Anglicanism has developed, these three churches also represent different traditions and styles of Churchmanship. Without falling into the trap of generalising too broadly, I believe it would be fair to assert that the Anglican Church in Chile stands firmly in the Evangelical tradition and has chosen to align itself with the GAFCON/FCA, while the Anglican Church of Japan is more oriented towards a liberal tradition, and the Anglican Church in Malawi remains faithful to its Anglo-Catholic roots in the Oxford movement. Another important reason I have chosen these three particular examples, is that they constitute minority churches. This means that at no point in their history have any of these churches constituted a majority in terms of numbers or held a position of privilege in terms of cultural heritage within their respective societies. The issue of ecclesiological identity has seldom been charged with the same acuteness than self-definition and identity carry among the Anglican “minority” Churches, for whom the issue of self-definition is often a matter of survival. Some of these churches are so small that failure to define themselves as a viable alternative, and as bearers of a unique gift for the salvation/liberation of its people, can easily lead to extinction.

That said, at first glance, it may seem that the Anglican Church in Malawi does not fit within these criteria, and to some extent this is true. However, although the Church in Malawi initially remained close to the British colonial government, these ties never translated into any obvious benefits in terms of numbers or resources. The area known today as Malawi, was considered something of an imperial slum, and very much

part of the backwater of the Empire, hence Anglicanism never had any major cultural influence on Malawi. Until today, the two strongest Christian traditions in Malawi are Presbyterianism and Roman Catholicism. Anglicans form but a small minority within Malawian society. In addition, despite its early closeness to the Colonial government, after Malawi gained independence, the Anglican church was deeply influenced by the anti-colonialist and nationalist movements of the time, to the point that it became assimilated into the new totalitarian regime of the fledgling nation. However, during the 1990s the Anglican church in Malawi, managed to divorce itself from its assimilation to the state, and took part in the movement for democracy, against the nationalist and totalitarian regime of Dr Kamuzu Banda. As result, the Anglican church in Malawi has undergone several and radical changes in its ecclesiological identity and self-comprehension, not least in its relationship to the state. Hence, the Malawian case represents a scenario where the Anglican Church's ties to British imperialism did not result in it becoming an established or privileged institution. In contrast, the Anglican Churches of Japan and Chile have both developed almost entirely outside the presence of the British Empire. This has affected the development of their ecclesiological identities in different ways. The Japanese Anglican Church/Nippon Sei Kokai (NSSK), was born and formed in a relationship of more or less constant strain (and sometimes outright antagonism) with the Japanese state and the nationalist ideology it has stood for, at several points throughout its history. Consequently, the NSKK has developed an Anglican ecclesiological identity which has managed to become both genuinely indigenous and contextualised, but without being bound to a particular nationalist agenda or identity. La Iglesia Anglicana de Chile (IACH), or Anglican Church in Chile, on the other hand, originated through the missionary efforts of the South American Missionary Society. These were directed mainly towards the native peoples of southern Chile, who are not of Iberian descent, and more often than not find themselves an ethnic minority at the margins of Chilean society. It was only in the latter half of the 1950s that the Church made a conscious effort to move into mainstream (Spanish-speaking) society. Thus, the IACH represents an example of a church which not only grew outside the main sphere of British colonialism, but also on the margins of the society within in which it now exists. For that reason, I will explore some of the choices and behaviour of the IACH surrounding the military coup d'état of 11 September 1973, an event of

critical historical importance which has influenced the shape of Chilean society today. I will look at how the actions and choices undertaken by the IACH, during this time period, has affected the identity of contemporary Anglicanism in Chile, especially in terms of its self-comprehension, ecclesiological self-definition, and in its relationship towards the state.

In terms of methodology, the research into these three case studies will be carried out by the use of written materials (books, articles and other materials published by the Churches under examination) as well as written statements and theological documents issued by institutions relevant to the three chosen Churches. Also, rather than present it in one bulk, the research produced from the study of these three cases will be divided and categorised under various subject areas throughout the thesis. I have chosen this approach in order to illustrate that the theory behind the ideas formulated under these respective subjects, is rooted in the real life of the Anglican Communion, past and present.

## **Key Theoretical Concepts and Notions Within the Thesis**

### **The Local and Universal Church in Anglican Terms**

To better understand this relationship between the local and the universal Church it is vital to first formulate a basic definition of each. Thus, within the parameters of this thesis, the term “local Church” applies to either a community of Anglicans within a given cultural and social context, e.g. a parish that belongs to a province or national Church within the Anglican Communion, or to a national church such as the Anglican Church of Mozambique or the Anglican Church in Japan. Either way, the term “local Church” carries the connotations of an Anglican church that has a given and particular context, be it cultural, ethnic or geographical. The term “universal Church” refers to the notion of a Church which ontologically transcends all local contexts.

In the ecclesiology of such a long-standing tradition as Anglicanism, these two terms often relate to each other. To be more specific, a local Church can be defined as a local assembly of all who profess faith and allegiance to Christ. In the New Testament, the Greek word *ekklesia* is often used in reference to both the local assembly and a universal Church (1 Thessalonians 1:1; 1 Corinthians 4:17; 2 Corinthians 11:8). In other words, the local Church can be defined as a community of believers in Jesus Christ who

meet in a particular geographical, temporal and cultural setting. The universal Church is the Church worldwide, which constitutes more than the mere sum of the local Churches. Thus, the notion of the universal Church is not so much one of the assembly itself but is instead a reference to the divine nature of the Church as willed into existence by God, before time itself, in and through Christ, created by the Holy spirit and made manifest at Pentecost. Now, if it is possible to make such a statement without getting too entangled in the debate between Platonic vs. Aristotelian metaphysics, then perhaps we can make the mental jump to what is clear (at least within the confines of this thesis), namely that the Church remains the Church even when it is not gathered together in assembly. In other words, the Church does not cease to exist when the local Church meeting is over. Hence the universal Church is more than the sum of the local communities. Sometimes the universal Church is called the “invisible Church” – invisible in the sense of having no street address, GPS coordinates, or physical building. However, the Church is never described in scripture as “invisible”, but rather as something which is surely meant to be visible (Matthew 5:14; 1 Corinthians 12:28; 15:9; Matthew 16:18; Ephesians 1:22-23; Colossians 1:18). Thus, even the “invisible” does not exist merely as an abstract concept beyond space and time, but rather as something which becomes visible in the sacraments and ministry of the Church, such as baptism and the Eucharist, and through its worship. The sacraments, liturgy and scriptural teachings, of course, only happen through the local Church – at least here on Earth. However, they do not belong or stem from the local context; they come from outside it. In other words, there is a relationship of incarnational reciprocity between the local Church and the universal Church: the one cannot exist without the other. In addition, there also exists in scripture the notion of a spiritual body of believers. This is the body of Christ to which all believers belong. All believers are “in Christ” and members of His body, His flesh and bones (Ephesians 5:30). This is the body of all believers, the Church for which Christ died on the cross, the existence of which is not dependent upon the local meeting of Christians but upon the will of God. In the unlikely event that there should be a time when there are no Christians gathering anywhere in the world, the salvific body of Christ would still remain.

Having said that, it is important to note that from a particularly Anglican perspective the local Church as a subject is complete unto itself, and through it God is

made fully manifest (in its sacraments and ministry). Consequently, because the Catholic and Apostolic Church is fully present in the local Church, the universal Church cannot be a mere federation of local Churches. Hence the universal Church is the result of reciprocal recognition between local Churches. Or to put it in Anglican terms, the Anglican Communion exists because the local Anglican Churches recognise each other as precisely that: Anglican. A conceptualisation of the Anglican Communion as a particular branch or aspect of the universal Church is theologically possible because the Churches of the Communion share a sacramental life, enjoy mutual recognition of ordained ministry and are in communion with the See of Canterbury (or at least were so until recently). In other words, there is a sense of mutual interiority among the Churches of the Communion, and it is from this sense of mutual belonging and interiority that the conceptualisation of an Anglican Communion is born. In addition, the Anglican Communion is distinctive in the way it has developed contrasting traditions of scriptural interpretation, ecclesial practice and the variations of liturgy, all within the same ecclesiastical body. Consequently, there is little room for abstractions in Anglican ecclesiology – at least if the ecclesiology in question has any aspirations to be applicable. Unlike the Roman Catholic Church, where one of the main questions since Vatican II, has been the ontological priority of the universal Church over the particular, or local Church, the Anglican Communion has no central magisterium that claims to be the “head of the Church”, and therefore must set recognition of itself as a fundamental necessity for a local Church to be recognised as sufficient on its own. For example, for Roman Catholics, for a Church to be authentically a “Church” it must recognise the authority of the Pope.<sup>2</sup> But this question of priority of the universal or the local is less acute for the Anglican Communion. For the purpose of this thesis it is perhaps sufficient to establish that the local and the universal Church exist in a simultaneous, reciprocal, perichoretic and incarnational relationship.

---

<sup>2</sup> For an example of this ongoing debate see “Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion” published by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) 1992.05.28. An online version can be found on: [http://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_28051992\\_ommunionis-notio\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_28051992_ommunionis-notio_en.html); (2017.01.24, 20:22 hrs). See also the discussion between Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger and Cardinal Walter Kasper on the tension between the universal Church and Local Churches, a summary of which can be found online <http://cdn.theologicalstudies.net/63/63.2/63.2.1.pdf>; (2017.01.24, 20:23 hrs). and <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/004056390206300201>; (2017.01.24, 20:23) hrs.

### **A Definition of Nation states**

A large part of this thesis focuses on the relationship between Anglican ecclesiological identity and its link to the concept of the nation states. It would therefore be helpful to define what this term entails, within the context of this thesis.

There is no official definition of the nation state. However the United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) writes that “The nation as we think of it today is a product of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In modern times nation is recognised as ‘the’ political community that ensures the legitimacy of the state over its territory, and transforms the state into the state of all its citizens.”<sup>3</sup> Although the term “nation state” can be traced back several centuries, it was only in the aftermath of WWI that the principle of “the right to national self-determination” began to be commonly used by international lawyers handling the cases of national governments and their challengers. This was the point at which the political idea or “demand” that people should govern themselves became identified with the demand that nations should determine their own destiny. Thus, the notions of “state” and “nation” came to signify the same thing and began to be used interchangeably. “National” came to mean anything run or regulated by the state, as in “national health insurance” or “national debt”.<sup>4</sup> Today, the idea is that nations should be represented within a territorially defined state. Consequently, the fundamental parts of the nation state are the *nation* and the *state*. *State*, in the broadest of terms, is a body of government. All the rules and laws, the government officials and their titles, the physical boundaries and those who define them, make up the state. The state is what makes a country run from a political, practical standpoint. *Nation*, on the other hand, is the people. In that sense, the concept of a *nation state* is created by a belief that the people inside a country are connected to each other through their citizenship and because they live within the geographical boundaries set by the state (otherwise known as nationalism).<sup>5</sup> Consequently, the notion of the nation state emphasises this relatively new alliance between nation and state. Nationality is supposed to bind the citizen to the state, a bond that will be increasingly tied to the advantages of a social policy in as much as the welfare state will develop.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> UNESCO 2016: Nation State

<sup>4</sup> Smelser, N. J. 1994, as quoted in UNESCO 2016: Nation State

<sup>5</sup> Muscato 2015, Lesson Transcript

<sup>6</sup> Smelser, N. J. and Baltes, P. B. 2001, as as quoted in UNESCO 2016: Nation State

However, as UNESCO states, the idea of the nation state is becoming increasingly problematical because in the current age, most states can no longer be seen as the primary focus of national culture.<sup>7</sup> The “crisis of the nation state” refers to the separation of the state from the nation. Social identities, and in particular national culture, can reassert themselves in a variety of ways due to a gradual freeing of the state from some of its traditional functions.<sup>8</sup>

### **The Anglican Church and the Notion of Nation states**

The relationship between the Anglican Church and the notion of nation states is an immensely complex and multifaceted subject, with a variety of political, social, cultural, theological and ecclesiological aspects, all of which are intimately intertwined and virtually inseparable. Consequently, an analysis of this subject is bound to touch upon these issues.

In a way, the ecclesiological link between the identity of the Anglican Churches and nation states is a logical development of the founding theology of the Church of England. During the Reformation, medieval Christendom, itself a transnational and global phenomenon, developed into a form of religion under the control of an absolutely sovereign state. As a result, (western) Christianity in England was transformed from a religion which was clearly international and global in nature (a faith that originated in Asia, with its main see in Rome and present for over a thousand years all over Europe, Africa and Asia, can be little else) into something which was intransigently nationalist (English) in character. Therefore, when Anglicanism first took form through the conception of the Church of England, it was perhaps impossible for it to become anything other than a national phenomenon (initially, at least).<sup>9</sup> Consequently, there are a number of Anglican theologians who view the ecclesiological link to the concept of nation states as one of the *fortes* of Anglican ecclesiology and theology.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps

---

<sup>7</sup> Delanty, G. 1996, *Beyond the Nation-State: National Identity and Citizenship in a Multicultural Society - A Response to Rex*. As quoted in UNESCO 2016: *Nation State*

<sup>8</sup> UNESCO 2016: *Nation State*

<sup>9</sup> Chapman 2008, p.7

<sup>10</sup> For examples of this school of thought see Quash Ben, "The Anglican Church as a Polity of Presence" in *Anglicanism: The Answer to Modernity*, ed Dormor, McDonald & Cadick (2005) London: Continuum, pp. 46-54 and Percy, Martyn "Chapter 7. Opportunity Knocks: Church,



unsurprisingly this school of thought is prominent amongst English Anglicans. After all, this is the country in which Anglicanism first took form and where, until today, the Anglican Church remains a nationally established institution. Two of the most influential apologists of this model of ecclesiology are Ben Quash and Martyn Percy. In addition to being prolific writers on the subject of Anglican identity and ecclesiology, both of these theologians have years of experience teaching theology in some of the world's most renowned theological institutions. As such, they have been influential in defining the theology and ecclesiology of contemporary Anglicanism in England. Ben Quash works principally in the area of Christian theology, with a long-standing interest in the 19th-century background to modern theology, 20th-century systematics, philosophical theology as well as Christian ethics. Percy's is generally considered to represent the liberal tradition in the Church of England and his theological outlook is rooted in his long-standing commitment to middle-way Anglicanism.<sup>11</sup> Percy has spoken and written about the threat of schism in the Anglican Communion, arguing that churches should embrace the diversity of belief that exists, rather than allowing such divisions to result in separation.<sup>12</sup>

One of the recurrent arguments in favour of linking Anglican ecclesiological identity to the notion of the nation state is the claim that this model grants a unique opportunity for the Church to exist as an embedded presence in society, and provides an outstanding platform for dialogue with the surrounding cultural, political and social contexts.<sup>13</sup> Writing from his own English perspective, Percy establishes the conceptualisation of a national Church in England in the idea of the Christian Commonwealth, as promoted by such thinkers of the British, Edwardian and Victorian

---

Nationhood and Establishment" in his book *Anglicanism Confidence, Commitment and Communion* (2013). Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Publishing Ltd. See bibliography for more details.

<sup>11</sup> For examples of Martyn's theological positioning see his work "Why Liberal Churches are Growing?" from 2010 in *Affirming Liberalism: A Church of England Network Supporting Liberal Christians of All Denominations*.

See also article by Walton, Andy. "Evangelical college stands by decision to invite liberal professor to preach". *Christian Today*, 2016.02.11. (2017.03.12; 17:35hrs). (2017.03.09,20:33 hrs) see also book by Mark Vasey-Saunders *The Scandal of Evangelicals and Homosexuality: English Evangelical Texts, 1960–2010*. (2015) Surrey: Ashgate Publishing. See bibliography for further details.

<sup>12</sup> Percy 2006, p.1

<sup>13</sup> Quash 2005, pp.46-54 and Percy, Martyn "Chapter 7. Opportunity Knocks: Church, Nationhood and Establishment" in his book *Anglicanism Confidence, Commitment and Communion* (2013). Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Publishing Ltd. See bibliography for more details.



eras, such as Coleridge, Arnold and Gladstone.<sup>14</sup> Percy reasons that even though the Church of England first took form as an institution during the Reformation and was later shaped during the Elizabethan era, the ecclesiological identity of the Anglican Church developed in pace with the national identity of England and Great Britain, as it evolved from being an island nation into an empire. Consequently, Percy writes, the Church of England became a national Church, in the contemporary sense of the word, only in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as part of the same process in which the modern-day national identity of Great Britain and England was formed.<sup>15</sup> Further, Percy writes that for Victorian and Edwardian theologians, the concept of a nationally established Church was seen as an integral part of providing and safeguarding the common good of the people of England.<sup>16</sup> According to Percy and Quash, the Church of England still provides this role today, through its function as a kind of National Spiritual Service.<sup>17</sup> Consequently, Percy argues, the national Church (that is a church whose ecclesiological identity is linked to a nation state and its governing structures) has a valuable role to play locally, regionally and nationally as an essential, organic and living part of a nation's identity.<sup>18</sup>

However, both Percy and Quash recognise that there are certain challenges in claiming such a holistic religious identity in modern-day society, with all its religious plurality, demographic variety, devolution of power and other significant dynamics of the economics of culture and political life.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, Percy states that even within such a complex ecology, an established national Church has something of intrinsic value to offer, in terms of common values, ethical guidance and pursuit of justice. Percy, proposes that these issues can be raised within the midst of the governmental structures of a nation (such as parliaments and ministries) by an established national Church, in a way that churches whose identity is not married to the concept of nation states (whose ecclesiology is not linked to the governmental structure of a nation) could not.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, for Percy, the establishment of a national identity works as a guarantor

---

<sup>14</sup> Percy 2013, p.110

<sup>15</sup> Percy 2013, pp.110-113

<sup>16</sup> Percy 2013, pp.110-111

<sup>17</sup> Percy 2013, p.112, Quash 2005, pp.48-51

<sup>18</sup> Percy 2013, pp.112-113

<sup>19</sup> Percy 2013, p.112, Quash 2005, pp.49-50

<sup>20</sup> Percy 2013, pp.112-113

that the Church remains a public body. This way the Church can be a genuine carrier of what he calls a “social form of truth”. In Percy’s mind, this means that the Church views its own message of Christian truth as being socially, contextually and temporally embodied.<sup>21</sup> Thus, the institution of the Church can become a truly socially transcendent body. In this manner, according to Percy, the ecclesiology of a nationally established Church protects the Church against sectarianism, and forces its own governing structures to be open to a form of dialogue with society in which the Church “cannot guarantee its own power absolutely, neither be sure of entirely protecting truth, nor be certain of the outcomes of its intercourse with society.”<sup>22</sup> Percy, sees this an “incarnate” model of the Church, one in which the Church has to live with all the ambiguity, lack of definition, distinctiveness, sense of mystery and power which the incarnation entails. He acknowledges that this could be potentially “risky” for the Church, but he states this is not more of a risk that what the Incarnation of Christ himself was. According to Percy, this model allows the Church to seek out what he calls “inter-dependent social, political and institutional relationships” for the sake of social flourishing and the betterment of society as whole, thus witnessing for the whole nation about the incarnation and the coming Kingdom of God.<sup>23</sup>

Of course, Percy is aware that in a religiously pluralistic society (e.g. his own context of England) an established national Church cannot claim a monopoly on religious truth, at least not if it is to be representative of all the citizens of said nation state. Therefore, he suggests that religion in public life must adopt the nature of a “Civil religion”.<sup>24</sup> He argues that being a Christian in the 21<sup>st</sup> century must be about more than belonging to the Church; a Christian faith should signify being a certain type of citizen. That said, Percy is careful to underline that he is not arguing that Christianity and the gospel message, viewed through the lens of “Civil religion”, should be limited to becoming the spiritual dimension of a society or a kind of mere cultural inheritance and social glue for the nation. Rather, Percy writes, being a Christian must be intertwined with the actual aspirations of society. This way, he argues, the spiritual and religious truths of the Church become accessible to all citizens whose religious and ethical traditions also

---

<sup>21</sup> Percy 2013, pp.113-114

<sup>22</sup> Percy 2013, p.113

<sup>23</sup> Percy 2013, pp.112-113

<sup>24</sup> Percy 2013, p.114

aspire to the betterment of the society and the common good. According to Percy, it then becomes possible for the Church, as a national entity, to care for and represent all citizens, including those who may personally ascribe to a different faith or none at all.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, Percy argues that the notion of “Civil religion” is in line with the idea of separating Church from state, even in a model where the Church remains part of the national identity. Once more, Percy goes back to the thinkers of Britain’s past, this time Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and lays out that “the Church of the nation is not quite the same as the Church of Christ, yet it is there to secure and improve the moral cultivation of its people”.<sup>26</sup> In other words, Percy argues that the Church is there to help fund civilising strands within society, but it does not own society, and neither does it entirely own the moral principles upon which society is based, nor does it have a monopoly upon the “moral impulses of a nation”. However, the Church does possess a vital voice in contributing to the common good, which in Percy's mind seems to be one of the main goals of an established national Church.<sup>27</sup>

#### Another argument

that is used to affirm the constructive nature of ecclesiological identities linked to nation states, is the potential this offers for the Church to be a representative of local realities before the national structures of governance.<sup>28</sup> Ben Quash, for example, describes how the contextual, personal and embodied knowledge of a local context such as parish or parochial area, which is gathered by its priest, can be communicated through the ecclesiastical structures, from area deans to bishops and archbishops, who then act as carriers and communicators of this reality to the nation at large. Thus, the Church can act out its calling, raising awareness of the needs of the marginalised and the potential social injustices that occur within society. Quash argues that in a nationally established Church, such as the Church of England, the archbishops of Canterbury and York are presented to the nation, through media, politics and culture in a way that perhaps could not be possible if the Church of England did not have its own, long history as a national

---

<sup>25</sup> Percy 2013, pp.114-115

<sup>26</sup> Percy 2013, p.115

<sup>27</sup> Percy 2013, pp.115-116

<sup>28</sup> For examples of this line of thought see Quash, Ben “The Anglican Church as Polity of Presence” in *Anglicanism The Answer to Modernity* 5th edition (2005); ed Dormor, McDonald & Caddick, pp 38-57. See also Percy, Martyn "Chapter 7. Opportunity Knocks: Church, Nationhood and Establishment" in his book *Anglicanism Confidence, Commitment and Communion* (2013). Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Publishing Ltd. See bibliography for more details. pp.107-119.

Church.<sup>29</sup> Arguably then, this kind of ecclesiology, which is intertwined with (and to a certain degree runs parallel to) national governmental structures, provides the Church with a similar insight and representative capability, in other areas as well, such as education and healthcare, e.g. through its vast network of Church schools and medical chaplaincies across the nation. As such, a nationally established Church has a strong potential to minister to a nation as whole, rather than to a faithful few, and thus it can work for the betterment of the whole of society within a nation state.

It seems then, that from a perspective of the pastoral ministry of the Church, there are some significant and practical advantages to the model of a Church linked to the concept of a nation state. However, the question that arises is whether at least some of these advantages, such as the ability to raise issues before the governmental structures and working for the betterment of society, is due to ecclesiology or is it simply a matter of social and financial resources? Are the well-established churches of the Communion in this advantageous position because of their ecclesiological self-comprehension or because they are able to draw upon (relatively) large economic resources as well as reserves of credibility with the general public? Perhaps this is a chicken-or-egg scenario, where it is impossible to tell which is cause and which is effect. But are we really prepared to say that for example, Methodist or Presbyterian, Quakers and Unitarians (amongst others), with their long-standing legacy of fighting for social justice, could not do an equally good job of raising issues and representing the poor and marginalised before the government, if given the same resources and privileges as the Church of England? And what about the Roman Catholic Church, which furiously guards its independence from nation states through the Vatican, but nevertheless has throughout its history used its vast resources to both confront governments on a wide range of issues, and to broker diplomacy between warring countries, including several nation states?

In addition, the current ecclesiological model, which ties the identities of the Anglican Churches to nation states, is not without complications, especially when viewed from the perspective of non-Anglo-Saxon Anglicanism. In many parts of the world, national boundaries tend to reflect the outcome of political processes (such as

---

<sup>29</sup> Quash 2005, pp.50-51

wars and colonisation and unification) which are irreconcilable with Christian doctrine. This is perhaps most evident in the history of colonised nations, such as many African, Asian and Latin American countries, whose borders often reflect European and North American imperial ambitions, rather than internal ethnic or cultural bonds. Yet this violent history is by no way limited to developing-world countries. If one looks back far enough, it is easy to deduce that most European nations were formed through equally violent and bellicious processes. England, came about through several wars of conquest by Romans, Vikings, Anglo-Saxons and Normans, France grew out of the conquest of Charlemagne and Spain emerged out of the bloody wars of the Reconquista. Of course, one could argue that the nation of Israel was also formed through a series of violent wars and upheavals, and yet that never stopped God from granting them the status of his chosen people in the Old Testament. However, from a Christian perspective, in which peace and reconciliation are God-given moral imperatives, it seems antithetical to link the identity of the Church to socio-political structures (nation states) which represent a temporal reality that is both fleeting and at odds with Christian doctrine. In other words, one-day nation states may disappear (in the same way that European feudalism and the tribal nations of the Aztec and Incas have ceased to exist) and yet the Church will remain; in the meantime, the identity of the Anglican Churches remains tied to a political construct with an inherent drive to always increase their own financial interests and protect their sovereignty, with violence if need be. A recent example of how the Communion concedes to the realities of statehood, is the division of the Province of Sudan into two Provinces of Sudan and South Sudan, in 2017. One of the main arguments for the split is that, since South Sudan gained independence in 2011, the Primate of Sudan and South Sudan has been challenged with overseeing two different countries.<sup>30</sup> However, the question remains what the Anglican Communion will do about the continued tendency towards national provinces in the Province of Central Africa. It seems that it is only a matter of time before other members of the same Province, e.g. Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi will attempt to create their own separate provinces. Essentially, this division, constitutes a breakdown of the transnational

---

<sup>30</sup> ACNS 2017: "Sudan announced as a new Province within the Anglican Communion"

character of the Anglican Communion, in the face of nationalist tendencies which at least partially mirror that of secular (nationalist) politics within the area.

Furthermore, the concept of the nation state is created out of a belief that the people inside a country are connected to each other through the fact that they live within the same geographical boundaries, and therefore share a bond that binds them together as a people, as well as entitles them to certain advantages of a social policy such as healthcare, welfare and education (ideally at least). However, this ideal is not always realised, especially outside developed countries. Furthermore, social identities, and national cultural traits can assert themselves in a variety of ways due to a gradual freeing of the state from some of its traditional functions. This is by no means a new phenomenon, in fact it has been commonplace among the indigenous peoples of the Americas, Africa, Australia and Asia, who have felt disenfranchised by their own modern nation states and governments. Instead, these peoples tend to see their own social and cultural belonging as tribal rather than tied to a nation state, an identity that often precedes the nation state they live under, by several centuries. Hence, an ecclesiological identity tied to that of nation states adds to the difficulty of the Church's work to become embedded in such a context. Moreover, the instability of the concept of nation states is by no means confined to the indigenous populations of the world. One need only look at the strained relationships between centuries old national identities of Scotland, England, Northern Ireland and Wales, in the post-Brexit climate, or the internal struggles for Catalanian independence in Spain, to see how fragile and artificial the bonds that hold together a nation state can be. Thus, to link the identity of Anglican Churches around the world with that of nation states binds them to a particular form of government and social structures. Structures, which do not always reflect the reality of the society within which they minister. As result, this link can make the Anglican ethos of inculturation and indigenisation more difficult to implement. Consequently, linking the ecclesiological identity of its Churches in such a way limits the ability of the Anglican Communion to embrace the radically transnational, universal (catholic), claims of Christianity. As English theologian Christopher Rowland points out, for the Anglican Church to be the Church, for it to fulfil its divine mission, it must not allow

itself to become captive to any one secular model of society or government.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, if viewed from the perspective of Christian anthropology in which “there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus”, then all man-made boundaries are temporary, artificial constructs, and thus are ontologically subordinate to the claim that in Christ the world was made anew, and that his Kingdom, which the Church looks to, has no borders. Consequently, national borders may even be viewed as eschatologically irrelevant to the universal claims of the Church.<sup>32</sup> From the ecclesiological perspective of this thesis, it becomes clear then that an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion capable of transcending the current tensions, must embrace the belief that the Church ties the human person to the salvific body of Christ through participation in God, and thus, imbues humanity with an identity that looks beyond the Eschaton; an identity that is manifested in the boundary-less Kingdom of God, in the here and now. As such, the Church transcends and ultimately overrides the artificial political boundaries of any man-made nation states. In other words, in the future it may well prove to be missiologically impractical as well as doctrinally antithetical for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to claim national identities.

### **The Tip of The Iceberg:**

#### **The Anglican Communion and the Debate on Human Sexuality**

The subject of human sexuality is frequently perceived as the epicentre of the current tensions within the Anglican Communion. However, in this thesis I postulate that, while the subject is obviously central to the current debate, the existent threat of schism is more a symptom of the current inter-Anglican structural instability than the actual cause of it. That said, the argument over homosexuality in the Anglican Church has revealed a crisis of identity and governance that is not easily resolved. Currently, the Anglican Communion is undergoing some inexorable transnational challenges which seem to

---

<sup>31</sup> Rowland 2001, p.23

originate from ostensibly irreconcilable differences amongst and within its member churches. Yet, this is only the tip of the iceberg, and that under the surface lies a complex network of causes and issues that are intertwined with the current conflict, ranging from mutually exclusive world views and interpretations of reality (e.g. a static moral universe versus a dynamic one) to radically different comprehensions of what constitutes human nature and what the essentials of Christian obedience might be. All these factors culminate in different and opposing visions of the Communion. Consequently, the current tensions over homosexuality are not limited to the realm of moral theology but are intricately linked with ecclesiology and the shortcomings of the current ecclesiological structures within the Communion. Thus, the current fault line has moved beyond the area of sexual ethics and has developed into a crisis of identity, an all-out battle for the hegemony of the Anglican soul.

From an ecclesiological perspective, a big part of the debate has been about different comprehensions of Communion and an increasing tension between those who wish for a more coherent and interdependent Communion and those who favour a looser federation-based model of Anglicanism. In broad terms, those who uphold a traditionalist view of homosexuality as idolatrous and immoral tend to favour a more cohesive model of Communion based on increased legislation, while those with liberal tendencies who argue for same-sex marriage and the ordination of non-celibate homosexuals, lean more towards a looser and more independent model of Communion.<sup>33</sup> This is an unfortunate development because (regardless of the current debate about homosexuality) it makes little sense for any church to be defined, partially or substantially, along the lines of sexual ethics. However, conflicts within the life of the Church, and even tears in its fabric, rarely hinge on one single issue, but arise from multiple sources. Therefore, any possible solution of the current crisis must also spring

---

<sup>33</sup> For examples on the liberal and conservative bias towards different models of Communion see: Radner, Ephraim & Turner, Philip *The Fate of The Communion, The agony of Anglicanism and the Future of a Global Church*. Cambridge UK: William B Eerdmans Publishing Co (2006). Slee, Collin "An Approach to the Commission" *The Windsor Report: A Liberal Response*, ed Jonathan Clatworthy and David Taylor. Winchester UK: O Books and Imprint of John Hunt Publishing Ltd (2005). Spong, John Shelby Foreword" *The Windsor Report: A Liberal Response*, ed Jonathan Clatworthy and David Taylor. Winchester UK: O Books and Imprint of John Hunt Publishing Ltd, (2005). Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON) "The Way, The Truth and the Life: Theological Resources for a Pilgrimage to a Global Anglican Future", The Theological Resource Team of the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON) Jerusalem: Latimer Trust (2008)



from several sources and incorporate a variety of measures, covering vast areas of theology, ecclesiology, doctrine and, perhaps most of all, ecclesiological praxis.

### **The Origins of the Current Crisis**

This part consists of an overview of the course of events that lead to the current crisis within the Communion. Due to its sheer size and scope, it would be impossible to summarise the entire chain of events leading up to the current state of things. I have therefore chosen to focus on what, through my research, I have concluded to be the most pivotal events and some of the main characters involved in the origins of said crisis.

Although there had been disputes among Anglican Bishops throughout the history of the Lambeth's Conferences, the current crisis can be traced back to the 1998 Lambeth Conference. Arguably, this marked the first time in which the power shift from Europe and North America, towards Africa and Asia, was truly felt in an organised form among the Bishops attending the meeting. One of the main consequences of this power shift was the passing of resolution 1.10, declaring that sex outside of marriage was contrary to scripture, and recommending abstinence for those "not called to marriage."<sup>34</sup> The resolution also added that homosexuality was "incompatible with scripture" and "could not advise the legitimizing or blessing of same-sex unions, nor ordaining of those involved in same-gender unions." Traditionally resolutions passed at Lambeth Conferences never been legally binding, resolution 1.10 marked a watershed moment within the Anglican Communion. It came to symbolise a new sense of empowerment among conservative Bishops from the "global south" who made a stance against the actions of the more liberal counterparts of the "global north", primarily The Episcopal Church in the USA.

Against this background, the Anglican Communion was thrown into further turmoil, at the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. This was due to two main factors. One was the controversial decisions made by some of its member churches and the second was the violent, intransigent reaction from some of their fellow Anglican churches. The two

---

<sup>34</sup> Anglican Communion Office 2005: Lambeth Conference 1998 Resolutions Archive

decisions were: the authorising of blessings in the name of the Church on same-sex relationships, by the Anglican Diocese of New Westminster in Canada; and the election, in 2003, to the episcopal See of New Hampshire, USA – and the subsequent confirmation of that election by TEC General Convention – of a priest, a divorced father of two, at the time openly living in a quasi-marital relationship with another man. Both of these decisions were taken against the pleas and warnings of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Anglican Primates' Meeting. Both, of course, were widely and sensationally reported by the news media. The situation was then exacerbated by a number of bishops from other Anglican provinces (mostly in Africa and South America) who violated the integrity of the Communion by offering their pastoral oversight and protection to all such TEC and Canadian parishes that could not bring themselves to accept these innovations. This offer was made against the explicit protests of the bishops of the North American dioceses in question and also against the pleas and warnings of Canterbury and the Anglican Primates.<sup>35</sup>

It is worth noticing that this was not the first incident of this kind of episcopal transgression in the modern history of the Communion. In 2000, two bishops had been irregularly consecrated in Singapore with the purpose of flying back to the USA to minister to those Anglicans who felt alienated by the decision of some bishops to bless same-sex unions and ordain openly homosexual people to the priesthood.<sup>36</sup> In August 2003, when celibate homosexual Jeffrey John was named as bishop of Reading in the UK, Archbishop Peter Akinola, at the time primate of the Anglican Church of Nigeria, stated that if the celibate John was consecrated as Bishop of Reading, or if the actively homosexual (non-celibate) Gene Robinson was consecrated as Bishop of New Hampshire, the Church of Nigeria would leave the Anglican Communion. A number of dioceses throughout the world, including the Diocese of Sydney, made similar statements.<sup>37</sup> Under pressure from the Archbishop of Canterbury, John withdrew from his appointment as bishop and was subsequently appointed as Dean of St Albans Cathedral in England. However, Gene Robinson's consecration went forward, precipitating a crisis in the Anglican Communion. At the end of 2003 Akinola, together

---

<sup>35</sup> BBC (2003.10.16) “Anglican Leader’s Statement”

<sup>36</sup> Quash 2005, pp.42-43

<sup>37</sup> See multimedia links, for interviews with GAFCON profiles:  
BBC: Hardtalk (2008.07.10) and Crisis in the Anglican Communion (2007).

with Archbishops Drexel Gomez (primate of the Church in the Province of the West Indies) and Gregory Venables (Presiding Bishop of the Anglican Church of the Southern Cone) commissioned a paper, presented to all the primates of the Anglican Communion, entitled: *Claiming our Anglican Identity: The Case Against the Episcopal Church, USA*. The paper detailed the implications of the consecration of Gene Robinson for the Anglican Communion, in the view of conservative Primates.<sup>38</sup>

In 2003, following the consecration of Gene Robinson as Bishop of New Hampshire, Bishop Robinson Cavalcanti, Diocesan Bishop of Recife in the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil, asked the Brazilian House of Bishops to express its opposition to TEC's actions, but he was refused.<sup>39</sup> The Diocese of Recife then issued, on its own, and without approval of the IEAB House of Bishops, a declaration of impairment of communion with the Dioceses of New Hampshire and New Westminster (the Canadian diocese which had recently approved the blessing of same-sex marriages). Under the leadership of Bishop Cavalcanti the Diocese of Recife proceeded unilaterally to cancel its companion diocese relationship with the Diocese of Central Pennsylvania, which had endorsed Bishop Robinson's consecration.<sup>40</sup> Bishop Cavalcanti also participated in irregular actions within the USA, including confirmations celebrated in Ohio, in March 2004, without the local diocesan bishop's permission.

Meanwhile in 2004, whilst strenuously supporting those parts of the Windsor Report which address the issue of same-sex issue, Akinola did not comply with those parts that deplore overseas interventions in the US Church. On the contrary, Akinola was instrumental in setting up a missionary body, the Convocation of Anglicans in North America, in order to formalise the ties between break-away Anglicans in the USA and the Church of Nigeria. In June 2005, Cavalcanti was finally deposed on the grounds that he had broken communion with the IEAB.<sup>41</sup> The deposition was a result of a series of events and actions undertaken by both the IEAB and the Diocese of Recife (North-

---

<sup>38</sup> *Claiming our Anglican Identity: The Case Against the Episcopal Church, USA: A Paper Commissioned For the Primates of the Anglican Communion*. By The Most Rev Drexel Gomez, The Most Rev Peter Akinola, and The Most Rev Gregory Venables, The Anglican Communion Institute (2003).

<sup>39</sup> Larom 2006, pp.1-3

<sup>40</sup> Uchoa 2005, pp.1-5

<sup>41</sup> Larom 2006, pp.1-3

Eastern Brazil). That same year, Bishop Gregory Venables, primate of the Anglican Province of the South Cone of the Americas, presumed to exercise authority in the jurisdictional area of the IEAB and extended his personal oversight to Bishop Cavalcanti and the 40 deposed priests of the Diocese of Recife. In September 2005, Akinola spoke out against the Anglican Church in Brazil (IEAB) deposition of Cavalcanti and the excommunication of over 30 priests, who had previously declared impaired communion with the rest of the IEAB and TEC.<sup>42</sup> In 2005 the Most Rev Robinson Cavalcanti, Diocesan Bishop of Recife, was deposed by the IEAB, together with 32 (later 40) priests of the Recife Diocese.<sup>43</sup> In 2008 Cavalcanti, along with 44 clergy (and most of their congregations), were officially received as an extra-territorial diocese of the Province of the Southern Cone.<sup>44</sup> Today both the original IEAB Diocese of Recife and the newly established “Anglican Diocese of Recife” formed under the jurisdiction of the Southern Cone, with Cavalcanti as its Bishop, exist as parallel entities roughly overlapping in the same geographical area. Currently a legal dispute is in course concerning the rightful ownership of several church buildings and important documents belonging to the Diocese.<sup>45</sup>

In September 2005, under the leadership of Archbishop Akinola, the Church of Nigeria redefined in its constitution its relationship to the Anglican Communion as “Communion with all Anglican Churches, Dioceses and Provinces that hold and maintain the Historic Faith, Doctrine, Sacrament and Discipline of the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.”<sup>46</sup> In a later press release, Akinola clarified:

We want to state that our intention in amending the 2002 Constitution of the Church of Nigeria was to make clear that we are committed to the historic faith once delivered to the Saints, practice and the traditional formularies of the Church. ... We treasure our place within the worldwide family of the Anglican Communion but we are distressed by the unilateral actions of those provinces that are clearly determined to redefine what our common faith was once. We

---

<sup>42</sup> The Living Church News Service, 2007a): “Mass Depositions In Recife”

<sup>43</sup> The Living Church News Service, 2007a): “Mass Depositions In Recife”

<sup>44</sup> The Living Church News Service, 2007b): “Brazilian diocese received into province of the Southern cone”

<sup>45</sup> Church Times 2005.10.07

<sup>46</sup> Canons of the Church of Nigeria, Canon 1: Of Fundamental Declarations

have chosen not to be yoked to them as we prefer to exercise our freedom to remain faithful. We continue to pray, however, that there will be a genuine demonstration of repentance.<sup>47</sup>

On November 12, 2005, Akinola signed a Covenant of Concordat with the Presiding Bishops of the Reformed Episcopal Church and the Anglican Province of America, two break-away groups from TEC. At both the Primates' Meeting at Dromantine in 2005 and the Primates' Meeting at Dar es Salaam in 2007, Akinola refused to take Holy Communion in company with the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church. On the latter occasion, he issued a press release in order to publicise and explain his refusal and that of others associated with him.<sup>48</sup> Akinola's name as chairman of the Global South Primates heads the list of signatories to a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on November 15, 2005. In this letter Europe is described as "*a spiritual desert*" and the actions of the Church of England in supporting the new civil partnerships laws are said to give "*the appearance of evil*".<sup>49</sup> However, in a dramatic turn of events, three of the bishops whose names appeared on the document at the Global South website (President Bishop Clive Handford of Jerusalem and the Middle East, the Primate of the West Indies Archbishop Drexel Gomez, and the Presiding Bishop of the Southern Cone Bishop Gregory Venables) denied signing or approving the letter, and criticised it as "*an act of impatience*", "*scandalous*", and "*megaphone diplomacy*".<sup>50</sup>

Akinola was among the Global South leaders who successfully pressed for the voluntary withdrawal of TEC's representatives from the Anglican Consultative Council's meeting in Nottingham in 2005, although representatives did attend in order to make a presentation supporting full inclusion of gays and lesbians in the life of the Church, for which a vote of thanks was passed. In August of that year, Akinola denounced a statement of the Church of England's House of Bishops on civil partnerships and called for the disciplining of the Church of England and TEC on the grounds that the Church had not changed its position on same-sex partnerships. Since the Anglican Communion has historically been defined as those Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, whose Archbishop is head of the Church of England and thus *primus inter*

---

<sup>47</sup> Church of Nigeria: Press briefing September 29th, 2005

<sup>48</sup> Church of Nigeria 2007a: Primates Explain Absence at Holy Eucharist

<sup>49</sup> GAFCON, 2005: Global South Primates Response to Archbishop Rowan Williams

<sup>50</sup> Davies 2006, p.1

*paris* in the Anglican Communion, this led to speculation that Akinola was positioning himself as a possible international leader of a more conservative Church than the present Anglican Communion, which would no longer recognise the authority or primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, he attended the subsequent Primates' Meeting in Tanzania in 2007, although he absented himself from all the celebrations of Holy Communion during that meeting. In May of the same year he flew to the USA to install Martyn Minns, a priest who had left the Episcopal Church of the USA, as a bishop of the Church of Nigeria in the USA. Akinola reportedly ignored requests not to do this from both the Presiding Bishop of TEC and the Archbishop of Canterbury. However, the timing of the requests and their intent, relative to Akinola's departure from Nigeria, is a subject of contention.<sup>51</sup> The newly installed bishop indicated at a press conference that the intention was to replace the Episcopal Church of the USA (as an organ of the Anglican Communion) with a structure formed under the auspices of the Church of Nigeria.<sup>52</sup> This new structure eventually evolved into The Anglican Church in North America (ACNA) as an “alternative” ecclesiastical structure to the Episcopal Church of the USA within the Anglican Communion. However, up until today it is not in Communion with the See of Canterbury and is still seeking recognition within the worldwide Anglican Communion.

Meanwhile, in 2008 some “Global South” Churches under the auspices of, amongst others, Archbishop Venables, who at the time was a primate of the South Cone (Maurice Sinclair's successor), and Archbishop Akinola, together with a number of other primates and bishops, accompanied by a smaller number of Churches from the “Global North”, formed the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON) and Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans (FCA) as alternative organisational homes for those Churches that viewed TEC, the Anglican Church of Canada, and all who would not take a stand against their approval of these innovations as hopelessly corrupt and heretical; and therefore could no longer in conscience remain in full communion with them. Some GAFCON/FCA members went so far as to include the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, among the individuals they could not bring themselves to remain in

---

<sup>51</sup> Church of Nigeria 2007b: “Letter to Rt Rev Katherine Jefferts Schory from Archbishop Peter Akinola”; and Church of Nigeria 2007c: “Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury from Archbishop Peter Akinola”.

<sup>52</sup> Banerjee 2007, p.1

communion with, since Archbishop Williams refused to condemn TEC and the Canadian Anglican Church and expel them from the Communion. (It should be noted that there is some question whether it lies within the competence of an archbishop of Canterbury to remove a Province or Church from membership in the Anglican Communion).<sup>53</sup> The Anglican Province of the Southern Cone, which was at the time under the leadership of Archbishop Venables, has been prominent in supporting the positions of the GAFCON and FCA.<sup>54</sup> In addition, after the consecration of Gene Robinson as Bishop of New Hampshire, leaders in several conservative dioceses in North America expressed their opposition to having a non-celibate gay person in such a position. Archbishop Venables extended an invitation to those Anglicans who wished to dissociate themselves from the Episcopal Church of the USA while still remaining members of the Anglican Communion. Several parishes in the USA and Canada currently claim this form of extra-provincial status. Nineteen parishes in Canada formed the Anglican Network in Canada (ANiC), which has described itself as an “ecclesial body under the jurisdiction of the Anglican Province of the Southern Cone”.<sup>55</sup> In 2009 the Network became part of the newly formed Anglican Church in North America (ACNA).

The ACNA considers itself to be a Province-in-formation in the global Anglican Communion, forming itself in response to the request (June 2008) of GAFCON. It was formally recognised by the GAFCON Primates (leaders of Anglican Churches claiming to represent 70 per cent of active Anglicans globally) on 16 April 2009, after a “thorough examination” of its leadership, organisational structure, proposed constitution and proposed canons.<sup>56</sup> The ACNA comprises parishes, dioceses and other groups of Anglicans who have broken away from TEC and the Anglican Church of Canada, and formed themselves into a parallel ecclesiastic body. The ACNA claims to have brought together in its Church some 100,000 Anglicans in 700 parishes in 28 dioceses (these numbers are disputed). Of the ecclesiastic organisations that collaborated in the formation of the 28 dioceses of the Anglican Church in the USA and Canada, at least five were break-away factions from TEC dioceses who had placed themselves under the

---

<sup>53</sup> GAFCON, 2008: “The Way, The Truth and the Life: Theological Resources for a Pilgrimage to a Global Anglican Future”, pp.4-13.

<sup>54</sup> See multimedia links, for interviews with Archbishop Venables: BBC: Hardtalk (2008.07.10) and Crisis in the Anglican Communion (2007).

<sup>55</sup> Anglican Network in Canada, 2010: “Who we are”

<sup>56</sup> ACNA, 2009: “About the Anglican Church in North America”



jurisdiction of the Anglican Province of the Southern Cone and Archbishop Venables. The break-away groups were sometimes composed of whole parishes, sometimes of factions within parishes, among them parts of the Anglican Dioceses of Fort Worth (Texas), Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania), Quincy (Illinois), and San Joaquin (California); as well as the Anglican Network in Canada and various missionary initiatives in the USA.<sup>57</sup> The Anglican Church of Canada and The Episcopal Church in the USA remain at present the only ecclesial bodies in the USA and Canada recognised by the Anglican Consultative Council and the Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>58</sup> Regardless, during its foundation in 2009, Archbishop Akinola declared the Church of Nigeria in full communion with the newly created Anglican Church in North America.<sup>59</sup> To paraphrase former Archbishop Rowan Williams, the question that arises from these tensions is one with deep ecclesiological consequences: Are we as Anglican Christians, who claim to be united in one Baptism, have a common allegiance to three folded order of ministry and the creeds of the ancient and undivided Church, and who recognise the authority of scripture in matters of doctrine, really prepared to say that because we disagree on a matter of sexual ethics, we no longer recognise each other as Christians?

---

<sup>57</sup> ACNA, 2009: "Our Genesis"

<sup>58</sup> Anglican Communion Provincial directory 2016: "Churches in Communion with the See of Canterbury"

To follow the debate on the status of the ACNA see the following articles:

Asworth, Pat "Synod to Debate ACNA" *Church Times* (2010.01.22) and Williams, Leigh Ann: "Anglican Church in North America wraps up inaugural assembly" *The Anglican Journal* (2009.06.27)

<sup>59</sup> Hodges 2009, p.1



## **Chapter II:**

### **Ecclesiology (ies) Of the Anglican Minority**

The Anglican Communion as a whole is not identified with a particular national character or ethos. However, the transitional challenges which the Communion is undergoing in the present generation are marked, at least in part, by the dissolution of English imperialism in the past century and the decolonisation of large parts of the Communion. The many different national identities of the Anglican Churches are in themselves a consequence of British imperial expansion, with its subsequent exportation and transplantation of an English Church with a distinct national identity, an identity which was very much located in the consolidation of power and the growth of English nationalism in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The ecclesiastical aspect of this identity is clearly represented in the Tudor Reformation settlements, especially the role given to the Royal Supremacy. As a result, Anglicanism has had a legacy of being linked to that of nation states (Church of England, Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil, Anglican Church of Australia, etc). This has led to the somewhat simplistic view that “Anglicanism”, as we know it today, is primarily a child of British imperialism, and that the Anglican Communion is a kind of ecclesiological counterweight to the Common Wealth of Nations. As usual, however, the reality is more complex than it appears at first glance. A significant number of Anglican Churches in places such as Japan, Latin America, and Portuguese speaking Africa, were founded beyond the political sphere of British imperialism. These Churches have grown and developed in parts of the world where neither the propagation of the English language nor the presence of the British Empire has been a driving factor of their existence. Even though these Anglican Churches form a relative minority within the Communion, in terms of numbers, theirs is a unique Anglican heritage, one that has been less affected by the political ambitions of the British Empire and the national ethos that comes with having originated as transplant of the Church of England or north American. Consequently, these churches often find themselves in a situation of double minority: Not only do they tend to be relatively small in terms of number of members and thus constitute a minority within their own contexts, in addition, they form a minority within the Anglican Communion since their

own functional and liturgical languages (often there is more than one) is not that of the vast majority of Anglicans.

Another aspect that grants these “fringe” churches a unique perspective on what it means to be Anglican, is that the issue of ecclesiological identity has seldom been charged with the same acuteness that self-definition and identity carry among the Anglican “minority” churches, for whom the issue of self-definition is often a matter of survival. As previously stated, some of these churches are so desperately small that failure to define themselves as a viable alternative for their people, and as the bearers of a unique gift for the salvation/liberation of their people, can potentially mean extinction. It is easy to forget that we only tend actively to reflect upon our identity when changed circumstances challenge us to define ourselves. Well established Churches can go on existing for a very long time without feeling the need to define themselves or present a currently valid justification for their distinct existence. They are in this position because they are able to draw upon (relatively) large economic resources as well as reserves of credibility with the general public, both stemming from a long history as culturally established institutions. In contrast “minority” churches, which have grown on the “fringes” of the Anglican Communion, e.g. the Anglican Churches of Japan, Mozambique, Chile, Nicaragua and Malawi, enjoy no such luxury. They exist only because they have been able to carve out an existence with such small resources as they have found at their disposal. For these churches having a clear *raison d'être* is acutely a matter of survival; no one is going to invite them onto the established socio-cultural stage as integral parts of their people's national and cultural heritage. And they do not dispose of any reserves of public credibility. Most people in countries like Chile and Japan are probably not even aware of the existence of Anglicanism. In fact, through my research I have found that most Anglicans in Europe or North America are not aware of the existence of Anglican traditions in these countries either. Consequently, Anglicans in such “fringe” positions must take seriously the need to define and communicate a justification for their particular existence. If they fail to do this, extinction will be a very real possibility.

The current struggles over the infrastructure of authority (mutual accountability of member Churches, grievance procedures, the nature of Church leadership, etc), especially in connection with issues related to homosexuality, have re-actualised the

need to assess the nature of the Anglican Communion. Consequently, the need to define Anglican identity and ecclesiology has now become acute among the “established” churches of the Communion. These issues have become an integral part of a worldwide struggle to re-examine, and perhaps redefine, the Anglican Communion’s rationale for existence.<sup>60</sup> No longer in themselves a primary concern of the “minority” churches, these issues are now forcing a convergence of the ecclesiological strivings and aspirations of the “minority or fringe” churches with those of “well-established” churches elsewhere, uniting them perforce in a common quest, in the interest of the whole Communion.<sup>61</sup> The voice of Anglican minorities, on the margins of society, wielding little (if any) power and influence, may portray an Anglican theology which has been less affected by British imperialism or the fiercely nationalist tendencies of post-colonial states, than most churches born as Church of England transplants. Both are socio-cultural factors which, this thesis argues, affect the current theological and ecclesiological tensions of the Communion. Consequently, the experiences of these minority or “fringe” Churches may now prove an invaluable contribution to the self-understanding and continued existence of the Anglican Communion itself.

### **Purpose of this Chapter**

Although it is a historical fact that the English Reformation was intricately linked with a particular national ethos, namely that of England, in the following chapter I will attempt to demonstrate that the Anglican Communion itself was born out of a vision of the Anglican Church as an institution capable of transcending the national and political barriers, set up by the English Crown (and other nation states), which initially divided the Anglican churches. This is evidenced by the work of the first visionaries of what can be called a “proto-Communion”. These theologians, such as William Patrick Palmer, Horatio Southgate and Bishop Blomfield of London (amongst others), sought to formulate a unifying ecclesiological identity for all Anglican churches around the world, without in the process losing awareness of the pluralism of the diverse contexts in

---

<sup>60</sup> Kay 2007, pp.136-139 and pp.142-143

<sup>61</sup> Kay 2007, pp.137-138

which Anglicanism existed.<sup>62</sup> Consequently, it can be argued that the origins of the Anglican Communion lie within a longing for the Church to conceive of itself as being more than an institution limited to a nation state. This universalistic ecclesiological principle is based on the belief that the nature of the universal Church, which the Anglican Communion forms a part of, is such that it transcends the set geographical, national, ethnic and cultural frontiers of the world. This notion may seem anathema to an ecclesiological legacy such as that of the Church of England, which for centuries had endeavoured to establish its identity as both English and national. Little wonder, then, that the idea of an Anglican Communion was considered to be such a radical notion, and thus managed to provoke such strong reactions from Anglican thinkers, for whom the notion of global Anglicanism seemed alien if not downright abhorrent to the Reformation, as well as from those who sought to safeguard what they perceived to be the particularly English character of Anglicanism.<sup>63</sup>

Nevertheless, in this chapter I will seek to demonstrate that while contextualisation and indigenisation are essential elements of Anglican ecclesiology, this does not need to imply an ecclesiology which is created along the lines of national boundaries. On the contrary, the implementation of contextualisation and indigenisation should foster a spirit of interdependence amongst Anglicans, beyond that of any national identity. National boundaries tend to reflect the outcome of political processes (such as wars and colonisation) which are irreconcilable with Christian doctrine. Furthermore, as previously established, from the perspective of a Christian anthropology in which “there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” then all man-made boundaries are nothing but temporary, artificial constructs, and consequently subordinate to the universalist claims of Christianity; perhaps even eschatologically irrelevant in view of the claim of divine origins of the Church.<sup>64</sup> In terms of Anglican ecclesiology, this means that an isolated church is less than a church that forms an active part of the universal Church. It is therefore of the utmost importance to make a strong differentiation between the innate Anglican ethos of

---

<sup>62</sup> For example, see “Chapter X: On the British Churches” in William Patrick Palmer’s: *A Treatise On the Church of Christ*, London J.G. & F. Rivington (1839); and Southgate 1847, p.1; Blomfield 1840, p.16. See bibliography for more details.

<sup>63</sup> For an example, of this line of thought see “Church of England: Never Only an English Church” in this thesis.

<sup>64</sup> The quote is from Galatians 3:28

cultural contextualisation and indigenisation, and the Anglican concept of ecclesiological identities linked to the concept of nation states. In other words, it is vital to safeguard the Anglican spirit of emphasising the local representation and expression of the Church in terms of culture, ethnic heritage and social context, without for that sake, claiming loyalty to a particular nation-state. This is a matter of primary concern for the Anglican Communion, if it wants to be perceived as more than an ecclesiological remnant of a furlong empire.

Hence, the following pages will be dedicated to exploring the concepts of *Contextualisation*, *Indigenisation* and *Mission*. I will argue that these are innate and vital components in the development of an Anglican understanding of the Church. It is therefore important to establish their role and meaning within the development of Anglican ecclesiology. Emphasis will lie on the narrative provided by the “fringe” ecclesiology of the minority Churches of the Anglican Communion. The purpose of which is to portray the other side of the coin, a tradition of Anglicanism formed under very different circumstance than most Anglican Churches of the English-speaking world.

## **Outline**

This chapter is divided into four main parts. The first is an introduction to the subject. In this part, will I also establish the relevance of the study and its methodology as well as the form it will take. That is followed by an exploration of the concepts of Contextualisation, Indigenisation and Mission within Anglican ecclesiology. I will demonstrate that these are innate and vital components for the development of an Anglican understanding of the Church. It is important to establish their role and meaning within the development of Anglican ecclesiology, especially from the perspective of “fringe” ecclesiology. In order to illustrate how intimate, the connection between Anglican ecclesiology and the concepts of contextualisation, indigenisation and mission is, I will analyse the work of Brazilian Anglican theologian Jace C. Maraschin. Before his death in 2009, Jaci Corrêia Maraschin was a priest and theologian of the Igreja Anglicana Evangelica do Brasil (IEAB). The Rev. Maraschin was one of the founders of the Association of Evangelical Theological Seminaries (ASTE) and served as its executive secretary for many years. In 1976, he was elected a member of the

Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches and in 1981 was elected to represent Brazil at the Anglican Consultative Council in 1990; there he helped draft guidelines for the Provinces of the Communion. The Archbishop of Canterbury chose The Rev Maraschin to serve on several international commissions, including the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC), where he helped draw up the widely acclaimed “Gift of Authority” declaration, subscribed by both churches. The Rev. Maraschin has also greatly influenced the liturgical development of the IEAB (especially with regard to music). His input has been felt as author, translator, and composer. I will draw mainly from Maraschin’s work titled “Liturgy and Latin American Anglicanism”, in *We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*, edited by John L. Kater, 1989, Panama City: Episcopal Church-Diocese of Panama, pp 31-47. Writing from a Latin American perspective, Maraschin establishes how the English Reformation can be understood to be the first true contextualisation and indigenisation of the western Church. In addition to exploring his work, I will extrapolate upon Maraschin's arguments, in order to demonstrate how the English Reformation was the genesis of the Anglican predisposition to give theological weight to cultural factors, and the consequent Anglican propensity towards contextualisation and indigenisation.<sup>65</sup>

This thesis endeavours to explore the possibility of re-imagining the Anglican Communion in the face of the challenges it currently faces. For that reason, it is important to demonstrate that the propositions herein are not only theoretical or speculative, but are actually based on the real life and praxis of the Anglican Communion. To illuminate this, point I will provide real-life examples of the application of the ecclesiological principles put forward in my research.

## **Contextualisation, Indigenisation and Mission**

The pluralism that exists within the Communion today originates from a combination of diverse historical circumstances and the purposeful shaping of the Church as an indigenous expression of the cultures from where it grew and now exists. It is the result of centuries-long application of innate elements of Anglican ecclesiology such as *Contextualisation* and *Indigenisation* and *Mission*. Although they constitute recurrent

---

<sup>65</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.36

element within Anglicanism, historically, these concepts have often been more implied rather than explicitly formulated in Anglican thought; present but not always declared. Nevertheless, they have been applied within the ecclesiology of the Communion for centuries, especially in the non-English speaking part of the Anglican Communion. Not only do these represent fundamental notions of Anglican theology in general, but constitute core elements of Anglican comprehension of the Church, and consequently constitute critical components to any workable theology of the Anglican Communion. In the following pages, I will expand on why the concepts of *Contextualisation*, *Indigenisation* and *Mission*, are fundamental to an Anglican understanding of the Church, and how they form part of the radical and transnational theology which lies at the heart of the Communion.

### **Contextualisation**

Being part of a worldwide Communion of Churches implies that Anglican churches are not simply transplants of their respective mother Churches (mostly England or the USA), but autonomous units striving to achieve, or already rooted in, their own cultural identity and have developed their own ecclesiastical structures. This may itself be considered a form of indigenisation, but for purposes of clarity I prefer to call this phenomenon (which deals mainly with the institutional and organisational dimensions of the Church) “contextualisation”. By nature, Anglicanism is concerned with the institutional and structural aspects of the Church (from Cranmer and Hooker to the Lambeth Conferences of the last two centuries, the question of the Ecclesiological nature of Anglicanism has been debated countless times). In addition, much of the contemporary work of Anglican theologians deals with the institutional and organisational dimensions of the Church. The Rev Dr Regunta Yesurathnam, an Indian theologian living in Jamaica, defines contextualisation as follows:

The term contextualisation includes all that is implied in indigenisation or inculturation, but also seeks to include the realities of contemporary secularity, technology, and the struggle for human justice [...] While indigenisation tends to focus on the purely cultural dimension of human experience, contextualisation broadens the understanding of culture to include social, political, and economic questions.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> As quoted in: Van Engen 2005, p.194

From their earliest days, as autonomous institutions, the commitment to become indigenous (not only in theology but in ecclesiastical structure and institutional life) has been a vital part of the identity of the Anglican Churches and essential in their self-identification with the cultures in which they were born. The following statement by The House of Bishops of the IARCA (*Iglesia Anglicana de la Region Central de América*, Anglican Church of the Region of Central America) provides an example of what lies at the heart of this ethos:

[...] serious efforts were made in Central America to change from the system of chaplaincy (foreigner in a foreign land) to that of an indigenous, national, autochthonous Church. Consequently, in 1967 the missionary dioceses of Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica were created with the purpose of spreading the Kingdom of God in each nation and revealing the Anglican spirit in the local culture, as well as forming an autochthonous Anglicanism.<sup>67</sup>

Anglican theologian Glenda R. McQueen, of the Diocese of Panama, proposes that, in order for the Church to become truly contextualised, it needs to begin a new investigation into what it means to be Anglican, forcing itself to question its own organisational structure; for, whether this has been inherited from the USA or from England, Anglicans must ask themselves if living in Latin America “implies doing things the same way they are done in other parts of the Communion”.<sup>68</sup> In terms of ecclesiology, this may imply dissociating the Church from Eurocentric presuppositions concerning such things as music, liturgy, and organisational and institutional models, which are not universal Christian givens, but in fact are merely “Anglo-Saxon cultural inheritances”.<sup>69</sup>

### **Indigenisation**

In post-colonial theory, the term *indigenisation* is used in much the same way as it is in world politics; that is, to describe the process by which less industrially advanced

---

<sup>67</sup> IARCA, 1997: “A covenant between The Anglican Church of The Central Region of America (IARCA) and The Protestant Episcopal Church In The United States Of America (TEC)”

<sup>68</sup> McQueen 1989, p 101

<sup>69</sup> Desueza 1989, p.103



countries re-define themselves and the meaning of their resources in the interests of modern agriculture and mass marketing. Under the pressures of economic imperialism and the urge to modernise, many such countries have, in the past, adopted the western values of self-determination such as liberalism, democracy, and independence. But now that they are enjoying their own share of economic prosperity, technological sophistication, military power, and political cohesion, many of them desire to revert to their ancestral cultures and religious beliefs.

A number of Anglican theologians from the non-English speaking and developing world, such as parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America, use the term *indigenisation* in a way which is informed and inspired by this application but which has been adapted to the theological sphere, in which it means: The process of dissociation from what is perceived to be the “Anglo-Saxon” cultural aspect of Anglicanism.<sup>70</sup> Brazilian Bishop Sebastião Armando Gameleira Soares, combines political, anthropological and theological arguments, and concludes that indigenisation is not only a necessity for the survival of the Church, but a matter of spiritual and theological credibility for Anglicanism:

In the case of our America Afrolatina [a play with words Afro-Latin-Indigenous], we must ask ourselves if we are willing to enter into a deeper dialogue with the rural world and the slums of cities, as well as with the Aboriginal world and the black world? And if we are willing to look with joy upon the possibility of acquiring new and previously unseen faces in Anglicanism, which might emerge from the alliance. Because it is an alliance! It is a partnership of solidarity with those peoples of Latin America who to this day are still the victims of colonization. Our option for the poor and oppressed, which is mandated by the Gospel, should inspire us to always strive towards becoming the "religion of the oppressed!" It is a disgrace to Christianity that after five hundred years, we do not yet have a truly indigenous church or a black church on our continent!<sup>71</sup>

This process of indigenisation is regarded as a necessary first step towards the “rebirth” of the Anglican tradition, in a form that is free from the impositions of Anglo-Saxon culture and wholly of a piece with the cultures and traditions of the none English-speaking world.<sup>72</sup> Part of this process involves getting rid of the theological mindset

---

<sup>70</sup> For example, see the following articles: Vilar 1989, p.12. See also: Brooks 2005, pp.93-105.

<sup>71</sup> Soares 2005, p.139 (my translation)

<sup>72</sup> Desueza 1989, p.114

inherited from the Anglican mother Churches in the USA and England. In other words, the Anglican Churches of the non-English speaking world, should assume, as part of their task, a deeper study of and reflection on such theology as has sprung directly from the different social and cultural contexts that Anglicanism is currently present in, as opposed to what they have inherited from Anglo-Saxon culture.

### **Mission**

Mission in an Anglican context is (to say the least) a complex theme. This is mainly due to the broad spectra of traditions within Anglicanism which all have been involved in missionary activities, and done so from their peculiar theological perspectives; ranging from the Evangelical societies of the 18th and 19th centuries who financed Lutheran and Calvinist missionaries, to the episcopally-centered missions of the Anglo-Catholic movement.<sup>73</sup> For although the dissemination of Anglicanism in Africa, parts of Asia, and the Caribbean was a consequence of the expansion of the British Empire, it was only through conscious missionary activity that Anglicanism was spread among many other parts of the world, far beyond the reach of the British Crown. For example, among the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking peoples of Latin America, it was mainly through the mission of the Episcopal Church of the USA that Anglican Churches were founded, with participation by the Church of England through South American Missionary Society, through its presence in the South Cone. The same thing can be said about the missionary activities in places like Mozambique, Angola and the Philippines, which were well outside the main sphere of British political and cultural influence. Therefore, one would be hard pressed to state something which is true across the board of all Anglican mission. However, I do believe that it would be fair to say that, since the days of 1910 Edinburgh Conference on World Mission (and probably for a long time before that), the Anglican pattern of obedience to Christ, all over the world, has been deeply committed to questions of justice, inclusion, and social struggle.<sup>74</sup> For that reason the concepts of mission and evangelism have often been inseparable from that of social action, and perhaps more so today than ever before.<sup>75</sup> Anglican theologian, from the

---

<sup>73</sup> For a more in-depth study of this phenomenon see: Yates, T.E “Anglicans and Mission” *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition (2002)*, pp.483-496.

<sup>74</sup> Ward 2006, p.102

<sup>75</sup> For example, see: Soares 2005, pp.132-138

Dominican Republic, Ashton Jacinto Brooks writes that, in terms of mission, one of the main tasks the Church faces today is to know and understand the “axis of power” along which society moves: for it has the responsibility to stay true to its mandate to proclaim justice for all human beings, regardless of their origin, class, or race. According to Brooks, to promote equality between humans is the greatest challenge the Church faces, a challenge that is rooted in scripture.<sup>76</sup> Essentially this integrates the concept of social action based on faith with that of the mission of the Church. In other words “Anglican Christian witness [...] cannot be authentic unless the Church commits itself to the struggle against oppression and injustice.”<sup>77</sup> From the perspective of Anglican ecclesiology (especially in the developing world, which is where most Anglicans live), being content with interpreting the purpose of mission as recruiting as many members as possible, is considered not only simplistic but also dangerous, since it implies acquiescing in the values of competition and expansion. These values are regarded as negative by-products of western (“First World”) individualist society imposed upon the developing nations, and therefore constitute threats to Anglicanism’s potential for indigenisation and contextualisation.<sup>78</sup>

Admittedly, neither the Anglican divines, nor the high churchmen of the Hackney Phalanx or the Oxford movement, nor theologians of the missionary societies of the 19th and early 20th centuries, would explicitly use the terms contextualisation and indigenisation. However, it is a recurring argument amongst Anglican theologians (especially amongst those from the non-English-speaking world) that these concepts were implicit in their theology; and what is more: They have formed core and innate elements of Anglican thought ever since the days of the English Reformation. For that reason, the next part is dedicated to exploring the intricate link between the English Reformation and the concept of theological contextualisation.

---

<sup>76</sup> Brooks 2005, p.95

<sup>77</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.45

<sup>78</sup> Maraschin 1989, pp.40-41

## **The English Reformation as Contextualisation of the Church**

In his work, Brazilian Anglican theologian Jaci C. Maraschin elaborates upon the English Reformation can be understood as the genesis of the Anglican predisposition to give theological weight to cultural factors, and the consequent Anglican propensity towards contextualisation and indigenisation. In fact, Maraschin goes as far as to argue that the English reformation was the first real contextualisation and inculturation of the western Church.<sup>79</sup>

Maraschin writes that, unlike other religious traditions with roots in the Reformation, Anglicanism was not constituted based on a set doctrinal system (e.g. Lutheranism and Calvinism), but rather on the basis of liturgical practice. The reforming fathers of the English Church never appealed to a body of doctrines or confessional statements of their own. According to Maraschin's interpretation, their break with Rome was chiefly over the Pope's claim to exercise authority over their Church; details of sacramental theology and the questioning of such practices as praying to the saints played a relatively minor role, at least in the early days. Later, as the Puritan party came to the fore, the more radical ideas of Calvin and Luther had their effect in England as well.<sup>80</sup>

Further, Maraschin states that when the Church of England, for purely political reasons, could no longer continue its subordination to the Bishop of Rome nor maintain itself organically within the structures of the Roman Catholic Church, it began to reinterpret its identity as the original Catholic Church in Great Britain. It sought to strengthen this identity, while at the same time legitimising itself, by stressing that, though it had broken with Rome, it had not broken with the Catholic and apostolic tradition of the ancient, undivided Church (as opposed to the Calvinists and Lutherans who formulated new doctrines unknown to the early Church: e.g. double predestination, consubstantiation, *solâ fideism*). The English Church affirmed its Catholicity not by adding doctrines, but by purifying its forms of worship.<sup>81</sup> To better understand Maraschin's train of thought, it is helpful to consider the nature of the doctrinal basis of Anglicanism. Some of the most commonly agreed-upon foundations of Anglican

---

<sup>79</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.36

<sup>80</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.31

<sup>81</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.31

doctrine are the three great Creeds of the early ecumenical Councils (the Apostles', Nicene and Athanasian Creeds), and these are interpreted by the dispersed authority of the four Anglican Instruments of Unity: The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primates' Meeting, the Lambeth Conference, and the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC).<sup>82</sup> Also, since 1888 the principles enshrined in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral have acted as a four-point articulation of Anglican identity: they are often cited as encapsulating the fundamentals of the Communion's doctrine and as a reference-point for ecumenical discussion with other Christian denominations. The four points are: (1) The Holy Scriptures, as containing all things necessary to salvation; (2) the Creeds (especially the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds), as the sufficient statement of Christian faith; (3) the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion; (4) The historic Episcopate, locally adapted.<sup>83</sup> But because these foundational elements can hardly be set out in undisputable, clear-cut terms, questions of methodology have always played an important part in Anglican theology. For it is less a body of doctrinal statements than a process of doctrinal development and the means of promulgating doctrine that have shaped the theological identity of Anglicanism. A crucial part of this has been the principle of *lex orandi, lex credendi* (the law of prayer is the law of belief: in other words, the Church believes what it prays). This means that, traditionally, Anglicanism expresses its doctrinal convictions by the prayer texts and liturgy it uses. When questioned what they believe, Anglicans have traditionally pointed to the Book of Common Prayer or to its successor prayer books. Sometimes it is hard to distinguish Anglican doctrine from Anglican order. The principal of *lex orandi, lex credendi* still remains at the heart of Anglican identity.<sup>84</sup> Thus, Maraschin claims that the English Reformation was essentially a liturgical rather than a doctrinal reform. Its principal aim, he says, was to replace a liturgy which in the middle ages had come to be thought of as imposed from above and was conceived by most laypersons as something foreign and essentially un-English. The liturgy was now to be given a local habitation: it was to be Anglicised! In short, the liturgy spawned by the English Reformation was to be a national liturgy, a liturgy for Englishmen. This was a thoroughly self-conscious choice.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Shriever, 1998 , pp.202-216.

<sup>83</sup> Butler 1998, pp.41-42

<sup>84</sup> Stevenson 1998, pp.187-202

<sup>85</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.32

For Maraschin, the English Reformation was an effort to *indigenise* the Church. By contextualising the liturgy, he argues, the Church of England opened it in a very real sense to the influence of the people – the ones who celebrated it. In this way the English Reformation was characterised not merely by liturgical reform, but by *contextualisation* and *indigenisation* (e.g. its insistence on public prayers and the sacraments being said in the vernacular), and this brought new strains of plurality and diversity into western Christendom.<sup>86</sup> Further, Maraschin argues that the celebration of the mass in English, the vernacular tongue, was perhaps one of the earliest and most decisive signs of the indigenising and contextualising ethos of Anglicanism. Article XXIV of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England states: “It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public Prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people”.<sup>87</sup> Drawing from works of the first Reformed Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, Maraschin proposes that, with the appearance of the first Book of Common Prayer (BCP) in 1549, largely written by Cranmer, the liturgical focus of the English Reformation was consolidated; and that it was through the BCP that worship in the language of the people became a prominent feature of the English Reformation. Maraschin goes so far as to argue that not only was the Anglican Reformation essentially a liturgical reform, but also that nowhere in the world where the Reformation took hold “did there appear with such coherence and beauty a work like the first Book of Common Prayer [...] A new practice was being inaugurated which was destined to break with the medieval world [...] in order to deliver to the churches’ people what had been until then forbidden them”.<sup>88</sup> Maraschin, claims that this new practice was defined by certain factors which came to distinguish the English Reformation as mainly liturgical with a limited explicitly doctrinal content.<sup>89</sup> He writes that, unlike the liturgies of the pre-Tridentine Roman Church, the BCP did not, while recognizing, honouring, and venerating tradition, turn it into an excuse for remaining in the past “as if the past were sacred simply because it has already happened.”<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, Maraschin argues

---

<sup>86</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.35

<sup>87</sup> Bicknell 1955, p.308

<sup>88</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.31

<sup>89</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.31

<sup>90</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.31

that the BCP, both in its original form as well as in later versions from various parts of the Anglican Communion, expresses an ethos of openness towards the future, consequently liberating Christian liturgy from the medieval view that liturgy should be regarded as timeless and unchanging, that is to say, non-contextual. In this sense, the BCP was imprinted with the Reformation ethos of bringing the liturgy back to the people, in words in the language of the people, and no longer a work addressed to the understanding only of specialists. Yet it should be noticed that it was the hierarchy of the Church, the specialists, who took the initiative in liberating the liturgy, which had been “imprisoned in the innumerable medieval service books and careful hands of the clergy”.<sup>91</sup>

Maraschin’s assessment of the revolutionary nature and liberating ethos of the BCP is set against the background of the composition of the Prayer Book of 1549. Arguably one of the most important facts about the preparation of that book was that a handful of parishes in England were experimentally allowed to use large portions of the texts that would later become the BCP in their liturgy and communal life. Popular response to these “experimental liturgies” was taken into account in the final redaction of the book. In this sense the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, became itself a kind of experimental text, modified in the successive revisions of 1552, 1559 and also in 1662 (after a period of suspension during the Puritan interregnum of Cromwell). Through this process of liturgical formulation, experimentation and reformulation, the Church of England worked out a distinctive form of Christianity which was both Reformed and Catholic, integrating some of the core Protestant ideas (inclusion of the laity, use of the vernacular, etc), yet staying within the Catholic and apostolic tradition of the ancient Church.<sup>92</sup> In returning the liturgy to the people the Church was recognising that it is precisely in the liturgy that faith is expressed, and given a context. The Church became truly English. This is not to say that before the Reformation liturgy was totally uninfluenced by the place where it was performed; only that in the 16<sup>th</sup> century the liturgy of the Church of England became contextualised, in the sense of nationalised, as it never was before. Thus, the liturgical forms that were born out of the English Reformation were, intentionally and self-consciously, meant for a specific group of

---

<sup>91</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.32

<sup>92</sup> Thomas 1998, pp.249-262

people.<sup>93</sup> Further, Maraschin states that the Anglican Reformation can only be considered a *re*-formation because “it did not abolish its past, but renewed it. It brought it into the present and did not fear to relate to it this time. But it did not limit itself to temporality. It also related itself to its place. The result of this daring was the “new liturgical practice developed through the Book of Common Prayer”<sup>94</sup> Showing that from the very beginning the Anglican perspective on liturgy allows and encourages a flexible responsiveness to place, time, history and culture – the fundamental principle of contextualisation.

To a certain extent Maraschin’s arguments are supported by Article XXXIV of the Thirty-Nine, which comments on the position of national Churches and states that traditions and ceremonies do not have to be the same everywhere, but can change according to the diversity of countries, peoples, and customs:

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one or utterly alike; for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men’s manners, so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word [...] 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.<sup>95</sup>

In non-Anglo-Saxon Anglican theology, Article XXXIV is often pointed to as evidence that, from very early on, Anglicanism has been strongly disposed to considering cultural factors.<sup>96</sup> The value of this flexibility has been nicely expressed by the early 20<sup>th</sup>-century Anglican theologian and historian E. J. Bicknell: “What is supremely edifying in Honolulu may be grotesque in London: what is worthy embodiment of English reverence and devotion, may be utterly meaningless in Timbuctoo.”<sup>97</sup> Maraschin argues that the Anglican Reformation on British soil began this movement in the right direction. The affirmation of “Anglicanism” passed through all levels of the Church’s reality from the political to the liturgical and the spiritual. A king already named “Defender of the Faith” by the Pope goes on to wrench the headship of his national

---

<sup>93</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.32

<sup>94</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.33

<sup>95</sup> BCP, Article XXXIV Of the Traditions of the Church

<sup>96</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.105

<sup>97</sup> Bicknell 1955, p.300



Church from the Pope. The English language, adopted for worship by men like Tyndale and Cranmer, becomes immeasurably enriched (although the former passed away before the publication of the BCP). A particular ethos emerges out of which new art, music and poetry are born, expressing a cultural flavour that is distinctly and uniquely British. “The Roman Church, foreign and alienated, dies to give place to the new indigenous Church of England”.<sup>98</sup> Maraschin then demonstrates how his interpretation of the Reformation, as constituting the genesis of the Anglican ethos of contextualisation and indigenisation, explains why what is important in the Anglican world is this very process of transformation, conversion and rebirth rather than the particular forms in which they manifest themselves. But then Maraschin adds that in some places (including his native Brazil), once established the Anglican missions failed to contextualise themselves. Its introduction there, Maraschin writes, was accompanied by nothing similar to Henry VIII’s break with Rome, and in many places in the Anglican world, nothing similar was done for the liturgy as was done by Cranmer and his collaborators with their transformation of the medieval liturgical books into The Book of Common Prayer “Here in the place of contextualisation, there was a transplant, and an uncritical transplant, at that”.<sup>99</sup> Therefore, Maraschin suggests, non-Anglo-Saxon Churches should draw upon the ethos of the Reformation and stop simply “translating the books of the ‘First World’ Churches”; instead they should motivate their congregations to invent new forms of expression to foster new forms of worship more intimately connected to the peoples and cultures of the non-Anglo-Saxon world, which is where most Anglican Churches exist.<sup>100</sup>

Anglican liturgical renewal needs not only to relate itself to the social, political and economic problems of our continent, but it should also seek to take full advantage of the possibilities of relating itself to the culture of our peoples, learning to sing, to play their instruments, and to transform that “noise” into the praise of God.<sup>101</sup>

Yet Maraschin is careful to remind his readers that the liturgy is part of the “organic whole of the Church” and is therefore part of the Body of Christ. For this reason, liturgy must be treated as a whole, and theologians should beware of merely grafting certain

---

<sup>98</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.36

<sup>99</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.36

<sup>100</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.37

<sup>101</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.46

innovative or fashionable elements onto the traditional forms of the liturgy. For when this is done the result can be disastrous: “I am not suggesting that we make our worship a liturgical fruit salad in which it does not matter if what we have to mix in is pineapple or orange”. Instead, what Maraschin is intent on pointing out is that non-Anglo-Saxon Anglicans need to acknowledge that the liturgical forms they have inherited are transplants and translations from an organism belonging to a different reality from that of most local cultures; and that, as such, they can never become truly indigenous. Therefore, Maraschin urges non-English-speaking Anglican Churches to “dare” to let go of their inherited and “transplanted” patterns of practice and *modus operandi*, in order to remain truly faithful to the indigenising and contextualising ethos of the Anglican Reformation.<sup>102</sup>

### **Church of England: Never Only an English Church**

Originally the word “Anglican” carried no special theological connotations, *Anglicanus* simply meaning “English” in Latin. “Ecclesia Anglicana” was thus the name applied to the Church in England and was in use centuries before the Reformation. For example, in the Middle Ages it was used to refer to the Church’s province in England: the “Anglicana Provincia” (which sometimes included Wales). In the same way, the Church in France was referred to as “Ecclesia Gallicana”, which carried no overtones of the ideological position which much later would be called “Gallicanism”. During the Reformation the Church of England, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, asserted its continuity with the medieval Catholic Church in England: it was, as it had always been, the English branch of the true Catholic Church (of course the Church of Rome thought otherwise). In that sense, Anglicanism as a concept is much older than “Anglicanism” as a word.

Nonetheless, it is important to remember that as a matter of historical fact *the Church of England has never, at any point in its history, been confined to England!* Not even to the realm of England, which from 1536 included Wales (already a part of the Province of Canterbury), and the royal dominions beyond the kingdom. In fact in 1521 the English courts confirmed that the Isle of Man was not part of the realm of England, yet the dioceses of Sodor and Man (formerly belonging to the Norwegian province of Nidaros,

---

<sup>102</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.46

based in Trondheim) was assimilated into the Province of York in 1521.<sup>103</sup> Similarly, the Channel Islands, which until today do not form part of the United Kingdom, were annexed (after decades of theological squabbles with its Presbyterian church government, which ended with the restorations of the episcopacy in Jersey in 1620 and Guernsey in 1662) to the Dioceses of Winchester, but do not fully form a part of it. Their relationship with the see of Canterbury is of a similarly ambivalent nature.<sup>104</sup> In addition, the notion of an Anglican family of churches, historically descended from the Church of England existed, to a lesser degree, as early as the 17th century, when the Church of England first left British shores with colonists who founded what would become the United States of America. It continued to spread with the first English settlers in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and other far-flung parts of the British Empire. This has been the basis for the somewhat simplistic view that “Anglicanism”, as we know it today, is a child of British imperialism. However, the reality is more complex than that. While it is true that, in many parts of the world the Anglican Church has been historically linked with the spread of the British Empire, it is also true that a significant number of Anglican churches in places such as Japan, Latin America, and French and Portuguese-speaking Africa, were founded far beyond the political sphere of British imperialism.

### **The Other Side of the Coin: Anglicanism of the Fringes**

There is no doubt that the ecclesiological identity of Anglican Churches which developed outside the main sphere of influence of the British Empire form a minority within Communion. Nevertheless, their experience of existing on the “fringes” of the Communion has granted these churches a distinct and unique perspective on what it means to be Anglican. So, while their voice may be small, it is a precious one within the Communion, for it is the voice of an experience that has been less formed by British imperialism and less conditioned by an English (or North American) national ethos. For these reasons, it would be fruitful to study how some of these Anglican churches developed under such circumstances.

---

<sup>103</sup> Pearce 2003, pp.62-74

<sup>104</sup> Davies 1999, pp.517-21

Through my research, I have selected three main examples of Anglican ecclesiological identities that have developed in areas that fall outside the main geographical and cosmopolitical nucleus of the Anglican Communion (which for historical reasons tends to be the English-speaking world). These three examples are the Anglican Churches of Japan, Malawi and Chile. The first two will be introduced in this chapter, while the Chilean example will be analysed further along. As previously stated, I have selected these particular cases because they have developed outside the main area of influence of the British Empire, but also the wide spread use of the English language has not been a contributing factor to their growth. Consequently, they have established their ecclesiological identities outside the Anglo-Saxon cultural sphere. At no point in their history has any of these Churches constituted a majority in size or numbers, nor held a position of privilege in terms of cultural heritage within their respective societies. While the Anglican Church in Malawi was initially planted by missionaries of the Oxford movement, almost all of its identity as an autonomous church has developed under the influence of the anti-colonialist, independence movements of Malawi. Nor has its British heritage translated into any kind of privileged position within what, today, is mainly a Presbyterian and Roman Catholic country with a large Muslim minority. Anglicanism in Malawi is still very much a minority affair. The Anglican Churches of Japan and Chile have, to a large degree, developed outside the colonial and political interests of the British Empire. A notion which has affected the development of their respective ecclesiological identities, in different ways. In addition to being clearly rooted in the non-English speaking traditions of Anglicanism, these three cases represent different traditions of Anglicanism. Without falling into the trap of generalising too broadly, I believe it would be fair to assert that the Anglican Church in Chile stands firmly in the Evangelical tradition, and it has aligned itself with the GAFCON/FCA “Global South” movement. The Anglican Church of Japan is more oriented towards a liberal tradition, and the Church in Malawi remains faithful to its Anglo-Catholic roots in the Oxford movement.

## Japan: Anglican Ecclesiology Beyond the British Empire

The Nippon Sei Kokai – The Holy Catholic Church of Japan, also known as the Anglican Communion in Japan, constitutes a unique development in the forming of the Anglican Communion. It was the first autonomous province to be formed outside the British Crown’s predominant area of influence. Arguably, the Nippon Sei Kokai (NSKK) was born and formed in a relationship of more or less constant strain and sometimes outright antagonism with the Japanese state and the nationalist ideology it has stood for throughout its history. From the Meiji Restoration onwards, to the nationalist military rule of the WWII era, all the way to modern-day democratic Japan, the Japanese Anglican Church has had to function at various degrees of almost constant tension with the Japanese state. When the first Christian missionaries set foot on Japanese soil, they encountered a powerful governmental structure already set in place. Although it was a feudal form of government, Japanese society and its governmental structures were of such advanced nature (and backed up by considerable military power) that the representatives of the west (both Church and secular) had no choice but to respect the structures and learn to work with them, even if sometimes only begrudgingly.<sup>105</sup> Similarly, when the first Anglican missionaries arrived in 1859, they too encountered a society with complex structures and well-defined national identity.<sup>106</sup> The militaristic and feudal society of the Shogunate era was in decay and would soon be replaced by the (relatively) pro-western imperial state of Emperor Meijie, and its endeavour for Japan to be shaped and modernised in the image of the west. Hence, the Japanese context was never one in which western missionaries could count on

---

<sup>105</sup> For a more in-depth account of these historical events and their consequences for the Anglican mission, please read: The Rt Rev, William Awdry's, Anglican Bishop of Osaka and later South Tokyo during the last decades of the 1800s, in “The Contribution of the Church of Japan to the Body of Christ, Chapter II: Japanese History and Religions” and “Chapter III: Missions to Japan” *Mankind and the Church Being an Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races To the Fullness of the Church of God*. Edited by H. H. Montgomery. London, New York, Bombay and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co (1907). See bibliography for further details. Read also Suggate, Alan M. & Yamano, Shigeko *Japanese Christians and Society*. New York: Berne & Lang. (1996). See bibliography for further details.

<sup>106</sup> For a more in-depth study on the subject please read The Rt Rev, William Awdry's, Anglican Bishop of Osaka and later South Tokyo during the last decades of the 1800s, “The Contribution of the Church of Japan to the Body of Christ, Chapters II: Japanese History and Religions, Chapter IV: Missions of the Anglican Communion” *Mankind and the Church Being an Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races To the Fullness of the Church of God*. Edited by H. H. Montgomery. London, New York, Bombay and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co. See bibliography for further details.

dominating with any ease. Consequently, the Anglican Church was, from its origins, more or less forced to deal with the power of the Japanese state. Due to ideological differences, the relationship of the Anglican Church in Japan with the state has never been an easy one. It has always existed within different degrees of contention; from the antagonism that grew surrounding the Anglican mission to Ainu people of Hokkaido (1880s onwards), to modern times, when an attempt was made to force the Anglican Church under state control during WWII (resulting in the persecution and incarceration of many of its members and leadership into concentration camps), to the present day, in which the NSKK has formulated very sharp criticism of the Japanese states ultra-commercialist agenda and its environmental policies (or lack thereof), a tension that has only increased in intensity after the disaster at the Fukushima Nuclear Power plant in 2011.<sup>107</sup>

From the time the first Anglican missionary set foot on Japanese shores, the endeavour has been for the Japanese Anglican Church to be truly Anglican and at the same time genuinely Japanese. This legacy, set against the historical background described above, makes the Nippon Sei Kokai a very interesting example of how Anglican ecclesiology has had to adapt to some very turbulent and fast-paced social changes. Also, it provides a living example of how the Anglican Church has had to fight very hard to keep its integrity, and remain truly Anglican and at the same time be faithfully inculturated. The ecclesiological identity of the NSKK, is that of a Church forged in the tension field between the Anglican ecclesiological ethos of contextualisation and indigenisation, and Japanese nationalism.

### **Mission to The Ainu: A non-national(-ist) Anglican contextualisation**

The Ainu are an indigenous group native to the island of Hokkaido (northernmost part

---

<sup>107</sup> For an example read the statements “Anglicans take a stand for nuclear truth in Japan” about the launch of the NSKK’s Isshoni Aruko (Let Us Walk Together) project (ACNS 2013.07.11; 3:06hrs ), and “Letter To The Prime Minister of Japan” (ACNS 2001.08.2;17:33hrs) about the NSKK openly challenging the Japanese Prime minister not to visit the controversial Yusukini Shinto Shrine on August 15, which commemorates the day of the Japanese surrender in WWII. See bibliography for further details. Read also Nishihara, Renta “The Nippon Sei Ko Kai (The Anglican Communion in Japan)” *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion*, First Edition. Edited by Ian. S. Markham, J. Barney Hawkins IV, Justyn Terry, and Leslie Nunez Steffensen. New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd. (2013), pp.268-271.

of Japan) and its neighbouring islands. Ethnically and culturally the Ainu are considered separate from the mainstream population of Japan. Like many other native peoples around the world, the Ainu have suffered marginalisation and oppression from mainstream society. Early on, the Anglican Church in Japan became deeply embedded in Ainu culture, something that happened in almost complete opposition to the nationalist interests of the dominating Japanese culture.

The Ainu are an aboriginal population of Japan and are quite unrelated to other neighbouring ethnic groups. Over the past several centuries they have many times been in conflict with the dominant Japanese, their culture and language often being suppressed.<sup>108</sup> During the Samurai era in Japan, the Ainu were expected to grovel and smear their face in soil when they met a Japanese soldier, or face immediate decapitation, “in the golden days of the knightly samurai—an Ainu, seeing a Japanese soldier approach, was obliged to get down on all fours and literally grovel. He had to wipe his face in the dirt as a sign he was part dog. The luckless aborigine who failed to show respect to his conquerors might have his head lopped off at once and without ceremony”.<sup>109</sup> The Anglican missionary endeavours to the Ainu people became a point of contention between the Anglican Church and the government of Japan almost from the very beginning. In 1869, the new Meiji government renamed the northern province of Ezo (home to most of the Ainu) to Hokkaido and unilaterally incorporated it into Japan. It banned the Ainu language, took Ainu land away, and prohibited the Ainu's two main sources of income, salmon fishing and deer hunting.<sup>110</sup>

At the time of the early Anglican expansion in Japan, the Japanese state was in the initial stages of implementing this so-called “integration policy” which usurped the Ainu language and culture. In its drive to modernise Japan, the state forced the Ainu from their land and prohibited them to practice their traditions and culture. As a result, the Ainu were no longer allowed to hunt for food, speak Japanese or obtain an education, and were forcefully segregated in small villages.<sup>111</sup> It was against this background that, in 1880, The Rev. John Batchelor, a missionary from the CMS,

---

<sup>108</sup> Wohlers 2008, “Book of Common Prayer in Japanese”

<sup>109</sup> Patric 1943, p.170. Quote attributed to the Rev. John Batchelor, missionary to the Ainu from 1877-1941.

<sup>110</sup> Howell 1997, p.614

<sup>111</sup> Patric 2005, p.72



undertook a mission to the Ainu people in Hokkaido, he came to be known as the father of the Ainu.<sup>112</sup> Batchelor, worked tirelessly to defend the culture, language and rights of the Ainu people, which he did in direct contradiction of the “integration” policies of the Japanese state. Amongst other great achievements, Batchelor edited the first ever Ainu Language Dictionary as well as the first Bible in the Ainu language and translated the BCP into Ainu .<sup>113</sup>

By 1899, the Japanese government modified its “integration efforts” and passed an act labelling the Ainu as “aborigines”, with the idea that they would assimilate. However, this resulted in the Japanese government taking the land where the Ainu people lived and placing it under Japanese control.<sup>114</sup> The Ainu were then granted automatic Japanese citizenship, effectively denying them the status of an indigenous group. Batchelor, and several other Anglican clergy continued to act and work in outright defiance of the state's policies, doing all they could to reinforce the Ainu culture, language and identity. In the context of this thesis, the missionary work amongst the Ainu demonstrate a real-life example in which the Anglican effort to indigenise the Church (e.g. translating scripture and BCP to Ainu and integrating their language in to the liturgy) happened in direct opposition to the (Japanese) idea of nation state. When asked whether this new policy of granting the Ainu status as “aborigines” could result in a positive change, which granted its people some kind of protection, the Rev John Batchelor replied:

The Japanese treat them better now [...] simply because they came to realize that the Ainu were a valuable curiosity worth preserving. There was no kindness or sentiment in it—none whatever. They quit trying to exterminate this shattered relic of a dying Caucasian race when visitors with money to spend began coming from all over the world just to see and study them. If today the Ainu are protected wards of the Government, and if the Government has paid me any honor, it is not because of a change of heart on the part of the Japanese; it is only because the Ainu became worth something to Japan.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Nishihara, 2013, pp.264-265

<sup>113</sup> Nishihara, 2013, p.265 and Wohlers 2008, “Book of Common Prayer in Japanese”.

<sup>114</sup> Fogarty 2008, "Recognition at last for Japan's Ainu". BBC News. See bibliography.

<sup>115</sup> Patric 1943, p.170



This statement given in an open and public context by an Anglican missionary and priest, provides a genuine example of a kind of Anglican ecclesiology which views the Church as an independent body, with a clearly defined prophetic mission to defend the oppressed, even against their own state. It is the kind of open and severe critique of the Japanese state and its policies, that early on influenced Japanese Anglicanism. Hence, the Anglican missionary presence amongst the Ainu provides clear evidence of a deeply rooted social commitment, which was based upon a view of the gospels as the good news to the poor and the oppressed, and of an understanding of the Church as the agent of this deliverance, regardless of the geographical and political limitations that the Japanese state wanted to impose upon the work of the Anglican Church.

Rev. Professor Renta Nishihara, Anglican Priest and Vice President of Rikkyo University, writes about the missionary work amongst the Ainu in an article from 2013, titled: *The Nippon Sei Ko Kai (The Anglican Communion in Japan)*. His article provides further evidence of the Anglican ethos of indigenisation amongst the Ainu. Professor Nishihara writes about the life and works of Yukie Chiri, a young Ainu woman who, although only in her teens, applied her exceptional literary talents to transcribing the epic tales of the *Yukar*, the mythological stories of the Ainu, which were handed down from generation to generation in the word-of-mouth culture of her people. Professor Nishihara writes that until her death at the young age of 19, Yukie was extremely influenced by Christianity and the gospels. Amongst her works, she transcribed “*Where the silver droplets fall, where the golden droplets fall.*” This tale, about an owl god who sacrifices himself for a poor Ainu boy, was her most prized one. It is the first to appear in Yukie’s *Yukar, Ainu Epic Tales*.<sup>116</sup> The tale is told from the perspective of the owl god, who is part of the Ainu pantheon of nature worship. The owl flies over a group of young children, who decide that whoever is able to shoot down the owl will be named champion. Most of the children are from rich families and produce fancy bows that shoot metal arrows. The owl god evades these with ease, but among the group was a child from a poor family. The child carried a very simple bow and arrow, made only of rough wood:

---

<sup>116</sup> Nishihara, p.265

I saw what the child was wearing and knew that he was from a poor household. This child also fit his wooden arrow into his wooden bow and aimed at me. As he did so, the children who had once been poor but were now rich laughed at him and said, “Now, that’s really funny! You silly pauper, that’s a divine bird. It will never accept your rotten wooden arrow when it won’t even accept our shiny metal arrows. Not in a million years.” They kicked him with their legs and hit him with their fists. However, the poor boy ignored them and carefully aimed his arrow at me. I watched him and was moved. “Where the silver droplets fall, where the golden droplets fall,” I sang as I drew a circle slowly in the sky. The poor boy drew one leg back and set it firmly behind him while setting the other leg firmly in front of him. He bit on his lower lip and steadied his aim. The arrow was released in a whoosh of air. The tiny arrow flew clean and straight towards me. I stretched out my claw and plucked that little arrow from the air. I sliced through the wind and was fluttering to the ground.<sup>117</sup>

In his article, Professor Nishihara writes that Yukie interpreted this story in a profoundly Christian way. In a prime example of the inculturation of the gospel that is rooted in a specific ethnic context, but without the embodiment of a nation state (at least not in the modern, western sense of the word), Nishihara argues that (in the mind of the Ainu) the owl god, who would allow himself to be struck by the metal arrows of the rich children, felt sympathy for the poor boy, with his tattered kimono, when the child was ridiculed and bullied by the other children. Therefore, the owl god deliberately sacrifices himself at the wooden arrow. “In other words, ‘plucked’ means that the owl aimed his body at the arrow that the poor boy had shot. The owl god fell to the ground dying”<sup>118</sup> In terms of an Anglican ecclesiological identity it is interesting to notice how Professor Nishihara, himself a Japanese Anglican Priest, interprets the reason why Yukie choose this beautiful, but very sad Yukar, to be the first in her work, “for Yukie, the gospels of Jesus were present in this tale in the compassion for the pain of the oppressed-Ainu. It was her religious belief that Jesus lived along with oppressed people.”<sup>119</sup> Nishihara writes that Yukie and her people read the gospel and the Bible as they learned from the missionaries, and understood “that Jesus died for people who were persecuted and poor. Jesus then rose from the dead”.<sup>120</sup> This modern-day interpretation of the Yukar, written by one of the most outstanding Japanese Anglican theologians of today, suggests that

---

<sup>117</sup> Nishihara, p.265

<sup>118</sup> Nishihara, p.265

<sup>119</sup> Nishihara, p.265

<sup>120</sup> Nishihara, p.266

the ecclesiological ethos of Rev Batchelor and all the other Anglican clergy who defied Japanese nationalism on behalf of the Ainu, and thus effectively challenged the Tenno-governments claim on cultural hegemony, is still very much alive in the Nippon Ko Kai of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The Church is steeped in the subversive theology which defied the Japanese government's nationalist agenda, in the defence of the poor and oppressed.

Another ecclesiological context which reveals how developing an indigenous Anglican, ecclesiological identity does not necessary imply linking the Church to the identity of the state, is illustrated by the story of St Barnabas Church in Okaya, on the banks of Lake Suwa, Nagano Prefecture.<sup>121</sup> The Church was founded in 1928 by The Rev Hollis Hamilton Corey, a missionary from Anglican Church of Canada. At the time, Okaya was a silk-manufacturing town of 60,000 with 70-80% of the population being female factory workers from the local silk manufacturing plant, all aged from around 14 to 18 years old.<sup>122</sup> Professor Nishihara, describes how the young women lived and worked under wretched, slave like conditions and received very little pay. The brutal reality of these young women, inspired the Rev Corey to build a Church for the female factory workers.<sup>123</sup> Initially, Corey was told by his mother Church that it would be impossible to financially sustain a Church amongst such poor people. However, the Rev Corey persevered, and told the Anglican Church of Canada that is should show more faith in that God would provide. After a period of deliberation, the Church was eventually built.<sup>124</sup> Professor Nishihara recounts the testimony of Koyoshi Fukazawa, a former factory worker who at the age of 98 (in 2013) was still a member of St Barnabas:

When I ran to Church clasping my non-existent pocket money in my hand as my offering, the tall blue-eyed priest was waiting for me at the bottom of the steps and hugged me and said "Thank you for coming." I didn't really understand the meaning of the sermons but my eyes spilled over with tears at the warmth of the hug I received from the priest. That Church really was heaven.<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> Nishihara, pp. 266-268

<sup>122</sup> Nishihara 2013, pp. 266-67

<sup>123</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.267

<sup>124</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.267

<sup>125</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.267

The women who worked in the factory wanted to feel that the Church was their home, and the Church provided them with a sense of dignity and self-worth that was denied them, by their own society and culture. In a genuine testimony to the Anglican ethos of contextualisation and inculturation, the floors of St Barnabas Church were covered with *tatami* (traditional Japanese floor mats) and they remain that way until today. The *tatami* were laid at the request of the factory women, who during their long shifts had to sit for 16 hours (or more) on hard wooden chairs without cushions, with only one 40-minute break.<sup>126</sup> Professor Nishihara, explains that in Greek the origin of the word “Church” is *Oikos Ecclesia*, which means “home”. Hence the Anglican Church employed a prophetic ecclesiology which acted in defiance of the “natural” lowly place on the social strata given to the young women working to fulfil the Japanese state’s vision of a fully industrialised nation. The Church, embodied in the Anglican spirit of indigenisation, became the place- the ecclesiological reality- in which these women could regain their dignity and be soothed from the physical, psychological and spiritual brutality, placed upon them in the factory.<sup>127</sup> Further, in a testimony of the Anglican conception of the Church as both radically prophetic and indigenised, Professor Nishihara writes that for people like Yukie and the young, female factory workers “the Bible was not a document that was written 2,000 years ago – but the food of life for living life today and in the future. Maybe those girls understood the real meaning of the gospel better than first-class theologians and famous ministers.”<sup>128</sup>

These descriptions, given to us by Anglican missionary priests from the Meiji era, in combination with those of Professor Nishihara, a Japanese Anglican priest in 2013, reveal a Church that was originally born as an almost antithetical institution to that of the imperial nation state of Japan. Through the earliest of the Anglican missionary efforts in such places as the Ainu people of Hokaido and the young women, factory workers of Okaya, the Anglican Church established itself, early on, as an institution which stood on the side of the oppressed and the poor. Thus, through its ethos of contextualisation and indigenisation, Anglicanism in Japan became a radical and prophetic voice which acted in defiance of the discriminatory policies of the Japanese

---

<sup>126</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.267

<sup>127</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.267

<sup>128</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.268

nation state. Certainly, in the case of the Ainu people, the Anglican Church openly challenged the Japanese state's claims to cultural hegemony on its isles, effectively punctuating its projected nationalist ideology, and chose to fight for the rights of a people who were not culturally, socially or even ethnically Japanese.

### **Malawi: Anglican Ecclesiological Ambivalence Towards the State**

In this part of the thesis I will draw upon the work of The Rt Rev James Tengatenga, Bishop of Southern Malawi from 1998-2013. Tengatenga has done graduate work at the University of Birmingham in the United Kingdom and holds a Ph.D. from the University of Malawi, as well as honorary degrees from the Seminary of the Southwest in Austin, Texas, and The General Theological Seminary in New York City. Tengatenga, is a member of the Anglican Consultative Council and of the Standing Committee. He also represents the ACC on the Board of St. George's College, Jerusalem. He was elected as ACC Chair in 2009 and acts as Chair of the Standing Committee. Within the broader African context, Bishop Tengatenga has contributed to the ongoing conversations with respect to the full inclusion of gay and lesbian persons in the life of the church. In his book from 2006: *Church, State and Society in Malawi: An Analysis of Anglican Ecclesiology*, Tengatenga conducts an in-depth analysis of the development of the ecclesiological identity of the Anglican Church in Malawi, with a special emphasis on its relationship to the state, and the various forms the latter has embodied throughout the nation's history.<sup>129</sup> Thus, the book constitutes an excellent source of information for the purpose of this study.

In 1857, upon his return from a journey through Nyasaland, the area known today as Mozambique and Malawi, Dr David Livingstone pleaded for the Church of England to plant a mission in central Africa. Livingstone had been horrified by the slave trade that went on amongst the indigenous peoples of the region, and had become convinced that the only way to eradicate this inhumane practice was to bring commerce and Christianity to the region.<sup>130</sup> During his tour of the country Dr Livingstone spoke at

---

<sup>129</sup> See bibliography for more details

<sup>130</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.51

Cambridge and Oxford universities, both of which responded to his call and formed the “The Oxford and Cambridge Mission to Central Africa”. Later, when other universities (and other institutions so inclined) joined the missionary effort, the name was changed to the Universities Mission to Central Africa.<sup>131</sup> This early missionary effort, which could be defined as pre-colonial in the sense that it took place before the establishment of Nyasaland as a British protectorate, consisted mainly of setting up the site, building educational centres, dealing with local native tribes and their leadership, and of course fighting against slavery. The slaves that were freed were rehabilitated within the missionary community, and thus essentially became the mission’s first congregation.<sup>132</sup> In these early days, there was no concept of state for the Church to relate to, at least not in the modern western sense of the word. Instead the first missionaries found local, tribal, political groupings. Thus, there were very few governmental structures set up within the environment in which the new missions functioned. This posed some interesting questions in terms of the ecclesiology.

Tengatenga describes how Bishop Mackenzie (the first Anglican missionary bishop, who arrived together with David Livingstone in 1861) hesitantly came to terms with the fact that there was “no ruler ordained by God” to whom he could pass on matters of government, and thus adapted an ecclesiology where he, as bishop, together with the senior clergy “were ourselves God's ministers for the purpose”.<sup>133</sup> But others, like Horace Waller (1833–1896), an English missionary clergy-man, anti-slavery activist and advocate of British imperial expansion, showed no hesitation at all towards this new order of things. Waller, like many other missionary clergy, saw himself as part of a crusade against slavery. The purpose of his mission was to “civilise the region”, which to him meant putting Nyasaland under British rule. Consequently, Waller had no quarrels with usurping any kind of political, cultural or social order, to achieve this goal.<sup>134</sup> Hence, for all intents and purposes, this pre-colonial mission field became a theocracy, where the lines between Church, government and state became increasingly blurred. Obviously, this had major consequences for the fledging church, whose imported (British) ecclesiological framework was no longer applicable in the new

---

<sup>131</sup> Tengatenga 2010, pp.31-33.

<sup>132</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.52.

<sup>133</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.52

<sup>134</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.53

reality of Nyasaland. Instead the new church saw itself assimilating many of the governing tasks, which originally had belonged to the state. In fact, one could argue that the church went as far as to found a semi-state of its own, at least within the missions, where the bishop and his clergy fulfilled the role of both spiritual and worldly authority. Ecclesiologically speaking, this put the Anglican Church in a fairly unique position in terms of identifying its ecclesiastical authority, particularly in reference to the state. This was an aspect of the fledgling ecclesiological identity of Malawian church which, as we shall see, would have far-reaching consequences for its development.

The situation changed for the Church once a British colonial government was put in place and Nyasaland became a British protectorate in 1889. The British established their military and political authority over the region, and the Church gave up most its (unofficial) temporal powers. As an institution, the Anglican Church cooperated with the British government on a number of issues and occasions. Tengtenga states that this constituted a natural “default” attitude for the fledgling Malawian missions. After all, the ecclesiological self-comprehension of these early missions was very much that of being Church of England transplants. Consequently, it was an innate part of their ecclesiology, which was married to an (English) national identity, and therefore linked to a specific notion of national government (namely the Crown), to follow the English/Anglican ecclesiological model.<sup>135</sup> The research carried out by Bishop Tengtenga shows, that although the Anglican missions and the colonial government collaborated closely at times, this did not mean that the Church always conformed to the demands of the state.<sup>136</sup>

One such example was the Anglican Church's reaction to the legislation against polygamy in the Marriage Ordinance of 1912.<sup>137</sup> Needless to say, it was not the case that the mission was in favour of polygamy, but rather that it did not agree with the punitive measures the government took against offenders. The Church wanted to base its teachings on religion, and not on people's fear of punishment from the state. In addition, the Anglican (UMCA) missionaries worked under the ethos of introducing Christianity with as little violation to local customs as possible.<sup>138</sup> Due to its roots in the universities

---

<sup>135</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.77

<sup>136</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.63-68

<sup>137</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.63

<sup>138</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.63-64

of Oxford and Cambridge, most of the missionaries working with the UMCA were well-educated people of some economic comfort (UMCA missionaries had to provide their own private income). Thus, most of the positions were filled by what has been described as devoted priests of great culture and refinement, who tended to be on the conservative side of things.<sup>139</sup> These priests had little time for the social fluidity and cultural change which the industrialism of the Victorian era brought with it. Therefore, rather than striving to shape the indigenous population into an appropriate work force for the British colonial industry, the UMCA missionaries sought to bring Christianity to Africa with the least possible disturbance to the ruling social order, except where slavery was concerned. From this perspective, the Church took issue with several items in the Marriage Ordinance of 1912. Chief amongst them was the facilities for marriage and divorce and the imposition of British Law of inheritance placed upon the natives. The Church argued that the latter was inapplicable amongst the tribal cultures of Nyasaland, whose concept of family was very different from that of British Law.<sup>140</sup> As a result, during its Diocesan Conference of 1914, an official request was made by the Church that the Bishop should express to the government the missions deep regret at the Marriage Ordinance. From an ecclesiological perspective, this marks an occasion when the Church did not hesitate to make a clear distinction between its ministry, and the political agenda of British colonialism. In other words, the Church's fidelity to its doctrine and ethos of contextualisation superseded that of its loyalty to the state.

Tensions also arose between Church and government in the area of education. The colonial government sought out the Anglican missions to establish a formal collaboration between the two, which would include financial backing of the Church's educational programs. However, the Church declined government funding. Tengtenga speculates, that this was due to the Anglo-Catholic roots of the UMCA, which gave the Church a self-understanding in which its primary duty was that of evangelism, and saw education (in the secular sense) only as a tool to achieve that goal. In other words, the purpose of UMCA education was to turn the natives into faithful Christians, not necessarily good industrial workers. This was a very different approach from that of the government at the time. The Crown wanted its educational programmes to focus on

---

<sup>139</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.61-62

<sup>140</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.63



turning natives into more productive citizens (and servants) of the colonies by teaching them industrial working skills. Hence the mission, with its Anglo-Catholic ecclesiological outlook, did not want government interference in their projects. For this reason, in 1905 the Anglican missions refused to accept a grant given by the government towards education, and also refused to sign a document which laid out the parameters of the government's policy on education in the region.<sup>141</sup> Malawian historian B. Pachai writes that the UMCA was the only European mission which opted not to subscribe to the educational code. "I saw its educational role as a purely religious undertaking and did not agree with the government's agenda of catering for industrial training and hence opted to remain entirely independent."<sup>142</sup> A colonial office memorandum from that period states that the reputation of intelligence of the local people "must be ascribed very largely to the comparative high standard of education of the natives" given by the UMCA, as well as other missionary societies.<sup>143</sup> In this domain, at least, the Church seemed to implement an ecclesiology which clearly differentiated between its own educational ethos – a religious endeavour with the aim of teaching the indigenous population how to be good Christians – from that of the "worldly" objectives of the colonial government.

Another area that shaped the nascent ecclesiology of the Malawian Church was that of the governmental structures themselves. Soon after the colonial government had established itself in the Likoma, it co-opted the missions into the Colonial Government Council. The different missions took turns in representing each other at the table. For a long time there would be no African representation at the Government Council, so the Church took it upon itself to speak on behalf of the native Africans.<sup>144</sup> Bishop Tengatenga observes that when the Church chooses to be the voice of the voiceless against those who would rule them, inevitably this lays the grounds for conflict.<sup>145</sup> However, Tengatenga also questions the legitimacy of the Anglican Church (of the time) to speak on behalf native Africans.<sup>146</sup> Black native Africans were not allowed to speak for themselves in the Government Council. Consequently, by partaking in said council,

---

<sup>141</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.63

<sup>142</sup> Pachai. B. 1973, p.173.

<sup>143</sup> Mufuka, K.N. 1977, p.46

<sup>144</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.64

<sup>145</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.64

<sup>146</sup> Tengatenga 2006, pp. 64-67

the missions were affirming the assumption (on behalf of the government and the Church) that Africans could not, or should not, speak for themselves, much less govern themselves.<sup>147</sup> The question remains whether the participation of the Church in the Government Council may have been a pragmatic decision, considering that the alternative was for the natives to have no one at all to speak on their behalf. However, in terms of historical evidence there seems to be little to suggest that the Anglican Church was in any way conflicted about the aforementioned, colonial governing structures. As an institution, the Church did not hesitate to assume its place at the table with the colonial powers, and take on the role of benevolent carer of those who were unable to speak for themselves.

That said, the Anglican Church did take on the government on several occasions, often concerning the peoples of Nyasaland. For example, tension rose between Church and the colonial government, concerning the treatment of the Yao people. Governor H. H. Johnston led an aggressive campaign against those native tribes of Nyasaland who opposed his government. This campaign included several military encounters, most of which he conducted successfully. However, the Yao, with their proud martial tradition, had offered the strongest resistance. Johnston struggled with the Yao for two main reasons: Firstly, some of the Yao chieftains were slave-traders, which he vehemently opposed. Secondly, within Yao society, each chieftain was independent and essentially led his own small nation, which added a layer of complexity to any negotiations. In addition, Governor Johnston would not accept having several small states within his own, which led him to take military action against the Yao.<sup>148</sup> Tengtenga, writes that the Church openly opposed the aggressive tactics of the governor, which put Johnston in a bit of a conundrum, because the UMCA's knowledge of the Yao was second to none and very valuable to his colonial enterprise. Thus, he could not afford to alienate the Church on this issue.<sup>149</sup> However, the Anglican Church had a very different idea of how to handle the Yao. The missions proposed that the administration should befriend the Yao; for example, by recruiting them as soldiers and police. This way, the UMCA believed, the Yao could be turned away from the slave trade and provide a more

---

<sup>147</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp. 66

<sup>148</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.64

<sup>149</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.64

constructive application of their considerable martial skills.<sup>150</sup> The Anglican Church, driven by its theological tenets against violence and its ecclesiological principles of religious education, sought to promote personal conviction rather than forced subjugation, and thus advocated a more patient and less violent way of bringing the people of Nyasaland into the “civilised” fold of Christianity. Although the intentions of the Church might have been benign and protective towards the native peoples of Nyasaland, the Church's attitude towards the Africans was paternalist, and in some ways, as oppressive as that of the British Crown's. The difference lay more often in their methods rather than in their goals.

### **Reflection on the early Ecclesiology of the Anglican Church in Japan and Malawi**

What becomes clear from this study is that the nascent Anglican Churches in both Japan and Malawi had to learn to work in entirely new realities. The old model of Church and its design of state and national identity relationships, could not be sustained in either of these cases, albeit for very different reasons. The Anglican missionaries in Japan had to accept and function within the pre-existing authoritarian governmental structures of the Meiji-era. In contrast, the Church in Malawi had to create its own structures due to the missionaries' perception that Nyasaland lacked government beyond the tribal societies of the region. The ecclesiology of the Oxford Movement, with its emphasis on the integrity of the Church as a self-governing entity, combined with the scepticism of the UMCA missionaries towards the modernisation of the Victorian era, enabled the Anglican Church in Malawi to have an almost duplicitous role. As seen in the examples regarding education and marriage law, the Anglican Church challenged the colonial government yet always chose to do so within the confines of the colonial ethos of the Crown. By contrast in Japan the Anglican Church was formed almost from the start within various degrees of opposition to the ruling government. Early on, the Anglican missionaries were forced to acknowledge the pre-existing imperial hierarchies of Japanese society. However, the Church found a home amongst those marginalised by those very same structures, as seen in its ministry to the Ainu and women factory workers of Okaya – both examples of indigenisation and contextualisation. By contrast,

---

<sup>150</sup> Pachai. B. 1973, pp.58-59

once Nyasaland became a British protectorate, things changed for the Anglican Church and it began to struggle with its continued indigenisation efforts. The more the Anglican Church allowed itself to be assimilated into the colonial machinery of the Crown, the more difficult it was to remain faithful to its ethos of contextualisation and indigenisation. It would take several decades before the Anglican Church in Malawi would be able to set aside its ecclesiological links to the state (as we shall see in the next chapters).

The examples of the Ainu people, the women factory workers of Okaya, the Marriage Ordinance of 1912 and the struggle with the Yao tribe demonstrate that when the Anglican Church sided with the weak and the oppressed, it often did so against the will of the state, thus denying its own inherited ecclesiological tendency to link itself with the identity of a particular, nation state. The imperative of the gospel is for the Church to side with the poor and the oppressed, of any and all nations, not only with those of a particular nation state. On the other hand, the work of Jaci Miariachin shows that the English Reformation worked as a kind of grand-scale contextualisation of the life and liturgy of the Church in England, by and for the English people. Wouldn't it then follow that Anglicanism should continue such a pattern, as it reproduces itself around the world? The answer is yes, contextualisation and indigenisation are both essential characteristics of Anglican theology. However, the both case studies, show that these do not require the identity of the local Church to be married to a nation state. Of course, this does not necessary imply that the Anglican heritage of linking its identity to that of nation states is contradictory to its ethos of contextualisation. However, it does point towards the fact that it is perfectly viable for Anglican ecclesiology to develop and function in opposition to the boundaries set by a nation state, and still remain faithful to its theological legacy and ethos of contextualisation.

## **Chapter III:**

### **Anglican Models of the Church - A Latin American Perspective**

In 1958 the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference described Latin America, in so far as the Anglican Communion is concerned, as “the neglected continent”.<sup>151</sup> Anglicanism in Latin America is different from Anglicanism in almost every other part of the world in that neither British colonialism nor the widespread use of the English language played a major role in its institution and development. As a consequence, almost all of the Anglican Churches of Latin America fall within the situation of “double minority” described in the previous chapter. Similar to the cases of Malawi and Japan, the Anglican Churches of Latin America have developed a different perspective on what it means to be at once a distinctly local or regional Church and at the same time part of a global Communion of Churches. Meanwhile, their view of the nature of the Communion itself tends to differ from that held by their sister Churches in other parts of the world. This makes their experience and ecclesiological formulations a unique input to an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, seeking to reinvigorate the Communion's reason for being.

#### **Introduction: The Case for Latin America**

While cultural differences may have variously affected the development of Anglicanism all across Latin America, not only between large subdivisions like the Southern Cone, the northern Andes, Central America, and the Caribbean, but also on a national and local level, all of this vast territory does share a significant common reality that must be taken into account in order to understand the Anglican presence in its midst. A factor common to the entire region is ethnic heterogeneity. The nations of Latin America all came into existence incorporating diverse ethnic, racial and cultural groups. As a consequence, all

---

<sup>151</sup> Anglican Communion, 1958:” The Lambeth Conference of 1958, 2.68-2.73.”

struggle to some extent with issues of racism. Where such issues exist, they mainly spring from tensions between indigenous populations and *criollos* (people of Iberian descent) – with the descendants of African slaves adding to the inflammable mix. In some Latin American countries, such as Bolivia and El Salvador, more than 60% of the population are of indigenous ethnicity and speak languages other than the official language of their country. Even where they are in the majority, such people tend to suffer from exclusion and lack of social opportunity.<sup>152</sup>

Another common factor is that ever since the Spanish and Portuguese conquests, Latin America has been a region of plunder and exploitation. From the era of oppressive colonial rule to the more recent one of dependency and forced underdevelopment under international capitalism, much of the population in Latin America has remained oppressed and left outside the political and economic mainstream.<sup>153</sup> One consequence of this marginalisation has been the emergence of (both right- and left-wing) authoritarian military regimes. Sadly, they are another phenomenon common to the region. Most of the right-wing dictatorships came to power in blood-drenched upheavals and with the help of American (CIA) support. Such tyrannies were regarded by their North American promoters as less undesirable than the governments they overthrew, even in cases where the latter had been democratically elected.<sup>154</sup> At the same time, other Latin American countries have suffered seizures of power by left-wing revolutionaries armed and driven, in some cases, by the former Soviet Union – and these upheavals have been no less bloody. All of the above has contributed to the problematic nature of Latin America today; and it should not be surprising to find marks of their impact on the peculiar forms taken by Anglican self-definition in that regio

### **Purpose of this chapter**

The Anglican Churches of Latin America can hardly be considered a single ecclesiastical entity; they represent a broad spectrum of ecclesiologies, theologies and cultures. Any attempt to analyse Latin American Anglican ecclesiology must constantly

---

<sup>152</sup> McQueen 1989, p.97

<sup>153</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.43

<sup>154</sup> For a well-documented and comprehensive example on the subject see: Melander, Veronica *The Hour of God? People in Guatemala Confronting Political Evangelicalism and Counterinsurgency (1976–1990)*. Especially chapter 2 (pp.72-121) and chapter 6 (pp. 188-210).

bear in mind this plurality. However, there are some common denominators in the self-perception of the various Anglican Churches of Latin America. This is not to say that I expect to find that they have a single common identity or share a single form of ecclesiological self-understanding. But, I will attempt to put forward some particular traits of Latin American Anglicanism which distinguish it from expressions of Anglicanism in other parts of the world, and suggest that these particular traits are expressed in the ecclesiology of the Latin American Anglican Churches, more specifically, within the ecclesiological models put forward in their respective theologies. Furthermore, I will make the case that these comprehensions of the Church have something vital to contribute to the conversation that is going on at a global level, about the nature of the Anglican Communion, its future and the mutual accountability of its member Churches.

### **Latin American Models of the Church**

The endeavour to face up to the challenge of becoming an indigenous Church has led Latin American Anglican theologians to propose a number of different ecclesiological models as part of the process of achieving a contextualised and indigenous Latin American Anglican ecclesiology. From the writings of a number of Anglican theologians from different parts of Latin America, representing diverse traditions of Anglicanism, I have sifted out four approaches, ecclesiological types, or, as I prefer to call them, “models of the Church”. In citing these I am attempting to show something of the plurality and mutable nature of contemporary Latin American Anglican ecclesiology. I have chosen these particular models because they are recurrent and commonly used as points of reference in Latin American Anglican ecclesiology. Sometimes this is done tacitly and the term “model of the Church” is not used, though the concept is. In some cases, I have chosen, for purposes of clarity, to use the term as an analytical tool in reference to theological material in which it is not found. Another challenge that arises when attempting to identify different models of the Church in the works of Latin American Anglican theologians is what method to use when labelling them. In some cases, the theologian may be abundantly clear about the content of his or her ecclesiological approach and proposals and yet not use any explicit ecclesiological label, such as “trinitarian” or “eschatological”. In other cases, two or more theologians

writing at different times and in different places may be suggesting a similar ecclesiology but choosing to label their models differently. I have therefore had recourse to the work of the Australian Anglican ecclesiologicalist Martin Foord, who has mapped, systematised and organised modern Anglican ecclesiology into different schools of thought, or, as I prefer to call them, models of the Church:<sup>155</sup> *The ecclesiology of God's people, Trinitarian Ecclesiology* and a *Distinctively Anglican Ecclesiology*. Although not Latin American himself, his “ecclesiological map” corresponds well to the Latin American context and, in doing so, constitutes an excellent analytical tool for understanding, surveying and categorising contemporary Latin American Anglican ecclesiology. To this I have added a fourth ecclesiological model based on the work of liberation theologian Leonardo Boff. Although a former Roman Catholic priest, Boff is one of the most influential liberation theologians of Latin America and has inspired a number of Anglican theologians in that region.<sup>156</sup> His work in the field of ecclesiology has become an integral part of the Anglican theology in many parts of Latin America and, although not without controversy, his ecclesiology has come to play a central part of various Anglican theologians' comprehension of the Church in the region. Therefore, his work is included in this section. I have also borrowed from the methodology of the Jesuit priest and theologian Cardinal Avery Robert Dulles, whose work on comparative ecclesiology, specifically regarding the concept of models of the Church, provides another analytical tool and methodological approach applicable to the Latin American context.<sup>157</sup>

### **The South Cone and The Ecclesiology of God's People**

The Anglican Church of the Southern Cone of The Americas traces its historical roots to the pastoral work carried out by chaplaincies caring for British (and later American) expatriates during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, it is important to stress that these pastoral initiatives were not confined only to these groups. In 1844 Captain Allen Gardner of the Royal Navy founded the “Patagonian Mission”. Twenty years later the organisation

---

<sup>155</sup> Foord 2001, p.316

<sup>156</sup> Several of the most prominent Latin American Anglican theologians show influence from Boff's liberation theology, see for example: Soares 2005, pp.132-138 ; Desueza 1989, p.106 and Calvani 2008b, pp.244-246

<sup>157</sup> Dulles 2002, pp.1-6.



changed its name to the “South America Missionary Society” (SAMS).<sup>158</sup> This society combined pastoral care for expatriate Anglicans with ambitious missionary work among the native peoples of the Southern Cone. Some of the SAMS’ most important work has been among the Araucanian Indians in Chile and the Chaco tribes of Paraguay and northern Argentina.<sup>159</sup> Thus, much of the contemporary Anglican presence in the Southern Cone originates from the work undertaken by the SAMS.

Until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, the Anglican presence in the South Cone was confined mainly to chaplaincies whose principal concern was with British and American expatriates and with missionary work among the indigenous people in rural areas. No real and systematic attempts were made to reach out to the predominantly Hispanic populations of the cities. This made Anglicanism a rather alien and marginal religious movement in South America. It was not just that few people belonged to it, or that it was openly antagonistic to the Roman Catholic Church; it was also that none of the ethnic groups chiefly comprising the Anglican community regarded themselves as part of the national cultures in which they lived! The British and Americans saw themselves as immigrants or temporary guests and the indigenous people had always been outside the mainstream Hispanic and Ibero-American culture, invariably seeing themselves as belonging to a different nation altogether – one marginalised, oppressed and discriminated against by the Ibero-American settler élite. (There have been armed uprisings of the native peoples of South America up until the present day, and there still exist uncomfortable tensions between the descendants of Hispanic colonialists and the native peoples.) The profile of the Anglican presence in Latin America changed radically in 1958, when the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference resolved that the Anglican Communion should turn its attention to the “neglected continent” of South America.<sup>160</sup> This led to the Anglican Churches of the region, for the first time, working in the cities and among the Spanish- or Portuguese-speaking majorities. Consequently, there was an influx of new Anglicans who saw themselves not as outsiders or “Indians”, but as Chileans, Peruvians, Argentineans, etc. This, combined with the fact that Roman Catholicism has long been closely intertwined with Latin American culture makes any

---

<sup>158</sup> Every 1915, p.1

<sup>159</sup> Ward 2006, p.104

<sup>160</sup> Bazley 1995, p.219

theological analysis and critique of its ecclesiology at least in part a critique of Latin American culture itself. This creates certain challenges for Churches, such as the Anglican Churches of the South Cone, which strive to be indigenous and yet to offer an approach to theology that is radically different from that of the majority of the people they wish to be indigenous with. This becomes abundantly clear amongst those Churches that identify with an ecclesiology of Church membership *through faith alone*, a notion radically opposed to the Roman Catholic institutionalism deeply rooted in Latin American culture and the Roman Catholic theology in which sacramental acts play a central role in defining who is and who is not a member of the Church. The kind of ecclesiology that comes into play here is what Foord refers to as the “ecclesiology of God’s people”. This model defines the Church in relation to Christ, and in particular in terms of the believer’s union with Christ: By faith, man is united to Christ and hence united with all other believers. This line of thought draws upon the Pauline notion of being “in Christ”. If, by faith, one is united to Christ, then in Christ one is also united with all others of the same faith. This union with Christ automatically makes each individual believer a member of “the Church”. Becoming a member of the Church is an act of grace. It is not based on what one does (such as receiving the sacraments), but on what God has done in Christ on one’s behalf. And since there is only one Christ, with whom believers are united, there can only be one Church. Therefore, those theologians who adhere to this school of thought tend to arrive at a definition of the Church as the totality of the faithful.<sup>161</sup> From this point of view various formulations have been put forth regarding the place of the local Church and its relation to the universal Church, and these have led to unresolved tensions.<sup>162</sup>

Chilean, Anglican theologian Hugo M. Fernandez suggests that Latin American culture and religious training are, by a long-ingrown second nature, essentially Roman Catholic, and therefore the concept of authority that Latin Americans spontaneously associate with the Church is hierarchical: “the voice of the Bishops is the voice of the Church”.<sup>163</sup> Fernandez states that the ordinary Latin American Roman Catholic is accustomed to strong authoritarian leadership. He also notes that Roman Catholic

---

<sup>161</sup> Foord 2001, p.316

<sup>162</sup> Foord 2001, p.317

<sup>163</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.69

hierarchical authority tends to be based more on the personal character of the leader than on doctrine – a tendency that has shaped the secular understating of authority as well. Fernandez makes the point of linking the Latin American *machismo* culture with this particular understanding of authority: “Authority in the family has characteristics of *machismo* which stem from ‘the man of the house’ and not from the father who instructs, corrects, understands, and stimulates.”<sup>164</sup> He also links this view of hierarchical authority with the years of military government that most Latin Americans have undergone (in Fernandez’s case, the dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet in Chile). From this perspective, an *Ecclesiology of God’s People* becomes an act of defiance, not only against Roman Catholic hegemony, but against what are perceived as oppressive tendencies in society, the latter often being perceived as a socio-cultural consequence of the former. An ecclesiology of belonging through faith alone, which accentuates the particular believer’s union with Christ and in which it is *only* by faith that man is united to Christ, negates the monopolisation of clerical power in the Roman Catholic model, according to which the means of salvation – membership of the Church and participation in the sacraments – are only accessible through the mediation of an (all-male) clergy whose control of them is absolute.<sup>165</sup>

In *An Ecclesiology of God’s People* the individual’s union with Christ is the backbone of the Church; and therefore all believers without exception, constitute the Church. However, this is not the same as stating that this model advocates a form of absolute individuality. In fact, the Pauline notion of “being in Christ” unites all believers through their faith in the salvific body of Christ. Thus, underlining a sense of belonging among the faithful, that supersedes any other common identity such as nationality or ethnicity, and the inherit divisions these bring with them. In addition, the claim of “membership through faith alone” should be understood as form of opposition to other popular ecclesiologies, which view the Church as an institution headed by the papacy (Roman Catholic), or just a local congregation (Free Church); as well as liberation theology models of the Church, which sees its essence in its ministry to the poor.<sup>166</sup> Fernandez criticises the Roman Church for promoting a popular religiosity which is

---

<sup>164</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.69

<sup>165</sup> Boff 1985, pp 8-9

<sup>166</sup> Foord 2001, p.318

syncretistic and pays “more attention to the sacramental and traditional aspects than to faith based on obedience to the Scriptures.”<sup>167</sup> He adopts a classical Evangelical perspective and suggests a model of ecclesiastical authority based purely on the absolute authority of scripture and demanding doctrinal conformity. Fernandez states that Jesus Christ is the Lord and supreme authority of his people (the Church) and that Jesus himself gives absolute authority to the Scriptures. He argues this on the grounds that Christ is the Word incarnate (John 1:1-14) and that the Old Testament Scriptures witnessed to him (Luke 24: 25-27), and that he himself insisted on the importance of searching the Scriptures in order to know him.<sup>168</sup>

However, theologians such as Jose E. Vilar argue that with such an ecclesiastical model, in which the authority of the Bible becomes absolute and tradition secondary, there is significant risk of exchanging one kind of authoritarianism for another. There are countless cases of authoritarian abuses taking place in denominations which, on paper, are non-hierarchical. In fact, one might argue that strong centralised leadership is one of the salient characteristics of the neo-Pentecostal communities that are currently spreading rapidly in Latin America, and that are, arguably, the biggest proponents of an ecclesiology of membership by faith alone.<sup>169</sup> Vilar, argues that, more often than not, the whole of such movements is centred on a strong charismatic leader. Historically among Evangelical movements the selection of a leader tends to be based mainly on personality, often giving more value to the particular charisma and personal gifts of the candidate than to his or her training, knowledge and experience. In contrast, the historical Churches, inclined towards an institutionalising ecclesiology, tend to use a more standardised process for selecting their clergy, one which insists on formal qualifications, undergoing rigorous academic training, passing tough examinations, etc (as is very much the case with the Roman Catholic Church). The purpose of this is precisely to avoid the risk of the ministry becoming the preserve of personal magnetism and the “charismatic” charm of individuals.<sup>170</sup> Moreover, theologians such as Maraschin and McQueen argue that there are certain difficulties in regarding an ecclesiology of God’s people as part of an indigenous Latin American Anglican ecclesiology. In

---

<sup>167</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.69

<sup>168</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.69

<sup>169</sup> Foord 2001, p.318

<sup>170</sup> Vilar 1989, pp.17-20

particular that an ecclesiology of belonging through faith alone makes too much of the individual believer's private union with Christ. Nevertheless, as seen above, this model of the Church can offer an alternative form of belonging together which has the potential to transcend and surpass worldly divisions such as social class and ethnicity, since it offers an ultimate form identity which is not based on any worldly attributes, but only on the faith that binds all believers to Christ. That said, such an ecclesiology does leave the door open for an overemphasis of individual faith, over corporate belonging. If the individual's own private faith takes precedence over his or her membership of the corporate Church – if a man or woman is united with Christ, and with all other believers, only by their *own, individual, private* faith – then what need is there for a corporate and collective identity at all? The challenge is not only to the Latin American sense of collectivism and community, but also to the traditional Anglican notion that the Church expresses its faith through its liturgy and the collective, corporate life of worship. Another argument brought forward by Foord is the inability of this school of thought to draw clear conclusions about the nature of local–universal Church relations is indicative of the major difficulty with an ecclesiology based solely on personal relation to Christ.<sup>171</sup> According to Foord, this leaves some unresolved tensions between the Church as universal and the Church as a local institution. A further difficulty arises when trying to square this way of thinking with scriptural language such as: “Now you are the body of Christ” (1 Cor 12:27-28) or “For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ.” (1 Cor 12). For how can a Church be *the Church* when there are other Churches not of its flock? For if *a* Church is identical with *the* (universal) Church, then, strictly speaking, it cannot *be* a local Church. It is either a manifestation of “the Church” at a particular place and time, or it is only a part of the Church and therefore not identical with the whole. As long as one assumes the categorical pair “local Church/universal Church” this difficulty will always plague an ecclesiology grounded solely on the believers' relation to Christ.<sup>172</sup> In addition, Maraschin points out, that most Evangelical and “charismatic” expressions (which are the ones generally favoured by an ecclesiology of God's people) are not liturgical. Such movements have a bias toward

---

<sup>171</sup> Foord 2001, p.327

<sup>172</sup> Foord 2001, p.328

individual expression, while liturgy, by its nature, is collective, communitarian and general. The word “Common” in the title of the Book of Common Prayer does not mean “ordinary” or “humdrum”, but “universal” – what is “common” is what is “for everybody”.<sup>173</sup> Also, Maraschin argues, the liturgy of the Christian Church is Trinitarian in its theological foundations, while the charismatic movements tend to unbalance the Trinity, placing a misleading excess of emphasis on the Holy Spirit. Beyond this, the individualism of an ecclesiology of God’s people mimics the exaltation of “First World” individualism in an escapist mode vis-à-vis the Latin American reality into which the Charismatic renewal movements have been transplanted. For some, this individualism and privatisation of faith may be a genuine part of their spiritual tradition, but it is far from an indigenous norm for the region and its people.<sup>174</sup> And this predilection for individualism also has consequences in the area of social doctrine. Fernandez writes that, while it is important for the Church to develop a prophetic ministry it is also important for this to centre on awareness and repentance of the sins of the individual, and not on political and social issues, preoccupation with which

[...] could give the appearance that the Church is taking positions which associate it with parties or political currents which in essence do not have the Christ-centered motivation of the Church, but quite to the contrary, tendencies which are centered in humankind and essentially materialistic. Hence it is not the responsibility to preach in favor of human rights, but that we are responsible for announcing human responsibilities before God who is just and abhors sin.<sup>175</sup> Furthermore, what for some people within the Church might be an absolute sin because of a dictatorial government as it is experienced from their social context, for others within the same Church is rather a consequence of the sin of resisting authority by an opposition directed by foreign interests.<sup>176</sup>

At the other end of the spectrum McQueen offers a different perspective on the Church’s involvement in politics. She writes that, while it might be sensible to argue the Church’s independence from any particular political party or movement; an ecclesiological model informed by a theology which relativizes the importance of

---

<sup>173</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.40

<sup>174</sup> Maraschin 1989, p.41

<sup>175</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.77

<sup>176</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.77-78

human rights in the Church's ministry and leaves the door open to interpret the gravity of the abuses committed by a military dictatorship as depending on the (private and individual) social perspective of the people; would essentially be stating that, in the eyes of the Church, such actions might not always be wrong. Obviously, this poses some serious challenges in terms of indigenisation in Latin America, with its history of violent revolutions and coup de etat's.<sup>177</sup>

### **Brazilian Anglicanism and Trinitarian Ecclesiology**

Brazilian Anglican theologian Carlos Calvani interprets the concept of the *perichoresis* as "the eternal dance of the Holy Trinity" and in his work he integrates that concept with a vision of the Church. From an ecclesiological viewpoint this leads to a model of the Church that mirrors that of God's Trinitarian communal being: it is what Foord calls a *Trinitarian Ecclesiology*.<sup>178</sup>

As one of the most recent developments in Anglican ecclesiology, this model is perhaps not so much a cohesive ecclesiological conception as a current of thought, or theological tendency, which has recently acquired considerable resonance in Anglican theology. Its main characteristic is the reinterpretation of Christology and eschatology in the light of recent developments in Trinitarian theology.<sup>179</sup> The term *perichoresis* refers to the threefold mutual interpenetration and indwelling within the Trinity of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. And so is used to describe the inter-relationship of the three persons of the Godhead. This can be described as co-indwelling, co-inhering, and mutual interpenetration. Alister McGrath writes that it "allows the individuality of the Persons to be maintained, while insisting that each Person shares in the life of the other two. An image often used to express this idea is that of a 'community of being' in which each Person, while maintaining its distinctive identity, penetrates the others and is penetrated by them".<sup>180</sup> As mentioned before, Dr. Calvani uses the term *perichoresis* to suggest the concept of an encircling, or interpenetrating life that is in perpetual harmonious motion.<sup>181</sup> And as with a dance,

---

<sup>177</sup> McQueen 1989, pp.99-101

<sup>178</sup> Foord 2001, pp.336-337

<sup>179</sup> Foord 2001, p.337

<sup>180</sup> McGrath 2001, p.325

<sup>181</sup> Calvani 2008a, pp.110-111

there is the suggestion of surprise and delight – the unexpected that yet seems inevitable, and the joyous that is at the same time solemn. With this conception, Calvani places himself in the Trinitarian school of ecclesiology, pointing to the plurality of the Church, which, through his interpretation of *perichoresis*, may be celebrated as a wonderful variety which reflects God's own communitarian and triune nature.<sup>182</sup>

Trinitarian ecclesiology thus shows itself very apt for meeting the pluralistic reality of Latin America and fostering the inculturation and contextualisation of the Church.

Calvani illustrates this notion of a “perichoretic” harmony in terms typical of contemporary liberation theology as it seeks to heal the classic division between body and spirit by celebrating spiritually the joy of the physical body (see topic *Liberation Theology as a Criterion*).<sup>183</sup>

Further, Calvani argues that during the current Anglican crisis the plurality and diversity of the Anglican Churches has become a heavy burden and issue of concern for the Communion. This is often expressed in documents like the Virginia and Windsor Reports, which are shaped by a classic western theology that is mainly preoccupied with uniformity and standardisation.<sup>184</sup> It would also seem that, because this Trinitarian analogy centres on how the Church should live, Trinitarian ecclesiology has more to say about the mission and vocation of the Church than about its existential reality.

Notwithstanding the potential advantages of a Trinitarian ecclesiology (especially linked with Calvani's idea of *perichoretic Samba*) there are certain weaknesses attached to its extreme emphasis on the communal nature of the Church. For one thing, it casts a certain obscurity over the relation between the spiritual and visible dimensions of the Church (similar to that found between the ecclesiology of God's people and eschatological ecclesiology). Second, if the interpretation of the Church as a totally free, spontaneous gift of the Spirit is overemphasised, the Church's organisational and hierarchical aspects become otiose; there seems no reason not to discard them. Yet in the Anglican tradition the institutional and organisational aspects of the Church – apostolic succession and the threefold ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop – are essential (see Article XXVI of the Thirty-Nine and the pronouncements of

---

<sup>182</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.110

<sup>183</sup> Althaus-Reid 2000, p.13

<sup>184</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.110



the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral; not to mention nearly all Catholic tradition from the earliest times). Also, if human interpersonal relations afford the only valid analogy with the Trinity, then no Trinitarian analogy can help resolve the tension between local Church and universal Church.

### **Liberation Theology and Latin American Anglican Ecclesiology**

Much of Anglican theology in Latin America is inspired and informed by liberation theology. A central theme for theologians coming from this background is the proposition of a process of dissociation of Latin American Anglicanism from its western and Anglo-Saxon cultural roots, viewed as impositions. In ecclesiological terms, the aim of this process is to liberate the Church in order to enable a new model of it to take form, one built upon a theology indigenous to Latin America. Of particular interest is the ecclesiological model proposed by the liberation theologian Leonardo Boff. A former Roman Catholic priest, Boff is one of the most influential liberation theologians of Latin America and has inspired a great number of Anglican theologians in that region.<sup>185</sup> His work in the field of ecclesiology has become an integral part of Anglican theology in Latin America. In his book *Church, Charisma, and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1985), Boff describes a new model for the Church which, though written from a Roman Catholic perspective, has often served as a basis and been used as a point of reference by those Anglican theologians who are pressing for a radically new Latin American ecclesiology; consequently playing a vital role in their comprehension of the Church. For this reason, though he is not an Anglican, I have chosen to include his work in this study. Boff offers something like a Marxist analysis of institutional Church life, speaking, for example, of “the expropriation of the religious means of production” (forgiveness, sacraments, and so forth) as a means by which the clergy deny power to the people. Such an excessive concentration of power, Boff believes, leads to domination, centralisation, marginalisation of the faithful, triumphalism, and institutional *hubris*.<sup>186</sup> Boff, proposes an alternative model of power for the Church, one based on the “service” of a living, changing Church in which theological privileges are not monopolised by the few but

---

<sup>185</sup> Several of the most prominent Latin American Anglican theologians show influence from Boff’s liberation theology, see for example: Soares 2005, pp.132-138; Desueza 1989, p.106 and Calvani 2008b, p.244-246

<sup>186</sup> Boff 1985, pp.9-11

shared among the many.<sup>187</sup> Boff's model of the Church takes the poor and marginalised as its starting point. It attempts to discern the causes of poverty and reviews how national and international economic models bring about development and underdevelopment. Boff's models also focus on the need of the oppressed people to assume their historic role as the protagonists in a process of liberation, acquiring a growing and ever more subtle awareness of their situation as an oppressed class, and thereupon organising themselves for the achievement of practical measures with the goal of a renewed, more just society:

[This model] generally began with reading the Bible and proceeded to the creation of small base or basic ecclesial communities (*comunidades eclesiales de base*). Initially such a community serves to deepen the faith of its members, to prepare the liturgy, the sacraments, and the life of prayer. At a more advanced stage these members begin to help each other.

[...] Faith is never absent from an analysis of the mechanisms of oppression, faith provides a means of understanding, a powerful spirituality for action, and a focal point for human activity. The base ecclesial focal point does not become a political entity. The community remains what it is: a place for the reflection and celebration of faith. But, at the same time, it is the place where human situations are judged ethically in the light of God [...]

The base ecclesial community is also the place where a true democracy of the people is practiced [...] For a people [...] whose "say" has always been denied, the simple fact of *having a say* is the first stage in taking control and shaping their own destiny.<sup>188</sup>

Boff argues that it is there, in the midst of those experiences, that a doctrine of the Church can be found whose structural supports are revealed in four different categories: People of God (the people of the basic ecclesial communities), Communion (the basic ecclesial communities and their structures of interdependence), Prophecy (social action based on faith) and Service (Christian ministry and the mutual relations of physical and spiritual care). The poor contribute to this; for, in spite of what they lack, they have great resources:

In conclusion, we can say that there are distinct pastoral practices in the Church ... each with its latent image of what it is to be the Church. Some ... adapt themselves to new historical realities

---

<sup>187</sup> Boff 1985, pp.134-161

<sup>188</sup> Boff 1985, pp.8-9

... advocating changes that are contrary to dominant social trends but that are nevertheless linked to a deep current desire for the liberation of the poor. This multiplicity of images make the vitality of the Church of Christ, living and suffering its paschal mystery on the periphery of the powerful societies and the venerable churches of Europe. But the voice of this new church speaks out more and more loudly and will be heard at the heart of the centers of power. This is a call to the whole Church to be more evangelical, more at service, and more of a sign of that salvation penetrates the human condition. The various pastoral practices outlined above incarnate what they are called to incarnate, and this has invincible historical power.<sup>189</sup>

From an Anglican perspective, Boff's model offers a certain potential in terms of inculturation, unity and plurality. In terms of a dissociation of the Church from Anglo-Saxon cultural impositions, it also offers an opportunity for a "rebirth" of the Church, firmly based on an indigenous ecclesial model, freeing her to be "born from the poor and [to end] by being a catholic, apostolic, Latin American Church".<sup>190</sup> Also Boff's model proposes a method to reach the most impoverished sectors of society, which is something that the Anglican Churches in many parts of Latin America are struggling to do. Equally important, it unites a biblical understanding of mission and the prophetic ministry of the Church with a contemporary socio-cultural and political analysis of Latin America. These two elements harmonise well with the Anglican ethos of basing the doctrine of the Church on both scripture and reason (which, translated into ecclesiology, might be defined as the value of discernment and analysis – i.e. learning from experience – and the establishing of a theological and pastoral practice of the Church informed by the reality of its socio-cultural context).

To be more specific, the theological method that accompanies this type of ecclesiology is what the Jesuit priest and theologian Cardinal Avery Robert Dulles calls a "secular dialogic": "secular" because the Church takes the world as a properly theological locus wherein are written the signs of the times; "dialogic" because it focuses on the frontier between contemporary reality and the Christian tradition (including the Bible) rather than making the latter the only measure of the former, as authoritarian models of the Church (whether based on Roman Catholic hierarchical institutionalism or Evangelical literal interpretation of scripture) tend to do.<sup>191</sup> For

---

<sup>189</sup> Boff 1985, p.11

<sup>190</sup> Desueza 1989, p.114

<sup>191</sup> Dulles 2002, p.84

liberation theologians, Anglican and otherwise, to make the cry of the poor the cry of the Church is an act performative of Christian identity, an expression of the innate mission of the Church:

Furthermore, we Christians reaffirm our identity, not because we say publicly that we are Christians, but because we act publicly like Christians. For the “Church which is born from the poor,” there is a very full ministry in which the whole community participates, and that is what 1 Peter, 1 Corinthians, Romans and Ephesians indicate to us: “The community is holy” The community is one; the community responds to a universal ministry; the community has distinct ministries which complement each other. These ministries and these apostolic functions are what are reaffirmed and grow in the Christian base communities, and they are what we must nourish in the Anglican Communion in Latin America.<sup>192</sup>

In other words, according to an ecclesiology based on liberation theology, Anglican Christian witness in Latin America cannot be authentic unless the Church involves itself in the struggle against oppression and injustice. The Peruvian Dominican priest Gustavo Gutiérrez, generally regarded as one of the founder of liberation theology, has written: “Our discipleship is our appropriation of his [Jesus’] message of life, his love of the poor, his denunciation of justice, his sharing of bread, his hope of resurrection”.<sup>193</sup> On this basis liberation theology argues that, although the Church should never be reduced to a political movement, its commitment to Christ and its eschatological hope have a necessary and proper impact on political and economic life and must therefore point towards a transformation of society. And it was always so. The duty to try to make things better here in this world has always been a part of Anglican theology; echoes of it are heard among the great Anglican divines from Richard Hooker to Frederick Denison Maurice, to William Temple, to Charles Gore.

Like any other model of the Church, Boff’s ecclesiological model has its strengths and weaknesses. In this case the emphasis on the Church as a countercultural agent calls forth one of the main challenges to the validity of the model. Depicting the Church as standing in contrast to society tends to accentuate the features that set Christians apart from their fellow human beings “outside” the Church. If blithely

---

<sup>192</sup> Desueza 1989, p.109

<sup>193</sup> Gutiérrez 1983, p.96

accepted, this dichotomy risks fostering a sectarianism and exclusivity which is antithetical to the Anglican ethos of an inclusive and catholic comprehension of the Church. In reply, however, one might argue that it may be unavoidable for tension and hostility to arise between the Church, with its ideals, and the Latin American reality of poverty and social oppression. A common objection to Boff's model, however, is its lack of a plain foundation in scripture. There is surprisingly little in the New Testament about the Church's responsibility towards the temporal order. In the Old Testament, the Kingdom is seen as a reign of peace and justice among men, with an abundance of blessings for all. In the name of the Kingdom – or better, the Kingship – of God, the prophets condemn rulers who are violent and oppressive. From this analogy one might wish to work out an argument in favour of a socio-political role for the Church. However, Dulles argues that such an argument could only be indirect because, in the New Testament, where the notion of the Church is explicitly addressed, salvation is individualised and spiritualised. The emphasis is apocalyptic rather than prophetic: The Church is seen as existing for the glory of God and Christ and for the salvation of its members in a life beyond the grave; it is not suggested that part of the Church's mission is to try to make the world a better place to live in. It would hardly have entered the mind of any New Testament author that the Church had a mandate to transform existing social institutions – e.g. to strive to end slavery, or the Roman wars of conquest, or Roman rule in Palestine.<sup>194</sup> Clearly in the parables Jesus places high value on material and spiritual help to one's fellow human beings. And indirectly there is no reason to think that this demand – to be the salt that has not lost its savour, to be the light of the world – does not weigh on the Church as a whole; but the New Testament gives us no direct instructions to take part in political activism.<sup>195</sup> Instead, Dulles argues, what can be found in the New Testament is a soteriology which is not collective or corporate, or a call to social or political liberation, but rather a promise of individual supernatural and spiritual salvation, not in time but in eternity. Dulles also points out that, while it is clear that Jesus includes beneficial service to others as a correlation of his disciples being the light of the world and the salt of the earth, the charge seems to refer principally to

---

<sup>194</sup> Dulles 2002, p.92

<sup>195</sup> Dulles 2002, p.91

spreading the gospel, to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, as is stressed by other models of the Church.<sup>196</sup>

Yet it might not be out of place to speak of an *indirect* scriptural foundation for Boff's model. The theme of human liberation and freedom is central to the Bible. From Exodus on, the subject of freedom and deliverance passes through the prophets, is expanded in the gospels, and goes on to the very heart of the Book of Revelation. It is the theme *par excellence* of the proclamation of God's Reign. It is the keynote of the Magnificat. When Mary hears Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Ghost, confirm that she, Mary, is to be the mother of the Lord, Luke has Mary say (or more probably sing): "He has shown strength with his arm; he has scattered the proud in the thoughts of their hearts. He has brought down the powerful from their thrones, and lifted up the lowly; he has filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich away empty." (1:51-53). And the same evangelist relates how our Lord stood up in the Synagogue at Nazareth and read what Isaiah had prophesied of him (Luke 4:16-19): "The spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me; he has sent me to bring good news to the oppressed, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and release to the prisoners;" (Isaiah. 61:1). The so-called Songs of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah are applicable to the Church as well as to Christ: "[...] I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations, to open the eyes that are blind, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, from the prison those who sit in darkness". (Isa. 42:6-7)

Absolutely essential to liberation theology is the notion of the Kingdom of God, in which liberation theologians find a call to social responsibility that should not be separated from the preaching of Jesus as Lord. In line with the Pauline themes of Jesus identifying himself as our wisdom, our justice, our sanctification, and redemption (1 Cor 1:30), liberation theologians argue that the Kingdom of God should not be identified *merely* with abstractions such as peace, justice, and the end of oppression, but that it should be kept in mind that the New Testament *personalises* the Kingdom, identifying it with Jesus Christ. Therefore, according to liberation theology, there should be no separation between preaching Jesus as Lord and working for the social and material betterment of mankind. This is something that is harmonious with the Latin

---

<sup>196</sup> Dulles 2002, p.93

American Anglican concept of mission and evangelism as activities inextricable from social action, activities through which the struggle for social justice in Latin America rings like a trumpet with the proclamation of God's deliverance of his people.

However, the incorporation of Liberation Theology into Anglican ecclesiology is not without complications. Boff argues that the historical Jesus had not thought about founding a Church: "Jesus did not have in mind the Church as institution but rather that it evolved after the resurrection, particularly as part of the process of de-eschatologization".<sup>197</sup> Consequently, for him the hierarchy is a result of "the powerful need to organize" and the "assuming of societal characteristics" in "the Roman and feudal style".<sup>198</sup> Hence the necessity arises for permanent "change in the Church"; today a new Church must arise, which will be "an alternative for the incarnation of new ecclesial institutions whose power will be pure service".<sup>199</sup> From this perspective the real formation of the Church only takes place after the Resurrection, which risks severing the ties between the heavenly and earthly dimension of the Church which existed before the beginning of time (pre-Eschaton). Furthermore, if all institutional formation comes out of sociological needs and imperatives, then, by definition, all Church structures are human inventions. The question then arises if there is a "divine dimension" to the visible Church, is the visible Church which exists today, the *ecclesia militans*, in any way connected to the *ecclesia triumphans* in Heaven? For the Anglican Church, with its strong incarnational ethos of contextualisation and inculturation, this poses some severe challenges. Because if the Church that is being inculturated is not connected to the "one true and universal Church", then what is the point of inculturation? If the Church is only a human construct born out of sociological necessity for institutionalisation, then attempting to inculturate and indigenise it means no more than an attempting to inculturate and indigenise any aspect of human culture or organisation, such as theatre, literature or sports. (Not to diminish these noble endeavours, but they are not tied the liberation/salvation of humanity.) Also, if the all institutional aspects of the Church are of human construction then Anglican affirmations of faith with institutional connotations such as its commitment to a threefold order of

---

<sup>197</sup> Boff 1985, p.74

<sup>198</sup> Boff 1985, p.40

<sup>199</sup> Boff 1985, pp.62-64

ministry (deacons, priests and bishops) and the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, which affirms the importance of the “historic Episcopate locally adapted”, lose their meaning. More importantly, such a relativistic ecclesiological outlook seriously questions the reality of the promise of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, that the Church is not made by human beings, but willed into existence by Christ, created by the Holy Spirit; and despite our human failures, not even “the gates of hell will prevail against it”.

### **A Distinctively Anglican Ecclesiology**

A fourth model of the Church is proposed by a number of Anglican thinkers who are attempting to define a distinctively Anglican ecclesiology. By this they mean not an Anglican ecclesiology of the universal Church, but an ecclesiology which by its nature is distinctively Anglican, one which rests on a foundation of what seems to them a distinctively Anglican understanding of the Church.<sup>200</sup> According to this school of thought, Anglicanism *does* have its own ecclesiological doctrines, especially in contrast to the doctrines upheld by the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox Churches and many Protestant Churches.<sup>201</sup> A number of Latin American theologians are associated with this school of thought. One of them, Jaci Maraschin, has been applying this model to his thought systematically in work which I have discussed in previous chapters (see Part III). Others, such as Glauco Soares DeLima, have been looking at it from a sacramental perspective or, like José E. Vilar, focusing on its epistemological and ontological aspects. Also, as previously mentioned, Paul Avis is one of the foremost contemporary representatives of this school of thought and has, for some decades now, been working out its implications for Anglican identity. His work has become virtually indispensable for anyone wishing to understand current thought on the existence or otherwise of a distinctively Anglican ecclesiology.

As noted in previous chapters, Anglicanism may be defined as the *faith, practice and spirit of the Churches of the Anglican Communion*.<sup>202</sup> In short, Anglicanism is known by (1) its doctrine, (2) its order, (3) its forms of corporate worship.<sup>203</sup> It is what Anglicans believe and teach, how their Churches are organised, and what forms their

---

<sup>200</sup> Foord 2001, p.317

<sup>201</sup> Avis 2007, p.41

<sup>202</sup> Avis 2007, p.18

<sup>203</sup> Avis 2007, p.18



liturgical and sacramental practices take. Avis sees a dominant ecclesiological theme running through the history of Anglicanism: “First and foremost Anglicanism knows and sees itself as a branch of the Christian Church”.<sup>204</sup> Anglican Churches do not claim to be the “true Church”, but to be true parts of the universal Church. As Maraschin reminds us, the true Church existed before the Reformation. What the Reformation did was correct some of its abuses.<sup>205</sup> At the same time Vilar, although also interested in defining what is distinctive about Anglican ecclesiology, is sceptical of epistemological and ontological assertions of the kind Avis is inclined to make. For the multi-faceted and heterogeneous nature of Latin American Anglicanism, he argues, makes it hard to point to any particular aspects and say they are distinctly and unambiguously both Anglican and Latin American. He prefers to focus on the individual rather than on the institution. “The most we can say,” he contends, “is that we must look up close, not at Anglicanism but at Anglicans. It is Anglicans as persons who, when we gather together their characteristics, worries and occupations, little by little will contribute to the collectivity of people and structure which we call *Anglicanism*.”<sup>206</sup> Yet Vilar admits that an empirical look at what “Anglicans as persons” consider the essential elements of their faith and Church reveals such traditional marks of Anglicanism as the order of bishops as central to Church government, the inclusion of the laity in Church government, and (this he particularly stresses) the common liturgy as expressed in the BCP. (*Lex orandi, lex credendi*.) In addition to these elements, Vilar notes the importance Anglicans give to the Reformation's insistence on reason and critical understanding when it comes to the interpretation of scripture and the direction of theological development.

Opposed to these positive conceptions of the nature of Anglicanism is the traditional negative view. It has been a recurrent boast amongst Anglicans that they have no peculiar doctrines of their own, that Anglicanism is not an “-ism”. According to this view, “Anglicanism is simply the Catholic faith freed from Roman centralization and authoritarianism”.<sup>207</sup> Those who maintain that there is a distinctively Anglican ecclesiology admit that in a sense this is true, but they deny that Anglicanism has no

---

<sup>204</sup> Avis, 1989, p.300

<sup>205</sup> Maraschin 1989, pp.31-32

<sup>206</sup> Vilar 1989, p.11

<sup>207</sup> Avis 2007, p.32

doctrines of its own. On numerous points, it maintains doctrines that other Churches and traditions downplay or ignore.<sup>208</sup> As Avis points out, the catholicity of Anglicanism rests not only on its continuity of worship and pastoral care going back to the earliest days of Christianity, but also on its retention of the threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons, in accordance with the Apostolic Succession. And most importantly, the Catholic character of Anglicanism rests on its uncompromising adherence to scripture – wherein are contained “all things necessary for salvation” – the creeds and the ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church (Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon) and the Christological and Trinitarian doctrines defined by them.<sup>209</sup>

Anglican catholicity is further evidenced by the fact it acknowledges the authority of the church (and a particular church) to adjudicate in disputed matters of the faith, provided it does so in harmony with scripture. In appealing to the authority of the Church gathered in council, Anglicanism shows itself to belong to the conciliar, as opposed to the monarchical tradition of Catholicism.<sup>210</sup>

For Avis this means that Anglicans, unlike many Protestants, have no objection to the doctrine of divine authority ruling the Church; they only deny that such authority can be found in the monarchical government of a visible Church (such as has evolved under the papacy over the centuries).<sup>211</sup> The Anglican *conciliar model of Catholicism*, on the other hand, sees a direct and free relationship not only between the individual believer and Christ, but between the Church as a whole (understood corporately and in its common acts of communion) and Christ, who is its head.<sup>212</sup> The theologians who argue for a distinctively Anglican ecclesiology hold that in claiming not to be introducing any innovations in order, doctrine, or faith, the Anglican reformers did not mean that the English Church lacked distinctive features of its own, still less that it was indistinguishable from the unreformed Roman Church or the more radical Protestant Churches.<sup>213</sup> After all, the Church of England had always been different from other

---

<sup>208</sup> Avis 2007, p.41

<sup>209</sup> Avis 2007, p.19

<sup>210</sup> Avis 2007, p.33

<sup>211</sup> Avis 2007, p.46

<sup>212</sup> Avis 2007, pp.46-47

<sup>213</sup> Avis 2007, p 43

Churches in some respects, just as they had always been different one from another. If we extend our view to Hooker's "things indifferent", this point becomes obvious, but it touches on things essential as well. The English reformers were committed to a very particular determination to remain in fellowship with the Apostles and early Church Fathers.

The importance of the sacraments to the Anglican tradition is particularly stressed by Glauco Soares DeLima, who sees a peculiarly Anglican sacramental theology lying at the heart of a distinctively Anglican ecclesiology.<sup>214</sup> From this viewpoint, he takes issue with certain "evangelical-charismatic" Churches over their doctrine of "Baptism in the Holy Spirit" (mainly for adults) as a way into a life of renewal in Christ. This, De Lima cautions, establishes an élite class within Christendom, set apart from the class of those who were baptised as infants, and this destroys the universality of the sacrament.<sup>215</sup> What Paul Avis calls the "baptismal paradigm" is a fundamental element of Christianity (and consequently central to any distinctively Anglican ecclesiology).<sup>216</sup> Its authority goes back to Paul's assertion in 1 Corinthians 12:13 that "*we were all baptised by one Spirit into one body*". Therefore, Christians must not deny or belittle the validity of each other's baptism; consequently, Anglicans must be prepared to accept Christians of other denominations and, to the extent doctrinally possible, to be in communion with their Churches. This general rule, which Avis bases on the consensus of Anglican divines from Hooker onwards, agrees with repeated declarations by Lambeth conferences.<sup>217</sup> DeLima goes further and denounces the tendency of some liberal Christians to demystify the sacraments, especially the Eucharist; he sees in this a tendency to vulgarise the sacrament out of a misguided zeal for "inclusiveness", to exalt its "koinonia" at the cost of downplaying its mystical nature. For him the sacred and mysterious character of the Eucharist and baptism – their noumenous qualities – are of the essence of Anglicanism. And this, he feels, is most poignantly present in the Catholic context of Latin America. At the same time he believes the Roman Church tends to put too-exclusive stress on the mystical nature of the sacraments, so that in the popular minds of many Latin American Roman Catholics,

---

<sup>214</sup> DeLima1989, p.51

<sup>215</sup> DeLima1989, pp.51-52

<sup>216</sup> Avis 1989, p.302

<sup>217</sup> Avis, 1990, p.31-35

the Sacraments become quasi-magical rites, thaumaturgic procedures, or instruments for acquiring good luck. Accordingly, DeLima insists on a distinctively Anglican sacramental theology at the heart of any model of the Anglican Churches in Latin America. This theology has three major sacramental aspects: first insistence on the mystical and sacred character of the sacraments, second an understanding of them as “part of the dynamic process of living history which calls us all to rebuild the world”.<sup>218</sup> In other words, the mystery of the sacraments must be combined with the prophetic ministry of the Church (the *ecclesia militans*) in its struggle to liberate all of Creation from the bonds of oppression, a social and political liberation as well as a spiritual and soteriological one. And this leads to DeLima’s third main point: *metanoia*. While understanding this concept in the traditional terms of repentance, he seeks to replace its negative connotations with positive ones, focusing not only on the sins repented but on the betterment aspired to through grace: “They [the sacraments] produce effects in the lives of those who have faith, of those who prove their ‘metanoia’ [...] it is the bearer of something that brands us in an indelible way with the possibility of changes and renewal. Faith according to the Apostle comes through ‘hearing’ but ‘seeing’ and makes us receivers of the energy, the grace of Christ new life.”<sup>219</sup>

In other words, according to DeLima, the sacraments are central to an Anglican model of the Church, especially in a Latin American setting. And because they are so vital to the life of the Church, they should not be interpreted as isolated as religious activities, but as marks of human participation in the redemptive process in history, part of which is currently being lived through Latin America

### **Reflection on Anglican, Latin American Models of the Church**

A realisation that arises from the study of these different models of the Church is the plurality and variety of Latin American Anglican ecclesiology. Sometimes even diametrically opposed positions seem to be upheld by the different models of the Church. For example, the ecclesiology of God’s people and the eschatological model propagate the concept of belonging by faith alone, accentuate the particular believer’s

---

<sup>218</sup> DeLima1989, p.52

<sup>219</sup> DeLima1989, pp.51-53

union with Christ and place little value on the traditional Anglican notion that the Church expresses its faith through its liturgy and collective, corporate life of worship as expressed by a distinctively Anglican ecclesiology. While the model based on the Latin American liberation theology also has a sense of collectivism and a corporate understanding of the Church at its very heart, this model has the prophetic ministry of the Church as its main purpose of existence. Another realisation that seems to arise from the study of these Latin American models of the Church is that most of them cannot be (and perhaps *should* not be) integrated into a single synthetic vision of the Church. In order to do justice to the various aspects of Anglican ecclesiology/ecclesiologies alive within the Communion today, and to facilitate the incorporation of the many valid elements of the different models, it seems necessary to work simultaneously, and perhaps even in parallel with, the different models, in a kind of juggling act, or perhaps a better expression would be a “perichoretic Samba”, something that would be in harmony with the Anglican ethos of keeping irreducibly distinct theologies alive within the same ecclesiastical Communion.

## Chapter IV:

# The Theological and Transnational Origins of The Anglican Communion

Among theologians who are sceptical of the Anglican Communion there is an ambivalence towards the Communion, which is often based on the notion that it seems peculiar for a Church conceived as the product of a particular national and cultural context and identity (namely that of England and the English) to claim a transnational presence. Nevertheless, as previously stated, the Church of England has *never at any point* in its history been confined to England! Thus, from its very beginnings, Anglicanism has been more than just an English affair, as it took partial root in Ireland, Wales and Scotland (albeit under a different, non-established form, in the latter case); and did not, as it has sometimes been suggested, spread beyond Britain only as an ecclesiological aspect of English culture and British imperialism. A mere transplant of “home” wherever the English settled, part and parcel of British Colonial rule. That is not to say that Anglicanism never functioned as an expression of British imperial triumphalism or cultural domination. Admittedly it has done so throughout its history (and at times continues to do so). However, there is another side to that history, which is often overlooked. For example, during the 18th century the Anglican Churches of Scotland and Ireland were influential in the spread of Anglicanism beyond British shores. While the Church of Ireland served as an early example of how necessary it was for Anglicanism to be identified with a local cultural context, using the local language and recruiting its clergy locally, the Episcopal Church of Scotland (founded in 1688) demonstrated that Anglicanism did not have to be identified with the English Crown in order to survive.<sup>220</sup> In addition, part of the Anglican Communion is constituted by Churches founded in places that never came under British imperial rule. Nevertheless, initially at least, the spread of Anglicanism beyond the British Isles did follow the expansion of the Empire. For example, the earliest Anglican Church in the Americas

---

<sup>220</sup> Jacob 1997, p.2

was the one founded in 1607 in Jamestown, Virginia. But an Anglican presence outside England can be traced even further back: for example, Robert Wofall, a Church of England chaplain in the company of Sir Martin Frobisher's second attempt to find a north-west passage, who celebrated Anglican rites in Nunavut (Frobisher Bay), Canada, before the expedition returned home in 1578. By the 17th century, there were several Anglican chaplaincies spread throughout the Empire, and by the turn of that century hundreds of missionaries were already establishing Anglican Churches in Asia and Africa.<sup>221</sup> However, regardless of this early transnational presence, as late as the first half of the 1800s, the idea that the United Church of England and Ireland (with its colonial Churches), the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA somehow belonged together, was by no means a given. In fact, these Churches were not even in communion with each other and their ministries were not interchangeable. It was among the High Church movement of that century, in England and its (former) colonies, that the idea of a family of Churches with a common identity began to grow.<sup>222</sup> The Foreigners Consecration Act of 1786, which permitted the consecration of bishops for America, also clearly stated that no bishop ordained under the Act, nor any of his successors nor clergy ordained by him, were thereby authorised to exercise their ministry within *his Majesty's Dominions*.<sup>223</sup> In a sense the episcopal American and Scottish clergy were further removed from Communion with Canterbury than Roman clergy, who, should they choose to, could minister in the Church of England without need for re-ordination. The principle of interchangeability of ministries between English, Scottish and American Churches was not established until 1840 by an act of the British parliament, and even then it was restricted to only short temporary permits. It was not until 1874 that all Episcopally ordained colonial, Scottish and American clergy were allowed to hold benefices within the Church of England, without being re-ordained.<sup>224</sup> Thus, the term "Anglican" only acquired its modern use as an ideological (rather than a merely geographical) marker during the Oxford Movement, in

---

<sup>221</sup> Hakluyt 1926, pp.137-154. See also Yates, T.E "Anglicans and Mission" *The Study of Anglicanism* Revised Edition (2002), pp.483-496

<sup>222</sup> Podmore 2005 pp.29-30. For a closer study of the relationship between the High Church movement and the ideas that gave birth to the Communion read: Jacob, W.M, *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide*, London: SPCK (1997)

<sup>223</sup> Podmore 2005 pp.29-30

<sup>224</sup> Podmore 2005, p.29

the early 19th century, when the Tractarians began to use it as a badge denoting the Church of England's participation in the universal "Catholic" Church as a distinct institution that was neither *Roman* Catholic, nor Eastern Orthodox, nor Protestant, but claimed its own ecclesiological identity.<sup>225</sup> In other words, the seeds of the ecclesiological lines of thought that were to lay the foundation of the Anglican Communion can be traced back to the end of the 1700s. A time when High Church theologians, in order to fill the vacuum created by the steady loss of faithfulness towards the relationship of Church and the British monarchy, brought forth the idea of a global Anglican Church. A shared ecclesiological reality for the all the Anglican Churches, whose international presence was governed by its bishops and other governing structures. Thus, they laid the seed of what was to become the Anglican Communion.

### **The Early Conceptualisation of The Anglican Communion**

Arguably, a proto-concept of an Anglican Communion first took form amongst the theologians of the Hackney Phalanx. This was a group of High Church Anglican theologians prominent for around 1805-30. Chronologically, it constituted one of the forerunners to the Oxford movement. The Phalanx, was also called the Clapton sect by analogy with the evangelicals of the Clapham sect.<sup>226</sup> The name alluded to the geographical association with Hackney borough, then east of the London. Some of the more prominent member consisted of Henry Handley Norris, brothers Joshua and John James Watson. Theologically they looked backwards to the High Church theology of William Jones of Nayland.<sup>227</sup> The Phalanx viewed the Church of England, the Scottish Episcopal and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the USA as forming parts of what they viewed as the Reformed Catholic Church.<sup>228</sup> A middle road between Roman Papalism and Protestantism, both of which were considered "deviations" or "spin-offs" from the one true faith of the ancient Church. Inspired by the legacy of Hooker's *via media*, these theologians claimed that the Church of England and its daughter Churches

---

<sup>225</sup> Avis 1998, pp.460-461

<sup>226</sup> Nockles 1996, pp. 271-272

<sup>227</sup> Corsi 1988, pp. 11-13

<sup>228</sup> Podmore 2005, pp.9-16



were both Catholic and Reformed: reformed because they had rid themselves from the medieval superstitions and abuses of Rome, but Catholic because, unlike the Protestant Reformations of Luther and Calvin, the Anglican fathers had never added to or subtracted from the original teachings of the ancient Church, nor had they ever formulated creeds or confessions of their own.<sup>229</sup> That said, in Anglican theology the case has often been made that the 39 Articles of Religion constitute a *de facto* Anglican Creed. This argument is often put forward by Anglicans who uphold the Protestant tradition within Anglicanism, and has played a major historical role for those theologians that view the English Reformation as unfinished, e.g. the 17th-century Puritan parties and later on among those that opposed the Catholic revival brought on by the Oxford Movement. However, regardless of the historical role and status that the Thirty-Nine Articles may have played within the Church of England, at an international level, the Thirty-Nine Articles have never been granted the status of a creed.

Consequently, many Anglican Churches have chosen not to include them in their own versions of the Book of Common Prayer.<sup>230</sup> Irish High Churchman Alexander Knox wrote in a letter dated 1813: “*What a perverse influence the nickname protestant has had upon our Church! [...] It will, perhaps, be at length discovered, that there is a medium between the two extremes, which combines the advantages, and shuts the evils of both [...] and which at this day exists nowhere, but in the genuine central essence of our own reformed episcopal Church.*”<sup>231</sup> In 1812 Henry Handley Norris (who together with Joshua Watson founded Hackney Phalanx) wrote: “*The distinguishing title of a member of the Church of England is a Reformed Catholic – and this places him in a*

---

<sup>229</sup> Avis 2007) pp.39-56, and by the same author “What is ‘Anglicanism’” *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition*, ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight., London: SPCK/Fortress Press, pp 38-56. See also Kay Bruce “Highs Speed Conflict and Anglican Identity”, *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 5(2007), Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications, pp.135-143; and Bicknell, E.J A *Theological Introduction to The thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. (1955), specially the chapter titled “The Place of The Thirty-Nine Articles in Christian Theology” pp.7-20

<sup>230</sup> For a more detailed account of this particular aspect of theological roots of Anglicanism see: Avis, Paul “The distinctiveness of Anglicanism” *The Identity of Anglicanism, Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology* London: T&T Clarck (2007) pp. 39-56, and by the same author “What is ‘Anglicanism’” *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition*, ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight., London: SPCK/Fortress Press, pp 38-56. See also Kay Bruce “Highs Speed Conflict and Anglican Identity”, *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 5(2007), Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications, pp. 135-143; and Bicknell, E.J A *Theological Introduction to The thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. (1955), specially the chapter titled “The Place of The Thirty-Nine Articles in Christian Theology” pp, 7-20

<sup>231</sup> Foster 1835, p.125

*central position from which the Papist and the larger portion of that mixed multitude known by the name of Protestant diverge, in opposite directions indeed but to equal distances.*” The use of the name Reformed Catholic Church in describing the transnational presence of the Church of England and its daughter Churches persisted, although some tried applying the name Reformed Episcopal Church, in order to avoid both the volatile labels: *Protestant* and *Catholic*. In 1825 a young High Church man by the name of Walter Farrar Hook (1798-1875) preached a sermon at the consecration of Mathew Luscombe as bishop for Anglicans with roots in the three Churches but who resided in continental Europe (Church of England, Scottish Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal Church of the USA). Hook’s sermon was later published as: *An attempt to Demonstrate the Catholicism of the Church of England and other Branches of the Episcopal Church*.<sup>232</sup> In it, Hook argued that there is among “true members” of the reformed Catholic Church “a bond of union which no time, no distance no disagreement even, on certain points in themselves indifferent can ever dissolve”. Further, Hook preached that a true member of the Church, no matter where in the world, will take an interest “not less fervent, not less sincere, not less devoted than that which he experiences for the particular branch of it [the reformed Catholic Church] to which he may belong, 'whether one member suffer, all members suffer with it, or one member honoured, all members rejoice with it'”.<sup>233</sup> This conceptualisation of the Anglican Church as transcending the national barriers of these respective institutions could be labelled as proto-Communion. In 1840 Bishop Blomfield of London argued that if the Church of England founded more overseas bishoprics she would in due course cause the “reformed episcopal Church to be recognised, by all nations of the earth as a stronghold of pure religion”.<sup>234</sup> And in 1841, Bishop Kaye of Lincoln wrote: “I consider the Reformed Episcopal Church to be the true representatives of the Primitive Church: the Roman and Greek churches to be branches, but erring branches, of the Catholic Church.”<sup>235</sup> However, the earliest registered use of the name Anglican Communion is not by an Englishman but by an American Episcopalian named Horatio Southgate, a missionary bishop in the Dominions and Dependencies of the Sultan of Turkey. In a

---

<sup>232</sup> Hook 1825, p.1

<sup>233</sup> Hook 1825, pp.24-25, (quotation is from 1Corinthians 12:26)

<sup>234</sup> Blomfield 1840, p.16

<sup>235</sup> Kaye 1841, p.1

letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> of November 1847, Bishop Southgate summarised a treaty he intended to publish in Armenian, Greek and Arabic in order to present the Anglican Church to the eastern Churches:

I next spoke of each of the branches of the Anglican Communion separately, namely the English, the Scotch, and the American branch of the Church of Christ [...] Next, I have given the main points of difference between us and Rome [...] Finally, I have spoken of the difference between us and the various protestant denominations. I have spoken plainly but not harshly [...] But I cannot consent [...] the Anglican Church should not be confounded with the multifarious sects which abound in our own country.<sup>236</sup>

This use of the term “Anglican Communion” pre-dates by more than three years those identified by Robert Bosher in his 1962 Monograph *The American Church and the Formation of the Anglican Communion, 1823-1853*. In it, Bosher identifies the following as the earliest uses: John McVickar, preaching in Trinity Church New York in July 1851; W. E. Gladstone, writing in December 1851; and Henry Casswall, in his description of the SPG anniversary.<sup>237</sup> Regardless of who the true originator of the term may be, it is a fact that by the 1860s the expression “Anglican Communion” was coming into widespread use as a collective term for Anglican Churches outside England that derived their existence, directly or indirectly, from the Church of England. Thus “Anglicanism” and “The Anglican Communion” (of Churches) are both, in their modern senses, 19th-century coinages, and can only be applied anachronistically in reference to earlier periods of Church history.<sup>238</sup>

### **Church vs Crown: The rebellious origins of the Anglican Communion**

The 1830s was a highly significant decade for the Church of England and for the emerging Anglican Communion. The dynamics of the old hegemony between Church and state changed as successive British governments recognised the need to provide for an increasingly religiously pluralistic society. It is almost impossible to overemphasise how much the reshaping of the established Church–state symbiosis in England during 1830–40s influenced the change Anglican ecclesiological identity was to undergo

---

<sup>236</sup> Southgate 1847, p.1

<sup>237</sup> Bosher 1962, p.21, p.28

<sup>238</sup> Avis 1998, p.461

during this period – a change that eventually was to give rise to the idea of an Anglican Communion. Since the times of the Elizabethan settlement (and its subsequent solidification by Richard Hooker's ecclesiological designs) the Church of England and Crown were two inseparable aspects of Anglican ecclesiological reality. The British sovereign was both supreme ruler in the state and Supreme Governor of the Church of England. Consequently, one of the primary duties of a Christian commonwealth was to provide “true religion”. In other words, the state had the obligation to provide for and protect the Church, and in turn the Church was the one body which granted institutional legitimation to the Crown. Simply put, the Church approved the monarch on the throne, thus symbolising that his/her rule was as an expression of the will of God. This is one of the reasons why, for the first century after the Reformation on the British Isles, the sovereign was regarded as the divinely appointed protector and guardian of the Church. In other words, Anglicanism was a state-sponsored religious monopoly and its symbol was a sacred kingship.<sup>239</sup>

Nevertheless, this model of ecclesiological rule suffered a severe crisis in the mid-17th century, with the Puritan victory at the end of the English Civil War. After Charles I was deposed and executed, the Puritan party under Oliver Cromwell went on to dissolve the episcopacy and to outlaw the BCP, and even though the episcopacy and the BCP were reinstated after 1662, the repercussions of the Presbyterian agenda of the Protestant movements was to be felt for centuries to come. Neither of the subsequent monarchs (Charles II or James II) reinstated the Church of England's privileges and monopoly on religion to its former glory. Their successors, the Dutchman William III, who was a Calvinist, and the Hanoverian George I (who was raised as a Lutheran) did so even less. Simply put, the old ecclesiological model of state sponsored Church monopoly would never return. In addition, the Whig administrations of the 18th century saw High Churchmanship as a threat, often perceived as legitimating divine right and total submission to an inherited monarchy of the kind that had been deposed after the revolution that toppled James II.<sup>240</sup> Thus, by the early 19th century the relationship between the state and the Church had severely deteriorated, or at least it had done so in the minds of the High Church movement.

---

<sup>239</sup> Avis 2002, pp.174-176

<sup>240</sup> Avis 2002, p.175

During the 1830s several steps were taken which established British society as a religiously pluralistic one, such as the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts from 1661 and the passage of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act.<sup>241</sup> From the state's perspective this did not mean that the government should preclude itself from the affairs of the established Church. In fact, the government continued to legislate on behalf of the Church of England, particularly when the Church acted as an agent of education and as “moral compass of the nation”. However, many Churchmen, especially those who held a high view of the institution of the Church as founded by God (and not the state), regarded the intervention of the government in Church affairs as increasingly invalid, and even as a kind of sacrilege.<sup>242</sup> From their perspective the governments natural role in ecclesiastical matters had been eroded the moment it ceased to be an exclusively Anglican body. After all, the passing of the aforementioned acts of parliament meant that the government *could* (and did) include those who did not adhere to the Church of England.<sup>243</sup> Consequently, from the 1830s onwards, there was increasing division of opinion about authority in the Church in regard to the state. Generally speaking, Evangelicals and Broad Church theologians tended to continue to look towards the state for protection, working within an ecclesiological model where the state was expected to provide for the Church. In their view, the lay people of the Church (and also some clergy) were broadly represented in Parliament. It was therefore natural that they had a responsibility to ensure that the gospel was preached and a Christian life was led

---

<sup>241</sup> **The Corporation Act of 1661:** The act excluded from membership of town corporations all those who were not prepared to take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. The Test Act passed in 1673 imposed the same test upon holders of civil or military office. Roman Catholics, Protestant Dissenters and followers of the Jewish faith were therefore excluded from public office. Religious groups including Unitarians, Wesleyan Methodists, Primitive Methodists and the Society of Friends campaigned for a change in the law.

**Roman Catholic Relief Act:** In the 18<sup>th</sup> century attempts were made to obtain full political and civil liberties to British and Irish Roman Catholics. In Ireland, where the majority of the population were Catholics, the Relief Act of 1793 gave them the right to vote in elections, but not to sit in parliament. By the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, William Pitt, the leader of Tories, became converted to the idea of Catholic emancipation. Pitt and his Irish Secretary, Lord Castlereagh, promised the Irish parliament that Catholics would have equality with Protestants when it agreed to the Act of Union in 1801. When King George III refused to accept the idea of religious equality, Pitt and Castlereagh resigned from office. In 1823 Daniel O'Connell founded the Catholic Association to campaign for the removal of discrimination against Catholics. In 1828 he was elected as M.P. for County Clare but as a Catholic he was not allowed to take his seat in the House of Commons. To avoid the risk of an uprising in Ireland, the British parliament passed the Roman Catholic Relief Act in 1829, which granted Catholic emancipation and enabled O'Connell to take his seat.

<sup>242</sup> Avis 2002, pp.175-176

<sup>243</sup> Jacob 1997, p.105

throughout Great Britain and in the imperial colonies. Among the adherents of the High Church tradition, however, these radical changes in the law of the land gave cause to a reconsideration of the relationship between Church and state. From their perspective, the link with the state had ceased to be a partnership. Once the state had ceased to be an exclusively Anglican affair, in the eyes of the High Church movement, it had lost its natural connection to the Church. Instead, the view began to shift towards regarding the state as a body foreign to the Church of England. In their minds, the state was becoming an increasingly non-Anglican entity attempting to implement control over the Anglican Church. Perhaps the most renowned expression of this was the famous disagreement over the Temporalities Bill of 1883. The government wanted to save on finances through the suppression of ten Irish bishoprics. The High Church movement regarded this as an intrusion by the state in the affairs of the Church, so sparking what came to be defined as the genesis of the Tractarian movement.<sup>244</sup> For these theologians the suppression of the Irish bishoprics by parliament, on purely utilitarian grounds, was regarded as something monstrous. It provoked John Keble's "Assize" Sermon, which has been historically bestowed as the symbolic starting moment of the Oxford Movement. The movement, whose members were often associated with the University of Oxford, argued for the reinstatement of lost Christian traditions and their inclusion into Anglican liturgy and theology. In that sense the Oxford movement was born out of crisis of authority: if the Whig government of the day could act unilaterally against the self-defined interests of the Church and thus suppress the ten Irish bishoprics, what did that show about the nature and power of the episcopacy? Was the Church powerless to act against a government that high-handedly bypassed the integrity of the ecclesiastical structures, and if so what did that say about the doctrine of the Church as a visible and divinely ordained community? In the eyes of the Oxford movement, the Erastian paradigm under which Anglicanism had been formed and flourished had finally failed. Now the Church had to look elsewhere to derive its *raison d'être* and authority.<sup>245</sup> It was within this ecclesiological mind-set that the idea of common ecclesiological reality shared by the Anglican Churches worldwide, began to take hold. The movement's interest in Christian origins led a number of its theologians to reconsider the relationship

---

<sup>244</sup> Avis 2002, pp.180-182

<sup>245</sup> Avis 2002, p.181

of the Church of England with the Church of Rome. Thus, the movement postulated the Branch Theory: Anglicanism along with Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism form three “branches” of the one “Catholic Church”.<sup>246</sup> On this basis several High Church theologians advocated that the Church of England should view itself not merely as a national entity, but as part of a larger worldwide and international presence. This view of the Church would be very influential in giving rise to the notion that the Anglican churches spread around the world, could form a common ecclesiological reality, not defined by their national context, but by their legacy as Anglicans, standing in a particular tradition of continuance with the ancient and undivided Church. A significant step in this direction was taken in October of 1841, when the The Foreigners Consecration Act Amendment Bill was passed. The amendment allowed the consecration of American bishops, and it extended the authority of the archbishops of Canterbury and York to consecrate foreigners to the office of bishop in the Church; in addition, candidates for the episcopacy could be excused from taking the oath of allegiance and supremacy; no royal licence was required for their election and no royal mandate under the great seal was needed for their confirmation and consecration.<sup>247</sup> At this point, however, it is important to remember that Tractarian reaction towards the state was not formed from a progressive point of view. Unlike other, later, more liberal movements which have expressed scepticism towards a state-run Church, the Tractarians did not wish to abandon the Church's dependency on the state in favour of a more democratic or egalitarian model. In the eyes of the Oxford movement, the state had abandoned the Church and not the other way around. There was a significant reason that most Tractarians were Tories: order, degree, hierarchy and delegated authority were at the core of their theology, and their conceptualisation of the universe remained essentially both conservative and hierarchical in its outlook.<sup>248</sup> When this perspective collided with the progressive and independently democratic ideals of the modern state, this world-view began to buckle. In the theological, philosophical and political vacuum that emerged when the Crown and state no longer could provide a basis for this

---

<sup>246</sup> For an in-depth discussion of this topic see: Jacob, W.M: *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide*, London: SPCK (1997) chapter 4: *The Beginnings of an Anglican Communion 1840-60*, pp.105-143.

<sup>247</sup> Jacob 1997, p.111

<sup>248</sup> For more in depth look at Tractarian worldview see Avis 2002, pp.181-84, Davage 2009 and McCulloch 2009, pp.838-46.



universal order, a new foundation was needed in order to sustain these hierarchical values; a foundation that was capable of detaching the Church of England from its initial base in a monopolistic national Church and unreformed establishment, but at the same time was capable of providing an adequate ecclesiological articulation of their cosmology. In the minds of the Oxford Movement, such a socio-philosophical and theological base was rediscovered in the old High Church doctrine of apostolic succession, in which bishops, as the successors of the Apostles, became the guarantors of the truth and the doctrinal integrity of the Church. This model also proved to be fertile ground for the kind of transnational, non-Crown/state-based ecclesiology that was to give birth to the idea of an Anglican Communion.<sup>249</sup>

Not all of the Church of England was behind this new thrust to turn the Church into a self-governing body. The Church Missionary Society (CMS) along with other representatives of the Evangelical party within the Church of England, reacted quite strongly against the rising High Church mind set. Evangelical theologians did not believe it to be scriptural to put such emphasis on bishops governing the Church, even with the assistance of lay people.<sup>250</sup> One of the main reasons behind this scepticism of a strong episcopacy was that Evangelical theologians thought that the ecclesiology promoted by the Tractarians would encourage bishops to usurp the traditional role of the Crown in parliament, in the governance of the Anglican Church. Those who strived to uphold the principles of the English Reformation feared that the Tractarian view of the Church too strongly mirrored the Roman Papal structure. In minds of the Evangelical theologians, the state represented the correct way to govern the reformed Churches and guaranteed its protection.<sup>251</sup> In essence, in their ecclesiological model, the Crown constituted the “Protestant” alternative to Papal authority. After all, one of the main purposes of the English Reformation had been to transfer the power of the papacy to the Crown, ergo granting the state the right to govern the Church. Consequently, in the eyes of those who wished to safeguard such an ecclesiological model, moving the Church away from the stately structures meant a step back towards pre-Reformation times.<sup>252</sup>

---

<sup>249</sup> Avis 2002, pp.181-182

<sup>250</sup> Avis 2002, pp.181-182

<sup>251</sup> Avis 2002, pp.173-180, McCulloch 2009, pp.840-841.

<sup>252</sup> Jacob 1997, p.110



## High Church Transnationality and the Origins of the Communion

In 1841, the British parliament debated the Canadian Clergy Reserves Act. A large number of representatives hesitated in funding the “Church in the Colonies”. Bishop Blomfield of London, fearing that the government would not grant any funding to the colonial Churches, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

“The time appears to me to have arrived at which a great effort is required on the part of the Church of England to impart the full benefits of her apostolic government and discipline, as well as of her doctrine and ordinances, to those distant parts of the British Empire where, if the Christian religion is expressed at all, it is left to depend for its continuance, under the blessing of its Divine Head, upon the energies of individual piety and zeal, without being enshrined in the sanctuary of a rightly-constituted Church, the only sure and trustworthy instrument of its perpetuation and sufficiency.”<sup>253</sup>

In a perfectly good example of how increasingly ambivalent the High Church view of the church–state “partnership” was becoming, Bishop Blomfield then went on to argue that he actually believed that it was “the manifest duty” of a Christian state's government to equip the Church with “its worldly means and appliances”. However he added that if the state refused to assume this responsibility it was the duty of the Church itself “to take the work in hand, and do which in no case may be left undone”.<sup>254</sup>

Archbishop Howley responded by calling a public meeting to discuss “the defective provision hitherto made [by the government] for planting the Church in the distant dependencies of the of the British Empire” and what effort could be made to “extend them the full benefit of its [the Church of England] apostolic government and discipline”.<sup>255</sup> This was an ecclesiological development with potentially global repercussions for Anglicanism: The Archbishop of Canterbury was publicly rallying for the Church to apply pressure on the government in order for the latter to align its ecclesiastical policies according to what the Church wanted, and not the reverse, which until that point had been commonplace. What is more, the Archbishop stated that, should this initiative fail, his office would set up a way for the Church to finance for itself that which it viewed as a vital part of its “apostolic ministry beyond British

---

<sup>253</sup> France 1941, p.9

<sup>254</sup> France 1941, pp.10-12

<sup>255</sup> France 1941, pp.10-12

shores”, regardless of what the government wanted.<sup>256</sup> The meeting in question was followed by a number of subsequent meetings, which resulted in the founding of what came to be known as the *Colonial Bishops Fund* with the purpose of: “providing for the Endowment of Bishoprics in such foreign possessions of Great Britain as shall be determined by the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland [...]”.<sup>257</sup> This marked a profound change in the ecclesiological outlook of the Anglican hierarchy regarding its responsibility beyond the British Isles. Until this point any provision for overseas bishoprics had come from individual bishops privately having to lobby the government. Although the official formation of the Anglican Communion would not happen until decades later, in connection with the first Lambeth Conference of 1867 (following the controversies surrounding the Colenso case), the establishment of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund was a crucial step for the Church of England to begin developing an identity beyond that of being the established Church in England.<sup>258</sup> The insistent and increased non-conformist cry for the disestablishment of the Church, and the results of the national Census of 1851 (which had allowed for the registration of a much wider religious plurality) demonstrated that, although the Church of England was officially the established Church, it was no longer the national Church in the way it had been in previous centuries. Consequently, it started to look elsewhere for its legitimation. As part of this reinvigorated search of identity, the High Church movement argued that the Church of England's reason for being was that it stood in direct continuation of the ancient Catholic Church in England, truly reformed but also truly catholic. The increased criticism of the more extreme Tractarians (such as Hurrell Froude, Fredrick Oakley and John Henry Newman) moved the more moderate High Church Anglicans to defend the Anglican Church's apostolic claims and to ascertain its suitability to head an international communion of churches. The Churches' longing for a shared Anglican legacy (such as the example of Canada) outweighed the wishes of the British government. In other words, the shared ecclesiological legacy of these different Anglican Churches superseded their individual national identities. In that sense, the origins of the Anglican Communion lie within a longing for the Church to conceive of

---

<sup>256</sup> France 1941, pp.11-14

<sup>257</sup> France 1941, pp.10-14

<sup>258</sup> Jacob 1997 pp.144-156

itself not as limited to a nation state, nor to be the Church *of a* state or nation (be it England, Canada, Africa or anywhere else). Thus, the case can be made that, the Anglican Communion originated from a belief that the Church, by its very nature, is an institution that transcends any worldly national, ethnic or cultural boundaries. Furthermore, the analysis above shows that the Communion was born out of a theology that strove to recognise and establish a shared ecclesiological reality for all the Anglican Churches, regardless of geographical or political boundaries. This neophyte ecclesiology claimed a strong transnational identity, which not only transcended the national barriers set up by individual states, but also openly challenged the provincial limitations of the English Crown.

### **The Origins of an Ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion**

Before venturing further into a current ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, it would be beneficial to gain a more specific, in-depth look into the kind of the theological groundwork which gave rise to the notion of a global fellowship of Anglican Churches. The purpose of this is to see how compatible the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion put forward in this thesis actually is with the theological roots of the Communion. Hence, it would be helpful to gain a more detailed and precise insight into the theology that originally conceived the idea of an Anglican Communion. The works of Anglican theologian William Patrick Palmer (1803-85) of Worcester College, Oxford, provide such an example. Palmer stands out as one of the foremost theologians of the Oxford movement and was a pioneer proponent of the “Branch Theory” which sought to re-establish the character of the Anglican Church as a “unique branch of the one true Church”, a conception which was to reach beyond Palmer's own time and become instrumental in creating the embryo of the notion that eventually became the Anglican Communion.<sup>259</sup> He was also very influential in developing the concept that Anglican ecclesiological identity was both Catholic and reformed. Through his work Palmer, influenced many contemporary thinkers within his own tradition such as Hugh James Rose (founder and editor of *British Magazine*, a principal Tractarian Organ) and W. F.

---

<sup>259</sup> See “Chapter X: On the British Churches“ in William Patrick Palmer's: *A Treatise On the Church of Christ*, London J.G. & F. Rivingston (1839), see bibliography for more details.

Hook. However, his legacy transcended that of his own time and tradition. Palmer influenced a wide range of significant Anglican theologians outside the Oxford movement, such as F. D. Maurice and W. E. Gladstone.<sup>260</sup> More than half a century after most of Palmer's work was published Gladstone would describe Palmer's expositions of Anglican ecclesiology as “perhaps the most powerful and least assailable defence of the position of the Anglican Church”.<sup>261</sup>

In addition to his significant influence, there are three main reasons why I have chosen to include an analysis of Palmer's work in this thesis. One: Palmer is firmly rooted in his Anglican identity and his ecclesiological outlook is singularly Anglican. Although he was a contemporary of the more extreme Tractarians such as John Henry Newman and Henry Edward Manning, Palmer never expressed any inclinations towards Rome. In fact, he openly challenged Newman in the latter's attack on the Reformation and the justifiability of the Church of England's secession from Rome. In this instance, Palmer systematically defended the Church of England as a “true branch of the Christ's Church”, upholding the validity of the Reformation and the reformed character of Anglicanism and its claim of an unbroken continuity with the primitive and pre-Reformation Church on the British Isles. The fact that Palmer is so firmly rooted in his Anglican identity and yet remains passionately committed to the idea of the Churches sprung from the English Reformation viewing themselves as united in one common branch of the one true Church, frees him of any suppositions of trying to emulate Rome in establishing a cohesive identity for the Anglican Churches, within the British Isles and beyond. Two: Palmer is equally eloquent in charting out the alleged uniqueness of Anglicanism against “Romanish pretensions” as he is against the Reformed Calvinist and Lutheran traditions, which he viewed as valid but also defective in their lack of episcopacy and sacramental ministry.<sup>262</sup> In so doing, Palmer upholds the particularity of the Anglican Church as both Catholic and Reformed in its nature, thus establishing an interpretation of the *via media* that is still very much alive within Anglican ecclesiology to this day. Three: In his work Palmer claims that in a fractured, post east-west schism and post-Reformation Church, Rome has lost its primacy as the natural focal point of

---

<sup>260</sup> Avis 2002, pp.188-189

<sup>261</sup> Avis 2002, pp.188

<sup>262</sup> See “Chapter XII: On the Lutherans, Zuinglians and Calvinists” in his book: *A Treatise On the Church of Christ* (1839) pp.361-398, see bibliography for more details.

Christian unity. Thus, his concept of ecclesial communion revolves around a decentralised Church, a concept very similar to that which has developed within Anglican Communion. This is no coincidence, since as I will demonstrate, the Communion draws much of its ecclesiological roots from the fertile theological ground sowed by Palmer and his contemporaries.

The objective of this analysis of Palmer's work is not a fundamentalist one. In other words, I will not attempt to promote Palmer as either normative or definitive for the Anglican Communion today (in fact as, I will discuss further on, this would be contrary to Palmer's own theology). Instead, I will endeavour to show that there are certain principles delineated within his theology which may prove to be of vital importance in the rediscovery of a sustainable ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion. In addition, Palmer's theology will serve to show that theological and ecclesiological principles laid out in this thesis do not constitute a new or foreign element to Anglicanism, but rather comprise something which has been present and latent ever since the earliest origins of what can be called Anglican ecclesiology.

### **Palmer and the Concept of a Proto-Anglican Communion**

Arguably, Palmer's greatest works are *The Treatise on the Church*, and *Treatise on the Church of Christ* (1839), described by H. F. Hook as “a complete vindication of the English reformation on Catholic principles”. In it, Palmer sets out his conception of the Church as a perpetual, visible society established by divine mandate “External visible communion between all Christians in matter of religion was instituted and commanded by God.”<sup>263</sup>

Basing himself upon patristic theology, particularly on St Augustine of Hippo, Palmer writes that no sin could be more heinous than voluntary schism or voluntary separation “*against our brethren, against ourselves, against God; a sin which, unless repented of, is eternally destructive to the Soul*”.<sup>264</sup> Nevertheless, as an Anglican, Palmer is all too aware that the visible and external communion of the Church can be (and indeed has been) broken. However, this need not necessarily imply a perpetual

---

<sup>263</sup> Palmer 1839, p.46

<sup>264</sup> Palmer 1839, p.54

disruption in the spiritual fabric of the Church catholic, because if “the essential unity of the Church is to be inferred from its being spoken in the singular number, as the “kingdom”, “household”, “body”, and “spouse” of Christ”, it is probably to be understood as spiritual unity of relations with Christ, which might exist even if external unity were interrupted.”<sup>265</sup> Further, Palmer writes that while there is no prophecy in scripture about division in the Church, there is also no promise of a perpetual and perfect union within the Church, at least not on this side of the Eschaton.<sup>266</sup> According to Palmer, the commandments of God and the prayers of Jesus Christ for the unity of the brethren, and the corresponding exhortations of all the Apostles, do not promise that the external communion of the Church will never be broken; in his words these “afford no promise, however, that the church should never be divided in point of external communion.”<sup>267</sup> On the contrary, Palmer argues that the reason Christ so imperatively impresses upon the Apostles the value of perfect unity seems to suggest that there was a real danger of division within the Church; “So when Christ and the apostles before their departure, with equal earnestness press on us the duty of perfect unity, we may infer that there was danger and probability of division in the church”.<sup>268</sup> From the viewpoint of the current tensions within the Communion it is interesting to note Palmer's emphasis that such separation can never be truly justified, even under the most severe of doctrinal differences (with the possible exception of a Church succumbing to devil worship!).<sup>269</sup> Palmer points out that the history of the Church is riddled with instances where doctrinal differences have caused great tensions, as well as instances when erroneous teachings may have been incorporated into the faith without it resulting in heresy or separation from the unity of the faith.<sup>270</sup> Palmer also stresses the difference between doctrinal disagreements and disagreements over morality, the latter being secondary (at best) in relation to the former. According to Palmer, perceived differences on the subject of morality (or the alleged lack of it) make a very poor case for schism; in fact, Palmer emphatically argues that tolerance in order to safeguard the integrity of the

---

<sup>265</sup> Palmer 1839, p.74

<sup>266</sup> Palmer 1839, p.76

<sup>267</sup> Palmer 1839, p.79

<sup>268</sup> Palmer 1839, pp.79-80

<sup>269</sup> Palmer 1839, p.64

<sup>270</sup> Palmer 1839, p.111

ecclesiological Communion always and in all cases outranks the need for separation on grounds of moral purity:

“[...] as the prophets tolerated those against whom they spoke such great things; nor did the relinquish communion in sacraments with that people; as our Lord himself tolerated the wicked Judas unto his deserved end, and permitted him to communicate at the holy supper with the innocent; as the apostles tolerated those who preached Christ through envy; as Cyprian tolerated the covetousness of his colleagues, which, according to the apostle, he called idolatry”.<sup>271</sup>

Here, Palmer formulates a clear example of the kind of drastic and intrinsically tolerant theology from which the Anglican ethos of contextualisation sprang – a notion that would come to shape the pluriformity of Anglican ecclesiology as it developed around the world. “The truth is, that every church and society of professing Christians, without exception, contains bad men and hypocrites; and were this sufficient reason to separate from the church, there could be no such thing in the as church communion”.<sup>272</sup>

### **The non-fundamentals of Palmer and the current Anglican divide**

What makes Palmer of even greater relevance, from a contemporary perspective, is his methodology in asserting the “essentials” of Anglican ecclesiology, or rather the lack thereof. Unlike many of his contemporary theologians, Palmer, does not endorse the concept of the fundamentals of faith as the basis of unity. On the contrary, Palmer claims that the term *fundamentals* is too ambiguous and that it has been claimed by so many and in such different contexts that it has become useless for the purpose of establishing unity:

This term [fundamentals] is capable of so many meanings as applied to Christian doctrine, and it actually is, has been, and must continue to be used in so great a diversity of senses, that it is morally impossible to avoid perplexity while it is employed in controversy. As an ambiguous term, as conveying no one definite notion, it seems unqualified to be of any practical utility in questions of controversy.<sup>273</sup>

---

<sup>271</sup> Palmer 1839, p.62

<sup>272</sup> Palmer 1839, p.63

<sup>273</sup> Palmer 1839, p.122

Palmer argues that if this notion is to be used at all, it can only be done so by previously agreeing on the exact method by which such fundamentals are to be ascertained “since there is the greatest difficulty in and uncertainty as to what doctrines are fundamental”. In the mind of Palmer, this makes it virtually impossible to establish an exact catalogue of such fundamentals of faith.<sup>274</sup> For that reason Palmer states, “I do not deny that we may, by some sort of intuitive light of faith, distinguish some doctrines of revelation as greater and more sublime than others; but it seems exceedingly dangerous to attempt by human reasoning to weigh the importance of truths, certainly revealed in Christ, as relatively to each other”.<sup>275</sup> This theological approach ties in directly with some of the central questions arising from the current tensions within Anglicanism: if Anglicanism, was not constituted on the basis of a determined doctrinal or theological system, where then does one look for markers of Anglican identity? And in such a diverse universe as the Anglican Communion, how does one set about defining the limits of diversity in the context of a praying community? It is in this area that voices such as Palmer's may prove valuable. In light of these modern-day tensions, Palmer's theological approach suggests the futility of establishing or (for lack of a better word) canonising a set of core Anglican beliefs, beyond those already (historically) established within Christianity. Most works on the subject of defining such Anglican “essentials” have revealed that there are several very steep challenges embedded in the proposal that all “Anglicans do or can or should agree on a ‘set’ of fundamentals”.<sup>276</sup> Hence the argument of this thesis that the Communion cannot legislate its way out of the current impasse. The idea that, in the wake of the current discussion, there may be a set of doctrinal statements or ecclesiological structures which may be recognised as binding and authoritative by all the Churches of the Communion seems questionable. It is against this background that Palmer's methodological proposal could be of vital importance: the validity and faithfulness of a Church cannot be assessed by a set catalogue of doctrinal fundamentals, but rather through its commitment to comply with Christ's commandment of unity within the Church universal. Palmer defines this commitment to unity as both

---

<sup>274</sup> Palmer 1839, p.126. For an example of Palmer's methodological dissociation with “the fundamentals of faith as the basis of unity” read “On Fundamentals: Appendix to Chapter V” in his book *A Treatise On the Church of Christ* (1839) pp.122-131, see bibliography for more details.

<sup>275</sup> Palmer 1839, p.130

<sup>276</sup> For examples see: Avis 2007 pp.19-38 and Avis 2002, pp.61-84. See also: Sykes 1998, pp.262-72



an *attribute* and one of the foremost and vital *signs* of the true Church of Christ.<sup>277</sup>

Accordingly, the Church is ultimately not defined by the purity of its beliefs but by its devotion to comply with the divinely ordained “obligation of external communion of the Church”;<sup>278</sup> of course, this does not mean that there are not certain practices and beliefs that are essential to the faith and the “one true Church”. The notion does, however, point towards a very Anglican element in Palmer's ecclesiology, namely that of *Lex orandi, lex credendi*.

### **Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi (and Lex Vivendi?)**

The position of the English Reformation was that the Church is subject to scripture, whereas Anglo-Catholics and High Church theologians such as Palmer affirm that tradition can, at times, be equal to scripture in terms of authority, which implies that the institutional Church possesses equal control over the content of orthodoxy and doctrine.<sup>279</sup> This is one of the great divides between the Protestant and High Church traditions of Anglicanism. For instance, in the hands of Palmer the *via media* becomes the outlook from which the English Reformation is viewed as a necessary development of the catholic Church upon the British Isles, the aim of which was to preserve the Catholic faith from the abuses and superstitions of the mediaeval Church. Thus, Palmer insists, scripture, tradition and reason must be held in tension, being equal in importance and authority.<sup>280</sup> The phrase *Lex orandi lex credendi* implies that it is in its prayer and worship that the Church express its beliefs which, in itself, is a form of exercise of authority. An authority granted to the people of God as being capable of discerning God's will, which is expressed through their worship. Herein lies one of the core elements of Anglican ecclesiology, namely that unity stems from below, and not from the top down. The discernment of the people shapes how the Church worships and, by reciprocation, in its worship the Church forms the spiritual (and physical) life of its people.. The later addition of *lex vivendi* to the concept (*lex orandi, lex credendi, lex*

---

<sup>277</sup> Palmer 1839, p.46, read also “Chapter V, Section IV: Unity in faith considered as an attribute and sign of the Church.” pp. 110-114, in the same work. See bibliography for further details.

<sup>278</sup> Palmer 1839, p.47

<sup>279</sup> For a more in-depth analysis of the theological nuances between the Catholic and Reformed traditions within Anglicanism read chapters 10-13 in Paul Avis *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective, Revised and expanded edition*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark LTD (2002)

<sup>280</sup> Palmer 1839, pp.22-28; 88-89

*vivendi* – “as we worship, so we believe, so we live”) further deepens the implication that: *How we worship reflects what we believe and determines how we will live*. Thus, Palmer's voice and methodology of defining the Church could make a contribution in the midst of the current contemporary tensions within Anglicanism. Of course, this does not mean that Palmer adheres to the notion that there is no such thing as wrong or right in the faith and life of the Church. For example, as with most theologians of the High Church tradition, Palmer lays a heavy emphasis on the importance of ordained ministry as being central to the Christian faith and a sign of the visible continuation of the historic Church. Consequently, in his mind, Apostolic succession is a core and innate feature of the Church and a necessary aspect of its universality.<sup>281</sup> For Palmer this striving for ecclesial communion constitutes an essential aspect of the Anglican Church's continuity with the ancient Church: “It is certain that the primitive Christians regarded Communion between Christians as a thing absolutely necessary, and viewed those who separated from it, as sinners”.<sup>282</sup> However, from the perspective of this thesis, Palmer's most important formulation about the nature of authority within the Church may be his reasoning that in a divided Church (post east-west split and post Reformation), Rome has lost its historical role of primacy and thus is no longer the natural centre of unity.<sup>283</sup> From the perspective of this thesis, this is an important claim, because here we see the origins of the “branch-theory” which extrapolates that the Roman Church, Eastern Orthodox Churches and the Anglican Churches constitute different but equally authentic branches of the “one true catholic Church”.<sup>284</sup> In other words it is not of ultimate necessity for the Anglican Church to seek communion with the Bishop of Rome, because it can very well stand on its own as a fully valid branch of the Church universal. To be more specific, it is precisely in the spawning of the branch-theory that the embryo of the Anglican Communion has its earliest conception! The branch theory requires a conceptualisation of the Anglican Church (which in the days of

---

<sup>281</sup> Palmer 1839, p.171. For a more in-depth analysis of Palmer's assertion on the necessity of Apostolic succession, read the chapter “Ministry in The Church Apostolical” in his book *A Treatise On the Church of Christ* (1839) pp.160-178, specially rubric 5. An Apostolic Succession of Ordinations is Essential to the Christian Ministry, see bibliography for more details.

<sup>282</sup> Palmer 1839, p.55

<sup>283</sup> Palmer 1839, p.537

<sup>284</sup> Palmer 1839, pp.214; 224-225. For a more complete understanding of Palmer's position on this issue read chapter X, specifically “Section IV: The British churches are catholic” in *A Treatise On the Church of Christ* (1839) pp.237-241. See bibliography for more details.

William Patrick Palmer already had a multinational presence) as precisely that: *a Church*, not a haphazardly formed group or federation, but a multifaceted yet cohesive entity with a common ecclesiological reality, which through its unbroken continuation with the ancient Church constitutes a part of the “one true catholic Church”:

The catholic and apostolical churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, are the parent stock from whence many flourishing churches of Christ have been derived in the United States, the Islands, and other parts of North America; in Hindostan, Ceylon, Australia, and other parts of the East; and even in Africa, congregations and pastors are to be found, who have derived their Christianity and their authority from our churches.[...] the British churches form a portion of the catholic church of Christ; and that every individual within their district is bound to himself to them, as being exclusively and solely the way of salvation established by divine authority amongst us.<sup>285</sup>

This goes to show that even before the clear emergence as a Communion *per se*, Palmer and his contemporaries had begun to conceive of the Anglican Church as one single entity, whose identity transcended that of the diverse nation states in which it had taken root. In their minds, the Church of England and its daughter Churches, shared a common ecclesiology which took precedence over that of their particular national identities, and thus formed part of a single yet pluriform Anglican ecclesiastical reality, through which and in which they all became one branch of the universal Church. In other words, before these Churches could begin to be defined as being particularly American, English or African in nature, they were first and foremost Anglican. In order to illustrate that this is not mere wishful thinking, the following pages are dedicated to the study of how, in Japan, several diverse and at times even opposing Anglican fractions were able to shed their individual national and theological differences and come together and form a single Anglican Church on the Japanese isles.

---

<sup>285</sup> Palmer 1839, p.214

## **Japanese Anglicanism and the Supersession of National Identities**

For a general comprehension of how the different Anglican missions in Japan operated and how they were brought together, it is important to understand the background against which they functioned.

Christianity first arrived on the Japanese shores in 1549, through Spanish and Portuguese explorer and trading vessels. The presence of both of these staunchly Roman Catholic nations meant, of course, the involvement of the Papacy. The first Roman Catholic missionary activities were exclusively performed by (Portuguese-sponsored) Jesuits and (Spanish-sponsored) mendicant orders, mainly Franciscans and Dominicans.<sup>286</sup> The Japanese grew suspicious of the Church as they gained more knowledge about Portuguese and Spanish history. The Japanese soon learnt that they [Portugal and Spain] were in the habit of first trading with and evangelising, and then conquering and absorbing, the countries they “discovered”. Could something similar to what happened in Mexico be in store for Japan? In the neighbouring Philippines, the Spanish had taken control soon after they converted the population to Roman Catholicism. These kinds of suspicions gave birth to a strand of xenophobia amongst the Japanese ruling class against Christianity, which was increasingly viewed as a force of foreign influence on Japan. This volatile mixture of political and religious interests set in motion a cascade of disastrous events which eventually resulted in the banning of Christianity throughout Japan, in 1614. Soon after a military campaign was launched to eradicate Christianity and all western influence from the isles. As many as 280,000 Japanese Christians were tortured and thousands were martyred. As a consequence of Japan's attempt to “purify itself” the nation closed its door to the rest of the world for the next 240 years; and Christianity was extinct amongst its islands, or so it was believed. This dim view of the Church continued to influence how Christianity was perceived later, in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, when Japan again opened its doors to the west and representatives of the Anglican Communion first appeared, in 1859.

This first fully fledged Anglican mission to the Japanese isles was led by The Rev Channing Moore Williams of the Episcopal Church in the USA, and eventually was

---

<sup>286</sup> Gonzáles 2004, pp.405-406

consecrated Bishop of Japan and China!<sup>287</sup> However, it was not until fourteen years later that it became lawful for a Japanese to be a Christian. It was therefore only after 1871 that a larger influx of Anglican missionaries began to arrive. In fact, Williams spent the first seven years of his Japanese ministry without being able to preach or minister to the Japanese people due to the Shogunate's and later the Emperor's anti-Christian policy.<sup>288</sup> By 1873 the C.M.S. had also started to send missionaries to Japan, and before the year was over the S.P.G. was also present in Tokyo.<sup>289</sup> Initially, the different strands of Anglicanism which were involved in missionary endeavours on the Japanese islands were all attached to different national identities, mainly American, Canadian and British. Nevertheless, in a demonstration of Anglican ecclesiological pragmatism, all of these national differentiations were eventually shaken off and set aside, in order to establish an autonomous and authentically Japanese Anglican Church. Or to put in ecclesiological terms, their common Anglican heritage was given ontological priority over their respective national ethos. Before that happened, the missions of the Anglican Communion spread along much defined lines, along the national identities of the missionary organisations that sponsored them. The American missions were brought under the charge of Bishop Williams, who was responsible for both China and Japan, while the bishop of Victoria (Hong Kong) was charged with jurisdiction over the English missions. As the missionary presence spread, some growing pains started to emerge and a number of concerns came to light. During this period the Anglican Church in Japan was served mainly by missionary groups originating from three different Anglican Churches: The Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA, the Church of England and the Anglican Church of Canada. These missionary groups did not have cooperative relationships, and each conducted activities according to their own policies, which caused frequent discords and confusion.<sup>290</sup> Inevitably the complications grew worse as the missionary activities increased. Hence, the interlacing of the various missions soon demanded some local delimitations and eventually some efforts were made to harmonise the missionary activities of the Anglican missionary groups. One such example is that, initially, the Americans and the English were each

---

<sup>287</sup> Nishihara, 2013, p.263

<sup>288</sup> Nishihara, 2013, p.263

<sup>289</sup> Awdry 1907, p.208

<sup>290</sup> Nishihara, 2013, p.264

using their own Japanese translation of the BCP, based on their own respective variations of the book. However, when a version of the BCP for use specifically in Japan was put into production, it became apparent that it would be much more desirable in terms of ecclesiological cohesion (and economics) that only one single version of the BCP should be adopted for all the Japanese members of the Anglican Communion. In addition, those bishops whose jurisdictions sometimes ended up overlapping each other decided to withdraw their missions from each other's jurisdiction. This was done so that the missions could better manage their resources, but also to remove any further potential occasions for friction.<sup>291</sup> Only in Tokyo and Osaka were the jurisdictions not to be delimited, and two or more missions worked side by side.<sup>292</sup> Awdry describes how even after an agreement had been put in place for the collaboration of the diverse ecclesiological national boundaries, there still remained several challenges for the Church to clear up, in order to gain further cohesion:

But it may be asked, when by agreement between the authorities of the English and American Churches there came to be an English Bishop of Osaka, why should not the Americans have withdrawn or been placed under him? [...] American Churchmen could hardly be expected to continue for any length of time to support work which was no longer the work of their own Church, nor directed by their bishops, nor reported in their own missionary periodicals; and the English mission was not in a position to undertake the responsibility of their institutions. At all events, it is quite certain that the first Bishop of Osaka would have been most unwilling that the American Bishop of Kyoto should withdraw from Osaka either his mission or his control of the Churches there connected with that mission, and the present Bishop shows no signs of being otherwise minded. The corresponding question in Tokyo, though at times it has been thornier, is, in great part, of the same kind, and space does not allow us to enter into it.<sup>293</sup>

Bishops Awdry's accounts portray how the difficulties caused by the national boundaries within Anglicanism were hindering the missionary work of the Church. This ecclesiological entanglement would prove hard to solve. Even after agreements where

---

<sup>291</sup> Awdry 1907, pp.210-211

<sup>292</sup> Awdry 1907, p.210

<sup>293</sup> Awdry 1907, p.211

put in place to harmonise the different “national interests” of the Anglican Churches in Japan, there remained some pretty intricate challenges to tackle regarding the Japanese government’s policies towards the Church. It would take several decades to clear up the difficulties caused by the combination of the “national boundaries” of the missionary groups, and the government's suspicious attitude towards the Church, only made the situation worse.<sup>294</sup>

In addition to the challenges described above, Japanese Anglicans were experiencing cultural pressure from the nationalist tendencies within their society. In theory, the Japanese constitution of 1889 officially separated religion from the state. In reality, however, this document did little to change the idea that Shinto and (to a lesser degree) Buddhism were thought of as essential to any embodiment of a genuinely Japanese national identity. Also, in the years following the Meiji restoration, there was an increased emphasis on the idea of the Tenno (emperor) as divine in nature and being the living embodiment of the Japanese nation. Of course, Christianity, with its Christ-centred cosmology, did not contribute towards this world view; in addition, many Christian institutions remained under foreign control. These factors caused Christians to be regarded with suspicion by most Japanese and to be discriminated against.<sup>295</sup> The aspiration on behalf of the Japanese converts to make the Anglican Church in Japan an autonomous institution was, at least partially, motivated by a desire to establish their Church as genuinely Japanese, removed from foreign control. This strand of thought, combined with the apparent need to make the missionary work more harmonious and economical, led to the realisation that, with the sanction of the Churches and missionary societies at home, a single Japanese Anglican Church should be constituted.

Neither the Episcopal Church in the USA nor the Church of England were deaf to these circumstances. In February of 1886, the Church of England, after deliberations with the SPG and CMS, consecrated The Rev Edward Bickersteth as Missionary-Bishop of the Church of England in Japan.<sup>296</sup> Bishop Bickersteth arrived at Nagasaki on April 13th of the same year and began to meet with Bishop Williams in order to outline the future of Anglicanism on the Japanese isles. These negotiations resulted in the

---

<sup>294</sup> Awdry 1907, pp.210-211

<sup>295</sup> Suggate & Yamano 1996, pp.56-117

<sup>296</sup> Alfreda 1905, pp.23-24

inauguration of the Nippon Sei Kokai (The Holy Catholic Church of Japan) in February of 1887, when its first general assembly was held. Through the cooperation of the three missionary groups in this assembly, the NSKK was legally established.<sup>297</sup> There were only 3 Japanese deacons at the time, but the 17 European and American participants at the first synod were outnumbered by 14 other clergy and 50 Japanese lay delegates.<sup>298</sup> The total of Nippon Sei Kokai adherents in 1887 was estimated to be around 3000.<sup>299</sup> Thus the foundation of the NSKK constitutes a unique breakthrough in the development of the Anglican Communion. It became the first autonomous province to be formed in a region where British presence was minimal.

Ecclesiologically speaking, the broad spectra of theological and ecclesiological differences amongst the diverse traditions of missionary organisations which founded the NSKK had to be transcended for the Church to be formed. The fact that they were all Anglicans had to be given ontological priority to any other aspect of their identity, English, American or Canadian, evangelical, Anglo-Catholic or Broad Church. For example, the CMS, with its clear protestant outlook, was displeased with the proposal to drop the Thirty-Nine Articles as a basis for confession, in favour of the more catholic and perhaps less explicit Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.<sup>300</sup> In the end, all these different strands of Anglicanism had to shed their national identities and set aside their particular theological differences in order to achieve an ecclesiological identity which was capable of providing cohesion and yet remained faithful to the multifaceted nature of Anglicanism. Thus, the process by which the Nippon Sei Kokai was founded constitutes an interesting case study in regard to the transnational, ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion proposed in this thesis. However, the application of such principles is not only a case of historical applicability, but very much something that concerns both the present and the near future of the Anglican Communion. For that reason, the following pages are dedicated to an analysis of how the afore-mentioned ecclesiological proposals can help the Anglican Communion navigate the stormy waters of its current tensions, in the face of what has been referred to as a “postmodern world”.

---

<sup>297</sup> Nishihara, 2013, p.264

<sup>298</sup> Bickersteth, 1908, p.56

<sup>299</sup> Ward 2006, p.262

<sup>300</sup> Takeda 1996, pp.419-421



## **Anglican Conflict and Postmodernity**

As previously mentioned, the current fault line among Anglicans over the issues of infrastructure in connection with “same-sex relationships” has thrown the Communion into a state of ecclesiological fluctuation and instability. On the surface, these tensions seem to have arisen from the subject of human sexuality, but at closer inspection several other aspects are revealed, not least the question of identity. It can be seen as a challenge hurled at the Church by a “postmodern” world in which the structures of traditional ecclesiology are no longer valid. Perhaps, it might be averred, it is not possible to claim a universal identity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Elaborating on this point, the Rev Dr Carlos Calvani theorises that the Anglican Communion needs to rediscover the authentic meaning of communion and get over the illusion that the rationality embedded in certain "consensual textual instruments" could be the warranty of unity of this part of the Church of Christ, because Communion is not achieved by a simple vertical dimension of truths built by reason. Dr Calvani is an Anglican priest and Doctor of Theology and Sciences of Religion; he is also Coordinator of the *Centro de Estudos Anglicanos da Igreja Episcopal Anglicana do Brasil* (Center for Anglican Studies of the Episcopal Anglican Church of Brazil), and as such is one of the most influential theologians of the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil. Dr Calvani is regularly invited to speak at conferences and in consultations all over the Communion on the subject of developments in Anglican theology and ecclesiology. In order to further examine Calvani's point about the nature of the Communion, in the following section I shall examine two of Dr Calvani's articles: “From Modernity to Postmodernity: Inclusiveness and Making the Myth of the Anglican Communion Relevant Today” and “Theological Education in the Brazilian Context”. Both articles will be examined and analysed together. In these articles Dr Calvani presents his view of the Anglican Communion from a non-Anglo-Saxon perspective, particularly shaped by his own Latin American context. He addresses several current issues that concern the nature of the Anglican Communion, and what it means to be Anglican in a non-Anglo-Saxon context, as well as what will be the fate of the Communion during and after the current crisis. In addition, in both of these articles Rev Dr Calvani tackles the issue of what measures should and should not be taken to resolve the current situation. As mentioned above, the subject of Anglican identity and the perception of the Anglican Communion are closely

intertwined with the issues of *contextualisation* and *indigenisation*. In the second article, “Theological Education in the Brazilian Context”, Calvani deals with the need for contextualisation and inculturation of Anglican theology in a contemporary context. In his article “From Modernity to Post-Modernity: Inclusiveness and Making the Myth of Anglican Communion Relevant Today”, Calvani argues that the current crisis in Anglicanism is not only theological and institutional, but that its true cause goes beyond Anglicanism itself. Calvani’s theory is that the Anglican Communion is a fruit of modernity or modern thought, and therefore its crisis mirrors that which the whole of modernity is undergoing in the face of postmodernism. According to Calvani, The Anglican Communion as an institutional body is one of the last achievements of modernity in the religious arena. Just as all works of modernity are questioned and lose strength as they expose their own weaknesses, the same is happening with the Anglican Communion. Accordingly, the Anglican Communion is being challenged to interpret the signs of the times, to understand better the postmodern environment, and to rethink its existence.<sup>301</sup>

Furthermore, Calvani hypothesises that, from a historical perspective, it can be argued that the Anglican Communion as an international body, is itself a fruit of modernity, sprung from a modern world view and shaped by modern as well as classical western theology, witness its ecclesiology so much preoccupied with uniformity and standardization. In this sense, the current crisis mirrors what the whole of modernity is currently undergoing as the world passes into the era of postmodernity.<sup>302</sup>

Calvani argues, that another element that has contributed to the present concern with Anglican identity and integrity stems from the application of theological analysis informed by methods of ideological criticism. These methods have previously been implemented on such conceptual and social structures as the Enlightenment, Capitalism and Marxism. In recent decades, they have also been applied to Christianity, unleashing a veritable onslaught of criticism and scepticism.<sup>303</sup>

---

<sup>301</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.104

<sup>302</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.104

<sup>303</sup> For an overview of the interaction between methods of ideological criticism and theology see: Althaus-Reid, Marcella: *Indecent Theology, Theological perversions in sex, gender and politics* (2000). Ruether, Rosemary Radford *Gaia & God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing* (1992). As well as the article by the same author “The Emergence of Feminist Theology” *The Cambridge Companion to Feminist Theology* (2002), pp.3-22. See also Mexican theologian Miranda José P. *Marx against the Marxists. The Christian Humanism of Karl Marx* (1980). And Peruvian Dominican

The endeavour of facing up to this challenge has led to the birth of several new schools of theology arising from within the Churches as well as the academic world. Each of these new schools (and I use the term loosely) appears oriented towards a particular aspect within the wide spectrum of criticism imposed by the methods of ideological criticism (feminism, ecology, Queer theory, etc). These schools attempt to remodel Christianity in conformity with the particular values of their ideological criticism. Feminist theology, for example, criticises Christianity for being patriarchal and androcentric, excluding and marginalising women and their experiences from its theology and spiritual tradition. Consequently, feminist theology has adopted as its particular theological outlook the ideological agenda of transforming Christianity into a “gender-neutral” if not gynocentric tradition.<sup>304</sup> Another example is eco-theology, emerging from the environmental movement’s general critique of Christianity. Eco-theology is particularly concerned with the anthropocentric character of Christian spirituality, which it maintains has fostered oppressive attitudes towards the non-human in nature.<sup>305</sup> Another, very recent example is criticism of the “heteronormativity” of Christian tradition and theology. This critique has been expressed by a school of thought called Queer theology.<sup>306</sup> While these challenges all serve the useful function of making Christians think about their unexamined assumptions, and some of them are helpful in enabling the Churches to deal with issues that tend to undermine the credibility of Christianity as something that can be believed in our time, the demands of these critiques for large-scale transformation, even when justified, are having an unsettling effect throughout the Christian Church. They are shaking the foundations of all the traditions of Christianity and affecting all aspects of Christian theology, ecclesiology being no exception. In turn, this internal questioning has given rise to a great deal of reflection on the identity of Anglicanism and what sort of ecclesiastical entity the Anglican Communion is. It has moreover called into consideration several other aspects of Anglicanism that should be taken into account when discussing the Communion’s

---

priest Gutiérrez, Gustavo *The Power of the Poor in History* (1983). Each of these theologians has drawn heavily from different methods of ideological criticism, ranging from “Queer theory” and feminist ideology to historical analysis based on Marxist theory (as pointed to by the titles of their respective works).

<sup>304</sup> For example, see: Parsons, Susan Frank “Feminist Theology as Dogmatic Theology” *The Cambridge Companion to Feminist Theology* (2002), pp.114-134.

<sup>305</sup> Ruether 1992, pp.3-10. See also Ruether 2000, p.9

<sup>306</sup> Althaus-Reid 2000, p.13

identity. One of these is the difficulty of defining Anglicanism itself and the somewhat elusive ecclesiological nature of the Anglican Communion. The very phrase “The Anglican Communion of Churches” points to the ambiguous nature of Anglican ecclesiology. This is the alpha point, the eye of the storm, out of which the need for a discussion of the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion arises. This is something which Anglican theologians have been engaged with for the past several decades, labouring to formulate a proposal for the rationale of existence of Anglican Churches as such, and in so doing, directly or indirectly engaging with the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion as a whole.

In “Theological Education in the Brazilian Context”, too, Calvani wrestles with the issue of postmodernity. He expresses the view that there is no real way out from the Anglican crisis other than for the Church to accept the fact that the systems of modernity which have long upheld it are steadily decaying. This realisation leaves the Church no alternative other than to seek out new paradigms for its theology, identity and self-understanding. For Calvani, the issues of *inculturation* and *contextualisation* seem to go hand in hand with postmodernity. It is as if Anglicanism’s ability to adapt to postmodernity is simply another challenge to achieve inculturation and contextualisation; only this time it’s not merely a geographical or socio-cultural area, but in a global era, challenging Anglican theology. To contextualise Anglicanism is to identify its situation clearly, a situation which, according to Calvani, is (among other things) postmodern.<sup>307</sup> Therefore, to seek out relevant theological answers for Anglicans today means seeking new answers for the postmodern era.<sup>308</sup> This can be interpreted as a natural development of the way in which Latin American liberation theologians of the 20<sup>th</sup> century once set out to find answers for their own time and place.<sup>309</sup> From this proposition it becomes clear that Calvani is influenced by a combination of postmodernism and Latin American liberation theology, upon which he bases his ecclesiological analysis of the Communion: “[...] what we call the Anglican Communion is a myth that through its liberating potential, invites us to be inclusive and

---

<sup>307</sup> Calvani 2008b, p.247

<sup>308</sup> Calvani 2008b, p.248

<sup>309</sup> Calvani 2008b, p.245

to consider the freedom of each group under the umbrella of the Anglican Communion to live its faith in Christ differently.”<sup>310</sup>

### **The Perichoretic Samba of God**

Continuing in his train of thought, Calvani uses the concept of the *perichoresis*, which he applies to *the eternal dance of the Holy Trinity*, as an ecclesiastical model for the Anglican Communion.<sup>311</sup> He points out that in Koine Greek the prefix *peri-* can be translated in many ways: “around,” “about,” “surrounding” or “near”, depending on what follows. Combining it with *-chore* (as in *choreography*) conveys the idea of a circling dance; attributed to the Trinity, perichoretism, then, indicates an eternal dance.<sup>312</sup> Like any dance it has different movements which to the uninitiated can be breathtakingly surprising. Calvani illustrates his point of *perichoretic harmony* in a way typical of contemporary Latin American liberation theology, which seeks to overcome the classic western dichotomy between body and spirit by a return to integrated awareness of the body and participation in the joy of the physical:<sup>313</sup> “Perichoretic harmony is found in the diversity of dance, be it in slow or quick movements, ballet or jazz, tango or samba, liturgical dance or a revealing striptease.”<sup>314</sup> Calvani notes that during the current crisis the plurality and diversity of the Anglican Churches has become a heavy burden and issue of concern for the Communion. According to him, we see this in documents like the Virginia and Windsor Reports, which are shaped by a classic modern western theology that is mainly preoccupied with uniformity and standardisation.<sup>315</sup> Being the Brazilian and Latin American that he is, Calvani recommends viewing the current tensions within the Communion not as a failure to standardise, legislate, or regulate, but as a challenge to the Communion to dance together in rhythm to the *Perichoretic Samba of God*.<sup>316</sup>

---

<sup>310</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.108

<sup>311</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.110

<sup>312</sup> Calvani 2008a, pp.110-111

<sup>313</sup> Althaus-Reid 2000, p.13

<sup>314</sup> Calvani 2008a, pp.109-110

<sup>315</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.110

<sup>316</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.109

## Inclusive Roots

Calvani examines a few episodes of Anglican history to show how the Communion has always been shaped by diversity and pluralism and by the dynamic tensions they cause. The point is illustrated by Article XXXIV (of the Thirty-Nine) on “The position of ‘National Churches’”, which assured respect for differences, and stated that traditions and ceremonies did not have to be the same everywhere but could change according to the diversity of countries, peoples, and customs. According to Calvani this shows that Anglicanism from its origins was strongly disposed to respect cultural factors; in other words, to contextualisation: “This [Article 34] allowed the first Anglicans to respect other reformed churches because they understood that the essence of the Word of God also resided there, albeit under different authorities and liturgical forms”.<sup>317</sup> Based on this legacy, Calvani insists that Anglican ecclesiology should not exist without adapting to the context and soil upon which it lives. This reflects a consciousness that Anglicanism is basically a European and North American import and therefore needs to be contextualised to achieve relevance.<sup>318</sup> Calvani writes that non-Anglo-Saxon Anglican Churches need to reconcile their western and local theological roots. Many of the theological and philosophical traditions of Anglicanism are viewed by Calvani not only as cherished parts of an important inheritance, but also primarily as products of Anglo-Saxon thought which need to be adapted, contextualised and inculturated (or, in some cases, even discarded); otherwise they risk becoming irrelevant in the non-Anglo-Saxon context.<sup>319</sup> To achieve this, non-Anglo-Saxon Anglican Churches need to set the aims of liberation theology as a criterion for the development of their own theology, as well as for an understanding of what it means to be an Anglican in their particular socio-cultural context.<sup>320</sup> The reason for this, Calvani states, is that liberation theology was born out of a faith inspired by resistance to the authoritarian regimes of Latin America and later its methodology spread to other parts of the world where the Church experienced similar oppressive regimes, such as Asia and Africa. This, according to Calvani, makes liberation theology one of the most indigenous and contextualised forms of theology. In that sense it is unlike most other forms of theology, which are the

---

<sup>317</sup> Calvani 2008a, p.105

<sup>318</sup> Calvani 2008b, pp. 245-246

<sup>319</sup> Calvani 2008b, p.245

<sup>320</sup> Calvani 2008b, p.244-246

products of western intellectual speculation. Another argument for the aims of liberation theology as a criterion for non-Anglo Saxon Anglicanism is that it has developed into the most ecumenical theological system in the region. Sectors within most of the different traditions, Roman Catholic, Protestant and Anglican, have worked together to help develop it. This has been possible because liberation theology puts a strong emphasis on social relevance. Its framework of pastoral and ethical concern has created an environment where most Christian traditions have been able to meet in fruitful communion with each other without insisting over-much on their institutional or dogmatic particularities.

## **Chapter V:**

# **The Anglican Covenant and Surpassing the National Boundaries of The Anglican Communion**

### **Introduction**

In previous chapters, we have covered how so much of the attempt to preserve national and provincial independence is intricately linked to Anglican ecclesiological identity and its historical legacy of being tied to the nation state. This became especially noticeable in the pan-Anglican discussion concerning the Anglican Covenant. The following is therefore a study of the current difficulties within the Communion and how these are tied to the Anglican ecclesiological identity and its intricate link to the concept of national churches. I will begin this study with an analysis of the content and theology of the Anglican Covenant. It could be argued that the Anglican Covenant, as an initiative to heal the split within the Communion, is dead in the water, especially since, as of early 2017, none of the main parties behind the current tensions (e.g. TEC, the Anglican Church of Nigeria and the Anglican Church of Canada) have chosen to adopt it. Nevertheless, I have opted to use the Anglican Covenant as a backdrop for my analysis for two main reasons.

First, the Anglican Covenant represents a very recent theological and ecclesiological grand-scale development within the Communion. As such it has generated a significant amount of debate and reflection, at a global level and across all traditions of Anglicanism, and consequently given birth to several proposals and trains of thought about the nature of the Anglican Communion. It has also generated a spectrum of different perspectives and comprehensions on the ecclesiology of the Communion and the potential epistemological claims (and limitations) of Anglican ecclesiological identity, especially concerning the area of how to govern the Church. Thus, the Covenant has had a significant impact on how the member Churches have defined (and in some cases even redefined) their comprehension of the Anglican



Communion as well as their understanding of what it means to be a Church member of such an ecclesiastical reality.

Second, my preliminary research into this subject has revealed that the document itself, and the worldwide Anglican debate that has accompanied it, constitutes an intricate synthesis of theology, political theory (independence vs interdependence) and ecclesiological comprehensions of the Church, as well as a series of different understandings of the nature of the Anglican Communion. Thus, it provides a good illustration of how intricately linked some aspects of Anglican ecclesiology are with the concept of nation states.

### **Anglican Ecclesiological Identity and the Link to Nation states**

The magisterial reformers and Puritans envisioned “national churches” where membership of Church and state was coterminous (every child baptised was an overlap between social and ecclesiastical discipline). In this context, it seemed reasonable to emphasise that somehow every Christian nation/Church was in a covenant with God, analogous to and growing out of the biblical notion of Israel’s covenant with God. Much of Protestant and Anglican theology was, at least initially, forged in that thought-world. Therefore, I believe it is justifiable to claim that Anglicanism finds parts of its origins in a reaction against the overreaching authority of a distant power structure. When the Church in England rejected the authority of the Pope, the claim was primarily about the right of the Church in a particular context (England) to make pastoral decisions appropriate for that context. So, when the Church rejected the authority of the Pope, it did so on the grounds that the Commonwealth of England was threatened by a foreign bishop. Of course, other Reformation issues came with this decision, such as the nature of the sacraments and interpretation of scripture. Nevertheless, one of the critical differences between the reformers and the Church in Rome was over the issue of authority. Thus, in some ways Anglicanism has always asserted that locality and particularity are essential for the integrity of the universality of the Church. It is therefore almost ironic, but perhaps not surprising, that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, many of the global pains which the Communion is undergoing stem from member Churches claiming primary identities as “American” or “English” or “Nigerian” “African” or even

“Global South”, rather than as Anglicans. A dimension of Anglican ecclesiology which, in no small measure, has affected the debate about the Anglican Covenant.

### **The Anglican Covenant and Anglican Ecclesiological Identity**

The recommendation of the Lambeth Commission, that the Churches of the Communion enter an Anglican Covenant would, if adopted, represented a major historical development for worldwide Anglicanism. However, the recommendation brought with it a host of both theological and canonical issues, ranging from the theological nature of the Communion, to the legal character of provincial autonomy. In December 2009, after several years of work, the proposed covenant for the Anglican Communion reached its final form and was distributed to the Provinces for a process of discussion and adoption (or rejection). However, the proposal was not universally welcomed. Some member Churches accepted the covenant in principle and the final text, some the principle but not the contents, and some rejected both. As of early 2017 the Covenant has been accepted and signed by a number of Churches of the Anglican Communion: Mexico (2010), the West Indies (2010), Ireland (2011), Myanmar (2011), South East Asia (2011), Papua New Guinea (2011), and the Southern Cone (2011), The Church of Southern Africa (2013), Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui/The Hong Kong Anglican Church (2013), The Episcopal Church of South Sudan (2014), The Anglican Church of Melanesia (2014).<sup>321</sup> Two provinces have rejected the Covenant flat out; namely, the Church of England (2012) and the Episcopal Church of Scotland (2012). In the Church of England, the diocesan vote against the Covenant was decisive but the popular vote was only narrowly against the Covenant.<sup>322</sup> Two provinces have neither rejected nor embraced the Covenant in full. In 2012, the General Synod of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia resolved that it was "unable to adopt the proposed Anglican Covenant due to concerns about aspects of Section 4, but subscribes to Sections 1, 2, and 3 as currently drafted to be a useful starting point for consideration of our Anglican understanding of the Church."<sup>323</sup> That same year, the Episcopal Church in the USA chose to neither accept nor reject the Anglican Covenant,

---

<sup>321</sup> Anglican Communion 2017

<sup>322</sup> Church of England, General Synod Report 2012, GS 1878

<sup>323</sup> Anglicantaonga 2012, “This is Church 'is unable to adopt' the Covenant”

instead opting for a "pastoral response" that recognised the "wide variety of opinions and ecclesiological positions" within the province.<sup>324</sup>

## **The Anglican Covenant and Anglican Ecclesiology**

The following pages constitute an attempt to explore the Anglican Covenant, both its regulative and normative contents, as well as its theological subject matter. The purpose is to try and explore if and how the Covenant coheres with Anglican theology and identity, and how, in light of recent events within the Communion, the Covenant may contribute to transcend the national(ist) identities of Anglicanism; which, as I will attempt to establish in this study, is a necessary step in overcoming the threat of schism within the Anglican Communion. Following the analysis of the Anglican Covenant, I will elaborate on this particular point in two main steps. First, I will attempt to demonstrate how the modern nation state, as it developed in the west, post French Revolution of 1789, is a secular invention born out of an ideology which is incompatible with the universalist claim of Christianity. Second, I will expand on the theory that as a consequence of Anglican ecclesiological identity being linked with that of nation states, the transnational and global pains which the Communion is currently experiencing, correlate at least partially with the national claims and identities of its member Churches. Hence it is critical to differentiate between what is the Anglican ethos of cultural contextualisation and indigenisation in terms of culture and ethnicity, from the marriage of Anglican ecclesiological identities to the notion of the nation states. The former being an innate and conscious, theological legacy of Anglicanism, and the latter a historical development which the Anglican Churches may have to shed themselves of, as part of a solution the ongoing threats of schism.

## **Outline**

This chapter is divided in four parts. The first part is an introduction the subject of the chapter and states the main questions I seek to answer. Here I also try to establish the relevance of the study and its methodology as well as the form it will take. The second part consists of a historical overview of the origins of the Covenant. This overview is

---

<sup>324</sup> TEC General Convention 2012: Resolution B005

not intended to be absolutely comprehensive and is only offered as an adequate background to the subject of this essay. The third part constitutes an attempt to illustrate why it is necessary for the Anglican Churches to shed themselves of their national identities, both from a theological and socio-political perspective. The fourth part consists a reflection regarding the Covenant's potential to solve the current crisis and finding way forward for the Communion.

### **The Making of a Covenant**

The Lambeth Commission on Communion was established in October 2003 by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the request of the Anglican Primates in response to developments in North America with respect to same-sex relationships. The mandate requested consideration of ways in which communion and understanding could be enhanced where serious differences threatened the life of a diverse worldwide Communion. In short, how does the Anglican Communion address relationships between its component parts in a true spirit of Communion? The Commission was chaired by the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All of Ireland, the Most Rev Robin Eames. The Commission delivered *The Windsor Report* (TWR) in 2004, which recommended the adoption of an *Anglican Covenant* to rebuild trust at a time of great strain on the Anglican Communion worldwide.<sup>325</sup>

### **The Origins of the Covenant**

The Commission understood that one cause behind the crisis was related to the nature of authority within the Communion. The principles upon which the Anglican Communion is based, such as autonomy, discernment and inter-Anglican relations, are all enunciated at a global level by the Instruments of Communion, which have a persuasive moral authority over individual Churches, but lack enforceable juridical authority (at any level) unless incorporated into the legal system of individual Churches (and generally they are not incorporated).<sup>326</sup> Moreover, with the exception of those few Churches that

---

<sup>325</sup> Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), 2004: *The Windsor Report* (TWR) <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/downloads/windsor2004full.pdf> (2011.03.10, 09:35hrs)

<sup>326</sup> TWR, para: 115 (For further details see bibliography: Anglican Consultative Council (ACC))

eventually went on to sign the Anglican covenant, no Church has a systematic body of *communion law* dealing with its relationships with other Anglican Churches. Inter-Anglican relations are simply not a distinctive feature of provincial laws.<sup>327</sup> (This is interesting when considering the increasing number of bodies of ecumenical laws in Anglican Churches regulating relationships with Churches outside the Communion).<sup>328</sup> According to the Lambeth Commission on Communion this creates “*a permanent problem in Anglicanism contributing directly to the present crisis*”.<sup>329</sup> Consequently, it found that making the principles of inter-Anglican relations more effective at the local ecclesiastical level was a crucial step towards solving the current impasse. The Commission recommended that this could be remedied by the adoption by each Church of its own simple and short domestic *communion law* in order to enable and implement an agreed covenant.<sup>330</sup> Another rationale for this was that “*As some matters in each church are serious enough for each church currently to have law on those matters – too serious to let the matter be the subject of an informal agreement or mere enforceable guidance – so too with global communion affairs.*”<sup>331</sup> For the Commission the purposes of the “brief law” would be twofold: to authorise its primate (or equivalent) to sign the covenant on behalf of that Church; and to commit the Church to adhere to the terms of the Covenant.<sup>332</sup> The form of the law would vary between each Church depending on the canonical styles of its central assembly and of its primate or equivalent. Upon the publication of the Windsor Report, the Primates Standing Committee set up a Reception Reference Group to receive and review responses to the Report from within the Communion and from ecumenical partners.<sup>333</sup> The group received 322 responses and, on the basis of these, reported to the Primates' Meeting in 2005 that: “*There seemed to be agreement and welcome for the principle of a covenant [...] however a number felt*

---

<sup>327</sup> TWR, para: 116

<sup>328</sup> See for example: *The Bonn Agreement* with the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht in 1931. This agreement of "inter-Communion" has formed the basis for an ongoing relationship mediated by the Anglican - Old Catholic International Co-ordinating Council. *The Porvoo Agreement*, signed by 12 mainly northern European Anglican and Lutheran Churches. It was established in 1992 by an agreement entitled the *Porvoo Common Statement* which establishes full communion between and among the Churches.

<sup>329</sup> TWR, para: 117

<sup>330</sup> TWR, para: 117

<sup>331</sup> TWR, para: 117

<sup>332</sup> TWR, para: 117

<sup>333</sup> TWR, paras: 117,118

*more work had to be done before it would be acceptable*".<sup>334</sup> The same Primates' Meeting acknowledged that there were some serious questions to be addressed about the content of the proposal for an Anglican Covenant, and also that the practicalities of its implementation meant that this would be a longer-term process. Nevertheless the Primates commended the Covenant as a project and agreed that it should be given further consideration in the Provinces of the Communion between 2005 and the Lambeth Conference of 2008; also they requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to explore ways to implement this.<sup>335</sup> Subsequently the Anglican Consecutive Council noted the continued consideration of a Covenant for the Communion as commented by the Windsor Report and the Primates' Meeting.<sup>336</sup> In March 2006, in a pastoral letter setting out his thinking on the Lambeth Conference 2008, the Archbishop of Canterbury stated:

The controversies of recent years have spotlighted the difficulties we have as a Communion of making decisions in a corporate way. The Windsor Report raises this as a major question, and we shall need time to think about the Report's theological principles and its practical suggestions, particularly the idea of a Covenant for our Provinces, expressing our responsibility to and for each other.<sup>337</sup>

That same month the Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consecutive Council and the Primates' Meeting adopted a paper entitled: *Towards an Anglican Covenant* (TAAC). It became an agreed-upon basis for discussion and reflection in the Communion, and requested the Archbishop of Canterbury in consultation with the Secretary General of the Anglican Communion to appoint a task group to initiate the process. In the following months several Churches from all over the Communion, from Australia to North America and Burundi, declared that they wanted to commit to the idea of a Covenant. In September 2006 a meeting of the Global South Primates decided to officially endorse the development of an Anglican Covenant.<sup>338</sup> In 2009 the final version of the Anglican Communion Covenant *The Ridley-Cambridge Draft* was sent to

---

<sup>334</sup> Doe 2008, p.4

<sup>335</sup> Primates' Meeting Communiqué (24.02.05), paras: 8, 9

<sup>336</sup> AC-13: Resolution 27 (22-23.06.05)

<sup>337</sup> ACNS 2006a: "Archbishop sets out thinking on Lambeth Conference 2008"

<sup>338</sup> ACNS 2006c: "Communiqué from the Global South Primates' Meeting in Kigali"

all the Churches of the Anglican Communion for formal consideration and to be adopted, or not, by each Province through appropriate processes.

### **The “Other” Origins of the Covenant**

As seen above, the idea of an Anglican Covenant was first officially proposed in 2004 in *The Windsor Report* as a means of addressing divisions among the Churches of the Anglican Communion on matters ranging from human sexuality to the role of women.<sup>339</sup> Therefore, in the official Anglican responses, commentaries and books on the subject, the concept of an Anglican Covenant is usually traced back to when it was first suggested in said report.<sup>340</sup> *The Windsor Report* itself was written by the Lambeth Commission on Communion, which in turn was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to make recommendations following the “emergency” in the Anglican Communion created by the response to the consecration of Gene Robinson (an openly homosexual man living in a monogamous same sex relationship) as Bishop of New Hampshire (USA), as well as the decision of the Diocese of New Westminster (Canada) to bless same-sex relationships.

However, as the Anglican theologian, the Reverend Dr Caroline Hall, suggests the concept of an Anglican Covenant can actually be traced further back in time, to a different part of the world and to a very different context, namely that of the *Dallas Statement* of 1997.<sup>341</sup> This was a statement made by the *Anglican Life and Witness Conference* which took place in September of that year. It was a pre-Lambeth 1998 conference which met in Dallas (Texas) from 20-24<sup>th</sup> of September 1997, and was attended by 45 conservative bishops and 4 conservative archbishops from 16 different nations. The purpose of the conference was to develop a conservative/traditionalist strategy on the issue of homosexuality for the 1998 Lambeth Conference. The conference outlined what was seen as “*a shared and coherent orthodox Anglican framework*” and called for discipline as a “*necessary corollary of accountability*” in

---

<sup>339</sup> The Anglican Communion Office: *The Windsor Process – An Anglican Covenant*

<sup>340</sup> See for example: *Following Christ the Lord in Communion, Covenant and Mission*. An Anglican Consultation hosted by The Anglican Communion Institute and Wycliffe Hall, Oxford (UK) 2-6.07.2007. See also Doe 2008, pp.1-9 and Chapman 2008, p.22.

<sup>341</sup> Hall 2010b, p.1



keeping to the “*bounds of Eucharistic fellowship within the Anglican Communion*”.<sup>342</sup>

Within a few years this idea had developed momentum and in 2001 the Archbishops Maurice Sinclair of the Southern Cone and Drexel Gomez of the West Indies published a small book entitled *To Mend the Net*. This document outlined a series of steps by which a province considered to be “*erring*” might be encouraged to repent and return to “*orthodox*” faith and morals. The suggested procedure began with an initial request not to allow changes considered to be outside the limits of diversity and led on to “*godly admonition*”, then to “*observer status*” for the non-cooperating diocese or province, followed by suspension of communion and finally the establishment of a new province or diocese. The proposals in *To Mend the Net* were not immediately adopted, but neither did they go away. The book was actually considered by the Primates' Meeting of that year and again in 2003 by the Inter Anglican Theology and Doctrine Commission. In 2004 the Windsor Report called for “*a common Anglican Covenant which would make explicit and forceful the loyalty and bonds of affection which govern the relationships between the churches of the Communion. The Covenant could deal with: the acknowledgement of common identity; the relationships of communion; the commitments of communion; the exercise of autonomy in communion; and the management of communion affairs (including disputes)*.”<sup>343</sup>

As a result, a Covenant Design Committee was created in 2006, chaired by none other than Drexel Gomez, co-author of *To Mend the Net*. Sinclair had retired and was succeeded by Gregory Venables as Archbishop of the Southcone (2001-2010). Although Venables was not directly involved in the Covenant design process he became one of founders of the GAFCON/FCA, becoming one of its prominent profiles.<sup>344</sup> Soon after the first draft of the Anglican Covenant (*Nassau Draft*) was produced, after a process of feedback, a second draft was produced in 2008, called the St Andrews Draft. This was discussed at the 2008 Lambeth Conference and led to a third and final draft, the *Ridley-Cambridge Draft*. The Anglican Consultative Council, which met in May 2009, basically approved it, except for Section 4, which had to do with discipline. In a move

---

<sup>342</sup> Anglican Life and Witness Conference: The Dallas Statement (24.091997)

<sup>343</sup> TWR, para: 117-120

<sup>344</sup> Archbishop Venables features prominently in GAFCON and FCA contexts. For example, visit the official GAFCON webpage: [www.gafcon.org](http://www.gafcon.org) and [www.fca.net](http://www.fca.net) (2011.03.15, 11:54hrs). See also multimedia links, for interviews with Archbishop Venables: BBC: Hardtalk (2008.07.10) and Crisis in the Anglican Communion (2007)



which was broadly seen as supportive of the The Episcopal Church in the USA (TEC), Section 4 was referred back to the provinces for more discussion. After some revision a final text of the proposed Anglican Covenant was sent to the provinces for adoption (or not).

The link between Maurice Sinclair, Drexel Gomez, Gregory Venables, and the GAFCON/FCA, with its subsequent systematic violation of the jurisdictional integrity of TEC, are contributing factors as to why the Covenant is so often perceived by its opponents as the result of a process which began with the explicit intention to stop, penalise or even eject from the Communion, TEC (and other liberal Anglican Churches) willing to ordain active homosexuals and bless same-sex unions. It is not then surprising that many of its opponents (specially from North America) view the Covenant as “*a big stick clothed in fancy words intended to prevent innovation in response to God’s continuing revelation*”.

### **Nassau Draft**

In January 2007, the Covenant Design Group appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, on behalf of the primates, met in the Bahamas at Nassau. The group discussed four areas related to the development of an Anglican Covenant: its content, the process by which it would be received, the foundations upon which it might be built, and its methods of working. The Nassau Group offered a new draft of the Covenant, the so-called *Nassau Draft*, which dealt with: the Life Anglican Share; commitment to the confession of the faith; life share with others (the Anglican vocation); unity and common life; the unity of the Communion, and a declaration.<sup>345</sup> The Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates' Meeting commended the work of the Covenant Design Group to the Primates' Meeting. Among the documents used by the Group in the design process were drafts from The Windsor Report, Global South and Australia.

### **St Andrew’s Draft**

At Dar el Salaam, Tanzania, in February 2007, the Primates' Meeting approved the *Nassau Draft* and commended for a new draft covenant for study, and urged the

---

<sup>345</sup> ACNS 2007: “Report of the Covenant Design Group”

Churches of the Communion to submit an initial response to the draft by the end of 2007. On the basis of response from thirteen Churches in the Communion, the Covenant Design Group met in London, 29<sup>th</sup> of January to 2<sup>nd</sup> of February 2008, and produced a new text called *The St Andrew's Draft Covenant* and accompanying documents.<sup>346</sup> This draft was to be used at the Lambeth Conference of 2008 as material for reflection and discussion by the attending bishops.

### **The Ridley-Cambridge Draft**

In March 2009 the Covenant Design Group considered all of the submissions received from Provinces until that point, along with the bishops' reflections, and produced a third text, the *The Ridley-Cambridge Draft* which was presented to the 14th meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in Jamaica in May 2009. ACC-14 discussed the text in depth and welcomed its development, but expressed concern that the text of Section 4 had not received the same depth of consultation with Provinces which the first three sections had, and consequently requested that a small working group be set up to 'consider and consult with the Provinces on Section 4 and its possible revision', for approval by the Standing Committee. That group met in November 2009, considered 18 responses received from the Provinces, and revised Section 4 in light of these responses (3 further responses were received after this work was completed). This text was presented to the Standing Committee, which then approved it for distribution. The final version of the Anglican Communion Covenant *The Ridley-Cambridge Draft*, was then sent to all the member Churches of the Anglican Communion for formal consideration, to be adopted or not, by each Province through appropriate processes.

The link between the Maurice Sinclair, Drexel Gomez, the Covenant, Gregory Venables, and the GAFCON/FCA and its systematic violation of the jurisdictional integrity of TEC are all contributing factors to why the Covenant is so often perceived by its opponents as the result of a process which began with the explicit intention to stop, penalize or even eject from the Communion, TEC (and other liberal Anglican Churches) willing to ordain active homosexuals and bless same sex unions. It is not then surprising that to many of its opponents (specially from North America) the Covenant still seems

---

<sup>346</sup> From: Australia, Canada, England, Hong Kong, Ireland, New Zealand, Philippines, Scotland, Southern Africa, USA, Wales, West Indies and the Lusitanian Church (Portugal).

to be “*a big stick clothed in fancy words intended to prevent innovation in response to God’s continuing revelation*”.<sup>347</sup>

## **Review of Content: What is in it?**

The following is a review of the contents of the Covenant. This is followed by an attempt to pinpoint some of the most common and recurrent arguments both in favour and against the Covenant. The objective is to explore both sides of the issue from a systematic-theological perspective but also to attempt to shed some light on the historical and political factors that influence both the sceptics as well as the proponents of the Anglican Covenant. The following text is a brief review of the contents of the Covenant. The Introduction begins by describing what is meant by communion:

This unity of the Church is expressed in the New Testament through the image of the Church as the body of Christ. As St Paul explains, the reality of the Church as the body of Christ means that we cannot say to another member of the body, “we have no need of you” (1 Corinthians 12).<sup>348</sup>

The Introduction discusses the scriptural understanding of covenant and communion. Although not formally part of the Covenant, the Introduction shall always be annexed to the Covenant text and shall be “*accorded authority in understanding the purpose of the Covenant*”.<sup>349</sup> In it is stated that “*We recognise the wonder, beauty and challenge of maintaining communion in this family of Churches, and the need for mutual commitment and discipline as a witness to God’s promise in a world and time of instability, conflict, and fragmentation*”.<sup>350</sup> Following the Introduction, the Covenant is divided into four sections. The first three sections take the form of an affirmation of the shared faith of Anglicans followed by a series of commitments.

### **Section 1**

The first section is entitled *Our Inheritance of Faith*. It describes the nature of the Anglican Communion as part of the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. This

---

<sup>347</sup> Hall 2010b, p.1

<sup>348</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, intro para. 1

<sup>349</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, article 4.4.1

<sup>350</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, intro para. 4

section also looks to the two founts of the Communion: the sharing of Word and Sacrament. The Churches are asked to commit themselves “*to teach and act in continuity and consonance with Scripture and the catholic apostolic faith, order and tradition*”.<sup>351</sup> There is a stress on the faithful, coherent and respectful interpretation of scripture. Similarly, there is included a call for those who sign the Covenant to commit, nurture and sustain the Eucharistic communion of the Churches.

## **Section 2**

The second section, entitled *The Life We Share with Others: Our Anglican Vocation*, focuses on the mission of the Churches of the Anglican Communion. This is a sharing in God’s mission in Christ “*to proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom of God and to bring all to repentance and faith*”.<sup>352</sup> The emphasis on mission in the Covenant is a helpful reminder of Christ’s Great Commission to make disciples of all nations (Matthew 28.18-20). This part of the text also refers to the five marks of mission: to proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom; to teach, baptise and nurture new believers; to respond to human need by loving service; to seek to transform unjust structures of society; to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.

## **Section 3**

The third section is entitled *Our Unity and Common Life*. It asks the question “what is the source of our unity?” The immediate answer is “our participation in Baptism and Eucharist” by which all Christians are incorporated into the body of Christ, the Church. It states that the gift of Christ in the Eucharist and Baptism, as the gateway to that Eucharistic life, is the crucial source of Christian unity, which is expressed through receiving “the Bread of Life” and sharing in Christ’s risen life. This section of the Covenant stresses the importance of bishops as guardians and teachers of the faith who are visible signs of unity, joining the local Church to the universal Church. The four Instruments of Communion which facilitate the common life of Anglicanism are also

---

<sup>351</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, article 1.2.2

<sup>352</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, article 2.2.2.a.

described according to role and function: the Archbishop of Canterbury, The Lambeth Conference, the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates' Meeting.

#### **Section 4**

The fourth section, entitled: *Our Covenanted Life Together*, deals with practical matters. It describes how the Covenant may be adopted by a particular Church. It also deals with how the functioning of the Covenant will be overseen and what happens if a particular Church is deemed to have broken the Covenant. Due to its normative and judicial function this section has been the most debated and controversial part of the Covenant.

#### **Arguments For and Against the Covenant**

Anglicans around the world recognise the depth of the current tensions and theological division within the Anglican Communion. There seems to be a widespread conscience of the difficulty of achieving any resolution of present conflicts. However, there are various opinions on the reconciliatory nature and healing potential of the Covenant. Although there are many various and intricate strands of argumentation concerning the Anglican Covenant, in my research I have observed that most of the arguments can be grouped into two main categories: *Theological* and *Ecclesiological*. The first category is generally based on opposition towards the theological content of the Covenant. Those arguing from this position view the covenant as contrary to the Anglican legacy of pluralism and of achieving harmony through reason, tolerance and diversity. From their perspective the Covenant is often portrayed as contrary to the “true nature of Anglicanism”, which is itself defined as being inherently non-authoritarian and non-doctrinal, to the extent where the Anglican Covenant is depicted as something fundamentally alien to Anglican thought, even down right un-Anglican.<sup>353</sup> The second category consists of ecclesiological arguments against the Covenant, often based on objections to the alleged effect the Covenant might have on the governance of the Church. In essence this is the result of an ongoing tension between the autonomy (often defined in the form of total and absolute independence by the sceptics) against the

---

<sup>353</sup> Clatworthy 2010, p.1. See also various responses and commentaries to the Anglican Covenant in The Modern Church Union's webpage: (2011.03.05; 20:05).

Covenant's legacy of increased mutual accountability between its member Churches. Sceptics arguing from this perceptive view the Covenant as a significant step towards a narrower, more centrally organised, and increasingly exclusive, Anglicanism.

These two categories are not monoliths and they inform and influence each other. However, for the purposes of this study it is useful to make a clear distinction within the context of a general observation.

### **Theological Arguments Against the Covenant**

The proposal of the Lambeth Commission to use a covenant as a foundation for long-term relations between Churches of the Communion presupposes that the figure of a covenant is consistent with the character of Anglicanism. Although several responses to the Covenant proposal suggest that a Covenant expresses the consensual character of the Communion, others maintain that the Covenant (in its current form) is repugnant to the spirit of Anglicanism, reflecting a western political tradition more appropriate for the state as a form of binding political association, rather than that of Church and scripture.<sup>354</sup> Therefore the Covenant is viewed as a threat to Anglican identity. Arguing in defence of what they understand to be the “core Anglican values” of tolerance and diversity, they view the Covenant as an extension of the traditionalist response to the liberal Churches’ ordination of people in openly active homosexual relationships and the blessing of same-sex unions. Consequently, the proposal to use the current Covenant as a foundation to regularise the relationships between Churches of the Communion is at odds with the spirit of Anglicanism. Instead, some critics claim that Anglicanism can find sufficient strength to retain its unity by drawing on its traditional, tolerant approach to theological difference and its instinct to *include* rather than *exclude*. They see flexibility as having been, historically, “the great strength of Anglicanism”, allowing differences of opinion to be expressed within the Church. Theologians of this school of thought fear that the Covenant would make theological change and development more difficult. *“Instead of creating unity a Covenant will tend to make the Communion more rigid and liable to fracture: where unanimity is expected those who in all conscience*

---

<sup>354</sup> IEAB 2009, para:2.2.1. For example of similar thinking view the various responses to the Covenant in The Modern Church Unions webpage; (2011.03.05; 20:05) and the Walking with Integrity Blogspot; (2011.03.07; 13:05) See bibliography for more details.

*cannot agree will be obliged to leave.*"<sup>355</sup> In contrast, for the Lambeth Commission a covenant symbolises the trust that parties have in each other, an idea implicit in the Windsor Draft Covenant.<sup>356</sup> The idea is expanded upon in *Towards an Anglican Covenant* (TAAC), which establishes that an important end of a covenant is to assist in the process of reconciliation post-Windsor, and that it can do so by "*focusing on that which unites us, reaffirming our commitment to one another, and thereby helping to heal and strengthen the bonds of affection that have been damaged in recent years*"; moreover, a covenant would represent a fundamental basis of trust.<sup>357</sup> Several of the responders to the TAAC seem to agree with this (ranging from Canada to the Sudan): a covenant provides "an expression" or "promotes a culture" of trust, the "willingness to expose oneself to the discussion of an "re-engagement" with Communion Commitments."<sup>358</sup>

For many of the Covenant's critics it seems to be a question of identity that lies behind their opposition. What makes Episcopalians "Anglicans"? What makes someone in the Church of Uganda "Anglican"? However, it is easy to forget that we only tend actively to reflect upon our identity when changed circumstances challenge us to define it and, arguably, it has always been difficult to define Anglicanism. In fact, many scholars question if there even exists such a thing that may be defined as *Anglicanism*; some argue that the strength of Anglicanism is precisely that it's not an *-ism*.<sup>359</sup> However accurate or not that statement may be, I think it would be fair to assess that in view of the current tensions and threat of schism within the Communion, Anglican(-ism) has become an increasingly nebulous term and progressively difficult to define. Those who oppose the adoption of a Covenant from this perspective seem to fear that it would make Anglicanism much more theologically narrow and move the Communion in a more protestant, confessionalist direction. Heavy emphasis is laid upon the fact that it is has never previously been necessary in the history of Anglicanism to resort to confessional statements and inter-provincial/national Canon law; because "*we have*

---

<sup>355</sup> The Modern Church People's Union: Response to Towards An Anglican Covenant, p.2

<sup>356</sup> TWR, para: 119

<sup>357</sup> TAAC, paras: 6 and 8

<sup>358</sup> Doe 2008; pp.59-61

<sup>359</sup> Avis 2007, pp.19-38 and Avis 2002, pp.61-84, Sykes 1998, pp.262-27

For a discussion on how the perception of Anglican identity has developed historically see: Kay, Bruce "Highs Speed Conflict and Anglican Identity", *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 5(2007), pp.135-143

*always tacitly experienced a state of ‘permanent covenanting’, trusting the Church consensus (sensus fidelum) without the need for written agreements’.*<sup>360</sup> This anxiety about the judicial and binding nature of the Covenant is a recurrent theme among its sceptics, often echoed in different responses and commentaries on the Covenant and highlighted in connection with the impractical nature of formulating a confessional Covenant. In other words the Anglican Covenant is perceived as an attempt to specify what makes Anglicans Anglican, but in a way that threatens the inclusive nature of Anglicanism:

You can come up with a historical definition – those churches that grew out of the Church of England – but there are always exceptions, like the Anglican Church of Mexico which chose to become Anglican. You can argue that we all use the same prayer book, except that we don’t. The 1789 Episcopal Book of Common Prayer was modelled on the English 1662 Book of Common Prayer, but it wasn’t the same, and the differences have increased since the liturgical renewal movement of the 1970s. [...] Anglicans don’t have a separate “confession” of faith which defines what we believe – in keeping with the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Church, we retain the ancient creeds.<sup>361</sup>

What is interesting to note is that to many of these critics the quest for Anglican identity seems only to have started in the 1970s by those who were reacting to the ordination of women and the greater inclusion of LBGTQ people in western society at large, and consequently also within the Church; which coincided and conflicted with the resurgence of Evangelical theology within the Anglican Churches in the global North. Due to the conservative/traditionalist response to the inclusion of LBGTQ people (according to this particular version of historical accounts) the loose consensus of what it means to be Anglican fell away gradually, only to be finally accelerated by the orchestrated response to the consecration of Bishop Gene Robinson and then Anglican Church of Canada's decision to bless same-sex unions.<sup>362</sup>

A strong point in favour of the apologist of this school of thought is that there never has been such a thing as a single dominant strand of Anglican doctrine. In fact, it

---

<sup>360</sup> IEAB 2009, para:2.2.3

<sup>361</sup> Hall 2010a, p.1

<sup>362</sup> For a view of the varying historical accounts see various responses and commentaries to the Anglican Covenant in The Modern Church Unions webpage: ; (2011.03.05; 20:05) and ;(2011.03.07; 13:05). Also, Doe 2008, pp.1-9 and Chapman 2008, p22



has long been a recurrent theme within Anglican theology that Anglicanism has no special doctrines of its own. As shown above, even a certain pride has occasionally been taken in that Anglicanism supposedly is not an *-ism*. Liberal theologians who adhere to this school of thought, such as Jonathan Clatworthy, Collin See, David Bruce Taylor, Marilyn McCord Adams, Carlos Calvani and Jaci Corrêia Maraschin, tend to play down the claim that Anglicanism has any special or distinctive beliefs of its own, including its perception of the Church (although the latter two only do so from the perspective that Anglicanism is simply the Catholic faith removed of both Roman Authoritarianism and protestant heresy).<sup>363</sup> Consequently, adherents of this school of thought feel less bound by the ecumenical commitments of the Anglican Communion, and thus often act as autonomous agents, unencumbered by a sense of history, tradition or loyalty towards the principals of mutual accountability between the Churches of the Communion. Instead this supposed lack of doctrine gives liberal theologians the operative freedom to make inclusivity their ultimate driving principal. Their commitment is to the Church as an agent of social justice and political struggle, and to scripture as a gospel of total inclusion, in other words, to what they perceive to be the Christian ethos of absolute inclusiveness. For the apologists of this school of thought, this alleged lack of Anglican distinctiveness has even been turned into a virtue:

[...] Michael Ramsey answering the question what is ‘Anglican Theology?’ insisted that there was no distinctive Anglican body of doctrine, though there was an Anglican theological method, usage and direction. Archbishop Henry McAdoo stated: ‘There is no specifically Anglican corpus of doctrine’. Clearly there is a weighty school of Anglican thought, perhaps even a consensus, that Anglicanism puts forward no particular teachings of its own.<sup>364</sup>

Bishop Stephen Sykes has dubbed this the “no special doctrine” stance.<sup>365</sup> A main feature of this line of thought is that (unlike the Protestant reformers) the reforming fathers of the English Church never developed any actual corpus of doctrines or

---

<sup>363</sup> For examples see: Brooks 2005, pp.97-99; Soares 2005, pp.138-141; Avis 2007, p.39; Also read Jaci Maraschin article “Liturgy and Latin American Anglicanism”, *We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*, ed John L. Kater, Jr (1989). Panama City: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama, pp.31-47.

<sup>364</sup> Avis 2007, p.39

<sup>365</sup> Avis 2007, p.40

confessional body of their own. Instead they claimed to merely uphold the apostolic faith and the teachings of the four major ecumenical councils of the Church.<sup>366</sup> In essence stating that “Anglicanism is simply the Catholic faith freed from Roman centralization and authoritarianism”.<sup>367</sup> Consequently, for this school of thought, not submitting to a central legislative authority (other than a bishop) becomes one of the main features of Anglican identity. From this perspective the Anglican Covenant, due to its emphasis on the mutual accountability of the Churches that sign it, is interpreted as an attempt to “*force the Communion into a sense of unity*” and a move towards the centralisation of power; which ultimately, in their minds, would compromise or even deny the full independence of each regional/national Church. In fact some liberal critics go as far as claiming that the independence of each national/provincial Church, often defined as total and absolute independence with no accountability other than to its own provincial/national structures, is an integral part of Anglican identity.<sup>368</sup> Those who adhere to this school of thought (especially in North America) tend to view the Communion more as a loose federation of Churches rather than as an ecclesiastical body with a common identity and sacramental life.<sup>369</sup> Consequently, theologians of this school of thought tend to view the efforts to implement the Anglican Covenant as a process that risks changing the Anglican Communion from a “*loose federation of legally independent Churches*” to one which more closely resembles the “*coercive and authoritarian structures of Rome*”.<sup>370</sup> In contrast the apologists of the Covenant uphold that Anglicanism is already “covenantal in nature” and therefore the Covenant, as a concept, is something which is very much in harmony with Anglican legacy. In other words, the relationship of Communion which the Churches uphold at a global level (considered innate and vital to the nature of Anglicanism) is already “covenantal” in nature:

The communion we enjoy as Anglicans involves a sharing in double 'bonds of affection': those that flow from our shared status as children of God in Christ, and those that arise from our

---

<sup>366</sup> Avis 2007, p.39

<sup>367</sup> Avis 2007, p.32

<sup>368</sup> Spong 2005, p.xiii

<sup>369</sup> See the discussion in “Children of Cain: The oxymoron of American Catholicism” Radner & Turner 2006, pp.25-56.

<sup>370</sup> McCord 2004, p.9

shared and inherited identity, which is the particular history of the churches to which we belong. This is a relationship of 'covenantal affection'; that is, our mutual affection is not subject to whim and mood, but involves us in a covenant relation of binding mutual promises, with God in Christ and with one another. All those called by the gospel of Jesus Christ and set apart by God's gift of baptism are incorporated into the communion of the Body of Christ. This communion is primarily a relationship with God, who is himself a communion of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and it binds every member of Christ into the whole body.<sup>371</sup>

According to this particular view, it is through this relationship with God that those saved by grace through faith in the gospel are to live as a united family across traditional and ethnic and geographical boundaries.<sup>372</sup> In other words, they propose forming a Covenantal Communion, which from this perspective entices a Covenant with God and Communion with each other. Rooted in the Trinitarian life and purposes of God, the covenantal relationship is the practical embodiment and fruit of the gospel, in which unity, communion and holiness all belong together; it gives Anglicans (together with all of Christendom) a “mutual interdependence” through which to live out the mission of God. This in turn is based on the notion that Communion is the theological basis of any covenant, or in other words: *Communion is itself a Covenant!* Therefore, a formal covenant would not be an intrusive innovation on Anglicanism but merely constitute a means to “incarnate” the already existing covenantal nature of the Anglican Communion.<sup>373</sup> On the opposite side of the spectrum some critics argue in a similar manner but arrive at a radically different conclusion. For example the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil (IEAB) has been very outspoken in its criticism of the Covenant and has published a paper entitled “*A Statement From the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil (IEAB) on The Anglican Covenant Ridley-Cambridge Draft.*” In it the IEAB expresses its concerns about the Covenant:

The Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil expresses its agreement with sections 1 to 3 of the proposed Covenant, in the understanding that these sections merely reaffirm the Baptismal Covenant (Pact) and what has been accumulated throughout the history of Anglicanism since the Lambeth Quadrilateral. The feeling of near consensus expressed by many churches in the

---

<sup>371</sup> TWR, para 45

<sup>372</sup> TWR, section A (subheading) and para: 2

<sup>373</sup> TWR; paras: 1-3, 46, 119, 120

Communion about these points, confronts us, at the same time, with a curious question: if such an affirmation is sufficient to identify us, while adding nothing to what has already been extensively shared, what is it that the Communion lacks which cannot be achieved through the existing instruments at its disposal?<sup>374</sup>

In other words, since Anglicanism and consequently the Anglican Communion is already covenantal in nature, then what is the need for an official Covenant “document”, especially one which might impose jurisdictional limitations on members of the Communion?

Another point often raised by its critics is that of the relationship between the Covenant and scripture and how this relates to Anglican identity. They argue that in scripture any initiative towards a “Covenant” or “Alliance” comes from God and not from mankind, contrary to what the Anglican Covenant document suggests when it reads “*we... solemnly covenant together in these following affirmations and commitments*”.<sup>375</sup> For example, the IEAB argues that the Covenant text is much closer to a contract in the modern western political tradition which is more appropriate for the state as a form of a binding political association, rather than Church. Further, the IEAB lays out that in the Scriptures the term “covenant” or “alliance” is always used with reference to the relationship between God and his people: “*We understand that the Covenant that binds us to God and to one another is Holy Baptism, and recommend that, in the Preamble to the text of the Covenant, the Baptismal Alliance be affirmed as sufficient to keep us united in mission.*”<sup>376</sup> While the proponents of the Covenant (e.g. the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Commission on Communion, the Covenant Design Group and the Churches in favour of Covenant, etc.) agree that the Churches need to be very careful that entry to a covenant is voluntary, they also recognise that many fear that the call to covenant, at this time, is tainted by duress and coercion rather than commitments which Anglicans can freely and honestly make with one another.<sup>377</sup> However, the Archbishop of Canterbury stresses that participation in a Covenant must

---

<sup>374</sup> IEAB 2009, para:2.1

<sup>375</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, preamble.

<sup>376</sup> IEAB 2009, para:2.2.1

<sup>377</sup> Jones 2005, p 120

be a free decision by the churches, it would necessarily be an “opt in matter”.<sup>378</sup> That a covenant is relational is a biblical concept and in scripture covenant is relational, even though “covenant” is not always synonymous with relationship. Covenants establish a “quasi-familial unity”, with rite and cultic acts bringing covenant relationships into being; however, the means of union is not the rites but the agreement based on the pledge they represent.<sup>379</sup> In scripture “covenant” translates the Hebrew *berith* and the Greek *diatheke*. In the Old Testament, a covenant is a formalised relation between two parties, and, in the New Testament, Christians enter a new covenant relationship with God through Christ in the Spirit.<sup>380</sup> The salvific covenant issues from the sovereign, gracious, free initiative of God, and its acceptance on the part of humankind requires an inner disposition of the heart. And as part of its contribution to the Anglican covenant debate, the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission focuses on the voluntary-relational elements of covenant in scripture: In the Old Testament, the covenant with Abraham is established on the initiative of God, through gracious and generous love and not on the basis of obligation. In the resultant “covenant community”, people are bound to God and one another; “covenant” is used to describe the relationship between God and Israel. Moreover, for the Commission, once Anglicans talk of being in covenant with one another, they are reminded of “*their participation in the covenant which God has made with us in Jesus Christ*”. Indeed: “*The horizontal relationship with one another is dependent, theologically and practically, on the vertical relationship with the creating, loving and reconciling God we know in Jesus and by the Spirit.*”<sup>381</sup> This does not mean, however, that the creation of an Anglican Covenant would be the development of a covenant between God and the Churches of the Communion; and as shown above, some doubt the sustainability of the title “covenant” in an Anglican context. The notion that the Covenant involves commitments is clearly recognized by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission. Voluntary relationships based on proper disposition may also be significant for the Anglican Covenant debate by virtue of their centrality in the

---

<sup>378</sup> ACNS 2006b: “The challenge and hope of being Anglican Today: A Reflection for the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion.”

<sup>379</sup> Kalluveetil 1982, pp.51, 91, 212

<sup>380</sup> TAAC, para 13. For further discussion on the nature and exegesis of the Covenant and the also A. Goddard “Unity and Diversity, Communion and Covenant” in Chapman 2008.

<sup>381</sup> TAAC, para 13.

sacramental covenants: in baptismal covenant (that which the IEAB chooses to call the “baptismal alliance”) the candidates experience (relational) adoption as children of God, an external sign of an inward reality, effective when combined with faith; the Eucharist expresses the covenant enacted by Christ at Calvary – in it the faithful are brought into closer communion, not only with the Lord and with fellow worshippers, but also with the whole Church; and canonically, marriage and ordination (which are equally binding if not more so than the Anglican Covenant) must also be free and voluntary.<sup>382</sup> The Covenant is not there to impose or create new bonds between the Churches of the Communion, but simply to acknowledge, formulate and re-enforce those that already exist. In other words, the covenant does not convey a new marriage between the Churches, but simply acknowledges that the Churches of the Communion are already married!

### **Ecclesiology of the Covenant: Autonomy vs Interdependence**

The second category of arguments consist of ecclesiological concerns about the Covenant’s potential effect on authority and the governance of the Church. At the heart of the storm lies an ever-increasing tension between what may be defined as the centralised authority and mutual accountability of the Churches of the Communion versus their national and provincial autonomy and independence. This is tension is illustrated by the disagreements concerning section 4 of the Anglican Covenant.

### **Grievance Procedure: Section 4**

Arguably the most hotly debated part of the Covenant has been section 4. This section deals with the maintenance of the Covenant and conflict resolution. Section 4 of the Covenant describes what happens if a Church is deemed to have broken the Covenant. The responsibility for monitoring the continuation of the Covenant belongs to the Standing Committee *on behalf* of the Instruments of Communion. When a question arises concerning fidelity to the Covenant, section 4 immediately calls the Churches of the Communion to the form of life described in section 3.2 of the Covenant: to have regard for common life; to spend time with openness and patience in matters of

---

<sup>382</sup> Thirty-Nine Articles, Art XXVII (baptism) and Doe 208, p.17

theological debate and reflection; to listen, pray and study with one another in order to discern the will of God; to seek a shared mind with other Churches, through the Communion's councils, about matters of common concern; to act with diligence, care and caution in respect of any action which may provoke controversy; in situations of conflict, to participate in mediated conversations, which involve face to face meetings, agreed parameters and a willingness to see such processes through.<sup>383</sup> If agreement concerning a particular dispute is not reached, the matter is referred to the Standing Committee, which may request a Church to defer a controversial action. If that request is ignored, the Standing Committee may recommend to any Instrument of Communion (for example, the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Primates' Meeting) the relational consequences of that action. It is important to stress that there are already "relational consequences" of certain decisions made by particular provinces of the Anglican Communion. Those consequences are frequently chaotic in nature. The Covenant provides a description of the form of life by which the Church has historically expressed its mission and a flexible structure for collectively recognising and facing shared tensions and difficulties. As the Archbishop of Canterbury has said:

The last bit of the Covenant text is the one that's perhaps been the most controversial, because that's where we spell out what happens if relationships fail or break down. It doesn't set out, as I've already said, a procedure for punishments and sanctions. It does try and sort out how we will discern the nature of our disagreement, how important is it? How divisive does it have to be? Is it a Communion breaking issue that's in question – or is it something we can learn to live with? And so in these sections of the Covenant what we're trying to do is simply to give a practical, sensible and Christian way of dealing with our conflicts, recognising that they're always going to be there.<sup>384</sup>

Certain apprehension has been expressed worldwide that the Joint Standing Committee may exercise powers of oversight in the internal life of national Churches by receiving the *munus* to recommend that a Province be temporarily barred from participation in the

---

<sup>383</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant: Article 3.2

<sup>384</sup> ACO 2009: A message from the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Anglican Communion Covenant (See bibliography) for online version: (2011.03.17; 10:00hrs)



instruments of unity where it is represented.<sup>385</sup> The argument is that it thereby wrongly establishes the principle of suspension, even before any divergence can be effectively clarified, thus characterising a prejudgement without the right to defence. This is sometimes considered as a great internal contradiction in the document, for it also states that “*no Church will be subject to any external ecclesiastical jurisdiction*”.<sup>386</sup> Consequently, if the composition of the Joint Standing Committee is drawn from the existing instruments of unity, then this does not guarantee that it will act as a merely executive instance for Section 4 provisions. The way in which procedures are laid out will always imply assessment, judgement and decision-making that will give the Committee powers of decision above all the current instances, inevitably resulting in interference in internal matters of provinces, even if the existing legal provision there is being fully complied with. Another particular concern connected to this is the fact that while none of the instruments of unity possesses decision making or arbitration powers over the Provinces, a representation of these may be given such powers, especially considering the asymmetry in the character of representation and forms of appointment of such participants in each of the instruments. Therefore, according to this line of thought, the Joint Committee has a normative and legitimate deficiency which Section 4 does not clarify nor duly sorts out.<sup>387</sup> According to the critics, in essence it creates a fifth Instrument of Communion!<sup>388</sup> Central to this argument is the distinctive Anglican understanding of the authority and autonomy of each Church within the Communion. One important characteristic of the Anglican Communion is that it has no central legislative and executive authority. Instead, Anglicans are bound together “*by mutual*

---

<sup>385</sup> For examples see IEAB 2009, para: 2.2.6. The use of the term *munus* is itself an indicator of negative attitude towards the Covenant. The biblical, dogmatic, theological and juridical foundation of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff in the Church of Christ is in the charisma of the *munus petrinum* in which is based the apostolic authority of the Bishop of Rome as Vicar of Christ and Successor of the Prince of the Apostles (*haereditas Petri*). It is the *munus petrinum* who founded the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff as Successor of the Prince of the Apostles (*Primus Apostolus*) and Vicar of Christ (*Vicarius Christi*). See also various responses and commentaries to the Anglican Covenant in The Modern Church Unions webpage: (2011.03.05; 20:05hrs).

<sup>386</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, paras: 3.1.2, 3.2.2, 4.1.3

<sup>387</sup> Doe 2008; pp.107-109.

<sup>388</sup> The Standing Committee:

This is an elected body of fourteen members. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the President. The members of the Standing Committee are elected by the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates' Meeting. They are drawn from Provinces from all over the Anglican Communion. The Standing Committee will oversee the working of the Covenant on behalf of the Instruments of Communion and make recommendations to the Instruments.



*loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the bishops in conference and of the other instruments of Communion*<sup>389</sup>. Therefore, according to the critics, as long as the full autonomy of the Churches in the Communion remains an ecclesiological reality (which is considered an absolute essential and innate principal of Anglicanism), differences such as those triggering the present crisis will continue to happen, no matter what amount of legalistic paperwork is signed. In this respect, sceptics uphold that the Covenant fails to provide a balance in the exercise of autonomy versus responsibility and mutual accountability.<sup>390</sup>

This argument is mainly born out of a view of the Covenant as an attempt to establish an international Canon Law for the Communion which will then be used to replace voluntary association and consensual relations with contractual relations regulated by international institutions. Further, the claim is made that any attempt to bring cohesion or healing to the Communion should be declaratory of Anglicanism, not a test of membership nor attempt to create a constitution for the Anglican Communion; and it should have the least possible content, establishing clear criteria to sift out inappropriate material. Therefore they propose that conflict resolution should be by non-binding arbitration and that mechanisms for such a procedure should be developed outside the Covenant.<sup>391</sup> The No Anglican Covenant Coalition, a (mainly) web-based international group of Anglicans (lay and ordained), formed with the purpose to stop the Covenant, wrote the following about the presumed centralisation of power:<sup>392</sup>

2. The proposed Anglican Covenant would transform a vibrant, cooperative, fellowship of churches into a contentious, centralized aggregation of churches designed to reduce diversity and initiative. The Covenant would institutionalize the “Instruments of Unity” as never before and would give extraordinary power to the newly enhanced Standing Committee.
3. The centralization of authority envisioned by the proposed Covenant is cumbersome, costly, and undemocratic. In an era in which power and authority are being distributed in many organizations in order to achieve greater efficiency, responsiveness, and accountability, what has

---

<sup>389</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, article 3.1.2.

<sup>390</sup> Taylor 2005 pp.39-40 and Clatworthy 2005, p.107. See also various responses and commentaries to the Anglican Covenant in The Modern Church Unions webpage: (2011.03.05; 20:05hrs).

<sup>391</sup> For examples see various responses and commentaries to the Anglican Covenant in the No Anglican Covenant Coalition webpage, and the Walking with integrity blogspot. Also see The Modern Church Unions webpage. See bibliography for further details.

<sup>392</sup> For further details see: No Anglican Covenant Coalition webpage, and the Walking with integrity blogspot. See bibliography for further details.

been proposed for the Communion seems out of step with current thinking regarding large organizations.<sup>393</sup>

According to this school of thought, unity will not be served by a Covenant; on the contrary, one of the primary consequence is likely to be the exclusion or expulsion of those who do not sign unconditionally, thus risking a future where the Covenant itself could become a focus for division.<sup>394</sup> This means that any gains from a Covenant will be outweighed by losses. Gains may include greater clarity of Anglican identity and working relationships and, possibly, improve conflict resolution. Losses would include: the conciliar nature and ideal of Anglican unity would be replaced by a constitutional and contractual ideal; innovation in theology and Church order, and contemporary restatements of doctrine will become more difficult; the interdependence and autonomy of Churches in the Anglican Communion will be diminished; legalistic considerations will displace bonds of affection and mutual regard; power will be centralised, central budgets will grow and, consequently, accountability to the local Church will shrink.<sup>395</sup>

And yet, as shown above, its proponents argue that the Covenant proposal is in harmony with Anglican history and ecclesiology. To further illustrate this point I will elaborate on what Anglican theologian Paul Avis defines as the *Conciliar Catholic* model of Anglicanism. Avis allocates the catholicity of Anglicanism in its continuity of worship and pastoral care, which goes back to the earliest days of Christianity in the British Isles.<sup>396</sup> Also, Anglicanism is grounded upon the retention of a threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons, in historic and apostolic succession. Most importantly, the Catholic character of Anglicanism lies in its adherence to scripture (upholding that everything necessary for salvation is contained within scripture), the creeds, and the general councils of the undivided Church (Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon) and to the Christological and Trinitarian doctrines defined by these councils. Avis upholds this argument by referring to article XX of the Book of Common Prayer, to which he adds:

---

<sup>393</sup> No Anglican Covenant Coalition, 2010a: Ten Reasons Why the Proposed Anglican Covenant is a Bad Idea, article 1 and 3.

<sup>394</sup> Clatworthy 2006, p.3

<sup>395</sup> Clatworthy 2006, p.11

<sup>396</sup> Avis 2007, p.19

Anglican catholicity is further evidenced by the fact it acknowledges the authority of the church (and a particular church) to adjudicate in disputed matters of the faith, provided it does so in harmony with scripture. In appealing to the authority of the Church gathered in council, Anglicanism shows itself to belong to the conciliar, as opposed to the monarchical tradition of [Roman] Catholicism.<sup>397</sup>

In essence this means that Anglicans, unlike the more radical Protestant reformers, do not oppose the doctrine of the divine authority of the Church.<sup>398</sup> Rather, they believe that such authority should not be centralised around a virtual ecclesiastical monarchy (which the papacy has evolved into over centuries).<sup>399</sup> Instead Anglicans uphold a *conciliar model of Catholicism*, insisting that there is a direct and free relationship not only between believer and Christ, but also that such a relationship exists between the whole body of the Church (as body and communion) and God.<sup>400</sup> From this perspective the Covenant proposal's allocation of power (section 4) into the hands of the Joint Standing committee of the Primates' Meeting (Head Bishops of Provinces) seems very much in harmony with the Anglican legacy and the ecclesiology of the *conciliar catholic* nature of Anglicanism.

### **Post-Colonial Tensions and the Political Backdrop of The Covenant**

The following part is intended as an analysis of the theological, socio-political and cultural backdrop against which the Covenant must be read, in order to more accurately comprehend the reasoning behind it. For that reason, this part is geared towards understanding the nature of the ongoing Anglican Crisis, out of which the concept of the Anglican Covenant was born.

Arguably one of the most heavily debated of the Instruments of Communion with regards to the Covenant is the Archbishop Canterbury. Those who argue that the Covenant would hinder any new developments towards the inclusion of people in committed and monogamous same-sex relationships worry also that the Covenant will

---

<sup>397</sup> Avis 2007, p.33

<sup>398</sup> Avis 2007, p.33

<sup>399</sup> Avis 2007, p.46

<sup>400</sup> Avis 2007, p.46

centralise too much power around the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Another important dimension of the theological and socio-political backdrop against which the Anglican Covenant must be understood: namely, that of post-colonial tensions between the global North and South. Anglicans of the Global South argue that, contrary to the assertions of many liberal (western) Anglican clergy, the concern of the bishops of the global “South” *“does not stem from the fact that they have not as yet lived through the Enlightenment, but stems rather from the perception that some form of idolatry has infected the TEC, and that this infection has led to forms of gross disobedience that compromise not only Anglican but also Christian identity.”*<sup>401</sup> As a consequence they believe that it is their duty and responsibility as bishops to be involved in the matter and to take care of what is being done in the name of Anglicanism (and so, implicitly, of Anglicans). Today more than two out of every three Anglicans are African; consequently, African bishops represent a large majority of the Communion and their views should (in their opinion) carry more weight than those of their European and North American counterparts who are trying to foist “liberal novelties” on the Church. This reveals another strand of the argumentation against the Covenant which touches both upon the issues of the theological content of the Covenant (identity) and its ecclesiological consequences (governance of the Church), namely that of the national identity of some of the Anglican Churches. Anglican understanding of what it means to be “a Church” has been profoundly influenced by the early development of western European regionalism and provincialism; a way of thinking that has shaped the formation of Anglican Provinces around the world for the past 200 years.<sup>402</sup> This I believe is one of the main reasons why becoming a global phenomenon has caused such a radical upheaval within Anglicanism.

The strong national identity of most Anglican Churches is (partly) a logical development of the founding theology of the Church of England. Medieval Christendom, which can be understood in itself as a global phenomenon, mutated into a form of religion which became completely bounded and under the control of an absolutely sovereign state. Christendom in England was transformed from a religion which was innately international and global in nature (a religion which originated in

---

<sup>401</sup> Radner & Turner 2006, p.22

<sup>402</sup> Sachs 2009, pp.117-122. See also Kay 2007, p.139

Asia with its main see in Rome and has been present for over a thousand years all over Europe, Africa and Asia can be little else) into something which was intransigently nationalist (English) in character. Therefore, at least in the beginnings of the Church of England, it was impossible for Anglicanism (I use the word anachronistically) to be anything other than a national phenomenon.<sup>403</sup> Although it might be slightly overstating the case, given the existence of pan-Protestant alliances, it is not without some justification to see the heart of the Reformation as resting on the idea of completely independent, national Churches, rather than in much of a conception of an international and global “communion”. In fact, I would argue that rejection of an international communion (the medieval Roman Catholic Church) was fundamental to the origins of the English Reformation, even if new models of international communion developed out of the Protestant Reformation, such as the Synod of Dort of 1618-19.

Later, in the age of British imperial expansion, that local national Church, with its particularly contextualised English ethos, began to be exported as part of British colonialism. In turn, that meant that the reproduction and implantation of the Church of England abroad led to the development of Churches with a distinctively national(-ist) character of their own. In a twist of historical irony, with time, this very feature of contextualisation would make these Church of England “offshoots” distinctively un-English. Quite soon after gaining independence they began to cultivate their own national, ecclesiological identities. As a natural consequence of the separation from the British Crown, these national and provincial Churches started to develop their own self-governing institutions and eventually adopted independent canons and jurisdictional systems. In part, this is why, in an age of globalisation and in the midst of predicted erosion of the national identity, Anglicanism has often perceived itself as something of a triumph of national sovereignty and provincial autonomy. Of course, such a theory cannot explain the presence of Anglicanism in places like Latin America and Mozambique, where neither British colonialism nor the widespread use of the English language played a major role in its institution and development. Instead, these Churches were founded in the 19th and early 20th centuries by British immigrants and North

---

<sup>403</sup> Chapman 2008, p.7

American missionaries, or in the case of Mozambique by the Universities Mission to Central Africa (C of E).

## **The Covenant and the Anglo-Saxon Inheritance**

In large parts of the Anglican Communion the theological concern of its Churches centres on the themes of indigenising and contextualising their alien and predominantly Anglo-Saxon heritage. From their earliest days, as autonomous institutions these Churches have had an ongoing and living commitment to making themselves indigenous, not only in terms of religious tradition – theology, liturgy, spirituality – but in terms of their ecclesiastical structure and institutional life.

Yet now, more than ever, Anglicans all over the world are going through a radical process of questioning their consciences and examining their traditions to determine just who and what they are. In the course of this, some Anglican theologians have gone as far as to recommend total dissociation from what they perceive as Anglo-Saxon cultural impositions. Some, like Edmundo Desueaza, even suggest dropping the name “Anglican” itself in the interest of preserving the Communion’s ethos of pluralism and contextualisation, while other theologians, like Jaci C. Maraschin, Carlos Eduardo Calvanati and Glenda R. McQueen, propose the rebirth of Anglicanism as a new religious form, free from the impositions of Anglo-Saxon culture and wholly at one with the cultures and traditions of its new surroundings.

In terms of ecclesiology, this process of dissociation would mean ridding non-Anglo-Saxon Anglicanism of all “Eurocentric” presumptions concerning liturgy, worship and institutional models, etc. For these, according to them, are not universal Christian givens but merely some of the Communion’s cultural excess baggage. However, neither these theologians nor others who propose a “process of dissociation” advocate breaking entirely with Anglican tradition. In fact, they see their proposed course as reflecting the values at the heart of that tradition.<sup>404</sup> They point to the analogous processes of indigenisation and contextualisation that took place in England in the 16<sup>th</sup> century when the *Ecclesia Anglicana* broke away from Rome. The Church was revitalised then as it became more English, and its stubborn Englishness, at first a

---

<sup>404</sup> For example, see: Vilar 1989, p.12 and Brooks 2005, pp.93-105.

cause and then a positive consequence of the rupture, led to the establishment of an ethos which these theologians see as marking the way for a thoroughly indigenised and contextualised Anglicanism.

In the same way, many of the non-Anglo-Saxon Churches are seeking to identify themselves thoroughly with the cultures in which they live. They are not transplants, they claim, but native growths, and they want their processes of formation and development to reflect this fact.<sup>405</sup>

Analogously, this school of thought draws upon the Reformation as the ultimate expression of the contextualisation of the Church: what motivated reforming fathers was the arrogance and authoritarianism of the Roman Bishop; they could not abide a foreign prince commanding and exploiting the people of England (and many of them, of course, had an eye on the ripe-for-picking wealth of the Popish monasteries). There were various theological tendencies at play in that turbulent time all over Europe, but the reformers who ultimately prevailed in England were by and large in favour of keeping the Church Catholic. What they demanded was that it be contextualised and indigenised as fully English, or in other words to nationalise the Catholic Church in England.<sup>406</sup> Thus, the driving force behind the fracture with Rome was not that the English reformers took exception to Catholic doctrine on the number of sacraments or the practice of prayers to the Saints (such struggles came later with the ascension of a radical ideology within the English Church) but that they wanted the Church in England to shed itself of foreign jurisdiction.<sup>407</sup>

Consequently, as previously covered, two of the main themes that constantly recur in contemporary global Anglican thought are indigenisation and contextualisation. These are not only fundamental general themes in Anglican theology, but constitute core elements of the Anglican comprehension of the Church, specifically in its role as a national and provincial entity. Arguably none of these represents by itself anything that is exclusively Anglican. However, because of the particular historical legacy and national identity of the Anglican Churches, the terms in which these two concepts are

---

<sup>405</sup> For example, see: Avis 2007, pp.18-38. See also: Vilar 1989, pp.9-20 and Fernandez 1989, pp.69-80.

<sup>406</sup> For examples and discussion on how Anglican identity has developed and crystallized see: Avis 2002, pp.61-84; Avis 2007 pp.18-38 and Sykes 1998 pp.262-277. For a discussion on how the perception of Anglican identity has developed historically see: Kay, Bruce "High Speed Conflict and Anglican Identity", *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 5(2007), pp.135-143.

<sup>407</sup> For an overview of this historical development see Avis 2002n chapters 1 & 2.

worked and the interpretations they provoke, have become distinctive traits of Global Anglicanism. Yet, to many of its sceptics the Anglican Covenant represents an initiative which is anathema to this contextualising and indigenising ethos. It is often perceived as an attempt to reach union “through unity in all things”, instead of validating and reinforcing the alleged “pluralist and inclusivist legacy” of Anglicanism, thus undermining the particular national/local identities of its Churches.<sup>408</sup> This, I believe, is one of the main reasons why critics of the proposed Anglican Covenant sometimes appear border-line xenophobic in much of their argumentation: “The proposed Covenant establishes mechanisms which would have the effect of forcing member churches to conform to the demands and expectations of other [foreign] churches or risk exclusion from the Communion.”<sup>409</sup>

### **Anglican Ecclesiology and The So Called North vs South Cultural War**

In his book *Homosexuality and the Crisis of Anglicanism*, Anglican Theologian William L. Sachs suggests that although the current crisis is continuously depicted as one over the issue of homosexuality, it has developed into a tug of war over authority in the Church, between the progressive and traditionalist traditions of Anglicanism, fighting over the very essence of the Church and the future of Anglican identity.<sup>410</sup> An important dimension raised by Sachs is that, especially in the media, the crisis is often portrayed as a conflict between the liberal Churches of the global “North” and the traditionalist ones of the global “South”. Often, the poor (but numerically stronger) Anglican Churches of the “South” feel they are being treated by liberal theologians (commonly of Northern European or American origin) as less enlightened people, simply because, when it comes to human sexuality, they choose to adhere to what they view as core common (biblically based) Christian values. A prominent dynamic of the current conflict has been the conviction of some Anglicans in the Global South that they are rejecting cultural influences from the global North.<sup>411</sup> On the other hand, those who

---

<sup>408</sup> For example, see: No Anglican Covenant Coalition, 2010a: Ten Reasons Why The Proposed Anglican Covenant is a Bad Idea, article 1 and 3. See also various responses and commentaries to the Anglican Covenant in The Modern Church Unions webpage: (2011.03.05; 20:05hrs).

<sup>409</sup> No Anglican Covenant Coalition, 2010b: News Release 03.11.2010

<sup>410</sup> Sachs 2009, p.34

<sup>411</sup> Sachs 2009, p.114



oppose the Covenant fear that it will allow “foreign” (read conservative and Global South) bishops to enforce their wills upon the more “enlightened” liberal Churches of the Communion. The *No Anglican Covenant Coalition* writes the following in “Ten Reasons Why the Proposed Anglican Covenant is a Bad Idea”: “*Anglican polity rejected control by foreign bishops nearly 500 years ago. The proposed Anglican Covenant reinstates them*”.<sup>412</sup> However it would be simplistic to portray the current crisis as mainly a post-colonial power struggle between the global “North” and “South”, for it is a divide that runs through all of the Anglican Communion, inciting heated controversy and threatening schism, not only among the member Churches of the Communion, but within some of the Churches themselves. Several of the Churches belonging to the “Global North” have come out against the covenant. In an equal manner, a number of Churches from the “South” and the non-English speaking parts of the Communion have been very open in their criticism of the Covenant. For example, The Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil (IEAB) has been very outspoken and sceptical towards the Covenant; expressing concerns about the Covenant which are very much along the lines of its western and northern counterparts and seems just as preoccupied with potential threats against Anglican identity and just as anxious over the speculated loss of autonomy of the individual Churches of the Communion.<sup>413</sup>

We acknowledge and value the work of the Ridley-Cambridge drafting committee, as well as recognise their intention to preserve the unity and interdependence of the churches of the Communion. However, we lament the fact that this process has been conducted without broad consultation with missiologists and liturgists, as well as the polemic circumstances, marked by mutual mistrust and judgement, which conferred a judicial character particularly on Section 4 of the Draft, showing little emphasis on spirituality, liturgy and mission, and accentuating traces of institutionalisation that significantly alter the ecclesiological nature of the Anglican Communion, bringing it closer to the idea of a denominational macro-structure.<sup>414</sup>

In November 2010, during the same time as the General Synod of the Church of England was debating the adoption of the Covenant (22-24<sup>th</sup>), the primates of the

---

<sup>412</sup> No Anglican Covenant Coalition, 2010b: News Release 03.11.2010

<sup>413</sup> IEAB 2009, paras: 1.4 and 1.7

<sup>414</sup> IEAB 2009, para: 1.7

GAFCON/FCA issued the *Oxford Statement* in which they declared that they were not going to sign the Covenant because they found the final draft to be “fatally flawed”:

For the sake of Christ and of His Gospel we can no longer maintain the illusion of normalcy and so we join with other Primates from the Global South in declaring that we will not be present at the next Primates’ meeting to be held in Ireland. And while we acknowledge that the efforts to heal our brokenness through the introduction of an Anglican Covenant were well intentioned we have come to the conclusion the current text is fatally flawed and so support for this initiative is no longer appropriate.<sup>415</sup>

In the eyes of many this rendered the Covenant almost irrelevant overnight. The whole concept of a Covenant had initially been born out of a will to keep together both the warring parties, whom seemed to be walking away from the Communion, but now none of them seemed willing to adopt it! However, beyond its capability of healing the potential split amongst and within the Anglican Churches (something which is still being debated today), the Covenant itself poses a deep theological question before the Communion: What has Anglican theology to say about the nature of the ecclesiological bond of its member churches?

### **Anglican Ecclesiology and the Theological Roots of the Covenant**

Sustaining a balance between innovation and continuity, in an age of such fast and fluid social and cultural change as the current one, constitutes an enormous endeavour for any religious tradition, not least for Anglicanism, with its decentralised pattern of authority and at times elusive notion of doctrine. Arguably, though, the strive to hold together tradition and reformation, legacy and creativity has been at the forefront of Christian theology since the time Jesus preached to the tribes of Israel about a “new” kingdom which was coming, but which paradoxically also represented the fulfilment of their own religious traditions. Navigating these stormy waters, in a so-called “post-modern” world constitutes a fresh and particular challenge for any long-running theological tradition such as Anglicanism. Indeed, it could be argued that Anglicanism faces a particularly acute form of this challenge because of the relationship between the spread of

---

<sup>415</sup> GAFCON 2010, “Oxford Statement of the Primates’ Council”, para: 5

Anglicanism with British imperialism and the radical, social-cultural, transformation that followed the decolonisation process of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. A critical element of the socio-cultural, theological and political backdrop against which the Covenant must be contrasted in order to gain insight into its rationale. One effect of all this has been the rise in a great deal of reflection about the identity of Anglicanism and what sort of ecclesiastical entity the Anglican Communion is. Moreover, it has called into consideration several other aspects of Anglicanism that should be taken into account when discussing the Communion's identity. One of these is the difficulty of defining Anglicanism itself and the somewhat elusive ecclesiological nature of the Anglican Communion. The very phrase "the Anglican Communion of Churches" points to the ambiguous nature of Anglican ecclesiology. This constitutes the epicentre, out of which the need for a reformulation of the ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion arises. I believe that it is crucial to understand the Covenant as part of this ongoing process. Given that the Communion as a whole is not identified with a particular national character or sympathy, nor does it have any natural underpinning cohesion (other than that of mutual affection), there is an urgent need for reinvigorated epistemological underpinning, an articulated *raison d'etre*, rationale of existence, elements of which can be found within the formulations of the Covenant.

For almost five centuries Anglicanism has tried to hold together diverse elements which, in other traditions, have failed to remain in unity. The Covenant should be understood as part of that process; for is not intended to be a detailed doctrinal confession which may seem to alter the nature of the Communion towards that of a confessional family.<sup>416</sup> The Inter Anglican Standing Committee on Ecumenical Relations was especially keen that the Covenant should not be perceived as confessional in form, as this would inevitably have a negative impact on some of the oldest ecumenical relationships between Anglicans and other Churches (e.g. The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht).<sup>417</sup> This is why the text of the Covenant, although containing and affirming certain doctrinal and historical elements (such as the episcopacy and common sacramental life), by itself does not represent a systematic summation of Anglican doctrine. The confessional and historical formulations present in

---

<sup>416</sup> Doe 2008, p.78

<sup>417</sup> IASER 2006, para 14.

the text have not been included as an attempt to establish some kind of Protestant confessional-ism, or to change and/or amend doctrine, but rather, to acknowledge them as a historically accepted standard for common discernment and order, particularly in respect to scripture.<sup>418</sup> Nor is the Covenant an attempt to create a new Anglican Communion canon law (although it may be the case that some Provinces will incorporate the Covenant into their canons):

Nothing in this Covenant of itself shall be deemed to alter any provision of the Constitution and Canons of any Church of the Communion, or limit its autonomy of governance. The Covenant does not grant to any one Church or any agency of the Communion control or direction over any Church of the Anglican Communion.<sup>419</sup>

The purpose of the Covenant is for the Churches of the Communion to collaborate in the creation of their own formal agreement, which supports but does not replace the bonds of affection and commits them to an agreed framework for life together as members of a global family of Churches.

Anglican Churches, although interdependent in terms of identity, are provincial in character (South African, South Cone, Central Africa, etc.). Therefore, their unity must be sought in a way that accepts this fact. However, instead of regarding these differences as unfortunate accidents of history, they should be the starting point, the touchstone, so to speak, upon which any theology and ecclesiology which claims to be Anglican should be based.

As I have attempted to demonstrate earlier, the fear of loss of autonomy through the Covenant is *intricately linked* to the national and provincial identity of the Anglican Churches. The origins of the transitional challenges which the Communion is experiencing in the present generation is marked at least in part by the dissolution of national English imperialism in the past century and the decolonisation of large parts of the Communion. However, as I have established above, the different national identities of the Anglican Churches are in themselves a consequence of British imperial expansion and the exportation and transplantation of an English Church with a distinct national identity; which clearly correlated with the consolidation of power and the growth of

---

<sup>418</sup> Doe 2008, p.78

<sup>419</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, article 4.1.3.

English nationalism in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. This national identity, developed along the concepts of contextualisation and indigenisation, has by some parties been considered both a virtue and an innate part of Anglican identity. The question is whether, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, this link between a Church's ecclesiological identity and its national identity is beneficial to the Communion in its current state. The modern nation state, as it developed in the west after 1789, is a secular invention born out of an ideology which can be argued to be incompatible with the catholic claim of Christianity. This point will be explored much more extensively in the next part, but for now though, we need to briefly touch upon it (without getting too caught up in its intricacies) because it is crucial to understanding the Covenant.

The introduction to the Covenant reads: “*we covenant together as churches of this Anglican Communion to be faithful to God’s promises through the historic faith we confess, our common worship, our participation in God’s mission, and the way we live together.*” And article 3.1.2 states “[...] *Churches of the Anglican Communion are bound together “not by a central legislative and executive authority, but by mutual loyalty sustained through the common counsel of the bishops in conference” and of the other instruments of Communion.*” This makes it clear that autonomy is a fundamental principle of Anglicanism and that it is the right of a Church to be self-governing. An autonomous Church has authority ordinarily to make decisions for itself in relation to its own affairs at its own level. Autonomy expresses subsidiarity; that is, decision making at the appropriate level. However, the Christian imperative of the universality of the Church means that the autonomy exercised by a local Church must be done within the context of the wider community of which it forms part. Therefore, autonomy includes the right of a Church to make decisions which may also touch the rest of the Anglican Communion, provided those decisions are compatible with the interest and standards of the wider Communion: what touches all should be approved by all.

### **The Covenant, Anglican Realignment and The Donatist Split**

In light of the debate concerning the Anglican Covenant, the split over homosexuality is often depicted as unprecedented, thus the Covenant has at times been portrayed as a possible solution for a unique kind of problem. However, while some dimensions of the conflict are genuinely unique; for example, there has never before been a religious

division over homosexuality on a global scale, and the extent to which Anglicans have formed ideological coterie threatening the Communion's unity may also lack precedent, the fabric of the Church has suffered tears on basis of moral purity before. Perhaps the most (in) famous of these is the Donatist split during the third and fourth centuries. The question arises, is there a lesson for the Anglican Communion to be learnt from this painful chapter of the history of the Church?

As stated earlier, in his book *Homosexuality and the Crisis of Anglicanism*, William L Sachs, extrapolates how, from its earliest origins, Christianity has endured tensions over matters of morality which often have culminated in colliding visions of the Church. Although it concerned the character of the Church leaders after Roman persecution; the donatist schism took a form that resembles the current division over human sexuality within the Anglican Communion, in that accusations of moral compromise by Church leaders prompted the rise of alternative Church order. Showing that the impulse to separate on the basis of presumed moral impurity- which is apparent in the conflict over homosexuality- may have precedence. For that reason, I believe that a more in depth study of Sachs's historical analogy can provide valuable insight into how the current tensions affect the ecclesiological self-comprehension of the Communion. The aim is not to accuse either of the parties of being donatists, rather, the goal is to highlight that within the current tensions there have been strains of donatist behaviour on both sides. Consequently, a sustainable ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion must make explicit the risk for donatist tendencies in cases of profound disagreement, and incorporate within it how to avoid it.

Donatism claimed that Christian clergy were required to be faultless for their ministrations to be effective and for the prayers and sacraments to be valid. This line of rigorous morality had its roots in the social pressures among the early Christian community of Roman Africa. During a time of persecution, the Roman governor of the province had been relatively lenient towards the Christian community and asked only for them to hand over their Scriptures as a token public renunciation of their faith. Some Christians, especially among the wealthier classes, acceded to this convenient action, as a way to avoid torture and incarceration. When the persecutions came to an end, however, they were branded as *traditores* (traitors) "those who handed (the holy things)

over" by those Christians, mostly from the poorer classes, who had refused to denounce their faith and paid a horrible price for it.<sup>420</sup> There are various dimensions to this split that parallel to the current threat of schism within the Anglican Communion. For example, there are different kinds of social pressure acting upon Anglican churches from different parts of the world. In many circles churches are seen as defenders of traditional social values, and such are expected to react against (perceived) threats to the social order, if they don't then they fail to be effective ministers of the contexts within which they exist. On the other hand, a number of Anglican churches are under pressure to prove their relevance in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and therefore wish demonstrate that they have evolved beyond their (perceived) authoritarian and morally rigorous past, and often choose to do so through a policy of radical inclusion. In addition, there is a dimension of post-colonial tension in that the current squabbles are often depicted as a split between the Global North and South. There is also an element of class and distribution of wealth involved, since the churches of the Global South are often poorer in terms of financial resources than their northern counterparts.

Technically speaking, donatism is, perhaps, a schism rather than a heresy. It is mainly an attitude and/or theological leniency towards Church discipline and order.

Nevertheless, ecclesiological convention has it that whereas heresy is opposed to faith, schism is opposed to love, and in this case the border between heresy and schism is a blurry one.<sup>421</sup> In fact one of the most instructive features of the Donatist split, especially in light of the so called Anglican realignment, is the way it highlights the artificiality of separating faith (creed) from love (praxis). As Anglican theologian Ben Quash points out, Christian practice is in itself a form of applied theology. In other words, the way the Church acts is an exposition of the actual contents of its faith. To those who upheld the catholic perspective in this controversy, donatism, offended against both proper Church order and "true" Church teaching, and (of course) the donatists thought the same in reverse. Another similarity with the current dispute amongst Anglicans is that, although the donatist split (technically) did not begin as a dispute about theology but rather about Church order (although, arguably, both categories are virtually inseparable), it quickly evolved into a major crisis of identity within the Church, and turned into a three-and-a-

---

<sup>420</sup> Cantor 1995, p.51

<sup>421</sup> Quash 2007, pp.81-90

half-century long, international dispute over who had the right to call themselves true Christians.<sup>422</sup>

Early in the fourth century, some thirty years before the birth of St Augustine of Hippo, the Christians in North Africa (as elsewhere in the Roman Empire) were living in the aftermath of the Great Persecution carried out under pagan emperor Diocletian (who had declared himself a demi-god and did not like rivals). Church buildings were demolished and sacred books, vessels and relics confiscated and burned. Clergy who resisted were imprisoned, tortured and in many cases killed. The Martyrs were revered as heroes by many Christians in North Africa, and those who survived imprisonment were granted the honorific title of *Confessor*.<sup>423</sup> But some clergy had capitulated, complying with instructions from their persecutors and handing over Church property. They were called *traidores* (English: *handers-overs*). Those Christians who had resisted and refused to collaborate with the secular authorities saw themselves as the protectors of authentic holiness and ritual purity of the Church at any cost, regardless of reprisals and personal consequences, until God's return. Many of them expected the end of times to arrive soon anyway. There was, however, another wing of the Church which was less keen on righteous confrontation with the Roman Empire and therefore open to letting the *traidores* return to ministry and resume positions of leadership within the Church. In 311 the Bishop of Carthage died and his post needed to be filled, so his archdeacon, Caecilian, was consecrated by three bishops. However, the Donatist argued that the main consecrating Bishop was a *traidor* who eight years earlier had handed over Church property to the confiscating authorities, rather than taking the consequences of his faith and office and becoming a Martyr. Consequently, a great portion of the North African Church would not recognise Caecilian's consecration and had a candidate of their own consecrated instead. After many tense negotiations, this latter candidate was not recognised by any of the Churches north of the Mediterranean, including Rome and the new Emperor Constantine the Great. This strengthened the North African Church's sense that they represented an authentic and indigenous African Christianity that was being unjustly put upon by alien forces that had no rightful claim on them.<sup>424</sup> Again

---

<sup>422</sup> Quash 2007, p.84

<sup>423</sup> Quash 2007, p.84

<sup>424</sup> Quash 2007, p.85



here, one might find an interesting note of comparison with the ongoing Anglican divide. From that moment on two rival groups existed within the same Church, both claiming the one true Christian identity, both claiming authenticity and overlapping episcopal jurisdictions, but each with its own episcopate, reciting the same creed, and with the same sacramental forms and liturgical structures; and so, for the next 350 years, in every village, in every city, church was built against church, and altar raised against altar. In similar way, both of the quarrelling parties within the Communion today, claim to uphold the true spirit of Anglicanism, one emphasising of doctrinal purity, the other the need for a radical inclusion of those long marginalised by the Church itself (e.g the LBGTQ community). Both claiming obedience to Christ and Anglican teaching. In a modern-day context, donatist behaviour entails for example refusing to take or acknowledge the validity of the sacraments from a priest or bishop because of the moral status of said person. To put it bluntly, refusing to take communion from an openly homosexual priest or bishop on the grounds that their fallen moral status compromises the validity of their sacraments or their orders, is in effect committing the heresy of donatism. So, when President Robert Mugabe (himself a Roman Catholic) encouraged the Anglican Church of Zimbabwe to break Communion with its western counterparts on the grounds that “these homosexual priests” are “dirty” and “filthy” (ergo: they can smear their “dirt” on others), he is actually encouraging the Anglican Church in his country to commit heresy.<sup>425</sup> Please observe that this is not the same as declaring impaired communion because of irreconcilable doctrinal differences! This also casts some unavoidable questions on a whole range of issues regarding Anglican ecclesiology, not the least the formation of the ACNA and its subsequent endeavour to seek an independent relationship with the rest of the Anglican Communion. Which is based precisely on the issue on the validity of ordaining openly homosexual clergy.<sup>426</sup> Believing that the sacraments and orders, or the authority structures of the Church, have somehow become “tainted” or “impure” due to the moral fallibility of a person in holy orders, e.g. ordained/consecrated deacon/priest/bishop, and are therefore “invalid” is, nevertheless, to commit the heresy of donatism. This sheds an interesting light on the actions of Archbishops Peter Akinola and Gregory Venables. At both the Primates'

---

<sup>425</sup> Sokwanele 2010: Zimbabwe President Mugabe Pours Fuel on Debate Over Homosexual Rights

<sup>426</sup> ACNA: “Birth of GAFCON”

Meeting at Dromantine in 2005 and the Primates' Meeting at Dar es Salaam in 2007, Akinola, together with Venable and a number of the Global South Primates, Abp John Chew, Abp Benjamin Nzimbi, Abp Justice Akrofi, Abp Henry Orombi, Abp Gregory Venables and Abp Emmanuel Kolini refused to take Holy Communion in company with the then Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church. They issued a press release in order to publicise and explain this refusal:

We each take the celebration of the Holy Eucharist very seriously. This deliberate action is a poignant reminder of the brokenness of the Anglican Communion. It makes clear that the torn fabric of the Church has been torn further. It is a consequence of the decision taken by our provinces to declare that our relationship with The Episcopal Church is either broken or severely impaired. Scripture teaches that before coming to sit with one another at the Lord's Table we must be reconciled. (Matthew 5:23-26 and 1 Corinthians 11:27-29) We have made repeated calls for repentance by The Episcopal Church and its leadership with no success. We continue to pray for a change of heart. We are unable to come to the Holy Table with the Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church because to do so would be a violation of Scriptural teaching and the traditional Anglican understanding, "Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways; Draw near with faith" (Book of Common Prayer) This is a painful decision for us and also for our host and brother, the Most Rev'd Donald Mtetemela. He understands our painful dilemma and accepts our decision. Pray for the Church."<sup>427</sup>

It is interesting that they have chosen to quote the Book of Common Prayer in justification of their actions, because the question then arises: Who are those who are not meant to receive communion, and who are those who do not seek reconciliation? Are we to assume that Archbishop Akinola and the others do not seek reconciliation with the Episcopal Church? Or is it Katherine Jefferts Schori (who was the presiding bishop of TEC in 2007) who is causing the schism through the unilateral actions of TEC? There seems also to be an inverted sense of the reconciliatory nature of the Eucharist underpinning the Primates explanation, for although the quoted scriptural passages speak of the need to reconcile with your fellow Christians before approaching the Lord's Table, the logic behind the statement seems to deny the reconciliatory nature

---

<sup>427</sup> Church of Nigeria 2007a: Primates Explain Absence at Holy Eucharis

and capacity of the blessed sacrament. Are the primates suggesting that there is no reconciliation made possible through partaking in the Eucharist and standing together at the altar despite profound differences? It bids the question: How high a percentage of concordance must I have with my fellow Christian before I may approach the altar with him/her? This kind of logic stands in diametrical opposition to the Anglican ethos of achieving unity through Communion rather than Communion through unity. As previously stated, Anglican unity stems not from uniformity and standardisation of all things but rather it is a unity which stems from a desire of being in Communion. In other words: it is because we pray together that we stay together, not the other way around; that we pray together because we are already the same in all ways. American Anglican theologian Ephraim Radner describes the essence of Christian Communion in the shape of God's Trinitarian life: since the Father sent his Son to die for us and through his death and resurrection the New Covenant of humanity with God was established, thus the Christian concept of being in Communion with someone means "recognising they [other Christians] stand in a pair with you and partake in the same Covenant with God".<sup>428</sup> Therefore, being in Communion with someone means being in a position to die for them, as described in Ephesians 5.<sup>429</sup> Of course Ephesians 5 also speaks of renouncing pagan ways (idolatry) and fornication, thus the sexuality debate becomes once more a large part of the debate about the nature of Communion, and the discussion comes full circle. Nevertheless, seen in the light of Radner's description, none of the warring parties seems eager to (re)establish actual bonds of Communion within Anglicanism. At least not if it entails the having to concede ground to the disagreeing counterpart.

In 2005 Akinola signed a Covenant of Concordat with the Presiding Bishops of the Reformed Episcopal Church and the Anglican Province of America (two break-away groups from TEC). Further, in 2008 Some "Global South" Churches under the auspices of (among others) the primate of the South Cone Archbishop Venables and Archbishop Akinola, together with a number of other primates and bishops, accompanied by a smaller number of Churches from the "Global North", formed the Global Anglican

---

<sup>428</sup> Radner, 2004, p.10

<sup>429</sup> Radner, 2004, pp.10-11

Future Conference (GAFCON) and Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans (FCA) as alternative organisational homes for those Churches that viewed TEC, the Anglican Church of Canada, and all who would not take a stand against these innovations, as hopelessly corrupt and heretical and therefore could no longer in conscience remain in full communion with them. Again, it becomes interesting to study these actions from the perspective of Sachs Donatist analogy; for, if not fully heretical, they do fall dangerously close to schismatic behaviour. It could also be argued that the TEC's refusal to listen to the pleas of Bishop of Canterbury and a number of other Anglican churches, asking it to wait before moving ahead with its innovations, also shows marks of schismatic behaviour.<sup>430</sup> In as much that the TEC decided it's own actions were more important than the well-being of the inter Anglican relationships. Either, arguing for an alternative ecclesiastical order/structure on the basis that some leaders in the currently existing one have become hopelessly morally corrupt, or ascertaining that such persons are somehow spiritually infectious (e.g. that an altar or a Church used by them needs to be reconsecrated) is heresy. Such attitudes contradict Jesus' (and St Paul's) own systematic critique of the Pharisaic rules of ritual purity and cleanliness, which they accused of being void of love of neighbour and consequently failing to reflect God's own unconditional love for all of humanity. If one is to take seriously the statement that heresy is opposed to faith, and schism is opposed to love, then the language employed by the GAFCON/FCA describing homosexuals as "inhuman" and "filthy" is a serious cause for doctrinal concern.<sup>431</sup> Both St Augustine of Hippo and St Thomas of Aquinas are clear in that sin does not have a substance of its own, it is simply the lack of God's love, a metaphysical void created by our inability to open ourselves to the eternal presence of Christ; and cannot, therefore, be metaphysically "infectious". To state the opposite is to attribute almost magical properties to sin, as some kind of curse or black magic. However, it is important to differentiate here between sin and evil, something which liberal theology, in defending the inclusion of same-sex relationships, sometimes fails to grasp. While sin is a negative condition, namely the lack of God's love, and therefore has no substance, evil can – metaphysically speaking – have its own substance, in so far as evil can be the manifestation of the Devil and/or the execution of

---

<sup>430</sup> BBC (2003.10.16) "Anglican Leader's Statement"

<sup>431</sup> Pritchard 2007.09.11, "Anglican Bishop Calls LBGTQ People Inhuman"

his will.<sup>432</sup> This logic is applicable, at least, in those Christian traditions which uphold a belief in personalised evil and in the figure of the devil; something which most Anglican Churches in Africa adhere to as well as several western/northern ones. For example, it is still a formal requirement for all Church of England dioceses to have at least one official diocesan exorcist. According to this Christian tradition, Satan is capable of metaphysically and even supernaturally “infecting” us with evil in the form of possession, demonic oppression and general manipulation of our sinful nature, all made possible through the “gaps” left in our souls by our own sins. Hence, humans do not infect others with their sin. Although a case could be made that hurting others through our own sinfulness may cause them to sin by retribution, I would argue that this is a psycho-emotional response and not an “infection” *per se*. To state the opposite, is in effect, to commit heresy.

## **Chapter VI:**

### **Anglican National Ecclesiological Identities, The Covenant and the Mythos of the Modern State**

As previously seen, in the current global debate about the Anglican Covenant and pan Anglican relationships there has emerged an increasing tension between those emphasising the Anglican tradition of the national and provincial autonomy of its Churches, versus those who express an acute need to deepen the mutual accountability of the Churches in the Communion. This current fault line runs deep both between and within the Churches of the Communion, and has incited heated controversy and threats of schism, not only among the member Churches of the Communion, but also within some of the member Churches themselves.<sup>433</sup> In order to formulate an ecclesiology

---

<sup>432</sup> For a more in-depth study of the concepts of sin and evil and how it relates to the Christian tradition read: *Heresies and How to Avoid Them* (ed) Ben Quash and Michael Ward London: SPCK (2007). And Alister E. McGrath *Christian Theology: An Introduction* Christian Theology: An Introduction, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell (2001), specially chapter 14: *The Doctrines of Human Nature, Sin and Grace*, pp.440-475. Also John Macquarries Chapter on the Immaculate Conception in his book *Mary For All Christians, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*; Edinburgh: T & T Clarck Ltd (2001), pp.51-77.

<sup>433</sup> Sachs 2009, p.233

capable of dealing with this current divisions, it is crucial to understand where it stems from. As written above, it is one of the main propositions in this thesis that the dispute over same-sex relationship, is symptomatic of the current state of pan Anglican relationships and the ecclesiology of the Communion (or lack thereof) rather than the actual cause of the current state of things. It is at this point the boundaries between theology, ecclesiastic policy and Church politics become increasingly blurry. For example, the IEAB argues that the Covenant text is much closer to a contract in the modern western political tradition, which is more appropriate for the state as a form of a binding political association than the Church.<sup>434</sup> However, exploring the intricate links between Anglican Ecclesiological Identity, The Covenant and the notion of modern nation states, requires looking into the theoretical underpinnings of said concept of state. Therefore, in order to elaborate on this particular aspect of Anglican Identity, it is necessary to venture into the realm of political theory and the theories of some of its most pivotal social contract theorists such as Rousseau, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. However, it is also vital to keep this discussion rooted in Anglican ecclesiology, and thus relevant to the theme of this thesis. To that end, I have chosen to draw from the work of Anglican theologians and ecclesiologists, varying from Richard Hooker to more contemporary thinkers such as representatives from the Radical Orthodoxy School of Anglican theology. The exception to this rule is William Cavanaugh, whose work on political theology, even though written from Roman Catholic perspective, has proven to be a very useful analytical tool in exploring the link between ecclesiological identities and the notion of nation states, within an Anglican context. Cavanaugh's work has also influenced number Anglican of 21<sup>st</sup> century Anglican thinkers working in the field of political theology such as John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock and Graham Ward. I have chosen to these theologians because, although Radical Orthodoxy has at times, mainly concerned itself with denouncing modern secularism and Kantian accounts of metaphysics (through criticising Duns Scotus's theory that the term "being" is used unequivocally of God and creature (which s is often presented as the precursor of modernity)) in their work, the writers have all engaged with the theological deconstruction of the theoretical underpinnings of the modern nation state. A notion that

---

<sup>434</sup> IEAB 2009, para: 2.1

unavoidably has great consequences for Anglican ecclesiological identity. Through reclaiming the original early church idea that theology is the "queen of the sciences", Radical Orthodoxy proposes that if the world is to be interpreted correctly, it must be viewed from the perspectives of theology. As a consequence, Radical Orthodoxy critiques secular sciences because their world-view is considered inherently atheistic and nihilistic, based on acts of ontological violence (of which the faith/reason, nature/grace separations are examples). Consequently, science, ethics, politics, economics and all other branches of study are interpreted and informed through a theological outlook in which the mainstream secular world-views (economic, commercial, anthropologic, etc) becomes heretical (as in deviations from orthodoxy) in that they either fail to include the holistic ontology which Radical Orthodoxy claims is innate to (orthodox) Christian theology, or because they inevitably attempt to usurp it with their own versions of soteriology and pseudo religion. As I will demonstrate, such a theological interpretation of the concept of nation state, has huge implications for Anglican ecclesiological identity and its link to nation states. For these reasons, the following chapter is dedicated to analysing how the concept of covenant is construed upon within the proposed document itself, accentuating the difference between the secular concept of a binding, legal, contract and the theological (Christian) concept of covenant. I will also attempt to show how (and why) much of the current fear of loss of provincial and national independence correlates with the Anglican churches links to national identities, and their ties to the modern state. Of course, no such analysis could be complete without also taking into account the current pan Anglican debate on human sexuality, and how this to is affects the notion of independence versus mutual accountability within The Anglican Communion.

### **Homosexuality as a marker of Ecclesiological Identity**

In the past decade's homosexuality has become a marker of boundary between conservative and liberal Anglicans. If seen as anathema, it has provided a key symbol of conservative identity, promoting a self-view of upholding the traditional values of Christianity. Equally, if accepted, homosexuality becomes a marker of tolerance and progressive thinking and a strong ethos of inclusion, all classical markers of liberal Anglican identity. Caroline Jane Addington Hall, an English-born and American-



ordained Anglican Priest, has studied this phenomenon in depth in her doctoral thesis from Leeds University (2009).<sup>435</sup> In the chapter named “Re-imagining the Anglican Communion” she writes about how, in the years following the Lambeth Conference of 1998, homosexuality became more and more crystallised as a marker of identity on both sides of the divide. Hall describes how through this symbolic construction, homosexuality became an indicator of other attitudes and beliefs. From a conservative perspective, those who accepted homosexuality were also unorthodox in their reading of scripture and their apparent disregard for the historic creeds, formulations and the faith and order of the Church.<sup>436</sup> As stated in the Anglican conservative booklet *The Way of Faithfulness*: “Clearly sexual behaviour is one crucial test of our Christian obedience. What is a test of obedience is, moreover, a test of orthodoxy”<sup>437</sup> However, one of the main difficulties arising from the current debate is that homosexuality is an unstable term which means different things to different people at different times and in different places. Yet the term is often used in the religio-political language of the current global Anglican debate as if it was a homogeneous and generally understood term, creating much frustration and misunderstanding in the process. Thus, homosexuality has become the theoretically unstable ground upon which the ongoing battle for the power to define Anglican identity is being fought.

In her thesis, Hall describes how every society has purity codes related to aspects of bodily functions, including food and sex, which define certain behaviours or foods as dirty and unacceptable. How these codes are constructed and reinforced varies between cultural contexts and times as well as in the intensity with which they are enforced. Since the codes are taught to children from a very early age, most of us are unaware that the things we consider “dirty” are the result of socialisation rather than biological or natural. In the west, as the tightly controlled social order of the post-war societies of the 1950s gave way to the era of “the summer of love”, “flower power” and student movements of the 1960s, radical socio-cultural changes followed and many of the long-established purity codes were strongly criticised and questioned, especially in the realm

---

<sup>435</sup> Hall J Caroline *Homosexuality as a Site of Anglican Identity and Dissent*, Leeds: Leeds University, Department of Theology and Religious Studies (2009)

<sup>436</sup> Hall 2009, p.142

<sup>437</sup> Goodhew & Sinclair 1999, p.23



of sexual conduct. Decriminalisation of consensual homosexual behaviour started in 1967 in the UK (with strong support and leadership from the Church of England).<sup>438</sup> Within the next twenty years, similar developments took place in Australia, Canada, USA and other western countries with a strong Anglican presence. Consequently, during the last fifty years' purity codes have shifted so that behaviours which have hitherto been regarded as taboo are now increasingly accepted in western societies (although not universally so) and subsequently are conceived of as falling within the parameters of "normality". Yet, since this acceptance is not universal, in most western societies, rather than having one coherent universal purity code, there are now multiple codes at work simultaneously; leading to the prevailing (western) perception that sexual purity is mainly an individual and wholly private concern.<sup>439</sup> In contrast, historically, the very idea of marriage has been shaped by a very public recognition of heterosexual practice. It is bound up with the securing of those kinship structures – of both horizontal affinities and vertical generations – which have always been central to the very constitution of human society. Hence, marriage has to do with the "exchange" of men and women between social groups and with the procreation of children that secures the extension of lineages.<sup>440</sup> Sometimes, and especially with the advance of time (as in the case of Christianity), the personal union of man with woman has also been granted a special symbolic value and has been seen as offering a especially intense degree of spiritual intimacy. Presumably, this is one of the main motivations for liberals who have wanted to extend that state of being to homosexuals as well. Homosexuality has always existed in human societies and has sometimes been tolerated or even made into an essential phase of cultural development – as in ancient Athens, but also many native American and pre-Colombian cultures, where only people with an androgynous and/or bi-sexual identity were allowed to practice shamanism, for only they were regarded as being able to incorporate both the masculine and feminine forces of the cosmos. However, it is important to remember that the term homosexuality can only be used anachronistically when it comes to ancient history, since the concept, as understood in post-Freudian times, did not even exist in the minds of those who lived in ancient Greece or in pre-

---

<sup>438</sup> For examples see Hall 2009, p.210 and Furlong 2006, pp.116-126

<sup>439</sup> Countryman 1988, pp.11-99

<sup>440</sup> Milbank 2012a, p.1

Colombian America, although homosexual activity, obviously, did take place and therefore must have been a familiar concept; however, it did not bring the same connotations of identity that it has in contemporary societies. Nevertheless, until recently, even in the most tolerant of societies, homosexuality has not been linked to marriage. Therefore, there is no reason to assume that those opposing gay marriage are necessarily opposed to homosexual practice as such. For many opposing same-sex marriages from a religious point of view, the issue is rather: why should it now be thought that an inherently heterosexual institution should be extended to same-sex relations also?<sup>441</sup> Inevitably these changes in culture are affecting Christian theology and thought, and thus impacting the ecclesiology of The Anglican Communion. For that reason, it is beneficial to any would be Anglican ecclesiology to analyse the relationship between the changing cultural patterns and the current dynamics within Anglican ecclesiology.

### **Human Sexuality and The Anglican Link to Nation states**

In the current Anglian struggles regarding same-sex relationships, what seems to be happening is that there are two very different comprehensions, of the Anglican Communion which are at odds with each other: on the one hand there is what may be define as federalist model of Communion which emphasises the national and provisional independence of the Anglican Churches as an essential and innate principal of Anglicanism versus a model of Communion which gives prominence to the mutual accountability and interdependence of the Churches in the Communion. These are two very different interpretations of the nature of the Anglican Communion. In general, those who express scepticism of the Covenant's potential to centralise authority within the Communion tend to see the “Anglican Communion as a federation of Churches held together only by their common historical ancestry” rather than as an ecclesiastical body with a common identity (or identities) and sacramental life.<sup>442</sup> From this perspective, the Anglican Covenant is often interpreted as “a move towards the centralisation of power”.<sup>443</sup> A process

---

<sup>441</sup> Milbank 2012a, p.2

<sup>442</sup> See the discussion in “Children of Cain: The Oxymoron of American Catholicism” Radner & Turner 2006, pp.25-56.

<sup>443</sup> Spong 2005, pp.xii-xiii

which ultimately denies the full independence of each regional and national Church, a concept considered a vital and integral part of Anglican identity.<sup>444</sup> Thus, from these particular standpoint, the Covenant is regarded as an attempt to “force the Communion into a sense of unity” and risks “changing the Anglican Communion from a loose federation of legally independent Churches” to one which more closely resembles the “coercive and authoritarian structures of Rome”.<sup>445</sup> On the opposite side of the spectrum there is the model which upholds the Anglican Communion as a family of Churches with a common identity/identities and sacramental life, that goes beyond the scope of federalism.<sup>446</sup> From this point of view, the Covenant is often perceived as a tool for avoiding schism by bringing an increased degree of cohesion into inter-Anglican relationships, and abridging the current gap “between Holy Scripture and circumstance which is currently shredding the Communion apart”.<sup>447</sup> In opposition to the federalist model, those who uphold this latter model of Communion assert that the main strength of the Covenant was that it had the potential to affirm the mutual accountability of its member Churches.<sup>448</sup>

As recounted earlier, in the early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century the Anglican Communion was thrown into turmoil by two controversial and unilateral decisions made by some of its member Churches and the subsequent violent, intransigent reaction from some of their fellow Anglican Churches. It can be argued that, because of the full inter-communion, mutual recognition of Holy Orders and basic doctrinal unity which the Anglican Churches enjoyed prior to the current divide, the American Episcopal Church should not have decided over such a matter on its own, since, while no question of doctrine was involved, there is an issue of fundamental Church order: the bishop in question was involved in a sexual relationship outside marriage. However, one of the main challenges of this line of thought is that, up until now, there has been no defined tradition, procedural protocol or regularising

---

<sup>444</sup> Spong 2005, p.xiii

<sup>445</sup> McCord 2004, p.9

<sup>446</sup> Radner & Turner 2006, pp.120-121

<sup>447</sup> See the discussion in “Children of Cain: The Oxymoron of American Catholicism” Radner & Turner 2006, pp.25-56.

<sup>448</sup> Radner & Turner 2006, pp.120-121

cannon which can provide guidelines as to how such a pan-Anglican decision could be achieved.

Also, the efficiency of arguing for an Anglican consensus in the present situation is questionable, especially in regard to the fragile and complicated state of current inter-provincial relationships within the Communion. It may seem correct to say that within the Communion such a decisive shift in practice should await general consensus; and while this may ideally be true, it did not apply in the case of women's ordination. In this case, the felt need to show a prophetic witness within individual countries took precedence. Hence, it is understandable if people in the pews as well as theologians of a progressive/liberal tendency feel the same thing about the issue of acceptance of homosexuality. However, it is not a coincidence that the Churches arguing for a more radical recognition of same-sex relationships tend to come from nations with societies that as a whole have a more egalitarian attitude towards the LGBTQ community. Of course, nothing is that simple and there are exceptions to this general trend, for example the USA remains a deeply divided society on the issue of sexuality in general, while TEC in later years has adopted a liberal approach on most issues of sexuality and ethics.

In countries like Canada, Australia and the UK, governments have begun to move past debate and towards legislative change that is being implemented mainly according to secular and legalistic, liberal-rights based logic. This argues that marriage is a purely human construct and therefore may be defined (or redefined) regardless of any religious, ontological claims. From an ecclesiological perspective, there is something odd about the state claiming to have the power by law to change the definition of a natural and cultural reality which has historically preceded the existence of the state itself. An interesting feature about the arguments put forward by governments in favour of legalising same-sex marriage is that they have been, almost paradoxically, at once liberal and conservative. In liberal terms, it is understood as a matter of equal rights; by allowing same-sex marriages the state is simply fulfilling its axiomatic role of providing all citizens with equal rights, regardless of gender or sexual orientation. In conservative terms, it is a matter of expanding the natural and (assumed) self-evident good of faithful, long-term, monogamous relationships to homosexual couples.

However, those resisting the change – mostly, but not entirely, religious people – argue that the issue is being framed in the wrong way.<sup>449</sup> For them it is not a matter of extending the right, nor the teleological good, of marriage to gay people, but rather of redefining the very thing in which marriage consists. For centuries – indeed, for millennia – they argue, marriage has been understood as a conjugal relation between men and women linked to the natural bearing of children.<sup>450</sup> Which is why, from this perspective, there is something odd about the state claiming to have the power to change the definition of a natural and socio-cultural concept with strong religious connotations and origins. Another factor that adds to the discrepancy between Church and state in this matter is that according to Christianity, marriage is a gift from God and therefore it is not for the secular state to regulate. This is especially true of those traditions which regard marriage as a sacrament. From a religious perspective, the attempt by the state to redefine marriage is as alien and intrusive as if it attempted to force priests to break the seal of confession, if that, somehow, was ever found to be against the laws of civil society. Opponents also point out that neither the United Nations nor the European Union regard homosexual marriage as a human right; rather, it is seen as a matter that must be left to the judgement of civil law and, by implication, to local cultural consensus. Since a right to enter into heterosexual marriage is recognised, this means that currently the *ius gentium* – "international law" – recognises something specific about heterosexual union. The implication here is that to deny same-sex couples the right to marry is not to infringe their rights as human beings, because the right to marry only applies to human beings insofar as they are male and female. By analogy the right to a pension may be universal, but applies only to people over a certain age. Of course, this analogy falters in that, regardless of gender or sexual orientation, if you have employment and live long enough, any citizen will eventually qualify for a pension. It is very important to make a clear distinction, here, between liberal rights- based logic and genuine theological arguments, because the controversy surrounding same-sex marriage has now reached a fever pitch in countries like Australia, the UK and northern Europe as

---

<sup>449</sup> Milbank 2012a, p.1

<sup>450</sup> Milbank 2012a, p.5

governments have begun to move past debate and towards legislative change. In the USA there seems to be an all-out cultural war going on as more and more states attempt to make marriage open to same-sex couples. While such intensity can have the benefit of clarifying just what is at stake – on both sides of the argument – it can also obscure some of the deeper, intrinsically related issues; especially since, on theological and not liberal rights-based grounds, it is apparent that many within the Church feel that it has become intolerable to deny that faithful same-sex partnerships witness to the love of God and the inner life of the Trinity. Thus, the Church is very likely to find itself fighting on two fronts: both by continuing to deny that the state has the power to change the definition of marriage and, at the same time, offering a defence of nature under the embrace of sacramental grace.

### **The ties that bind:**

#### **The debate on homosexuality and Anglican unity**

Due to its historical role as the mother Church of the Communion, the Church of England has traditionally enjoyed a position of influence within the Anglican world. I think it would be fair to say that in modern times the prevailing view in the UK is that the C of E is a national Church that should be subordinate to the state and its policies, and, as far as possible, reflect the views of the British population. From this perspective, it is understood to be the role of the C of E to adjust itself to the new common sense of contemporary Britons, especially in the face of the current debate.<sup>451</sup>

Former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams has rightly rejected this view, in accordance with the traditions of the High Church and of Evangelicalism alike. During his time as archbishop, Williams systematically argued for the unity of the Church to take precedence over any temporary, national and/or cultural concerns. Standing in a lineage that would include, equally, Hooker, Wesley, Newman and Wilberforce – Archbishop Williams argued that the establishment of the Church of England does not imply a rubber-stamping of the current political consensus, but

---

<sup>451</sup> Milbank 2012b, p.2

rather the subordination of the state to the eternal unity of human beings in the God-Man Christ, as being the very test of the legitimacy of any human-made order.<sup>452</sup> This is not a reactionary argument seeking to pit the Church against any kind of liberal socio-cultural development, nor is it an arch-conservative entrenchment projecting a desire for the Church to remain impervious to the cultural and social developments in society, liberal or otherwise. Rather, Archbishop Williams' position is a radical assertion of the identity of the Church as not being subordinate to the secular state, while at the same time arguing that a simplistic, narrow-minded negligence of the theologically acceptable aspects of current social cultural change may seriously impair the preaching of the gospel and critically undermine the Anglican ethos of contextualisation. Moreover, the primacy of Church over state and the recognition of the Anglican Communion as part of the universal Church has hitherto not been involved any canonical submission to a global Anglican Communion. Instead, up until quite recently, the various Anglican Churches (some established in their own countries and others not) have been only loosely linked by a common respect for the see of Canterbury, which otherwise has enjoyed no magisterial nor juridical authority outside the realm of England – not even within Great Britain – since Scotland and Wales are both within separate archdioceses. On this basis, some voices from within the UK advocate a federalist model of Communion and argue that the Church of England must now look to itself “and not try to put an irreparable world-egg back together again”.<sup>453</sup> However, the archbishop's concern for the global Anglican Communion is no mere ecclesiological fantasy. It is, rather, an accurate response in the face of an increasingly globalised world which will continue to ensure that, not only individual Churches will progressively affect each other, but also that the internal troubles of one communion will, to an ever-greater extent, create potential trouble for another. Especially since the roots of the current crisis go beyond Anglicanism itself. This ties in to the previous outlay about the Church being defined, from its earliest origins, by its radical transcendence of ethnic and political boundaries.

---

<sup>452</sup> See for example: Williams, Rowan: *Anglican Identities*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd (2004). See also: Milbank 2012b, pp.2-3.

<sup>453</sup> Milbank 2012b, p.2

Hence, there is an intricate connection here between the ecclesiology of the Communion and the debate over homosexuality. As I've postulated earlier, the current debate is actually more symptomatic of the current inter-Anglican structural instability rather than the actual cause of it. In the following text, I will attempt to elaborate upon that connection.

### **Anglicanism versus the Modern Myth of Secularisation**

In his address to the Lambeth Conference of 2008, Lord Jonathan Sacks, Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the Commonwealth, was pithily penetrative and perceptive in drawing out the contrast between the secular notion of “a contract” (law) and the biblical understanding of covenant, and in so doing pitting the secular notion of power and wealth versus the holiness of covenantal life: “A contract is a transaction. A covenant is a relationship. Or to put it slightly differently: a contract is about interests. A covenant is about identity. It is about you and me coming together to form an ‘us’. That is why contracts benefit, but covenants transform.”<sup>454</sup>

In his address, Lord Sacks reminds us that a covenant is a kind of relationship. Two relationships which dominate many of our lives concern our employers and the government. These are about wealth (earning money, working) and power (the government’s rule enforced through the law). Rabbi Sacks suggested that a covenant is not about taking power or earning wealth:

The state is about power. The market is about wealth. And there are two ways of getting people to do what we want them to do. One of them is to force them to do it – the way of power. The other one is to pay them to – the way of wealth. But there is a third way, and to see exactly what makes the third way different from the other two [...] Imagine, for a moment, you have total power, and then, in the fit of craziness you decide to share it with nine other people. How much power do you have left? You have 1/10 of what you began with. Supposing you have a thousand pounds, and you decide to share it with nine other people. How much do you have left? 1/10 of what you had when you began. But now supposing that you decide to share not power or wealth, but love, or friendship, or influence, or even knowledge and you decided to share those, with nine others. How much would you have left? Would you have less than when you began? No,

---

<sup>454</sup> Jonathan Sacks, ‘The Relationship between People and God’, Lambeth Conference 28 July, 2008 available at: (2015.03.17; 22:08Hrs)



you would have more. Why? Because love, friendship and influence are things that only exist by virtue of sharing them with others. And those are the goods I call covenantal goods – covenantal goods are the goods that, the more I share, the more I have. And that makes covenant different from wealth and power.<sup>455</sup>

Anglican theologian Graham Ward notes how much of modern economics is based on the doctrine of scarcity.<sup>456</sup> This is made clear when looking in the role of the Christian doctrine of creation. Ward argues the modern nation state is based on an economic system of scarcity. This system assumes that, since all resources are limited, we must always be locked in deadly competition with one another for the resources we need in order to live. It makes conflict and violence the default reality of all human life. Any account of peace and goodness has to be reactive, a secondary attempt to bring order to chaos. However, the attempt will always be futile since the primary cause of the conflict, the perceived scarcity of resources, will not be solved by this methodology. The impersonal forces of scarcity and competition will sooner or later overthrow any man-made peace as long as they are allowed to constitute humanity's main motivational drive.

One of the thriving myths of secularisation is that it is, somehow, value neutral and objective, that it simply constitutes the supplementation of religious thought by pure reason and empirical, scientific methodology. However, as usual, the truth is more complicated. Secularism is not merely a neutral observable process in which beliefs and institutions, based on faith or religious authority, are supplanted by those based on science and reason alone. Secularism is not value neutral. It has a very prejudiced way of organising our world and our thinking. It is full of undisclosed value judgements. As a theory of religion (arguing that is a neutral point amongst all religious believers), it will impose its will and exclude all other ways of being in and valuing the world.

In addition, one of the most destructive features of this kind of secularist world view is the modern economic theory which assumes that we live in a perpetual situation of scarcity. According to this school of thought, we are indoctrinated into a belief system that tells us that there are only a limited number of goods and resources to go

---

<sup>455</sup> Jonathan Sacks, 'The Relationship between People and God', Lambeth Conference 28 July, 2008 available at: [\\_](#)(2015.03.17; 22:08Hrs)

<sup>456</sup> For a more in-depth discussion please see: Ward, Graham: *Cities of God*, London: Routledge, 2000.

around, so we have to compete and fight for them; capitalism being the most vivid and widespread contemporary expression of this philosophy. However, the socialist concept of state is equally antithetical to the gospel. Under a socialist state the mechanism of distribution of wealth runs (at least theoretically) along the parameters of “*From each according to his ability, to each according to his need (or needs)*” – thus summarising the Marxist theory that every person should contribute to society to the best of his or her ability and consume from society in proportion to his or her needs; such an arrangement is made possible by the abundance of goods and services that a developed communist/socialist society will produce. The idea is that there will be enough to satisfy everyone's needs. However, in reality this is just another scenario of competition for power. It may not be the market that decides about the distribution of wealth; instead this task falls upon the state, which governs through implementation of (secular) law, which, in order to implement its policy of distribution, must compete for power and influence against its own population of potential dissidents for ideological dominion. From this perspective the only difference is that the principal of capitalist competition in the form of individual citizens/consumers competing against each other in a “free market”, is replaced by the concept of the state that competes for power to govern and implement its policies.

Anglican theologian John Milbank states that Christian theology offers a totally different vision than any of the post-French-revolution concepts of the nation state: the true good is given by God, and is always abundant. According to Milbank, Christian doctrine of creation recounts that the Triune God is eternally self-emptying and as such is an endless source of life and love for His creation. There is always more than enough. Hence our lives are not defined by competition but by grace! For this reason, according to Milbank, the Church, with its unique life and model of Communion, provides a certain way of being in community which is part of *the essential* content of the Christian faith. “Believing without belonging” is just the consequence of the secular world's privatisation of religion into a domestic, individual sphere which poses no threat to the way things are: “Go ahead and be a Christian or a Buddhist or anything you like, just don't think we will let it affect any of your public life or the rest of society”.<sup>457</sup> Further,

---

<sup>457</sup> Milbank 1997, pp.227-229

Milbank states that secularism can tolerate any amount of private faith.<sup>458</sup> What it cannot tolerate is a community which seeks to embody an alternative to secularism in a material and social way. Christianity, uniquely, has this idea of community, which is what the Church should be all about: the Christian community mirrors what God is like. Milbank argues that, therefore, the Christian view of the world is incompatible with the modern concept of the nation state, because, unlike in most pagan religions, Christian doctrine states that God makes the world out of nothing, simply as a free expression of love; there is no pre-existing force, chaos or evil with which God has to fight to bring the world into being. The creation is perfect, peaceful and sufficient for all life.<sup>459</sup> It is not characterised by scarcity but by fullness. Consequently, the secular state or any other man-made, power-hungry institution, such as a mega-corporation or any for-profit business movement, becomes a “parasite” upon humanity, since it is bound and driven by the anti-gospel principle of competition, feeding of death and scarcity, demanding endless sacrifice. In contrast, Milbank argues that Christian virtue begins with the belief that “In the beginning there was only gift: no demon of chaos to be defeated, but a divine creative act; this virtue of giving was not required, was not necessary, and so was a more absolute good, complicit with no threat.”<sup>460</sup> Arguably, the most arresting parts of Milbank’s claim is that death itself is not part of creation. Sin “invents” death as it invents the contrast between good and evil. In the beginning, there was only good, only life. Milbank goes as far as to say:

It is, of course, quite simply impossible to be a Christian and to suppose that death and suffering belong to God's original plan, or that the struggle of natural selection (which one doubts is even prove as full account of evolution) is how creation *as creation* rather than thwarted creation genuinely comes about. To do so is to embrace a sickly masochistic faith, against the explicit words of scripture (and one note here the co-belonging of kenotic and evolutionary Christologies.)<sup>461</sup>

---

<sup>458</sup> Milbank 1997, pp.227-228

<sup>459</sup> Milbank 1997, pp.227-229

<sup>460</sup> Milbank 1997, p.228

<sup>461</sup> Milbank 1997, p.229

This accords with what Milbank calls the “ontological priority of peace over conflict”.<sup>462</sup> This means that peace and harmony are not things we have to cobble together out of the wreckage of the world, but the gifts that come first of all, the gifts that define reality, because they reflect the nature of the giver. God the Trinity is peace between Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is an idea that Milbank derives from Augustine, who in his own work contrasts the heavenly city of peace with the earthly city founded on war. From an ecclesiological perspective, these claims can seem very radical and perhaps even alien to the Anglican Communion, which was born out of an established Church. In order to establish the compatibility of these claims with the inherent nature of Anglicanism (if there is such a thing) we need then go straight to source, in the form of one of the founding pillars of Anglican ecclesiology, Richard Hooker.

### **Hooker and the National, Ecclesiological Identity of Anglicanism**

Richard Hooker is unquestionably one of the most defining theologians in the history of Anglicanism. He is especially important for this particular study because his writings are concerned almost entirely with ecclesiology and the nature of the Church. Together with other theologians such as Richard Field, Hooker's work has been normative in consolidating the architecture of Anglican ecclesiology. Hooker is also credited by Anglican scholars as being the first to truly identify Anglicanism (the term is used anachronistically in Hooker's case) and consolidating its identity.<sup>463</sup> Anglicanism, for Hooker, was a method as well as an institution. Certain aspects of Hooker's method, such as his distinctive hermeneutics of scriptures, human reason and the living tradition of the Church, fall outside the scope of this study. However, it is worth noticing that it was this particular comprehension of the Church which enabled him to defend the English Church as both catholic and reformed, episcopal and conciliar, against the criticisms of both Puritans and Papalists, alike. In addition, and perhaps most relevant to the present study, Hooker was crucial in establishing and defining the Anglican Church as a national entity.<sup>464</sup> But does that mean that Hooker wanted to establish that the identity of the Church was coterminous with that of the English nation state in an

---

<sup>462</sup> Milbank 1997, pp.227-230

<sup>463</sup> E.g.: Avis 2002, pp.31-32

<sup>464</sup> Kaye 2002, p.391

absolute way? Or did his ecclesiological design allow for a conceptualisation of the Church beyond that of national borders? The immediate answer may, at first glance, seem obvious since Hooker has often been perceived as the defender of the Elizabethan settlement, for which he has often been interpreted as defending a theory of Church and state as coterminous with that embodied in the Elizabethan settlement. But while it is obvious that he views the monarchy as the ruler and protector of both the secular and spiritual spheres of interests, is it possible – based on such a core element of Anglican ecclesiology as Hooker's ecclesiological designs, and while still respecting their integrity, in a credible way – to conceive of an Anglican Church which is indigenous and contextual, but not married to the notion of a nation state? The answer to that lies primarily in Hooker's conceptualisation of the authority of the monarchy over the Church. For Hooker, a child of the symbolic world of 16<sup>th</sup>-century England, royal supremacy was the symbolic representation of that single entity the nation, of which there were two parts, spiritual and secular. Thus, in Hooker's ecclesiological comprehension of the Church, the authority which the Crown exercises over the Church becomes a defining feature of Anglican ecclesiological identity. Consequently, it is in this question of authority within the Church that the possibility of a non-nationalist Anglican ecclesiological identity, that remains loyal to Hooker's ideas, may be explored.

Needless to say, Hooker's influence on the English tradition of the interpretation of church–state relations has been very significant. While the theory of the royal supremacy in the hands of someone like Stephen Gardiner (and a number of subsequent interpreters particularly in the 18<sup>th</sup> century) work on the (theoretical) assumption of an entirely united and religiously homogeneous society, the reality in 16<sup>th</sup> century England was one of diversity and division.<sup>465</sup> Anglican Scholar and theologian Bruce Kaye argues that Hooker sought to clarify the distinctions and differences that can be made between the Commonwealth and Church. Kaye claims that Hooker is well aware that, in history, the Crown has had spiritual and temporal authority and that some of his contemporaries argued not just for a distinction but for an actual separation of the commonwealth from the Church. However, as Kaye notes, in England at the time Hooker was writing *Church and Commonwealth*, the monarchy and the Church were

---

<sup>465</sup> See especially, Gascoigne J., 'Church and State Unified: Hooker's Rationale for the English Post-Reformation Order', *Journal of Religious History*, 21, 1997, pp.23-34

very much an overlapping jurisdictional and political affair, which was “the political reality with which his argument was concerned”.<sup>466</sup>

Having established the socio-political context within which Hooker formulated his ecclesiological designs, Kaye then also establishes that Hooker developed his ecclesiological outlook from the perspective of the necessity of order in society, and order that comes from the Crown /Church political nucleus. “Without order there is no living in public society, because the want thereof is the mother of confusion, whereupon division of necessity follows, and out of division inevitable destruction.”<sup>467</sup> Noticeably, however, Hooker argues that Christian monarchs do not have their power and their Dominion “simply without exception of anything”.<sup>468</sup> In other words, according to Hooker, the dynamics of authority and national identity are such that the Crown is held under God and refers only to the territory of the particular kingdom. Within that kingdom the spiritual dominion of this Christian monarch (of what is presumably a Christian society) may not be overruled by any foreign jurisdiction. However, as Kaye argues, Hooker is aware that not all nations are Christian, nor all monarchies are integral to the Church.<sup>469</sup> In other words it is possible, based on Hooker's work, to conceive of a Church which is contextualised and indigenous, just not on English soil. But what about the role of the monarch in the ecclesiology of the Church?

Hooker is clear that the monarch of Christian a society such the English is not in the position of the judges in ancient Israel who received their authority and power directly from God. There is no question that, according to Hooker, the monarch is enthroned according to human rule, as the Christian head of a Christian society. However, once that has been established, the members of such a society have to recognise the authority of said monarch as part of their Christian pattern of obedience. In other words, Hooker does not argue for the divine power of Kings. Rather he emphasises that the source of a subject's obedience to the monarch is not that the monarch's power is divine in nature, but that the subject's pattern of obedience to Christ inherently implies obedience to their monarch, but only when and if said monarch has

---

<sup>466</sup> Kaye 2002, pp.391-392

<sup>467</sup> Laws, 8.2.1

<sup>468</sup> Laws, 8.2.3

<sup>469</sup> Kaye 2002, p.392

been established by the Church as the rightful ruler of their nation.<sup>470</sup> Here, Hooker is addressing a specific context, namely that of England, where, at the time, the rule of the monarch was a voluntary rule, by agreement. In England “the people are in no subjection but such as willingly themselves have, condescended unto for their own most behoof and security.”<sup>471</sup> It is clear then that for Hooker the rule of the monarch over the nation and its church, theoretically at least, is based on a voluntary social contract and does not signify the *sine qua non* of the nature of the Church. In terms of the defining of authority and covenant theology, Kaye argues that Hooker's contract theory is built on the assumption of voluntary remaining, and by public acceptance of the royal authority:

May then a body politic at all times withdraw in whole or in part that influence of Dominion which passes from it if inconvenience doth grow thereby? It must be presumed that supreme governors will not in such case oppose themselves and be stiff in detaining that, the use whereof is with publique detriment.<sup>472</sup>

In other words, according to Hooker the amount of authority and power which the monarch has is that power which was originally agreed upon and subsequently accepted either overtly or by silent consent. Thus, Hooker reasons that the extent of the monarchy's authority is that which is best for the people and is related to the rule of law both within the Crown and the Church: "I mean not only the law of nature and of God but every national or municipal law consonant thereunto. Happy that people, whose law is their King in the greatest things than that who's King is himself their law."<sup>473</sup> According to Hooker, such law is derived from the power of the monarch according to its use and purpose in serving the common good of the people, which in Hooker's ecclesiological design includes the good of the soul.

Kaye points out that it is important to notice that Hooker then goes on to explain that this sort of “kingship” differs from Christ's own, on three main points. 1) Order: Christ's kinship is overall and all encompassing, the monarch's is not. 2) In terms of measure: It is less in extent than Christ's, which has no geographical or political limitations. 3) In its kind: The kingship of the monarch relates to externals whereas

---

<sup>470</sup> Laws, 8.2.1, 8.2.3, 8.2.3

<sup>471</sup> Laws, 8.3.2

<sup>472</sup> Laws, 8.3.2

<sup>473</sup> Laws, 8.3.3

Christ's kinship is universal and relates to all aspects of the human condition. "The headship which we give unto Kings is altogether visibly exercised and ordereth only the external frame of the churches affayres here amongst us, so that it plainly differeth from Christs even in very nature and kinde."<sup>474</sup> As Kaye points put, Hooker does appoint the monarch the authority to call General assemblies for all of society, and such an assembly may (or may not) involve and include the Church; but Hooker clarifies that the powers of the monarch to make ecclesiastical laws when in such an assembly derive mainly from the authority to deny proposals rather than to formulate them. In addition, the monarchy has the power of making ecclesiastical judgments and appointing ecclesiastical administrators and governors (e.g bishops and clergy). Thus, Kaye claims, Hooker does not commit himself to the doctrine of the divine right of kings; for that would be to confuse the distinction between Christ's Lordship and the dominion of the Crown, in particular the character of Christ's moral Lordship and the need for order in human society.<sup>475</sup> It would also place the monarch in too privileged a position in relation to law and the law. This then goes to show that Hooker's view of royal supremacy and authority in the Church is a fairly restricted one, with clear delimitation on how that power can and cannot be wielded. It is heavily contextualised according to the English political reality of his own time and situation. So, while it is true that Hooker projects an overlapping identity between the Church and the political community, he does so not only in terms of its overlapping membership (the baptised) but also on the grounds that they share a single purpose. On this point Hooker uses Aristotle's view that the end of political life is not just living but "living well".<sup>476</sup> In other words Church and state are coterminous only in that they encompass the same people and share the same goal. The latter takes on the form of pragmatic agreement for the common good, rather than as a theologically essential aspect of the Church. The former is a virtual impossibility in a world that is so religiously diverse as our planet during the first century of the second millennium. So, while it is true that, as Kaye writes, in a Christian country with a Christian king, religion comes within the compass of the meaning of the term "living well" this is not necessarily true of all societies.<sup>477</sup> This brings forward another, rather

---

<sup>474</sup> Laws, 8.4.5

<sup>475</sup> Kaye 2002, p.398

<sup>476</sup> Laws, 8.1.4

<sup>477</sup> Kaye 2002, p.398



radical feature of Hooker's ecclesiological design, namely his strong emphasis for the need of the community to be involved in the execution of authority, as a test against royal supremacy that could potentially establish itself in absolute terms as a universal principle in all political circumstances, including that of the Church.<sup>478</sup> Hooker's emphasis on the role of the community in the exercising of authority is truly radical, especially in its 16<sup>th</sup>-century setting. It would then seem possible, based on Hooker's own ecclesiology, to conceive of an Anglican Church where the rule of the monarch is not an imperative necessity, and thus would fall outside the framework of the nation state, especially if such an Anglican Church was to be conceived beyond English shores.

Thus, Hooker can be read as one of the pioneers of the Anglican ethos of contextualisation. He took what he understood to be his own contemporary reality (16<sup>th</sup>-century England) and conceived of an ecclesiology founded upon that particular setting, formulated according to how he perceived that the Church needed to function within that unique context. Bruce Kaye notes how significant it is that in Hooker's method the common good and the well being of the community becomes the measure for the relevance and applicability of his ecclesiological design, as well as the location of its particular exposition.<sup>479</sup> Following the spirit of Hooker, the door opens for a reflection of what is needed in our times, in terms of transcending the Anglican national identities and expanding the borders of the current comprehension of what Anglicanism is and can be.

### **The Leviathan: Salvation by State**

In the following pages, I will elaborate further on the doctrinal dichotomy between the Church (as a unique expression of physical Communion) and the modern state (and its ideal of social contract). In this endeavour, I will borrow from William T. Cavanaugh's essay *The City: Beyond Secular Parodies*, which focuses on the subject of the quasi-theological and soteriological claims of the modern state. William T. Cavanaugh is senior research professor at the Center for World Catholicism and Intercultural Theology and is also professor of Catholic studies at DePaul University. Cavanaugh has

---

<sup>478</sup> Kaye 2002, pp.398-400 and Laws, 8.3.3; Laws, 8.4.5; Laws, 8.1.4

<sup>479</sup> Kaye 2002, p.400

contributed to the Radical Orthodoxy movement and although his essay is not specifically about Anglicanism, his work is relevant to this study because it is very penetrative in revealing the mutual exclusivity of the anthropological and soteriological claims of both Church and State. Cavanaugh traces this dichotomy to the very genesis of the modern theories of state and their theistic roots in the *Enlightenment* period.

In *The City: Beyond Secular Parodies*, Cavanaugh writes about how the primeval stories told by the classical theorists of the modern state begin from a state of fallen nature and how these, despite their criticism of Christianity and their propagation of secularism, tend to parody Christian tradition, especially in the fact that they tend to see the state as a *soteriological* agent, delivering humanity from a state of uncivilised chaos and fallen nature into one of civility and well-being under the patronage of the modern state; but unlike Christianity these theorists tend to remain ambiguous in terms of identifying the origins of such a fallen state of humanity.<sup>480</sup> Rousseau, not identifiably Christian, assumes an original state of freedom for humanity, but is agnostic on the cause of its loss – *How did this change from freedom into bondage come about?* Cavanaugh points out that none of the philosophers who have brought forth the notion of the modern nation state such as Rousseau, Hobbes and Locke, make any effort in trying to identify or describe a pristine, pre-fall, state. In fact, they tend to regard the state of nature as being ordained by God, beginning with Adam.<sup>481</sup> From an ecclesiological perspective it is important to see that this *mythos* establishes human government not on the basis of a primal unity, but from an assumption of the essential individuality of the human race. When Rousseau says that humanity was born free, he means free primarily from one another; by way of contrast, in the Christian interpretation of Genesis, the condition of true human freedom is participation in God with other humans. English philosopher Thomas Hobbes famously points to a natural state of *bellum omnis contra omnes*, which he derives from the formal equality of all human beings, and the more liberal and sanguine Locke agrees on the essential individuality of humanity in the state of nature:<sup>482</sup>

---

<sup>480</sup> See: Cavanaugh, William T “The City: Beyond Secular Parodies” in *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology*, John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock, Graham Ward (eds). London: Routledge, 1999

<sup>481</sup> Cavanaugh 1999, p.182-183

<sup>482</sup> A Latin phrase meaning "the war of all against all," is the description that Thomas Hobbes gives to human existence in the state of nature thought experiment that he conducts in *De Cive* (1642) and *Leviathan* (1651.)

To understand the political power aright, and derive from its original, we must consider what estate all men are naturally in, and that is, a state of perfect freedom to roder their actions, and dispose of their possessions and persons as the think fit, within the bounds of the law of Nature, without asking leave or depending upon the will of any other man.<sup>483</sup>

Hobbes, Rousseau, and Locke all agree that the state of nature is one of individuality; individuals come together on the basis of social *contract*, each individual entering society in order to protect person and property. Further, although the essential individualism of the state of nature contrasts with the created unity of the human race found in the Christian interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2, both accounts (Christianity and secular state) agree that salvation is essentially a matter of making peace among competing individuals. In other words, it is in sotereology that the ends of the Christian *mythos* and the state *mythos* seem to coincide. However, under the *sotereology* of the state, an individualist direction or relationship between mine and thine is inscribed into modern anthropology, as the given nature of the world. Hobbes paints this competition among individuals in the starkest terms: two people in the state of nature, by nature equal, will want what only one can have. From the natural equality of humans therefore arises the war of all against all, from which the *Leviathan* (the man-made power of the state)– enacted by social contract – saves us. *Leviathan* was the name Hobbes gave the man-made state in his theory of civil government: the state, according to the philosopher, might be regarded as a great artificial man or monster (Leviathan), composed of men, with a life that might be traced from its generation under the pressure of human needs to its dissolution through civil strife proceeding from human passions. Therefore, Hobbes argues for a social *contract* and rule by an absolute sovereign.

Christian theology, on the other hand, offers a totally different vision than any of these modernist concepts of the nation state (such as proposed by Rosseau, Hobbes and Locke). Christian doctrine teaches that the true good is given by the Triune God of Christianity who is eternally self-emptying (*kenosis*) and thus constitutes and endless source of life and love for His creation. Therefore, humanity's natural state is that of a living in relationship of participation with God (or in other words a Covenant!). It is sin

---

<sup>483</sup> Hobbes 1651, p.118

which distorts that natural relationship with our creator and thwarts it into establishing *contractual* relationships with each other, under the paradigm of competition for limited resources. For this reason the Church, with its unique life and model of Communion, provides a certain way of being in community which is *the essential* content of the Christian faith, but which is also incompatible with the modern concept of the nation state. It follows then that a step towards the dissolution of the national identity and the nationalist limitations of the Christian Church is a positive one. Provided that this is a step towards a more catholic (universal) embrace of the self-understanding of the Church. As elaborated upon earlier, the covenant model is harmonious with the Anglican Concept of Communion. Furthermore, from the perspective of covenant theology, the state (the Leviathan) is constructed on a philosophical basis which is diametrically opposed to Christian doctrine, which makes the two not only incompatible but inherently and mutually exclusive. This resonates with Lord Rabbi Sacks' comments on the concept of contract versus covenant, in which the former is a transaction whereas a covenant is a relationship; a contract is about interests, a covenant about identity.<sup>484</sup>

### **The Church, Covenant and A True *Religio***

As shown above, in *The City: Beyond Secular Parodies*, Cavanaugh opens with a biblical narrative, using the New Testament writings of Paul and John, alongside patristic texts, to present Christianity's story of creation, fall and redemption as "the loss and regaining of a primal unity".<sup>485</sup> This is central to his political theology, for, as Cavanaugh argues, modern social contract theorists such as Hobbes (but also Locke and Rousseau) were attempting, fundamentally, to redeem human society from the effects of brokenness (e.g. pride, violence, theft, war) through the mechanism of the state. Cavanaugh deems these efforts a failure, arguing that the mythos of the state is based on "a 'theological' anthropology which precludes any truly social process"; we relate to our fellows not as participatory creatures of the *Imago Dei*, but as bearers of individual rights; thus, the formal mechanism of contract precludes full integration of the individual and the group by the state. Furthermore, Cavanaugh suggests that the

---

<sup>484</sup> Jonathan Sacks, 'The Relationship between People and God', Lambeth Conference 28 July, 2008 available at: (2005.03.17; 22:08Hrs)

<sup>485</sup> Cavanaugh 1999, pp.182-183

resulting corporate body is perverse at its core, leading, as “Hobbes foresaw...with his usual clarity”, to a commonwealth in which “the members cohere, not as in a natural body to one another, but only to the sovereign”. Hence, modern political soteriology obliterates local communities in favour of the universal state. This is especially relevant to ecclesiology since the Church provides a certain way of being in community which is not only antithetical to the *Leviathan*, but which is part of the *essential* content of the Christian faith. As a social doctrine, state soteriology is antithetical to the nature of the Church, for the Church as communion and the Body of Christ mirrors the very nature of the triune God. From an ecclesiological perspective, this is not an uncomplicated notion. The following is, therefore, an attempt to further examine upon what basis the Church, as a unique kind of community and agent of God's will, can claim to provide the true *religio*, which binds us to each other and, ultimately, to the salvific Body of Christ, rejecting the modern state's *religio* of habitual discipline as the means of binding us one to another.

In her book *After Writing*, Anglican theologian and co-founder of the Radical Orthodoxy school Catherine Pickstock discusses the words attributed to Jesus in the gospel accounts of the Last Supper, which are spoken again by the priest at the Eucharist as the bread and wine are consecrated. She makes the following claim: “*the words of consecration “This is my body”, therefore, far from being problematic in their meaning, are the only words which certainly have meaning, and lend this meaning to all other words*”.<sup>486</sup> This seems an extraordinary thing to say. The words she quotes have been the subject of intense controversy within the Church since the Reformation. To those outside the Church, they might sound strange, superstitious or simply irrelevant. But Pickstock suggests that these are actually the only words that heal the split between words and things; in the sacramental presence, the barrier between the physical, natural aspects and the spiritual and supernatural reality is completely overcome and transcended. All of creation shares in the nature of God and therefore participating in God (covenant theology) is essential to the fulfilment of the Divine will, which, as previously seen is contrary to the soteriology of the modern state, be it under capitalism, socialism or any other social system (or man-made institution) that has competition—

---

<sup>486</sup> Pickstock 1998, p 264

either for resources or for the power to distribute them – as its main driving force. From an ontological perspective, this means that the natural only has meaning because it looks towards the supernatural; all matter, bodies, culture and time have an eternal source of meaning, which does not stem from within themselves, but comes from the Creator, who is eternally self-emptying (*kenosis*). Human beings are called to embody and reflect this relationship of participation in God in a conscious way:

The natural human destiny that looks towards the supernatural vision of God is only the outworking in a conscious, knowing and willing created nature of the paradox of creation as such: it is of itself nothing, and only exists by participation.<sup>487</sup>

We participate in God through forgiveness and the generosity that are the essence of peace and harmony. The Christian interpretation of humanity is inseparable from this end point, our destiny is *beatification* – to be made like God. This is what Thomas of Aquinas formulated as humanity sharing in the “beatific vision”. However, this final beatitude is not individualistic, because all of creation exists to participate in God, all of creation exists by participation, which is the very essence of a relationship of covenant. There is nothing that exists which is not a gift from God. So, there cannot be any more all-encompassing reality, or surer ground (doctrinally and philosophically) to stand on than a theology based on faith in this vision; in other words, an ecclesiology based on a relationship of covenant and of participation in God. In the words of Henri de Lubac, the Church is the “universal sacrament of salvation”.<sup>488</sup> Though this notion of the Church as a sacrament has patristic roots, it owes its modern articulation not least to de Lubac, who wrote this in his book *Catholicism* (1938): “*If Christ is the Sacrament of God, the Church is for us the Sacrament of Christ; she represents him, in the full and ancient meaning of the term; she really makes him present.*”<sup>489</sup>

## **Church, Sacrament and Eucharistic Anarchy**

The above given comprehension of the Church as a sacrament, such as expressed in the

---

<sup>487</sup> Milbank 2003, p.114

<sup>488</sup> De Lubac 1938, p.73

<sup>489</sup> De Lubac 1938, p, 76

theology of Pickstock and de Lubac, is very much in harmony with Anglican theology. In response to the failures of Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and other modern political philosophers, Anglican theologians such as Cavanaugh, Pickstock and Milbank propose a vision of politics informed by what Cavanaugh has named *Eucharistic Anarchism*.<sup>490</sup> The anarchy of which he speaks is not chaos, but rather a challenge to the false order of the state – a true *religio* that binds us to each other and, ultimately, to the salvific Body of Christ. This vision of the Church as the Body of Christ offers the Eucharist as a diffusion of “the false theology and the false anthropology of will and right”, a sweeping effacement of the distinction between mine and thine, a radical questioning of property and *dominium*, the proper integration of the individual and the group, and the actualisation of diverse communities through shared participation in the divine life. “Whereas in the modern state the center either vindicates the rights of property against the marginalized or takes direct concern for the welfare of the marginalized out of our hands [...] in Christ the dichotomy of center and periphery is overcome”.<sup>491</sup> By resolving the dilemma of the many and the one, by unmasking the falsity of this antithesis of local and universal, the Eucharistic community redefines boundaries, citizenship and earthly practices of peace and reconciliation. Eucharistic anarchism, as defined by Cavanaugh, may not be fully realisable in the world in time (at least not on this side of the Eschaton), however what is not only applicable but absolutely essential is its tenet about the salvation mythos of the state – the state *religio* – as a distortion of true hope, and that the resources for resisting this distortion are provided by the Christian tradition, and I believe, embodied in the principals of what may be defined as an Anglican theology of Covenant:

For the most part, Christians have accepted the integrating role of the state on the assumption that the state is a ‘secular’ and therefore neutral apparatus for the working out of conflict among disparate interests. To see the state instead as an alternative soteriology is to begin to notice the inherent conflict between state practices and the practices, such as the Eucharist, which Christians take for granted. True peace depends not on the subsumption of this conflict, but on a recovered sense of its urgency.<sup>492</sup>

---

<sup>490</sup> Cavanaugh 1999, p.196

<sup>491</sup> Cavanaugh 1999, p.196

<sup>492</sup> Cavanaugh 1999, p.198

This is a calling of believers to the very battle that Hobbes' Leviathan was expressly designed to abolish. Therefore, it is necessary that, in harmony with Richard Hooker's method of taking the empirical reality as he saw it in 16<sup>th</sup>-century England and making something of it in theological terms, the Anglican Church must incorporate into its DNA the contemporary and empirical reality that a national identity implies a marriage to the identity of the state – which, as I have attempted to demonstrate in this essay, is ultimately incompatible with Christian doctrine. Therefore, the Anglican Church must learn to transcend or perhaps even abandon its nationalist identities which, conscious or not, willingly or unwillingly, inevitably bind it to the contemporary, modernist interpretation of state. This brings us, once again, back to the origin of the current threat of schism within the Anglican Communion.

### **An Ecclesiological Outlook on the Issue of Same-Sex Relationships**

The present threat of schism within the Communion represents not only a danger to Anglican unity but constitutes a potential tear in the fabric of the whole universal Church. Anglicans, Roman Catholics, along with Orthodox Christians, Protestants and Evangelicals and those of dissenting Churches, increasingly find themselves involved in a common struggle against a culture of atheism and individualism in the West and Global North. In addition, it is a fact that the Church exists within an increasingly globalised world which will continue to ensure that not only individual Churches will progressively affect each other, but also, that the internal troubles of one communion will, to an ever-greater extent, create potential trouble for another. The Anglican Communion is one of the largest united bodies of Christians in the world, and if it is currently riven by issues of sex and gender, then it would be complacent to imagine that any other tradition or group of Christians will remain immune to tensions, or even divisions, concerning these dimensions of human life, especially since the roots of the current crisis actually go beyond Anglicanism itself. Consequently, no denomination or church can afford to view with indifference the prospects of their sister communion. Thus, the current dilemmas of the Anglican Church are not of a merely local or sectional concern, but a global one, with potential consequences for millions of people all over the world. In the discussion that is currently taking place on how (and if) to restore the



Communion, it's easy to put all the blame on TEC or to make the first “openly gay” bishop Gene Robinson the fall guy for the failings of the Communion. It is equally tempting to explain away the objection of certain bishops to the Church’s approval of homosexual relations as merely the result of narrow-mindedness and failure of Enlightenment. Unfortunately, these snap judgements have often been made, both in the portrayal of the conflict by the media (liberal and conservative alike) and in the debate within Anglicanism, which has further exacerbated the inflammatory nature of “gay rights” within the Church. I am certain that much of the schism-threatening controversy could have been avoided if the rhetoric with which the conflict has been conducted had been wielded with greater responsibility and moderation. After all, TEC has been ordaining openly “gay” clergy since the late 70s, without provoking any reaction commensurate to that which is accompanying the current global Anglican crisis. Both sides have often failed to keep the integrity of the Church in the prominent place it should occupy in such a discussion; maintaining that integrity should be a primary concern of any Church leader, no matter what views he or she may hold.

Archbishop Rowan Williams, speaking to the Anglican delegates attending the World Council of Churches assembly in Porto Alegre (Brazil) in 2006, said that one of the biggest difficulties of the current crisis is that Anglicans are failing to recognise the patterns of obedience to Christ in one another.<sup>493</sup> one of the unfortunate consequences of it is that the plurality and diversity of the Churches of the Anglican Communion is increasingly viewed as an issue of concern and a burden, rather than as a source of joy and inspiration. As stated earlier, part of the reason for this is that the Anglican Communion is shaped by a classic, modern and Anglo-Saxon centred theology. Perhaps we should not view the current tensions within the Communion as a failure to standardise, legislate or regulate things, but instead as a challenge posed to Anglicans all over the world to once more learn to recognise in each other our different and diverse patterns of obedience to Christ. Unfortunately, both the conservative model of achieving unity within the Communion through legislation (as expressed in doctrinal statements and agreements such as the Dallas Statement and the Jerusalem Declaration, and, at least initially, the Anglican Covenant), as well as the liberal model of a federation of

---

<sup>493</sup> Williams 2006: “Plenary on Christian identity and religious plurality: Address to the World Council of Churches, Porto Alegre, Brazil, 2006.02.12.”

independent national churches, end up putting the Communion at risk. Earlier generations of scholars tended to search for an archetypal ‘apostolic liturgy’, believing that, behind the accretions of later centuries, there was a common nucleus which could be traced back to New Testament times. More recently, however, scholars have recognised the existence of a far greater diversity in the practice of the early centuries, and have suggested that what was common was an archetypal shape and structure of both the organisation and rites of the early Christian communities.<sup>494</sup> Yet it is now emerging that even this cannot be accepted without some qualification. More variations in structure between different communities are beginning to be detected from the evidence, suggesting that there was much more pluriformity in the development of early Christian tradition than was thought probable, only a few decades ago.<sup>495</sup> The Anglican ethos of Communion, of endeavouring to maintain not only different, but often contradicting and sometimes even mutually exclusive, traditions within the same Church is, conceivably, a direct expression of this early Apostolic and patristic vision of the Church. In fact, as discussed above, though itself born out of the early modern era, the Anglican Communion can be conceived of as contemporary incarnation of that proto-orthodox comprehension of the Church, which is capable of making the Communion of Churches which the Apostles and the earliest fathers of the Church envisioned, into an ecclesiastical reality. As a Communion, the worldwide Anglican Church shows the same diversity, and sometimes even contradicting plurality, as the proto-orthodox Church once did, all held together by a deeply rooted desire to stay in Communion as a sign of obedience to Christ. Thus, it represents a comprehension of the Church that existed before both ecclesiastical monarchism as well as Congregationalism sprung into the centre stage of Christianity. This is a valuable contribution to the universal Church. However, in order to safeguard this precious Anglican legacy, it is necessary to achieve a common theoretical ground upon which to base any future dialogue. The fragile and complex state of the relationships within and between some of the member Churches of the Anglican Communion is proof that the dialogue so far has been less than fruitful. It is also questionable whether the Communion could bear the financial burden and political cost of another series of grand-scale meetings in order to

---

<sup>494</sup> Ehrman 2000, pp. 2-3

<sup>495</sup> Bradshaw 2001, p.2

attempt (again) to come to terms with the current doctrinal discrepancies. It is crucial for the formulation of a working ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion to provide the underpinnings of a theoretical ground, acceptable to both parties. In other words, for such an ecclesiology to be feasible it must have within it the potential to contribute to a more nuanced and well-balanced dialogue, without leaving the boundaries of orthodoxy. However, such an enterprise is much more complex than simply finding a compromised balance between *hyper* and *hypo* orthodoxy. For if balance is defined as the be all and end all of the Church, then moderation and not orthodoxy will become the main pillar of doctrine. As stated above, there is such a thing as excessive balance, which often comes in the form of what Michael Ward calls “doctrinal and theological lukewarmness”.<sup>496</sup> Arguably, it is precisely this lack of definition and over-compromising attitude that has caused the Anglican Communion to lose its sense of direction and fall down a slippery slope of unstable compromises and non-functioning structures, eventually landing it in the predicament it's currently in. In the end, it all comes down to praxis and the actual applied theology in the life of the Church: the only thing keeping the Anglican Communion together is the desire of the people in its pews, rectories and bishops' palaces, to stay in Communion. The institutions of the Anglican Communion will become meaningless if its people do not wish to stay in communion with each other. It is people and not institutions that stay in communion; institutions may uphold agreements and accords and theology might help clarify the purpose of their existence, but it is people that put life into them.

### **National Identities, The Covenant and the Future of the Communion**

The early years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century have seen some dramatic developments within Anglicanism which have led to different and sometimes seemingly incompatible ways of understanding what it means to be a member of the Anglican Communion. Nevertheless, the historical facts are that there have always been many different traditions within Anglicanism. By mixture of historical accident and design there is today a veritable synthesis of churchmanships and traditions alive within the Communion. When this fact is forgotten, theology, and consequently ecclesiology,

---

<sup>496</sup> Ward 2007, pp.133-34

becomes idealistic and the Church it speaks of is not the historical Church we know. Such an ecclesiology becomes disembodied and an overly romanticised, a distorted ideal, which can easily fall victim to partisanship and/or lack of knowledge of what is on the other side of the current divide. This is one of the biggest challenges that the Covenant, in some ways, has failed to tackle. While it clearly expresses a vision of the Anglican Communion as much more than “a loose federation of churches” it did not manage to convincingly put across the importance that Anglican unity cannot be centred simply on a shared set of beliefs, rather it must be centred on a *shared life*.<sup>497</sup> What needs to be emphasised is that “belonging to, the realization of, subsistence in, and the presence of the Church universal” in the local Church, is critical for a community to be a Church in the fullest sense. Therefore, the centre of a shared Anglican life cannot be a formulation on how to handle descending parties (valuable as that may be in some cases), but rather that how valuable it is to keep alive the conception of the Anglican Communion as a Church or “a fellowship of churches *within* the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church”.<sup>498</sup> In addition, the current crisis seems to reveal that, because of its richness and vast plurality, the Communion lacks a natural underpinning cohesion (other than that of mutual affection) and seems to be in need of a reinvigorated epistemological underpinning, an articulated *raison d’etre*, a rationale of existence. That is why, the Anglican Covenant should be interpreted as constituting part of a process of learning “what on the other side” of the divide. I believe this is possible because the Covenant is not intended to be a detailed doctrinal confession. Neither does it aim to change or amend doctrine. Rather, the Covenant aims to restate long-established Anglican teaching by affirming what the Provinces of the Communion have in common, and therefore, may aid in building a foundation for a future where Churches live together in mutual care and affection as one Communion. As written above, from an Anglican ecclesiological perspective, an isolated Church is less than a Church tied to a universal body. It follows then that a step towards the dissolution of the national identity and the nationalist limitations of these imply within a Church, is a positive one. However, it is important to make a strong differentiation between the innate Anglican ethos of cultural contextualization and indigenisation, and the marriage to the secular notion of a nation

---

<sup>497</sup> The Anglican Communion: The Anglican Communion Covenant, articles: 3.2.3 & 3.2.6

<sup>498</sup> Lambeth Conference 1930, Resolution: 49, online version available at: [f](#) (2011.0319; 22:28hrs)

states, which comes with the claim of a national identity. In other words, it is of vital importance to safeguard the Anglican spirit of emphasising the local representation and expression of the Church in terms of culture, ethnic heritage and social context, without claiming loyalty to a particular nation state.

## **Chapter VII:**

# **When Anglican Ecclesiological Identities Transcend Nation states**

### **Introduction**

As written earlier, a disembodied ecclesiology which does not reflect the reality of the historical Church runs the risk not only of becoming a “pipe dream”, but also a distorted ideal which is not grounded on the actual life of the Church. Consequently, any ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, such as the one proposed in this thesis, needs to be grounded on the practical examination of how it can be (or has already been) applied within the life of the Anglican Communion. For that reason, the following part follows the previous investigation of the more theoretical aspects of the link between Anglican ecclesiological identities and nation states, with a study of how Churches “on the ground” have developed their ecclesiological identities in relation to their national contexts. Let us therefore return to the three chosen “real-life cases” of Chile, Japan and Malawi.

### **Origins of Anglicanism in Chile**

As described in the beginning of this thesis, Anglicanism in Chile traces its historical roots to the pastoral work carried out by chaplaincies caring for British (and later American) expatriates during the 19th century. However, it is important to stress that these pastoral initiatives were not confined only to these groups. In 1844 Captain Allen Gardner of the Royal Navy founded the “Patagonian Mission”. Twenty years later the organisation changed its name to the “South America Missionary Society” (SAMS).<sup>499</sup> This society combined pastoral care for expatriate Anglicans with a committed, pioneering missionary endeavour among the native peoples of the Southern Cone. Some of the SAMS’ most important work has been among the Araucanian Indians in Chile

---

<sup>499</sup> Every 1915, p.1

and the Chaco tribes of Paraguay and northern Argentina.<sup>500</sup> Consequently, until the mid-20th century the Anglican presence in Chile was confined mainly to chaplaincies whose principal concern was with British and American expatriates, and to missionary work among the indigenous people in rural areas. Due to the political and socio-economic reasons stated above, no real and systematic attempts were made to reach out to the predominantly Hispanic populations of the cities. This made Anglicanism a rather alien and marginal religious movement in Chile. It was not just that very few people belonged to it, or that it was openly antagonistic to the Roman Catholic Church; it was also that none of the ethnic groups chiefly comprising the Anglican community regarded themselves as part of the Chilean national culture in which they lived. The British and Americans saw themselves as immigrants or temporary guests and the indigenous people had always been outside the mainstream Hispanic and Ibero-American culture, invariably seeing themselves as belonging to a different nation altogether, one marginalized, oppressed, and discriminated against by the Ibero-American settler élite. There have been armed uprisings of the native peoples of Chile (and other parts of South America) up until the present day, and there still exist uncomfortable tensions between the descendents of Hispanic colonialists and the native peoples.

The profile of the Anglican presence in Chile changed radically in 1958, when the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference resolved that the Anglican Communion should turn its attention to the “neglected continent” of South America.<sup>501</sup> This led to the Anglican Churches of the region, for the first time, working in the cities and among the Spanish- or Portuguese-speaking majorities. Consequently, there was an influx of new Anglicans who saw themselves not as outsiders or “Indians”, but as Chileans, and very much part of mainstream society. This new demographic meant that, for the first time, Anglicanism could be regarded as something other than an imported phenomenon; it was at last starting to take root in “mainstream” society. This also meant that many of the new Anglicans came from at least a nominal Roman Catholic background – a fact which, however, does not seem to have affected the Evangelical and Protestant character of Anglicanism in Chile.

---

<sup>500</sup> Ward 2006, p.104

<sup>501</sup> Bazley 1995, p.219

### **The Ecclesiological Identity of the IACH and the Military Coup in Chile in 1973**

The following is an in-depth account of the role the Anglican Church in Chile played in the period following the military coup d'état of 11 September 1973, led by General Augusto Pinochet. I have chosen to analyse this particular part of the history of the Anglican Church in Chile for two reasons. One is that it is sufficiently circumscribed in nature to admit of comprehensive treatment. The second is that, as I will attempt to demonstrate, this era forms a decisive and critical moment in the development of Chilean Anglican ecclesiological identity, especially with regard to the concept of the nation state in the Chilean context. Consequently, an examination in detail is important, touching events of great historic importance in shaping the identity of Anglicanism in Chile, particularly in terms of its self-comprehension and ecclesiological definition, as well as its relationship with the state.

What few sources there are touching on the behaviour of the IACH during periods of political turmoil tend to be critical of the left-wing movements and governments of the time and yet are almost completely silent in the face of oppressive right-wing rule. For example, in her historical accounts of the Anglican Church of Chile, Mrs Barbara Bazley (wife of Bishop Colin Bazley, retired bishop of Chile and former presiding Bishop of the Southern Cone of the Americas) says very little about how the Church fared in the time of the troubles.<sup>502</sup> In several places, she criticises the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende (1970-73) and comments on the personal economic strains some members of the Church underwent at the time, as well as on how hard it was for the Anglican Church to remain neutral in an increasingly polarised political environment. Yet she mentions virtually none of the harm done by the oppressive right-wing dictatorship of Pinochet:

With all the tensions and lack of subcontracting and the Unidad Popular ["Popular Unity", or "People's Unity", a coalition of political parties that supported Salvador Allende's election in 1970], when "the Santiago Community Church" needed a new pastor, it was very difficult to hire a new minister because of the unrest and uncertainty of the future.<sup>503</sup> [...] The Morrison family lived a year of semi-separation due to the difficulty of renting a home in Valdivia [southern

---

<sup>502</sup> Mrs Barbara Bazley has produced a series of books in which she retells stories and anecdotes of her and her family's years working as missionaries in Chile. See bibliography for full details.

<sup>503</sup> Bazley 1995, pp.225-26 (my translation)



Chile]. During the regime of the Unidad Popular, the city had undergone a veritable invasion of socialist foreigners who wanted to study or participate in the experiment of a democratic Marxism.<sup>504</sup>

One of the few mentions Mrs Bazley makes of the events surrounding the military coup of 1973 is a comment on the prohibition by the military government of all public gatherings:

After the military coup of September 11, 1973, all meetings were banned in private places. Owing to a Thanksgiving Offering from the U.S. Episcopal Church, money was received to build a chapel for public meetings.<sup>505</sup>

In the course of my research I contacted Mrs Bazley's husband, Bishop Colin Bazley (Suffragan Bishop of Chile in 1969, Diocesan Bishop from 1977-96, Bishop of Peru 1977-78, Bishop of Bolivia 1977-1981, Presiding Bishop of the Anglican Church of the Southern Cone of America 1983-1996 [?]). In an e-mail exchange, I posed the following question to him:

In some parts of her book Mrs. Bazley commented that during the era of the "Unidad Popular" IACH suffered financially and that this was a troubled time for the Church. However she makes no comment on how the IACH experienced the military coup of 1973 and the time that elapsed between then and the return to democracy. This is a very important phase of the modern history of Chile. Therefore I wonder if the IACH has produced any material or stated any position on the events that occurred during the military government; especially concerning human rights violations such as systematic torture, "disappearing" persons, etc. I understand that this remains a sensitive issue in Chile, but from a scholarly standpoint it is important to try and establish how IACH experienced this era of Chilean history and how it has interpreted the events that occurred then.

The following is an excerpt from an e-mail sent to me by Bishop Bazley in reply to my questions:

[...] I think it is also important to grasp the situation that developed in the country during the Allende regime. We were living in Temuco at that time, and were acutely aware of the division

---

<sup>504</sup> Bazley 1995, pp.236 (my translation)

<sup>505</sup> Bazley 1995, pp.238 (my translation)

that Allende produced in the country as we had people in our church from all sides of the political spectrum. Our work was principally in rural areas among the Mapuche people, who were among the poorest people in the country. Yet it was very interesting that a majority of them were opponents of the Marxist beliefs that Allende's people propounded.

In the Temuco area, we were very aware of the movements of left-wing activists as farms and small industries in the countryside were taken over by people spurred on by Cubans, Bolivians and folk from other Latin American countries. Farmers were left outside their farm gates with nothing except the clothes they stood up in. We also observed how bulls and rams needed for production were slaughtered and eaten by countryfolk often the worse for drink.

After the coup, hundreds of people were shepherded into the Temuco prison, in the belief that they were communists. Some, true, were terrorists, others were activists, while others just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. For 18 months, together with other ministers, I visited the political prisoners in Temuco prison three times a week. Many of them had suffered torture. We sought to get food for their families, enabled them to be employed in productive work while in prison and our home became a base for their wives who came on visiting days to see their husbands.

Neither during the Allende regime nor during Pinochet's time did we make public statements. Our concern was to seek to meet the pressing needs of those who suffered in some way or other. Sometimes it was folk on the right politically, at other people with left-wing views. We made that our policy, rather than to seek space in the press. That enabled us to remain in the country permanently. The Lutheran Church suffered a split from which it has never recovered and their bishop was expelled from the country. Things were never as black and white as people often like to make it. Sometimes the fault lay with one group, and at others it was the other way around.

I believe that Bishop Bazley wishes to present a balanced view of the events surrounding the coup of 1973, as he himself states: "Things were never as black and white as people often like to make it". His application of the term *terrorist* to opponents of the regime, however, does reveal an interpretation of the events that in some manner favours the actions of the military regime. By using the term *terrorist* he implies that although many were innocent, some did deserve to be imprisoned (whether they also deserved the torture and abuses that came with imprisonment the Bishop does not comment on). I can only assume that when using the term *terrorist* Bishop Bazley refers to those individuals who were imprisoned for having fought or who were planning to take up arms against Pinochet's military. However, surely taking up arms to defend a duly and democratically elected government against an autocratic usurper is hardly an

act of terrorism. Rather than unlawful (like overthrowing a democratically elected government by force of arms), one would expect it to be considered – in both Chile and England (the bishop’s own country) – a moral duty to help in the defense of such a government.

The split that Bishop Bazley refers to within the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Chile, ELCC (*Iglesia Evangélica Luterana en Chile*, IELCH), happened as a direct consequence of the 1973 coup d’état. I believe that it is useful to undertake a brief examination of the historical accounts surrounding this split, because the position and actions undertaken by some of Chilean Lutheran leadership and laity stand in stark contrast against the decision of the IACH to remain “impartial” in the face of the military takeover of government, and thus will aid to better illustrate the context in which this critical choice made, which was to influence the development of the IACH's ecclesiological identity, and its relationship towards the state, for many years to come. In order to understand this, split it is important to look at the historical background of Lutheranism in Chile.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Chile was founded in the 1860s, when German Lutheran immigrants colonised the southern part of the country. For a long time, the Church remained ethnically a German institution dominated by the descendants of the original settlers. The cultural bond to their ancestral home remained so strong that during the Second World War many of its member families sent their sons to fight on behalf of Hitler’s Germany.<sup>506</sup> By the 1970s several Spanish-speaking congregations had grown up within the Church, and many of them did not feel any strong cultural or ideological attachment to Germany. As part of their indigenous character, many in the Spanish-speaking congregations applied themselves to working amongst the marginalised and economically oppressed. As a consequence of that ethos of solidarity with the downtrodden, after the coup of 1973, under the leadership of Bishop Helmut Frenz, part of the membership of the Church, its pastors and the majority of its Spanish-speaking laity, took an active stance on behalf of those persecuted and tortured by the military government and against the oppressive ideology and abusive acts of the military junta of General Pinochet. Under the guidance of

---

<sup>506</sup> Iglesia Luterana en Chile (undated):” Templos (Historia & Direcciones)”

Bishop Helmut Frenz, the Evangelical Lutheran Church obtained the release of many imprisoned Chileans and is credited with having assisted 5,000 people in leaving the country.<sup>507</sup>

However, the German-speaking majority of the 25,000 members of the ELCC opposed Bishop Frenz, claiming that his operation had been “infiltrated by communists” and that he himself was working for the World Council of Churches (!), a supporter, in their view, of guerilla movements all over the world. Frenz’s opposition called for his removal as bishop and his expulsion from Chile.<sup>508</sup> Overwhelmingly, the German-speaking majority of the denomination then walked out and formed a new body that dropped the name “Evangelical”: *Iglesia Luterana en Chile* (Lutheran Church in Chile). But this only happened after the break-away faction had succeeded in ousting Bishop Frenz as leader of the EILCH in September 1974.<sup>509</sup> In collaboration with the junta, Frenz’s opponents also managed to have him driven out of the country. On October 3, 1975, while Bishop Frenz was in Europe, the military regime prohibited him from returning to Chile. He was subsequently appointed Secretary General of the international human rights organisation Amnesty International and spent the rest of his life actively engaged in human rights struggles and testifying against the abuses in Chile. He was awarded the Nansen medal for his service to refugees, which he continued as the head of Amnesty International after returning to his native Germany. Upon retirement, he returned to Chile, where the president, Verónica Michelle Bachelet Jeria (the daughter of one of the officers who was killed opposing Pinochet), conferred upon him honorary Chilean citizenship in recognition of his courageous stance three decades before.<sup>510</sup>

There are many other examples of religious communities that openly defied the military junta. It is worth taking a look into these historical accounts, because they too help to put the “neutrality” of the IACH into perspective. Persecution of members of the Roman Catholic Church began the day of the coup. An estimated 150 priests, nuns and

---

<sup>507</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

<sup>508</sup> Johnston 1979, p.18

<sup>509</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”,

<sup>510</sup> Johnston 1979, p.18

other clergy were forced to leave Chile within the first days after the coup. Some had been expelled, while others were transferred abroad by their congregations under pressure from the military authorities.<sup>511</sup> Throughout the military regime, the ethical and moral stance taken by some sectors of the religious community made them, in the eyes of the military rulers, dangerous allies of the left. The Anglican Church in Chile was excluded from such suspicions due to the efforts of its leadership to remain neutral in the face of the events surrounding them, and their habit of never speaking out (at least not officially) against the military regime. Nevertheless, the rupture of the democratic order and the extreme degree of violence that accompanied it compelled other sectors of the religious communities of Chile to take a stand. Amongst the first to do so was the Methodist Church of Chile. On September 12, 1973 (within 24 hours of the coup), the Methodist Bishop Isaias Gutierrez sent a letter to the military junta repudiating the brutality of the coup. However, he represented a minority position in his Church. Following the publication in January 1984 of a statement condemning violence, a Methodist Church daycare center in Peñalolen was set on fire, and Gutierrez, who ministered to prisoners and *relegados* (people sent to internal exile) was the object of numerous threats.<sup>512</sup> On October 6, days after the coup, a meeting of religious leaders, including Evangelical Lutheran Bishop Helmut Frenz and Cardinal Raul Silva Henriquez, resulted in the establishment of the *Comité de Cooperación por la Paz en Chile* (“Committee for Cooperation in Promoting Peace in Chile”). This group, also known as the *Comité Pro-Paz*, was founded by Catholics, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians and Jews (under the Grand Rabbi of Chile). The Committee’s work in defence of human rights provoked the ire of the military regime, fulfilling the words of Cardinal Silva when he said “...they will begin to call me the red bishop.” In fact on September 27, 1973, Air Force personnel raided the private house where Archbishop Cardinal Silva resided.<sup>513</sup>

The accusation of harbouring “Marxist infiltrators in the Churches,” first heard from fundamentalist religious leaders, plus some Roman Catholics, finally became the motive for the regime’s decision to disband the *Comité Pro-Paz*. In a letter dated

---

<sup>511</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

<sup>512</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

<sup>513</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

December 2, 1975, Augusto Pinochet explained to Cardinal Silva his reason for banning the organisation, describing it as “a channel by which Marxist-Leninists create problems that disturb national tranquillity.”<sup>514</sup> In its two years of life, legal defence work had been the major service provided by the *Comité Pro-Paz*, both for those tried in military courts or councils of war and for political prisoners. During those two years it handled more than 6,900 cases of political persecution in Santiago and 1,900 in the rest of the country. It also handled more than 6,400 cases of dismissal from employment on political grounds.<sup>515</sup>

Bishop Bazley did indeed avoid damaging his Church when, as its leader, he led it away from taking any clear stand against the military regime: “Neither during the Allende regime nor during Pinochet’s time did we make public statements [...] We made that our policy, rather than to seek space in the press.” Those religious communities, clergy and laity whose faith did lead them to take a stand suffered severe persecution. Arrests and expulsion of priests, raids on church buildings, the murder and torture of priests and prominent laypersons, the torching of chapels in low-income areas.<sup>516</sup> Six Roman Catholic priests died at the hands of agents of the regime during the dictatorship. On September 14, 1973, a Roman Catholic priest, Fr Miguel Woodward, was arrested in Valparaiso and taken aboard the ship *Lebu*, where he died under torture. He had been accused of involvement in “political activities”. Two other priests, the Spaniard Antonio Llido, in Santiago, and Gerardo Poblete, in Iquique, were also to die as a result of torture in 1974. The Spanish priest Joan Alsina, Personnel Director of the San Juan de Dios Hospital in Santiago, was executed on September 19, 1974. These priests were accused of being “Marxists and/or Communists”. Altogether, some 50 priests and other clergy were arrested on that charge during the first months following the coup.<sup>517</sup>

The religious communities were no less divided than the rest of Chilean society over the issue of the coup. While several religious leaders united in opposition to the regime after the first United Nations’ resolution denouncing human rights violations in Chile

---

<sup>514</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

<sup>515</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

<sup>516</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

<sup>517</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

was made public in 1974, fundamentalist Pentecostals united in defence of the regime.<sup>518</sup> In July 1975 the Council of Pastors (Consejo de Pastores) was founded. It became the self-appointed “moral-religious guarantors of military government legitimacy”.<sup>519</sup> The Council was rewarded for its loyalty to the regime in 1976, when it sought and was accorded “official recognition as sole representative of the Evangelical Churches of Chile”. To its credit, the Anglican Church in Chile was not part of this group. In a religious service offered on the first anniversary of the coup, the Evangelical Churches which later formed the *Consejo de Pastores* affirmed to Pinochet that “the military pronouncement [...] was the response from God to the prayer of all believers who see Marxism as the highest expression of the shadowy satanic force.” The Roman Catholic Church also had authorities who supported the military rulers within its fold. The Armed Forces Bishop, Msgr. Jose Joaquin Matte, stated during a mass celebrated, on September 9, 1985, in commemoration of the coup: “Twelve years ago we prayed the rosary incessantly, and Mary has produced a miracle with the second independence of Chile.”<sup>520</sup>

In the light of these events, it perhaps should be noticed that, while the Anglican Church in Chile managed to remain officially neutral and silent (rather than “seek space in the press”) concerning the events surrounding the coup, it was outspoken in its criticism of President Salvador Allende and the *Unidad Popular* regime, as both Bishop Bazley’s e-mail and his wife’s historical account make clear.

### **Reflection on the Ecclesiological Identity of the IACH**

The actions and choices of the IACH during the military coup of 1973 disclose much about its ecclesiological self-understanding. On closer analysis, certain aspects of its ecclesiology reveal that although the IACH has not attached its identity to a nation state to any large degree, and conceives of itself as being part of a larger and transnational ecclesiological reality (e.g Anglican Communion, GAFCON/FCA and even the Anglican Covenant), there are, nevertheless, other elements of its ecclesiological identity that have, both by design and through its historical legacy, hindered it from embracing some of the other principles proposed in this thesis, which are meant to

---

<sup>518</sup> UN 1974: 3219 (XXXIX)

<sup>519</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

<sup>520</sup> Derechos Chile, 2002: “VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES”

accompany a potential transcendence of a national identity. One of these principles is the radicalisation of the Church (lat. *radix*, "root"), in the sense of returning to the roots of the universal Church, as an institution that not only challenges the cultural and social boundaries of the world but also acts as a prophetic voice of the oppressed, and as such uses its identity to challenge the status quo, especially in times of oppression, rather than opting to remain "neutral".

The analysis of the ecclesiological work of Rev Hugo Fernandez (see chapter on Models of the Church) sheds some light on what has influenced the IACH in such a direction, as well as revealing some of the factors which have defined the Church's relationship with the state. Following in the footsteps of Bishop Bazely, Rev Fernandez emphasises the need for an awareness and repentance of the sins of the individual, and not on political and social issues, preoccupation with which could give "the appearance that the Church is taking positions which associate it with parties or political currents".<sup>521</sup> According to Fernandez these issues, such as human rights, distribution of wealth and civil liberties, "do not have the Christ-centered motivation of the Church" but quite to the contrary, display tendencies which are centred in humankind and are of this world (as opposed to a post-Eschaton reality). Consequently, from this perspective, it does not fall to the Church "to preach in favour of human rights" but rather "announcing human responsibilities before God who is just and abhors sin".<sup>522</sup>

Arguably, this perceived dichotomy between social action and evangelisation, combined with a strong emphasis on individualism, has led the IACH to make such decisions as remaining "neutral" to the abuses committed during Pinochet's time in power. In fact, Rev Fernandez uses his ecclesiological construct to relativise the evils and human rights' violations committed by the military junta, and makes the argument that "what for some people within the Church might be an absolute sin because of a dictatorial government, as it is experienced from their social context, for others within the same Church is rather a consequence of the sin of resisting authority by an opposition directed by foreign interests."<sup>523</sup> In other words, the Church should not make a stand in what can be perceived as matters of the state, even when these entail violence

---

<sup>521</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.77

<sup>522</sup> Fernandez 1989, p.77

<sup>523</sup> Fernandez 1989, pp.77-78



and systematic torture, because these are matters of this world and therefore are, potentially at least, not related to the ministry of the Church.

This emphasis on an eschatological comprehension of Church, which dichotomises the earthly and heavenly dimensions of the Church's ministry, combined with an individualistic approach to sin and the redeeming message of the gospels, has influenced the IACH in developing an ecclesiology which does not concur with the principles proposed in this thesis. By making the gravity of oppressive actions dependent on the private and individual, social perspective of the people, this ecclesiological construct risks relativizing the injustices committed against the people whom the Church is meant to minister and care for. It thereby essentially states that actions such as the systematic torture, persecution and human rights' abuses committed by the military government of Augusto Pinochet might not always be wrong in the eyes of the Christian Church (!) nor be antithetical to the Christian gospel, and thus are objectively and categorically not necessarily abhorrent in the eyes of God. Consequently, this aspect of the ecclesiological identity of the IACH constitutes an example of the "real-life" ramifications of an Anglican ecclesiology which does not incorporate the idea that the Anglican Church should re-embrace its *radical* origins – radical in both the connotations of this word, *thoroughgoing* or *extreme* in regard to change from accepted and/or current forms in the comprehension and self-understanding of the Anglican Communion, as well as in terms of favouring radical ideas that challenge *the status quo* in times of oppression; thus enabling the Anglican Church to embrace its prophetic ministry and act as an agent of God's liberation in the face of tyranny. In relation to this subject the Anglican Church of Malawi offers a very different perspective on the development of an Anglican Identity in relationship to the state, during two very different phases of the nation's history.

## **Malawi**

In the case of Malawi, during the years of colonial rule the main difference between the Anglican Church and the Colonial government lay in their respective choice of tactics rather than in their goals. The Anglican Church, driven by its theological tenets against violence and its ecclesiological principles of religious education, sought to promote

personal conviction rather than forced subjugation, and thus advocated a more patient and less violent way of bringing the people of Nyasaland into the “civilised” fold of Christianity. However, there is little question that the Anglican Church of the time wanted the natives to become loyal subjects of the colonial government just as much as the Crown itself did. Evidence of this is given by the conduct of the Church throughout much of the colonial era. For example, during the Chilembwe uprising of 1915, the Church sided against the natives in favour of the Colonial government. The revolt was led by John Chilembwe, an American-educated, black, Christian minister who was based in the village of Mbombwe, in the south-east part of Nyasaland. Chilembwe and his people stood up against the injustices of the colonial system and the new demands on the indigenous population caused by the outbreak of World War I, which amongst other things included forced labour.<sup>524</sup> However, the Anglican Church opposed the uprisings ideals of “Africa for the Africans” and sided with the government, against the revolt.<sup>525</sup>

Eventually the Church attitude concerning African self-rule did change, especially towards the end of the colonial period. In 1955, when the formation of the Anglican Province of Central Africa was proposed, the UMCA mission objected to it, and the formation of the Province had to be postponed. According to Tengtenga, this objection was based on the fact that the Province was geographically juxtaposed with the proposed Central African Federation (Rhodesia, North Rhodesia and Nyasaland) and was viewed as an attempt to bring the Anglican Church in line with the proposed plans for what was to become a mostly white-governed federation.<sup>526</sup>

The Rt Rev Frank Thorne (Bishop of Nyasaland from 1936-61) was the mission’s representative at the Government Council from 1937-49. In 1943 he spoke out against the formation of the CAF. Thorne warned that the Federation was likely to hinder the participation of black Africans in government. Bishop Thorne voiced his opposition publicly, both within and outside the Church. In 1953, he wrote two articles criticising the proposed Federation. These were published both in the Anglican Journal and the Diocesan Chronicle. In these articles Bishop Thorne stated that most of the six

---

<sup>524</sup> Rotberg, R. I 1967, p.140

<sup>525</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.64

<sup>526</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.64

million black Africans living in the three territories where against the Federation, but that their voices were ignored in favour of forty thousand white Europeans.<sup>527</sup> The Bishop explained that if (black) Africans did not get fair treatment and have their opinions taken into account, they would become radicalised and risk “being moved towards revolutionary ideologies such as socialism and communism”, which would inevitably result in a more violent option for liberation.<sup>528</sup>

The ambivalence of Bishop Thorne, who wished for native Africans to have a larger representation in government but simultaneously was also against full independence, reflects the uneasiness of the Church's relation to the state. The situation also illustrates how two theological principles were working almost in paradox within the ecclesiology of the Anglican Church at that time. On the one hand, driven by the gospel imperative of justice, the Church aimed to defend the rights of the Africans against the colonial government, but on the other hand, the Church sought to make loyal subjects, which in the mind of the Church was coterminous with being good Christians, out of Africans. When ideas of offering resistance against the Federation in the form of civil disobedience started circulating amongst the local population, including some of the African clergy, the Bishop argued that although the Federation was certainly against the expressed wishes of a great majority of Africans, African Christians ought to follow the constitution of the established Federation and not offer resistance because said constitution was lawfully instituted by the Crown, and therefore not against divine law.<sup>529</sup> In other words, the Bishop conceded that the Federation was unfair to most Africans but, in his mind, they should still submit to this injustice because it was not contrary to the will of God.

When looking back at this situation Bishop Tengtenga criticises this ambivalent and conciliatory attitude of the Anglican Church, accusing it of acting against the interests of the African peoples, favouring only colonial interests. Tengtenga quotes the Kairos Document (KD), a theological statement issued in 1985 by a group of mainly black African theologians. The document challenged what the authors saw as the Church's weak response to the vicious policies of the apartheid state in South Africa.

---

<sup>527</sup> Mufuka, K.N 1977 pp.154-155.

<sup>528</sup> Mufuka, K.N,1977 pp.164-166.

<sup>529</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.67-68

The KD constitutes a classic example of contextual theology and liberation theology (or "theology from below") in an African context.<sup>530</sup> Tengtenga uses the KD to draw parallels between the Church's feeble and compromised (initial) response to the atrocities in South Africa, with that of the how the Church behaved under the dictatorship of Kamuzu Banda. "Nowhere in the Bible or in the Christian tradition has it ever been suggested that we ought to try and reconcile good and evil, God and the devil. We are supposed to do away with evil, injustice, oppression and sin – not to come to terms with it. We are supposed to oppose, confront and reject the devil and not to try to sup with the devil."<sup>531</sup> Tengtenga also adds "[...] the idea is not to understand the situation but to manage it. This is what the Bishop could not see".<sup>532</sup>

In the end, the conservative, Erastian ecclesiology of the UMCA, with its intimate links to the state, was unable to contain the kind of ecclesiological self-understanding which had begun to grow at root level. A different view of the Church had begun to develop amongst native African clergy and laity (and small number of more radical British clergy). Based on the principles of *indegenisation* and *inculturation*, a re-embrace of the identity of the Church as an agent of God's liberation had begun to take root. Consequently, pressure mounted upon the Church to stop acting as agent of the colonial government. This was an understanding of the Church brought forward by the increasing demand for structural and social change that was growing at a grass-roots level. As stated by Bishop Tengtenga, it was no longer the time for the "top to speak to the top".<sup>533</sup> The call for change and liberation came from below. An ecclesiological identity began to take form which inverted the top-heavy structures of the Church of the colonial era. This self-view, which was gaining momentum amongst the laity and clergy (a number of which, by now, were native Africans) applied increasing pressure on the Church to genuinely act on behalf of the

---

<sup>530</sup> For a more in depth analysis read: Dladla, Thembas : Kairos '95: *At the Threshold of Jubilee: A Conference Report*. Johannesburg: Institute for Contextual Theology (1996) see also Leonard, Gary S.D *Kairos, The Moment of Truth* "The Time Has Come, The Moment of Truth Has Arrived" *The Kairos Documents* (ed) Leonard, Gary SD, Natal: Ujamaa Centre For Theology and Community Research University of Kwazulu-Natal (2010) specially Chapter 1: Challenge To The Church, *Kairos Document (First Edition)* 1985, pp.1-36.

<sup>531</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.67.

<sup>532</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.67.

<sup>533</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.77-78.

African people, and not simply as benevolent colonial mouthpiece.<sup>534</sup>

This native opposition to the Church's reconciliatory attitude towards the colonial state, in combination with an increasing internal demand for a kind of change which could not be brought about within an ecclesiological model that was attached to the British Crown, resulted in Bishop Thorne (himself an Englishman and a royalist) being forced to resign. Tengatenga writes that as pressure for change increased both from within and from without the Anglican Church, Thorne's "noble intentions had outlived their welcome".<sup>535</sup> According to Tengatenga, the structural and social changes that needed to happen in order to achieve justice could only happen from below. Tengatenga argues that the missionaries' original ecclesiological outlook, with its close ties to the Crown, could no longer sustain the "new" comprehension of the Church that was taking hold amongst African Anglicans.<sup>536</sup> This new vision, saw the Church as an agent of God's liberation for the oppressed peoples of Africa, and demanded that their Church act as such. As Bishop Tengatenga puts it, what needed to be done could only be done by Africans themselves.<sup>537</sup> The missionaries may have seen themselves in the role of speaking for the Africans, but could never genuinely be African. Tengatenga, writes that the fact that the missionaries were themselves white Europeans (and consequently related and fraternised with the colonial representatives) influenced their stance. Within the old Erastian model of Church-state relationships, the Church was trapped in colonialism, at a time when British colonialism became unbearable.<sup>538</sup> However, I would argue that this *Erastian* trap was not only the result of fraternisation between the Church leadership and government officials at a personal level (although this might have contributed to it), but rather that the inability of the Church to act outside the boundaries set up by the colonialist agenda was a direct result of the ecclesiological identity of the Anglican Church being married to that of a state or nation, in this case the British Crown. It could therefore be argued that, from an ecclesiological perspective, Bishop Thorne's resignation represents a turning point in the development of the ecclesiological identity of the Anglican Church in Malawi. Up until then, the Anglican Church had been

---

<sup>534</sup> Tengatenga 2006, pp.75-77.

<sup>535</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.67

<sup>536</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.78

<sup>537</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.67

<sup>538</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.77

involved in a quasi-Constantinian relationship with the colonial state. Consequently, although it did challenge the government over certain issues, the Church worked more as legitimator of the Crown's power rather than as a prophetic, critical voice, an attitude that was an almost unavoidable consequence of the ecclesiological model applied by the UMCA. This was an ecclesiology that was born out of the Oxford Movement, steeped in conservative ideology, with its inherent bias to preserve the social order of English (Anglican) Christianity. The Church of England saw the Crown's right to rule as an expression of divine will, which led the Church (or at least its governing elite) to identify with the Colonial state. Consequently, the borders between the state and the Church were often blurred, which in turn led the Church to apply a reconciliatory attitude towards the state, urging its subjects to patiently accept the abuses and injustices they experienced, rather than to rebel against them. Consequently, even though the Church could at times recognise how unjust and oppressive the government policies could be, in the end the Church saw the colonial government as lawfully instituted by the monarchy. Thus, in the popular minds at least, to obey the Crown was (by extension) to be obey the God-given order of things.

Tengatenga, argues that when this outlook is adopted by the Church, it can no longer be called a theology of the Church, but rather “a theology of the state”. In such a “a state theology” there is no criticism of the government but only a legitimation of it, no matter how evil or oppressive the system may be.<sup>539</sup> Thus, while there were certainly moments of confrontation, in the end the cooperation and identification of the Church with the state and the British nation were so deeply rooted in the ecclesiological self-view of this era that they limited the Church's capacity to confront the injustices committed by the state, at least in a way that was thoroughgoing enough to bring actual justice to native Africans. In other words, when push came to shove, the Anglican Church always sided with the state; and when individual missionaries or priests spoke up against this, they were reprimanded by their own leadership.<sup>540</sup>

From the perspective of this thesis, the colonial era of the Church in Malawi illustrates the potential dangers of marrying the identity of the Anglican Church with that of a nation state. One of the main tenets of this thesis is that the Churches of the

---

<sup>539</sup> Tengatenga 2006, pp.77-78

<sup>540</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.77

Communion would benefit from recognising and embracing the transnational character of the theology which once gave birth to the idea of an Anglican Communion (see previous chapters). The incapability of the Church to genuinely side with the native peoples of Nyasaland, and its failure to act on behalf of their needs and their struggle for liberation demonstrates the necessity for the implementation of a self-understanding of the Church which draws its identity not primarily from being a national institution, but as a transnational entity that is not linked to any man-made nation or concept of state, and yet is capable of becoming indigenous and inculturated. This also links to the proposed idea of the Anglican Communion re-embracing its *radical* (lat. *radix*, "root") origins, including the connotations of this word as *thoroughgoing* or *extreme* in regard to change or deviation from accepted forms of self-perception.

In the next part I will attempt to demonstrate how, such a radicalisation of the ecclesiological identity took place within Malawian Anglicanism, a change that was made possible by a movement to transcend the national borders of the early Malawian Church, affirming its identity not primarily to the state of Malawi (or its predecessors) but upon the universality of the Church, thus providing a real-life example of the application of the ecclesiological principles proposed in this thesis.

### **Anglican Ecclesiological Identity in Independent Malawi**

The decades leading up to independence brought with them a time of turbulence and change in Malawian society, which of course affected the Church. In 1953, the controversial Anglican Province of Central Africa had been formed. This new structure brought with it some thoroughgoing change to ecclesiological structures. Perhaps the most important of these was that the Anglican Church in Malawi went from being a missionary field under the Church of England to forming part of a province within the Anglican Communion: The Church in the Province of Central Africa. Furthermore, in 1960 the UMCA and SPG united to form the United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Hence, as the governing structures of the nation were changing, so were the Church's own structures.<sup>541</sup>

As written earlier The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland did not last for

---

<sup>541</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.80



long. In 1958, one of the elders of the Malawian nationalist movement, Dr Hastings Kamuzu Banda, assumed the leadership of the Malawi Congress Party (MCP). Banda, who in previous decades had been active in the movement for Malawian independence, had spent the previous years living in the Gold Coast (Ghana), relegated there after a scandal in which he had been accused of adultery.<sup>542</sup> By 1960, the British government was considering some kind of self-rule for Nyasaland. This eventually happened in 1961, after Banda and several other leaders were released from prison.<sup>543</sup> Full independence was finally granted in 1964 and in 1966 Malawi became a republic with Banda as its first president.<sup>544</sup> Banda was soon able to consolidate his power base and declared Malawi a one-party state under the Malawi Congress Party. In 1970, the MCP made him the Party's President for Life and in 1971, Banda was declared President for Life of the Republic of Malawi as well.<sup>545</sup> His official title was "His Excellency the Life President of the Republic of Malaŵi, Ngwazi Dr. Hastings Kamuzu Banda." In Chicheŵa, the title Ngwazi literally means "great lion" but carries the meaning of "chief of chiefs".<sup>546</sup> Throughout his decades' long rule, Dr Banda's government regularly imprisoned, tortured and murdered political opponents. Human rights groups estimate that somewhere between 6,000 to 18,000 people were killed, tortured and jailed without trial, during Banda's rule.<sup>547</sup> In addition, Banda was strongly criticised for maintaining full diplomatic relations with apartheid-era South Africa.<sup>548</sup>

Independence meant the dawn of a new era for the Anglican Church in Malawi, an era that would culminate in the early 1990s with the demise of Dr Banda. This period would greatly affect the Anglican Church's relationship with the state. Tengtenga recounts how, following Malawian independence, the Church endeavoured to become more indigenous and to be accepted as a truly African institution, no longer the captive

---

<sup>542</sup> Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004 ed.) "Banda, Hastings Kamuzu". See also Kasuka 2012, p.45.

<sup>543</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.79

<sup>544</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.78-79, for more in depth analysis see: Philip, Short, *Banda*, London: Routledge & Kegan (1974).

<sup>545</sup> Gascoigne 2001, "History of Malawi: Independence From 1964

<sup>546</sup> Kasuka 2012, p.45.

<sup>547</sup> Drogin 1995: "Malawi Tries Ex-Dictator in Murder: Africa: Aging autocrat is one of few among continent's tyrants to face justice for regime's abuses" in *Los Angeles Times* 1995.05.21. For more in depth analysis read: Williams, T. David: *Malawi, the Politics of Despair*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1978), see bibliography for further details.

<sup>548</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.79-83



of its colonial roots.<sup>549</sup> However, Tengtenga also notes, that as an institution, the Anglican Church allowed itself to become so closely linked with the new, independent nation state that it capitulated to everything that the government demanded of it. Consequently, more often than not, the Church would choose not to speak out against the atrocities committed by the independent, national government.<sup>550</sup> Tengtenga, describes this era as one in which the Church was indeed both present and visible; but, that in the same way it preached about the Kingdom of Heaven and God's justice on Sunday, on Monday it would sit with the national leader and confirm that his power came from God, blessing and praying for his leadership, “advocates of democracy be damned!”<sup>551</sup> According to Tengtenga the Anglican Church of the independent nation of Malawi became a silent observer and would not stand against the government, even in the face of the abuses and persecutions that were being carried out. It would seem that although the Church might have become genuinely indigenous, it had not managed to shed itself of its Erastian inheritance.

From the perspective of this thesis, there is a case to be made that the failure of the Anglican Church to embrace its calling as a prophetic voice and to be an agent of God's liberation and love is in no small measure due to its enthusiastic embrace of the new national identity of Malawi. Even though the Church managed to become indigenous and eventually gain a leadership that was mostly African, this did not translate into an ability (or perhaps even a willingness) to oppose the transgressions and abuses of the nation state. The close ideological links of Church with the independent state of Malawi gave it cause to remain silent throughout most of Banda's reign. In other words, the Anglican Church went from a closely-knit relationship with the British Colonial government to having an equally close relationship (if not more so) with the independent state of Malawi. Hence, it was not enough that the Church became indigenous and inculturated after Malawian independence, because without shedding its Anglican tendency to identify with a nation state, it was that very same longing for indigenisation which allowed the Church to be drawn into the mechanisations of the new state.

---

<sup>549</sup> Tengtenga 2006, chapter 4: “The Church in Independent Malawi”, pp.79-1146

<sup>550</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.145-46

<sup>551</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.79

### **A Paralysed Ecclesiology**

A clear example of how the Church was paralysed by its marriage to the new state is provided by its decision to remain passive to the introduction and implementation of The Forfeiture Act of 1966. In this act, the state basically reserved itself the right to expropriate any and all material belongings of any of its citizens who was accused or even suspected of “subversive” activities, without the state ever having to provide any real evidence to support the accusations.<sup>552</sup> In a speech given when the Act was being voted through parliament, President Banda said: *Here is a warning to those who are intending to engage in subversive activities. If they are declared to be people engaged in subversive activities, if the Minister considers their activities dangerous, he can declare them forfeit, and if they are forfeit, they will lose whatever they have, a house, a farm, cattle, goats, even nkhumba [pigs].*<sup>553</sup> He also added that those involved in making such a forfeiture could, themselves, not be held legally accountable or be sued by anyone.<sup>554</sup> The Act became an instrument of punishment for dissenters and/or anyone even suspected of dissent, including entire religious groups such as Jehovah's witnesses. In the face of this clear abuse of power the Church remained silent. As Bishop Tengtenga puts it, this passivity was a cowardly stance of capitulation to the will of the state.<sup>555</sup> Thus, in terms of its ecclesiological identity, the Anglican Church had been effectively neutralised as an agent of God's liberation and justice by its bonds to the state.

In order to grasp the position in which the Church found itself, and why it decided to remain passive, it would help to briefly examine the political climate of the time. In his book, Tengtenga exemplifies this climate with a speech by President Banda, delivered in parliament during the cabinet crisis:

Chimpembere is a traitor, Chiume is a traitor, Chirwa is a traitor, Chisizia is a traitor, therefore anyone under the guise of being a missionary who supports these people has no right to be living in this country. Whatever church, that church must withdraw him from this country and send him back. And if the churches do not send these people back then I will have to sign and order declaring them prohibited immigrants, because I must have peace of mind and I cannot have

---

<sup>552</sup> Roberts 1966, pp.131-134

<sup>553</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.97

<sup>554</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.96

<sup>555</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.97

peace of mind if some missionaries interfere in our internal politics [...] let missionaries stick to their preaching [...] and leave my politics alone.<sup>556</sup>

These words were spoken in connection with the so-called Silombela uprising.<sup>557</sup>

### **Zasinthu: The Radicalisation of Malawian Anglican Ecclesiology**

In 1989, Pope John Paul II made an official Papal visit to Malawi, which was highly publicised as the world grew increasingly aware of the situation in the country.<sup>558</sup> Bishop Tengtenga writes that the Papal visit indirectly marked a turning point in the Anglican Church's own relationship to the state. Throughout the 70s and 80s part of Dr Banda's policy was to keep the diverse religious groups as separated and split as possible in order to prevent them from uniting in opposition.<sup>559</sup> However, according to Tengtenga, all that changed on the 8<sup>th</sup> of May 1992, the day that the Roman Catholic Bishops' Lenten Pastoral Letter was published and publicly read out in most RC parishes in the country. The Lenten Letter was the Bishops' answer to the Pope's call for action. In it, the seven Roman Catholic Bishops of Malawi, openly criticised and challenged the government on several points, including the unjust distribution of wealth, corruption, as well as the censoring and persecution of those who would speak out against the government:

Because the Church exists in this world it must communicate its understanding of the meaning of human life and society [...] We would, however, fail in our role as religious leaders we kept silent on areas of concern [...] Many people still live in circumstances that are hardly compatible with their dignity as sons and daughters of God. Their life is a struggle for survival. At the same time a minority enjoys the fruits of development and can afford a life of luxury and wealth. We appeal for a more just and equal distribution of wealth. Nobody should have to suffer reprisals for honestly expressing and living up to their own convictions: intellectual, religious or political.

---

<sup>556</sup> Dr Kamuzu Banda's speech in Third Meeting of First Session of Parliament, on 4th day, October 1964, Hansard p.253. As featured in Tengtenga 2006, p.99

<sup>557</sup> Silombela had continued with the guerilla activities after Henry Chipembere had been evacuated from Malawi in 1965, following the capture of most of the group's leadership, including Henry's brother Arthur Chipembere. Further, President Banda, claimed that Chipembere and Chisiza were sending assassins to kill him and his minister's. As a result, Banda treated the whole matter as an all-out war, rounding up and arresting the families of the descending ministers. Thus, as Tengtenga puts it, it's not difficult to see that the Church's leadership decided not to act out of fear that the government would turn on the Church as well. For more details see bibliography:

Baker, Colin A. 2001: *Revolt of the Ministers: The Malawi Cabinet Crisis 1964-1965*. New York: IB Taurus & Co, Ltd, pp.261-266

<sup>558</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.147-148

<sup>559</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.140-142

[...] Academic freedom is seriously restricted; exposing injustices can be considered a betrayal, [...] some people have paid dearly for their political opinions [...] We cannot ignore or turn a blind eye to our people's experience of unfairness and injustice, for example those who, losing their land without fair compensation, are deprived of their livelihood, or those of our brothers and sisters who are imprisoned without knowing when their cases will be heard. The human rights and duties identified in this pastoral letter for our reflection are only the issues that our God invites us to consider seriously.[...] We hope that our message will deepen in all of us the experience of conversion and the desire for truth and the of Christ. This will prepare us for the worthy celebration of Easter, the feast of the risen Lord in who we see our selves as a risen people with dignity restored.<sup>560</sup>

Following the publication of this letter the Malawian Congress Party held a special convention to discuss this “subversive” document and to decide on a course of action.<sup>561</sup> The convention resolved to arrest the bishops and murder them if they had to!<sup>562</sup> All this done in camera; that is to say, not in a shadow meeting but as part of official government business. Some of the delegates who were Roman Catholics warned the clergy that something sinister was in the works.<sup>563</sup> Tengtenga writes that the government wrongly assumed that the arrest and potential execution of the bishops would silence those amongst the public who had welcomed the Pastoral Letter. In reality, the government's action had the opposite effect. Other religious leaders woke “out of their stupor” and sided publicly with the bishops, including the leadership of the Anglican Church. A group of the top religious leaders in the country wrote an open letter to the government challenging it on this issue.<sup>564</sup> The escalated situation, and the threat of deadly violence against religious leaders, led to an official visitation by the World Alliance of Reformed Churches in April of 1992, who together with the General Synod of the Church of Central Africa Presbyterian (CCAP) confronted Dr Banda.<sup>565</sup>

A consequence of the visitation was the convening of a Christian Council of Church Leaders in Malawi, chaired by an Anglican bishop, the Rt Rev Peter Nyanja.<sup>566</sup>

---

<sup>560</sup> Excerpts from *Living Our Faith*, Pastoral Letter from the Catholic Bishops of Malawi, Lent 1992

<sup>561</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.150

<sup>562</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp. 150-152

<sup>563</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp. 150-151

<sup>564</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.150 see also Council of Churches: Open Letter to the Government, August 26th 1992.

<sup>565</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp. 151-152

<sup>566</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp. 155-156

This gathering formed the foundation of what became known as the Public Affairs Committee (PAC), an interfaith civil society made up of Catholic, Anglican, Protestant and Muslim groups in Malawi.<sup>567</sup> According to Tengatenga, this created an unprecedented momentum within the Anglican Church; every section of it was mobilised in an attempt not only to preach the gospel, but to live out its message of deliverance, peace and justice.<sup>568</sup> In terms of ecclesiological identity this marks a turning point in the self-perception of the Anglican Church in Malawi. Inspired by the actions of the seven Roman Catholic bishops and the international support provided by ecclesiastical entities from beyond its own national borders (e.g. the visit of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, the Papal visit and intervention by other Anglican bodies) the Anglican Church no longer perceived of itself as merely an ally of the government and the state. Through the support of structures from outside, the Church was freed to act in the defiance of the worldly authorities that had scared it into submission for decades. For the first time since the foundation of the nation state of Malawi, the Anglican Church acted in its official capacity as an institution, in defiance of the state and in defence of the principles of peace and justice, enshrined in the Christian gospels. In a clear example of a real-world application of the ecclesiological principles proposed in this thesis, the Anglican Church was now in a position where it was ready to re-acknowledge its origins in the ancient Church, an institution that once had radically challenged the power structures of the ancient world, politically, economically and socially, principles similar to those which had once laid at the core of the UMCA missionaries fight against slavery. In other words, the Anglican Church in Malawi was radicalised, it re-embraced its roots (*radix*) and returned to a vision and comprehension of the Church which, as Bishop Tengatenga notes, is not a sustainer of the status quo, colonial or nationalist, but a prophetic challenger of those who would oppress and persecute its people, regardless of national or governmental interests.<sup>569</sup>

Arguably, the process of radicalisation within the Anglican Church began as a reflection of the underlying socio-political currents in Malawi, tensions that were born out of its struggle for democracy, which had existed long before the Lenten Letter was

---

<sup>567</sup> Tengatenga 2006, p.157

<sup>568</sup> Tengatenga 2006, pp.162-163

<sup>569</sup> Tengatenga 2006, pp.190-191

published. However, Tengtenga observes that the actions of the religious communities of Malawi and their response to the government's reaction to the Letter triggered an era of change in Malawian society, known as *Zasintha*, a Chichewa word meaning “the situation has changed”.<sup>570</sup> The Anglican Church began to speak up, more and more boldly against the oppressive regime. In addition, the Church soon caught on to one of Dr Banda's main tactics, which was to isolate “trouble makers” in order to make them weaker.<sup>571</sup> Hence, it became clear for most of the Church leadership that they had to work across demoninational and confessional boundaries, in order to formulate a united strategy of opposition. Consequently, some strong ecumenical (and interreligious) winds began to blow across Malawi.<sup>572</sup> The visit from the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) was followed by one from the Council of Churches for Britain and Ireland (CCBI).<sup>573</sup> Tengtenga writes that The Anglican Church in Malawi felt encouraged by this international and Eucumenical support, thus strengthening its resolve to confront the government.<sup>574</sup> The Anglican Dioceses of Lake Mawi composed an open letter addressed to the Bishop of Birmingham, The Rt Rev Mark Santer, who was the head of the Anglican contingent of the CCBI visitation. In this letter the clergy and laity of the Diocese of Lake Malawi drew upon the statements made by their Roman Catholic and Presbyterian counterparts, and spoke out against the social problems in Malawi:

The Country is facing problems of drought, famine and several others such as social, economic, and political problems [...] the cost of living has become everybody's concern especially when the basic needs have become very costly and scarce.[...] There are hardly any drugs in the Hospitals, hence many people will die of hunger and disease if the situation does not improve[...] We also endure the contents of the Malawian Roman Catholic Bishops letter and that of the Presbyterians on the situation in the country. [...] Indeed we are grateful to the Government for the efforts being made to reduce the political tension in the Country. In particular we applaud the government for the release of some political prisoners [...] and the proposed amendments to the Forfeiture Act of the Laws of Malawi, amongst other measures.<sup>575</sup>

---

<sup>570</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.151

<sup>571</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.140-43, 151-152

<sup>572</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.151

<sup>573</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.152

<sup>574</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.142-43

<sup>575</sup> Letter to Bishop Mark Santer of Birmingham, 10 Auguts 1992. As feauterd in Tengtenga 2006, p.152

However, Dr Banda was not going to let himself be outdone just yet. He retaliated time after time, in speech after speech, demanding that the clergy returned to their altars and pulpits and “stop meddling in the politics of the state”.<sup>576</sup> This time, however, the Churches were ready to stand their ground and in an open letter to the government the Council of Churches declared that they were not going to back down, because their mission was to “promote the extension of the Kingdom of God by fostering closer cooperation between the Churches of Malawi” and “To be the representative body for expressing the minds of members on matters of public importance”.<sup>577</sup> The Episcopal Synod of The Anglican Church of Central Africa held a meeting in September of 1992 where it resolved to make a pastoral visit of solidarity to Malawi and announced it in the media. This visit also resulted in an official statement by the Anglican Province of Central Africa, urging for the international support of the Churches involved in the movement for political and social change.<sup>578</sup> These winds of unity and international support continued to apply pressure on the government, and further strengthened the Anglican Church in Malawi. The question is, what changed within the Church that enabled it to embrace its mission to minister to and defend the people of Malawi against the abuses committed by the state? In order to answer this question it is necessary to take a look at what factors influenced the Church during this era. One such factor, which is in line with the theory put forward in this thesis, was the support which the Anglican Church gained from ecclesiological structures beyond the national border, as well as from the ecumenical movement, which provided support for the Anglican Church from beyond its own confessional boundaries.<sup>579</sup> Bishop Tengtenga writes that this support, given by the the Province of Central Africa, the Church of England and much of the Anglican Communion, strengthened the Malawian Anglican Church's willingness to get involved in the political situation. It is therefore conceivable that the actions of the Anglican Church in Malawi reflect what was going on in the circles of the Anglican Communion at large. In its Episcopal Synod of 1992, the Province of Central Africa expressed great concern about the worsening situation in Malawi, especially regarding human rights abuses. The synod also issued a statement on the subject which was

---

<sup>576</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.152

<sup>577</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.153

<sup>578</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.155

<sup>579</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp151-153



released to the press.<sup>580</sup> That same year, a conference took place called “Anglican Encounter in the South”. The conference produced a report stating that: “The whole church [...] is God's voice in society [...] and God's instrument for effecting kingdom values. We acknowledge the prophetic ministry of various churches in their own contexts, seeking political and ecclesiastical justice. We urge the Communion to stand in solidarity with those churches which face particular pressures of any kind.”<sup>581</sup>

Statements such as this demonstrate that the ecclesiological principles proposed in this thesis, which allow for the churches of the Communion to view themselves as more than primarily national institutions, are already part of Anglican consciousness.

However, they need to be brought into the forefront of Anglican ecclesiological consciousness. A crucial step in finding way forward, beyond the current internal tensions within the Communion.

### **Reflection on the Development of Anglican Identity in Malawi**

One of the things that the Malawian case study shows is that the transnational reality in which the Anglican Churches exist should be reflected in the ecclesiastical structures of the Anglican Churches themselves. Their ties of identity to the Anglican Communion should supersede their national ones, without compromising, for that sake, their genuineness as indigenous and inculturated Churches. An application of this can be seen in the development and reinforcement of certain transnational structures of support, through which the Anglican Church in Malawi began to understand itself as forming part of a larger ecclesiastical reality. This change in self-perception, radically transcended the national identification it had bought into for so long, and which had facilitated its assimilation by the government and its submission to the will of the state. By reaching beyond its local, national, ecclesiological structures, the Anglican Church in Malawi gained the strength and the ability to speak out, and what is more important, it was capable of backing up a change of discourse with concrete actions. Bishop Tengtenga describes this radicalisation of the ecclesiological identity of the Anglican Church as the Church finally embracing the KAIROS moment.<sup>582</sup> This is another

---

<sup>580</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.174

<sup>581</sup> Tengtenga 2006, p.175

<sup>582</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.145,180-182.



reference to the previously discussed Kairos Document, according to which the KAIROS is the moment of grace and opportunity, the favourable time in which God issues a challenge to decisive action.<sup>583</sup> In other words, the Church was able to accompany its people in their struggle for justice, freedom and “kingdom values” at a critical time in their history. As Tengtenga puts it, in endeavouring accomplish this task the Church itself was redeemed.<sup>584</sup> It was no longer the instrument of the Pharaoh to be used for the legitimisation of his power, instead it became the prophetic voice demanding freedom for the people of God. As for the Pharaoh, himself, after some questions about his health due to his age, Dr Banda ran in Malawi's first truly democratic presidential elections in 1994, and was roundly defeated by Bakili Muluzi (whose two terms in office were not without serious controversy, either). The party Dr Banda led since taking over from Orton Chirwa (in 1960), the Malawi Congress Party, remains a major force in Malawian politics today. Dr Banda was arrested in 1995 and put on trial for murder, but was later acquitted due to lack of evidence. He died on a hospital bed in South Africa on 15 November 1997, reportedly aged 99 or 101 (his death certificate is missing).<sup>585</sup>

Across the globe, in Japan, the ecclesiological identity of the Anglican Church developed in different manner. In addition to surviving an attempt by the Japanese Empire to a forced union with other Churches under direct control of the WWII government, as well as tackling pressures to adopt emperor worship, the modern-day Anglican Church in Japan has developed an ecclesiological identity which has allowed it to remain contextualised and indigenous, as well as taking on the government over such issues as the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster in 2011.

### **Japan: The Development of Anglican Ecclesiology vs Nationalism**

The 1930s brought a whole new set of challenges to the Anglican Church in Japan. Due to the increasingly tense political situation in the west, overseas funding decreased and consequently the number of western Anglican missionaries in Japan declined considerably. At the same time, the ordained leadership and laity of the young Church

---

<sup>583</sup> Leonard 2010, p.7

<sup>584</sup> Tengtenga 2006, pp.180-181

<sup>585</sup> Tenthani 2000: “Mystery of the Banda millions”

faced some increasingly challenging circumstances within Japanese society. When nationalism and militarism intensified in what was to become the run up to WWII, Christianity was increasingly portrayed by the nationalist political powers as incompatible with the loyalty expected of Japanese subjects.<sup>586</sup> Nationalist politicians romanticised the militarism of the Samurai era and wanted to promote Shinto as the state-sponsored national religion of Japan, with the cult of the Tenno (emperor) as the divine embodiment of Japan at its centre. This growing influence of militarism in domestic and foreign policy would eventually reach its apex during WWII.

Japanese Anglican theologian and priest, Rev Samuel Isamu Koiishi, writes about this era of the Church in an article from 1998 entitled “The Nippon Sen Ko Kai: Today and Its Future Task”.<sup>587</sup> In it, Koiishi suggests that modernism, as a force, was prevalent in those days on a worldwide scale, something which needs to be understood as a vital part of what led Japan into WWII.<sup>588</sup> The imperial government attempted to modernise the nation in a very short time, in a race to catch up with the west after centuries of isolation. It sought, therefore, to avoid the struggle and social division which such violent change can cause within a society. A central aspect of this ambitious social and political project was the ideal of a modern Japanese nation state under the Tenno, the emperor, assuming the mantle as a living embodiment of Japan, a concept which went hand in hand with the use of traditional religious and cultural exclusivism, with the purpose of giving a clear definition of what a modern Japanese national identity entailed. As a part of that ideological drive, the government also put in place a systematised mutual-surveillance program. “These two points gave people a strong xenophobia which made them close their eyes and ears to anything from outside, and at the same time forced the people into a hierarchy in which Tenno was at the apex”.<sup>589</sup> This aspect of Japanese society is vital in order to understand the existential reality of the Anglican Church at the time. Increasingly it faced the question of how Christians should understand political leadership as authority. Should the Church incorporate into its cosmology the authority of the Tenno? Did a genuinely Japanese ecclesiological identity have to accept the quasi-divine nature of the emperor? “Or the truth that has

---

<sup>586</sup> Ion 1993, pp. 254-256

<sup>587</sup> See Bibliography for further details about the document.

<sup>588</sup> Koiishi 1998, p.370

<sup>589</sup> Koiishi 1998, p.370

been revealed by the cross and the resurrection of Jesus Christ as the real authority?<sup>590</sup> The Nippon Sen Ko Kai had struggled with these political and theological issues since its origins. However, these questions grew even more acute in the years leading up to WWII. During this era the NSKK, had to find of way of asserting its Japanese identity without marrying the nationalist ideas and the concept of a (Tenno-centred) nation state, as projected by the government. From an ecclesiological perspective, this gives evidence of the kind of inculturation and indigenisation proposed in this thesis, which seeks to affirm the ethnic, cultural and social value of the local context, without linking it to a particular nation state.

On 27 September 1940, Japan signed the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Italy, which marked its official entry into WWII, on the side of Axis powers.<sup>591</sup> This development only served to exacerbate the relationship between the Anglican Church and the state. Due to their historical ties with their mother institutions in the west, most Churches where regarded with suspicion by the Japanese war government. Consequently, through the propaganda machine of the state, Christianity was once again portrayed as an unwanted, western influence upon Japanese society. Even worse, the Christian faith was often caricatured as a kind of religious treason against the Emperor.<sup>592</sup> This was especially true for the Anglican Church, which had ties with both the United Kingdom as well as the USA and Canada, three nations against which Japan was now openly at war! This added to the perception that Christian institutions posed a security risk, due to their western origins. For that reason the Japanese government devised an attempt to bring all the “Protestant” Churches into one ecclesiastical body under its control, including the NSKK (the Japanese government seems to have lacked the theological expertise to recognise the Anglican Church as reformed but not “Protestant” in nature).<sup>593</sup> On June 24 of 1941, thirty-three very diverse religious groups in Japan were forcibly brought together by the wartime government to form the United Church of Christ in Japan, or Kyodan. Thus, the Kyodan became the forced union of such disparate groups as Baptists, Lutherans, Pentecostals, Dutch Reformed and other independent Churches, as well as parts of the Anglican Church which where willing to

---

<sup>590</sup> Koiishi 1998, pp.370-371

<sup>591</sup> Hill 2003, p.91

<sup>592</sup> Ion 1993, pp. 254-256

<sup>593</sup> Ion 1993, p.254

submit (mostly the Evangelical congregations).<sup>594</sup> Potentially, there is an argument to be made that the Evangelical congregations, with their tendency towards an ecclesiology that puts more emphasis on biblical authority and is less concerned with the institutional and incarnational aspects of the Church, may have been more willing to change institutional structures without perceiving any loss of integrity to their faith. Regardless, the majority of the NSKK congregations led by their Primate, Bishop Paul Sasaki, refused to join the Kyodan. Arguably this was a direct reflection of the ecclesiological identity of the NSKK, a Church which at this point was mostly Japanese in terms of its leadership and its congregations, but remained staunchly opposed to the nationalist, warmongering agenda of the Japanese state.<sup>595</sup> This was an act of defiance that came at a high price.<sup>596</sup>

Primate Sasaki issued a written statement in October of 1942, which was signed by the majority of the Japanese Anglican bishops, in an act of great personal valour on behalf of the bishops in question. In this statement, the NSKK adamantly rejected the union with the Kyodan. In no uncertain terms, the NSKK held fast to the ecclesiological principle that religion should not be “unduly interfered with by the state”.<sup>597</sup> They also highlighted as a reason (amongst others) for rejecting the government proposal, the failure of the Kyodan to adopt the Apostles' Creed as one of its main theological tenets.<sup>598</sup> Through their courageous stand, the Anglican Primate of Japan and his bishops upheld the authority of the Anglican Church's episcopacy and Apostolic succession. Their actions not only reflect the distinctive doctrinal character of the NSKK, but also demonstrates how the Church affirmed its Japanese identity at the same that it defended its institutional integrity, refusing to submit its ecclesiological identity to the will of the nation state. This provides a good example of the kind of Anglican ecclesiological model which is put forward in this thesis as a potential template for the Anglican Communion as a whole. A model that acknowledges and affirms the value of contextualisation, but does not prioritise its particular national identity above that of the

---

<sup>594</sup> Ion 1993, pp.254-255

<sup>595</sup> Ion 1993, p.256

<sup>596</sup> Bishop Paul Shinji Sasaki (1885 -1946) served as the Primate of the Nippon Sei Ko Kai throughout much of the Second World War. He was the first Japanese born Anglican Bishop of the Diocese of Mid-Japan, and had trained for the priesthood at Westcott House in Cambridge. For more details see: Standing Commission of Liturgy and Music of The Episcopal Church, 2010. (See bibliography).

<sup>597</sup> Ion 1993, p.311

<sup>598</sup> Ion 1993, p.308

greater context which is the Anglican Communion, an expression of the universal Church of God.

The NSKK's non-cooperation with the religious policies of the state came at a high price. The Church and its leadership underwent years of public humiliation as well as harassment by the government and especially the military police. Several of the leaders of the NSKK were imprisoned, amongst them Primate Sasaki as well as Bishops Samuel Heaslett (an Englishman who, after his incarceration, went on to become assistant Bishop of Sheffield) and Sugai Todomu, Bishop of South Tokyo.<sup>599</sup> During the war years, government prosecutors examined Sasaki and Sugai Todomu on numerous occasions, and the military police detained them for extended periods of time on charges of treason and “for being defeatists”.<sup>600</sup> Both Sasaki and Todomu were incarcerated at Sugamo Prison in Tokyo, which was reserved for political prisoners and allied spies. Upon their release both men were found malnourished and in poor health from their confinement.<sup>601</sup>

Unfortunately, the Japanese military government was not the only threat to the Anglican Church during the war years. As if the risk of persecution was not enough, the Allied incendiary bombing of Tokyo and other urban areas caused a great number of casualties amongst the civilian population and damaged an unmeasurable number of buildings, including several churches. Upon his release from prison, Bishop Sasaki and a number of Anglican clergy remained in Tokyo throughout the Allied incendiary bombing of the city, supporting and leading their Church through this crisis. Bishop Sasaki died less than a year after the end of the war. Thanks to the great sacrifices of Primate Paul Sasaki and all of those Japanese clergy, who together with their congregations, resisted government pressure and police harassment, the Anglican Church in Japan was able to retain most of its land, but more importantly, its distinctive Anglican identity. To this day the Church upholds an ecclesiological model which safeguards its institutional integrity and yet continues to be committed to the Anglican ethos of contextualisation, a theme that we shall explore in the next part.<sup>602</sup>

---

<sup>599</sup> Ion 1993, p.254

<sup>600</sup> Ion 1993, pp. 311-312

<sup>601</sup> Ion 1993, p.311

<sup>602</sup> Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music of TEC, 2010.

### **Anglican Ecclesiological Identity and the Modern-Day Japanese State**

One of the main challenges of trying to discern Anglican comprehensions of the Church is that they are often more implicit than explicit. Consequently, one of the main sources for trying to detect the ecclesiological self-comprehension of a Church is through its actions and by analysing its theological statements, which are often produced in the face of events or changes within the society in which the Church exists. Hence, in order to understand the current relationship of the Anglican Church in Japan with the nation state, it is worth studying the behaviour of the Church through some of the recent defining moments in Japanese society. As main examples of this I have chosen the disaster caused by the Tohoku Earthquake and Tsunami that hit Japan in 2011, with the subsequent failure of the Fukushima nuclear reactors. In addition, I have chosen to analyse the role that the Anglican Church has played in dealing with some of the recent social tensions within Japanese society, which have resulted from Japan's struggle with modern-day attempts to reconcile itself with the atrocities and human rights abuses it committed during its wars with Korea and China, and during WWII. The purpose is to attempt to distil the kind of ecclesiological self-comprehension which has allowed the Anglican Church in Japan to challenge the position of the state on behalf of Japanese society. I will attempt to demonstrate how the NSKK has managed to assert its identity as an indigenous Church that speaks from within Japanese society defending the wellbeing of its people, precisely through remaining in various degrees of opposition to the nationalistic tendency of submission to the will of the state – for example, by strongly indicating the government's faults concerning the Fukushima disaster, and criticising the state's welfare policies (or lack thereof), as well as by standing in staunch opposition to the nationalist ideologies which do not wish for Japan to acknowledge its war crimes.

On Friday 11 March 2011, at 14:46 JST, the Tohoku Earthquake (the Great East Japan Earthquake) hit most of eastern Japan. Its magnitude was 9.0 on the Richter scale (the strongest one registered in the history of the nation). In addition, the undersea mega-thrust which triggered the earthquake caused one of the most savage tsunamis in modern history.<sup>603</sup> Less than an hour after the earthquake, the first of many gigantic

---

<sup>603</sup> Oskin 2013: Japan Earthquake & Tsunami of 2011: Facts and Information

waves hit Japan's coastline. The waves reached heights of up to 39 meters (above sea level), hitting Miyako city (Iwate Prefecture on the east coast of Japan) and travelling inland as far as 10 km, reaching as far as Sendai (the capital city of Miyagi Prefecture). The tsunami flooded an estimated area of approximately 561 km<sup>2</sup>, and approximately 30,000 people died or went missing; an even greater number were injured by the combination of the earthquake and tsunami.<sup>604</sup> However, this was not to be the end of the disaster. The immense mass of water that came over the coast, with such enormous power, caused a catastrophic failure at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, triggering a meltdown of three of the plant's six nuclear reactors.<sup>605</sup> The result was a level 7 nuclear meltdown (the maximum level possible in the International Nuclear and Radiological Event Scale, INES) and a subsequent release of large amounts of radioactive material. In the week following the accident, about 300 tons of radioactive water leaked from the plant, every day, into the Pacific Ocean, with disastrous effects on all marine life in the area.<sup>606</sup> During this cataclysmic event (and in the years that followed it), the NSKK continued to demonstrate its ecclesiological ethos as a Church steeped in a relationship of various degrees of tension with the nation state. It openly and repeatedly challenged the governments policies regarding the failure of the Fukushima Nuclear Power plant. In a statement written by Professor Nishihara in 2011, which was introduced to the world by the (then) Archbishop of Canterbury, The Most Rev Dr Rowan Williams, the Church severely criticises the Japanese government:

And then, in addition to the earthquake and the tsunami, we were gripped by an additional fear: Fear due to the explosion of the reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant, as they went out of control and spread concentrated radioactivity. The Japanese scholars would tell us that these levels were “at levels that would not affect the human body,” but the thing which I have learned when I was a student of the department of technology at Kyoto University, is that there is no radioactivity which does not have influence in a human body.<sup>607</sup>

---

<sup>604</sup> Oskin 2013: Japan Earthquake & Tsunami of 2011: Facts and Information

<sup>605</sup> Wakatsuk 2014: New radioactive water leak at Japan's Fukushima Daiichi plant

<sup>606</sup> Oskin 2013: Japan Earthquake & Tsunami of 2011: Facts and Information

<sup>607</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.269 and ACNS 2011: “Easter will be a time of hope, a small shoot amongst the rubble”

In an article from 2013, Professor Nishihara writes that the vulnerability of the Fukushima reactors, in the case of a Chile-classed tsunami, had already been flagged up four years before the accident.<sup>608</sup> Nishihara states that, in the mind of the Church, the accident at the Fukushima reactors was “entirely man-made in nature”.<sup>609</sup> He criticises the government, and writes that now “all of the world could see the nuclear power plants, which were lauded as being absolutely safe in the face of any natural disaster, explode one after another, and unbelievable amounts of radioactivity and radioactive substances were spread into the air, earth, and ocean”.<sup>610</sup> Further, Professor Nishihara expands upon the NSKK's criticism of the nuclear safety policies of the Japanese government. He reflects upon the many Japanese scholars that appeared on television in the months following the meltdown, repeating that “there is no immediate influence to the human body” which Nishihara contradicts, stating that there is no level of radiation leak which does not directly affect the human body (as seen above).<sup>611</sup> In addition, Nishihara writes that “the Japanese government, power companies and university experts who compose the so-called ‘nuclear village’ held vested interests in nuclear power”. Nishihara goes on to accuse these government experts of purposefully obscuring the facts in favour of governmental and commercial powers, and they therefore “often misrepresent the extent of the damage – despite knowing the immeasurable damage which will have an impact of 10 years, 20 years, and many generations from now”.<sup>612</sup> Consequently, Professor Nishihara reflects upon the nature of the NSKK as both Anglican and Japanese, and what this means in the face of the Fukushima reactor leak, encouraging the Church to take a stronger stand against the environmental negligence of the Japanese government and the disastrous consequences this has had upon the Japanese people:

Japan has been a “victim” of radiation represented by “Hiroshima” and “Nagasaki.”  
However, after “Fukushima,” Japan was continuing to spread radiation across the world and subjectively must be seen as having become the “offender.” Meanwhile, we, as an Anglican Church in Japan, must strongly reflect upon why we could not speak more

---

<sup>608</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.269

<sup>609</sup> Nishihara 2013, pp.269-270

<sup>610</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.270

<sup>611</sup> Nishihara 2013, pp.269-270

<sup>612</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.270



prophetically. In light of Christian ethics, why does the Anglican Church in Japan not oppose Japanese nuclear energy administration and knowledge?

At the same time, from this disaster, we have recognized how important it is to encourage our congregations to be more sympathetic to the pain of others and to be able to have a concrete solidarity.<sup>613</sup>

In addition, Nishihara writes that, faced with this tragedy, the Anglican Church in Japan should increase its efforts to fulfil its responsibility to “deepen ties with the world, our society, and our neighbours.”<sup>614</sup> In this statement Nishihara is firmly rooted in his own identity as a Japanese Anglican priest, which in turn is based upon on the universal claims of Christianity. As a priest of the Church, he transcends the national boundaries of Japan, expressing a concern for the world as a whole. This kind of ecclesiological reflection ties in directly to the radical, prophetic and non-nation bound, but simultaneously inculturated and indigenised, ecclesiological identity, which this study seeks to demonstrate and to put forward as an example for the whole of the Anglican Communion.

Another useful example of the self-perception of the NSKK as an indigenous Church, with a ministry that is embedded in Japanese society, but without being compromised by national ties, is provided by NSKK's conference on mission, held in August of 1995. The theme of the conference was “The Mission of the NSKK – Our responsibility to History and Outlook on the 21st Century”. One of the main points of the conference was that the Church sought forgiveness for its inactions through Japan's occupation of various countries in Asia during the 1900s, including Korea and China. Consequently, at its 1996 general synod, the NSKK formally adopted a resolution entitled: “A Declaration concerning the war responsibility of the NSKK”. This document received much positive attention at the 1998 Lambeth Conference.<sup>615</sup>

### **The Missiology of The NSKK and the Japanese State**

Missiology is another area which provides some evidence of the NSKK's endeavour to have a ministry which is embedded in Japanese culture without having its identity

---

<sup>613</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.270

<sup>614</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.269

<sup>615</sup> Nishihara 2013, pp.269-270

entangled with that of a nation state. During the 1990s, the Executive Committee of the NSKK issued a statement defining the Church's missiology.<sup>616</sup> The theological formulations of this document reveal much about the Japanese Anglican Church's ecclesiological identity and self-perception. The document begins by expressing that the Church understands that it is an essential part of its calling to develop and adapt its mission to the needs of the times “[...] we affirm anew that the Church exists for God’s Mission. Mission in this sense means that, under God’s calling and guidance in history, we do not maintain the status quo as something fixed, but ceaselessly and boldly follow the process of reform.”<sup>617</sup> The Church also renews its commitment to stand on the side of the poor and oppressed, stating that an essential purpose of the Church is the “restoration of their rights and position in society to those who suffer and are despised as ‘little ones’” and pledges to become an institution which listens “not to the stories of the rulers but to the stories of the people. Following them we will tell our own stories. In our own words, we will tell about the history and the present of the NSKK, and also of its future.”<sup>618</sup> The statement then also affirms the prophetic character of NSKK's ministry, asserting human rights, social justice and the environment as central issues of its mission:

Through this effort, we believe that we will be able for the first time to make incarnate the Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ. We are also being called to fulfil a prophetic mission in this world and this society. Above all, the NSKK must become the salt of the earth, the light of the world, to change the social order itself, that gives birth to and supports discrimination and oppression. We understand the Mission of God in which we have a part to include all of these things.<sup>619</sup>

This statement demonstrates that the Church is conscious that there have been occasions in history when it has failed to live up to its God-given mandate to protect the poor and stand on the side of the oppressed. This gives evidence that the Church, in its self-awareness and recognition as belonging to Japanese society, shares and shoulders the burden of guilt felt by a large fraction of the Japanese population. The Church accepts

---

<sup>616</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.271

<sup>617</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.271

<sup>618</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.271

<sup>619</sup> Nishihara 2013, p.271

part of its responsibility for the actions of Japan through the wars of the 1900s, and seeks forgiveness for its own transgressions and inactions in the face of these atrocities. In this sense, when the Church formulates its own genuine admission of guilt, it is also acting out a pastoral response to a social trauma that exists at large within the society, regarding its nation's history.

### **Reflection on the Ecclesiological Identity of the NSKK**

The aim of this study has been to stipulate how the ecclesiological legacy and identity of the NSKK is not merely the result of accidents of history, but was formed and developed out of the conscious appliance of Anglican ecclesiological principles, and that these have been, and continue to be, alive throughout the history of NSKK. One of these principals is the striving for the Church to become indigenised and to have a ministry which is embedded in Japanese culture, and which meets the needs of its society in a way which is faithful to the universal claims of the Christian gospel. But as I propose in this thesis, this ethos need not and should not amount to the Anglican Church adopting a national identity as one of its primary paragons of institutional definition. The NSKK continuously endeavours to be genuinely indigenous and inculturated within its society, and yet, time over time, it has refused to submit to the nationalistic ideologies of the Japanese state (through its various incarnations), and often paid a very high price for it. This also ties in to the proposed idea that the Anglican Communion should re-embrace its *radical* (lat. *radix*, "root") origins, including the connotations of this word as *thoroughgoing* or *extreme* in regard to change from accepted or current forms in the comprehension and self-understanding of the Anglican Communion. As well as adapting the meaning of radical, in terms of challenging the *Status Quo*, and favouring radical ideas. As an institution, the NSKK was born within a nation that not too long ago had vowed to eradicate Christianity from its borders, and which had persecuted Christians for several centuries. Yet, through the earliest of the Anglican missionary efforts in such places as the Ainu people of Hokaido and the young women, factory workers of Okaya, the Anglican Church established itself, early on, as an institution which stood on the side of the oppressed and the poor. Thus, Anglicanism in Japan became a radical and prophetic voice which acted in defiance of the discriminatory policies of the Japanese nation state. Certainly, in the

case of the Ainu people, the Anglican Church essentially challenged the Japanese state's claims to cultural hegemony on its isles, effectively punctuating its projected nationalist ideology, and chose to fight for the rights of a people who were not culturally, socially or even ethnically Japanese.

Another point at which the ecclesiological development of the NSKK is linked with the ecclesiological principals proposed in this thesis, is the need to recognise the transnational character of the theology which once gave birth to the idea of an Anglican Communion. The foundation of the NSKK itself was only made possible by transcending the “national boundaries” initially set up by the different Anglican missionary groups present in Japan, who clung on to the national identities of their mother Churches in the west (mainly England, USA and Canada). In other words, the common Anglican inheritance of the different groups involved took precedence over their various national identities. In addition, as a witness to the multifaceted nature of Anglican ecclesiology, the newly formed NSKK was capable of incorporating within its ecclesiological framework, the broad spectra of theological traditions upheld by the missionary organisations from which it originated. In the years leading up WWII, and then during the war itself, the Church struggled with the rise of nationalism and Tenno ideology. The situation became even more critical when the relatively young, Japanese Anglican Church, saw itself forced to openly defy the government's attempt to submit it under its control, through a forced union with the Kyodan. The issue of Tenno-ideology, however, was one with which the Church was not to come to terms with, until the end of the twentieth century.

In more recent times, the ecclesiological identity of the NSKK has led the Church to openly question and challenge the government's nuclear policies in the wake of the Tohoku disaster and the subsequent reactor leak from the Fukushima Daiishi Nuclear Power Plant. The NSKK has done so on behalf all the Japanese people, and has acted in conjunction with other religious bodies and various institutions, out of a great pastoral concern for the communities to which it belongs. A concern that was born out of the same theological and ecclesiological principles that once led the first missionaries to establish a presence amongst the Ainu and the poor of Japan, even when it had to be done against the expressed interests of the Japanese government. The Church has also given evidence of possessing the maturity to publicly admit its mistakes and

shortcomings and to seek forgiveness for its own transgressions and inactions, which is exemplified by the missiological definition-statement of 1995.

As discussed in previous chapters, many Anglican Churches have their origins within the British imperial expansion, and some were born as attempted transplants of the Church of England, with its distinct national identity. Consequently, Anglican ecclesiological identity has often been linked to that of national, secular states (Church of England, Anglican Church of Australia, etc,etc). This national identity, with the sense of independence that comes with it (the notions of sovereignty and territorial integrity being innate to the modern concept of nation state), has at times, been considered both a virtue and an essential part of Anglican identity. However, one of the main arguments put forth in this thesis is that the transnational and global pains which the Communion is undergoing in the first decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, are to a large extent, caused by the respective ties to national identities which the member Churches are linked to. It follows then that a move towards the dissolution of such national identities (and the limitations these impose on the universality of the Church), while simultaneously upholding the principles of inculturation and indigenisation, constitutes an essential element of a theology capable of moving the Anglican Communion beyond its current impasse. The case of the Japanese Anglican Church (NSKK) constitutes, therefore, a valuable example of an Anglican ecclesiological identity which was born outside the direct influence of the British monarchy and consequently was not established as a part of British colonialism. Instead, the NSKK's conception of an Anglican identity was founded upon adherence to classical Anglican principles and ecclesiological formulations, such as embodied by the Book of Common Prayer and the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. Consequently, Japanese Anglican ecclesiological identity was not primarily formed as a transplantation of an English national Church (or American for that matter). Instead, the NSKK developed its identity within an early conception of the Anglican Communion as a Church or “a fellowship of churches *within* the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church”.<sup>620</sup> The chosen name Nippon Sen Ko Kai, which translates as *Japanese Holy Catholic Church*, gives evidence of this. From an early stage the Japanese Anglican Church developed a self-understanding as a unique branch

---

<sup>620</sup> Lambeth Conference 1930, Resolution: 49

of the one true universal Church, which was based upon its communally upheld identity within Anglicanism, a claim that was, and continues to be, advocated not on the basis of some historical links with the British Crown nor with North American culture, but on the grounds that, through its ecclesiological inheritance as Anglican, the NSKK understands itself as forming part of a continuous and unbroken link with the ancient and primitive Church.

### **The Future of Anglican Ecclesiological Identities and Nation states**

In his teaching, Jesus often turned to a language of imagery and parables. Especially so when communicating the deeper mysteries of God and the human experience. Perhaps then, it should not be so surprising that when describing the Church, Jesus turned to the rather compelling metaphor: *I am the vine, you are the branches* (John 15:5). The use of the word *branches* in the plural rather than the singular, is probably no accident. The imagery of branches implies a relationship of interdependence and a living tension between plurality and unity. Each branch may vary from the others, to the point of uniqueness, nevertheless, at the end of the day, all branches stem from the vine and thus are interconnected. What affects one branch will affect all others, it is only a matter of time. In a way, this analogy reveals the heart of Anglican ecclesiology, it describes the relationship between commonality and singularity, change versus tradition, faithfulness and change, and as well as the correlation between particularity and catholicity. As demonstrated in this chapter, this describes a reality with which Anglicans all over the world, wrestle with daily. The question of how to reconcile that sense of interdependency with that of that of the Anglican ethos of living out the gospel as seen fit within each context, has been at the heart of this study. How can the Anglican Communion (re) kindle a strong sense of belonging among its churches, in a way reembrace the value of union, and rekindle deep desire to remain in communion beyond their sometimes diametrically opposed views? Going back to the analogy of the vine: What could make the branches realise how much they need each other in order to stay faithful to the will God? One of the conclusions rising out of this research, is the necessity to realise that the idea that branches from the same vine can be independent of each other (the federalist model), is little more than an illusion; but that simultaneously,

any attempt to pruned the branches in a way that excludes those who think differently (the legislative route) is equally contra productive?

As discussed throughout this thesis, and in this chapter in particular, the link with nation states has provided the Anglican churches with a sense of independence and entitlement, as well as with a tendency for a perceived need to guard their own theological self-interests (e.g conservative and traditionalist vs liberal and inclusivist) against the claims of sister churches, in a manner that mirrors that of nation states. However, within a Communion the right to self-express and to exercise particularity must be subject to a voluntary form of self-imposed inhibition. In other words, the ecclesiological identity of belonging to the Anglican Communion must take ontological precedence over that of a national or local identity. However, unlike other more hierarchical ecclesiological entities (e.g Roman Catholicism, and some of the Orthodox churches) within the Anglican Communion, this kind of inhibition should not, and cannot, be imposed through a form of top down authoritarianism. As the old saying goes *if I climb on the cross, it is self-sacrifice, if you put me there against my will, then its murder.*

Consequently, this self-inhibition must be born out of a genuine and internal desire to put a common ecclesiological identity before that of any perceived individual or local need to either pruned the vine or to innovate, in ways that will affect the whole Communion. If the churches, members of the communion, fail to live out such a sense of self-imposed inhibition (on both sides of the divide) then the issues of gender, sexuality, morality and patterns of inclusivity will continue to be focal points of division and primary markers of identity, rather than secondary points of disagreement, inferior to the interconnectedness of the Anglican churches, to each other, and to the vine. As such, the tensions caused by these issues will only continue to aggravate the current situation, until such point where a final schism may take place. It is at this stage that the Eucharistic Anarchism suggested by Cavanaugh, may fall into place. A true *religio* (as opposed a national one) binds human beings to each other and to the salvific Body of Christ (another application of the branches and the vine metaphor), transcending any national or geographical borders and particular theological tendencies. This vision of the Church as the Body of Christ, adds to the imagery of the vines and the branches a comprehension of the Eucharist as the ultimate diffusion of “the false theology and the false anthropology of will and right”, thus shattering the false distinction between mine

and thine, which in turns brings about a radical questioning of property and *dominium*, not just in material terms but also in terms of an identity of belonging, and hegemony of interpretation. In terms of Anglican ecclesiology, when combined with an anthropology where “*There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus*” Eucharistic Anarchism resolves the dilemma of the many and the one. It unmasks the falsity of this antithesis of local and universal. Thus, the Eucharistic community redefines boundaries citizenship and nationality, transcending all political, geographical, national and even ethnical borders. Hence, Eucharistic Anarchy offers the proper integration of the individual and the group, as well as the actualisation of a diverse community/ies (including the diverse phalanxes within the Communion) through shared participation in the divine life. Consequently, while it may not be fully realisable in the secular world, Eucharistic Anarchy may well offer a vital contribution to a (new) and radical ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion.

As pointed out throughout this thesis, this is not just a matter of theory, but a notion that carries weight within the actual life of the Communion. One such example is the case in Japan. In which the broad spectrum of theological and ecclesiological traditions of the diverse Anglican missionary endeavours, came together to form the Nippon Sen Ko Kai. In order for the NSKK to be formed, their diversity and pluriform nature had to be transcended, without extinguishing their particularities. Or to put in more precise, ecclesiological terms, their common identity as Anglicans was given ontological priority over other aspect of their identities, such as being, English, American, Canadian, evangelical, Anglo-Catholic or broad Church. Thus, what was born out of this amalgamation was not a Frankenchurch with disparate and irreconcilable limbs, but rather a mosaic of different traditions, all sharing the same ecclesiological reality, and yet maintaining much of their own particularities. Another important aspect of the need for Anglican ecclesiological identities to reach beyond and transcend national boundaries, is revealed by the fate of the Malawian church. Initially allied with the colonial powers and later almost fully absorbed into the political machinations of dictator Kamuzu Banda; through reaching beyond its local, national, ecclesiological structures, the Anglican Church in Malawi gained the strength and the ability to embrace the KAIROS moment. The Malawian case study show the need for the



transnational reality in which the Anglicanism operates, to be reflected in the ecclesiastical structures of the Anglican churches themselves, and consequently incorporated into their ecclesiological identity. Thus, the Anglican Church in Malawi, with an ecclesiology which was seemingly paralysed, completely under the thumb of an authoritarian dictatorship, working mainly as a tool for the legitimisation of state power; was able, through implementation of transnational structures of support, the church was radicalised (to re-embrace its roots), and re-embrace a self-comprehension, no longer as a sustainer of the Status Quo (colonial or nationalist) but as a prophetic challenger of those who would oppress and persecute its people. This change in self-perception, was brought about by the implementation of transnational structures of support which radically transcended the limited national identity of the Anglican church in Malawi, at that time. Limitations which had facilitated its assimilation by the government and its submission to the will of the State.

Nevertheless, as seen in the case of the Anglican Church in Chile, being able to stay separate from the structures of the state is not necessarily a goal in its self, unless this brings about the ability to speak up in defence of Christian principles, especially in the face of violence and oppression. The actions and choices of the IACH during the military coup of 1973, disclose much about its ecclesiological identity. Although the IACH has never displayed any close ties to the government, and clearly conceives of its self as being part of a larger and transnational ecclesiological reality (e.g Anglican Communion, GAFCON/FCA and the Anglican Covenant) there are, nevertheless, other elements of its ecclesiological identity that have, both by design and through its historical legacy, hindered it from embracing some of the other principles proposed in this thesis. Principles that are meant to accompany a potential transcendence of a national identity. For example, due to its emphasis on private and individual faith, and a perceived dichotomy between social issues such as human rights, distribution of wealth and civil liberties and evangelization, a process of radicalisation similar to of the Anglican church in Malawi, has not been possible. This becomes clear in the examination of the IACH's relationship with the state, especially during the crimes and abuses committed by the military government of Augusto Pinochet. Crimes before which the Anglican church chose to remain "neutral". Consequently, this demonstrates the need for the churches of Anglican Communion to embrace ecclesiological identities

that not only roots them in a transnational reality, but also, underlines the nature of the Church as radical institution that not only transcends the cultural and geographical boundaries of the world, but also questions the status quo and acts out its divine mandate as agent of God's liberation.

Moreover, as previously stated, the disputes which the Communion is currently experiencing at a global level, are at least partially caused by the respective ties to national identities to which the member churches are currently linked. It follows then that a move towards the dissolution of such national identities (and the limitations these impose on the universality of the Church), while simultaneously upholding the principles of inculturation and indigenisation, constitutes an essential element of a theology capable of moving the Anglican Communion beyond its current impasse. Again, as demonstrated in the three "live cases" in this not a matter of pure theory or a disembodied pipe dream. For instance, the Japanese Anglican Church, constitutes Anglican ecclesiological identity borne outside the colonial ambitions of the British Empire. As result, the Japanese conception of an Anglican identity was founded upon adherence to classical Anglican principles of contextualisation and indigenisation, rather than on the basis of allegiance to a particular nationality. While it is true that the NSKK is unquestionably Japanese, it has always existed in various degrees of tension against the Japanese government and its state, including suffering persecution. As a result, it has based its ecclesiological identity on an allegiance to The Anglican Communion as a church or "a fellowship of churches *within* the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Consequently, from an early stage the Japanese Anglican Church developed a self-comprehension as a unique branch of the one true universal Church, founded upon its communally upheld identity within the Anglican Communion. A claim that is not based not some historical links with the British Crown nor with North American culture, but on the grounds, that, through its ecclesiological inheritance as Anglican, the NSKK understands itself as forming part of a continuous and unbroken link with the ancient and primitive Church.

Furthermore, in the postmodern world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, social identities, and in particular national culture, can assert themselves in a variety of ways beyond that of nation states. The nationalist backlash which the Europe is undergoing as the 2010's move to a close, is nothing if not a reaction to the destabilisation of national identities

brought about by such project as the European Union, and pan European federalism. However, for the indigenous peoples of the Americas, Africa, Australia and Asia, this is by no means a new phenomenon. As result of centuries of feeling disenfranchised by their own nation states, their socio-cultural belonging and anthropological identity is tribal rather than tied to a nation state. While some of these peoples perceive of themselves as nations (e.g Sioux Nation, Mapuche Nation, Ainu Nation etc, etc) their concept of nation is mainly tied to their ethnicity and cultural legacy, not to that of nation states. Something which both the IACH and the NSKK (and to a certain extent also the Anglican church of Malawi) have demonstrated through their ministry to native peoples of their respective countries. Accordingly, Anglican ecclesiology needs to engage with the fact that for a large portion of the global population, its main ethnic, cultural and social allegiance is not to that of the political construct of Nation states. Thus, it may become necessary both from a missiological perspective as well as doctrinal one, for the churches of the Anglican Communion to move beyond their current ecclesiological link with nation states.

## Chapter VIII:

### Thesis Conclusion

The birth of the modern world is often associated with the so-called Enlightenment period of 17th-century Europe, and the fractionalisation of western Christendom. It could also be argued that the early modern era has its roots in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century with the “discovery” of the Americas, which is contemporary with the Lutheran reformation. From an ecclesiological perspective, this suggests that the birth of the modern world is interrelated with the fractionalisation of the western Church. The radical and sometimes violent upheavals of the Reformation seem to go hand in hand with the process through which philosophy and science brought the ideals of personal freedom and wellbeing to the forefront of human consciousness. Thus, several advancements in social and political thought came about, such as democracy and human rights. It is no coincidence, then, that this became the era in which the centuries-old corporate identities that flourished within Western Christianity during the Middle Ages gave way to ecclesiological identities with a more contextualised and theologically defined basis. That is not to say that there was no theological foundation behind the corporate identity of the pre-Reformation Church. However, to put it bluntly, for centuries there simply was no other option beyond the Church of Rome (at least not in the west).

During the Reformation, the Lutheran, Calvinist and Zwinglian movements (and their respective offshoots) developed ecclesiological identities along the lines of common confessional foundations, while the English reformation settled for a more ethnical, cultural and at times nationalist approach. As illustrated in the works of modern Anglican theologians outside the mainstream of Anglo-Saxon Anglicanism (e.g. Jaci C. Mariachin, Glauco Soares De Lima and Glenda R. McQueen), from a non-Anglo-Saxon Anglican perspective (which is little concerned with English nationalism in the 1500s) the English Reformation is often thought of as the genesis of the Anglican predisposition to give theological weight to cultural factors, and the consequent Anglican propensity towards contextualisation and indigenisation. For example, in non-Anglo-Saxon Anglican theology, Article XXXIV (of the 39 Articles of Religion) is often

referred to as evidence that, from its origins, Anglicanism has been strongly disposed to considering cultural factors. The affirmation of “Anglicanism” passed through all levels of the Church’s reality, from the political to the liturgical and the spiritual. The English language, adopted in the service of worship by men like Tyndale and Cranmer, became immeasurably enriched and brought about a golden era within English culture, through music, poetry and art. Hence the claim arises that Anglicanism, unlike other religious traditions with roots in the Reformation, was not based on a set doctrinal system, but rather on liturgical practice and ecclesiology. In other words, the reforming fathers of the English Church never appealed to a body of doctrines or confessional statements of their own. The English Church affirmed its catholicity not by adding doctrines, but by purifying its forms of worship. Hence, from the perspective of non-Anglo-Saxon Anglicanism, the primary rationale of the English Reformation is the *contextualisation* and *indigenisation* of the life and practices of the western Church.

When the Church of England, for purely political reasons, could no longer continue its subordination to the Bishop of Rome, it began to reinterpret its identity as the original Catholic Church in Great Britain. Consequently, the break with Rome was not a theological one, but a political and ecclesiological one, concerned mainly with the Pope’s authority over the English Church. Of course, making such a distinctive division between theology and ecclesiology might be oversimplifying things, since they are both closely interlinked. Nevertheless, disputes over the nature of the sacraments and the questioning of medieval practices, such as devotion to the saints and the nature of confession and absolution, played a relatively minor role in the early days. It was only later, as Puritan theology gained influence across Europe and on the British Isles, that the more radical ideas of Calvin and Luther had their effect in England as well. This is an important aspect of the genesis of Anglican Ecclesiology, which needs to be made explicit within an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion. Tying its origins to such a radical and ground-breaking process as the first systematic and conscious contextualisation and indigenisation of the life and liturgy of the western Church, to a specific people (the English), binds contemporary Anglican ecclesiology to the notion that its pluralism and diversity is not an accident of history, but a conscious, purposeful and necessary aspect of its existence. In this way, pluralism becomes more than a necessary burden brought about through disparate origins and processes of formation, as

something that needs to be endured in order to keep unity. Instead, the wondrous variety of Anglicanism is brought forward as a legacy of the great endeavour of the Church to strengthen its identity. For though Anglicanism, may have broken with Rome, it has not broken with the catholic and apostolic tradition of the ancient and undivided Church. Such an ecclesiological identity makes it explicit that the Anglican Communion is not a mere accident of history, but constitutes a particular and contemporary embodiment of the vision and comprehension of the Church (and the potential Communion of Churches) which the Apostles and the earliest fathers of the Church envisioned, before either the ecclesiastical monarchism of Rome or the Confessionalism of the Reformation entered the main stage of Christianity. Such a formulation of its ecclesiological foundations endows the Communion with a sense that there is a unique purpose to being Anglican and to being a member of the Anglican Communion.

Nevertheless, this is not the only gift which the minority Churches bring to the table of mainstream (Anglo-Saxon) Anglicanism. As seen throughout this thesis, the current struggles over the infrastructure and authority (mutual accountability of member Churches, grievance procedures, the nature of Church leadership, etc.) especially in connection with issues related to homosexuality, have re-actualized the need to assess the nature of the Anglican Communion. Consequently, the need to define Anglican identity and ecclesiology has now become acute among all the Churches of the Communion. These issues have become an integral part of a worldwide struggle to re-examine, and perhaps redefine, the Anglican Communion's rationale for existence. This is where the voice of Anglican minorities, on the margins of society, wielding little (if any) power and influence, may portray an Anglican ecclesiology which has been less affected by British imperialism or the fiercely nationalist tendencies of post-colonial states, two factors that affect the current struggles within the Communion. Consequently, the experiences of these minority or "fringe" Churches represent an invaluable contribution to the self-understanding and continued existence of the Anglican Communion itself. Those "fringe" Churches have grown and developed in parts of the world where the propagation of the English language has not been a driving factor behind their existence, and they often find themselves in a situation of double minority: they are both relatively small, in terms of size and number, and also constitute a minority within the Anglican Communion because their own functional and liturgical

languages (often there is more than one) is not that of the vast majority of Anglicans. This experience grants them a unique perspective on what it means to be Anglican.

The issue of ecclesiological identity has seldom been charged with the same acuteness that self-definition and identity carry among the Anglican “minority” Churches, for whom the issue of self-definition is often a matter of survival. In fact, some of these churches are so desperately small that failure to define themselves as a viable alternative for their people, as bearers of a unique gift for their salvation/liberation, can potentially mean extinction. They exist only because they have been able to carve out an existence with such small resources as they have found at their disposal. Theirs is a different way of embracing Anglican ecclesiological identity, one that is formed by an experience that, historically, has been less conditioned by a national ethos. For these Churches, having a clear *raison d’être* is acutely a matter of survival; no one is going to invite them onto the established socio-cultural stage as integral parts of their people’s national and cultural heritage. Consequently, their perspective is a useful contribution to the pursuit of ecclesiology capable of moving the Anglican Communion beyond its traditional patterns of thought and formulations.

Another contribution made by a non-Anglo-Saxon perspective to Anglicanism is the realisation that the Church of England has never, at any point in its history, been confined to England, as a nation nor as a royal realm. As demonstrated in this thesis, the realm of England included Wales from 1536 (already a part of the Province of Canterbury), and in 1521 the English courts confirmed that the Isle of Man was not part of the realm of England, yet the diocese of Sodor and Man (formerly belonging to the Norwegian province of Nidaros with its episcopal see in Trondheim) was assimilated into the Province of York in 1521. Also, the Channel Islands, which until today do not form part of the United Kingdom, were annexed to the Diocese of Winchester. As a result, Anglicanism has never been a purely national affair.

Nevertheless, the notion of an Anglican family of Churches, historically descended from the Church of England, can be traced as far back as the 17th century, when the Church of England first left British shores with settlers to the Americas, and continued to spread in the same way to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and other far-flung parts of the British Empire. This historical fact has laid ground for the somewhat simplistic view that “Anglicanism”, as we know it today, is a child of

British imperialism. Consequently, there is a need for an ecclesiology that explicitly underlines the reality that Anglicanism was never simply a national affair, and thus brings to the forefront the fact that the Church of England has never, in its history, been limited to the nation of England! That way, the transnational aspect of Anglicanism is established as part of its original DNA, and not as an add-on that was born out of colonial ambition rather than theological design. This point is not one of historical revisionism, nor of denying that Anglicanism has served as a tool for promoting British imperial triumphalism and nationalism, because it has – that is just a matter of historical fact. Instead, the idea is to establish within contemporary Anglican ecclesiology that this is far from the whole truth. There is a very different side to the story of Anglicanism and its ecclesiology, which is removed from the ambitions of a now dead empire. This is the narrative of the “fringe” Churches.

Furthermore, the formulation of an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, such as the one proposed in this thesis, could easily run the risk of becoming too abstract and distanced from the actual reality of Church life within the Anglican Communion. That is why the theoretical proposals and underpinnings of this thesis have been intertwined with real-life studies of how the ecclesiological principles put forward within the thesis have been applied within the Anglican ecclesiology. The purpose of this has been to prove that the ecclesiological principles proclaimed in this thesis are not mere ecclesiological science fiction, but are actually rooted within the life and ecclesiology of the Communion, even if only implicitly so. These principles are the proposed impetus which needed to be re-embraced and re-discovered by an ecclesiological narrative capable of endowing the Anglican Communion with a self-comprehension as a contemporary embodiment of an apostolic and patristic vision of the Church. In order to prove that such an ecclesiology is prompted by a theology that is rooted within the origins of the Anglican Communion, an analysis was conducted of three “live cases”, Japan, Chile and Malawi, each of which represents a different tradition of Anglicanism within a unique cultural and geographical context.

The study of the development of the ecclesiological identity of the NSKK revealed a Church that was originally born as an almost anti-thesical institution to that of the Imperial nation state of Japan. The Holy Catholic Church of Japan was the first autonomous province to be formed outside the British Crown’s predominant area of



influence, born and formed in a relationship of constant strain and sometimes outright antagonism with the Japanese state and the nationalist ideology it has stood for throughout its history. From the Meiji Restoration and onwards to the nationalist military rule of the WWII-era, all the way to the modern day democratic Japan, the Anglican Church in Japan has had to function at various degrees of almost constant tension with the Japanese state. Nevertheless, from the earliest days of the Anglican missionary endeavours among the Ainu people of Hokaido and the young female factory workers of Okaya, the Anglican Church established itself as an institution that was both indigenous and contextualised, and yet managed to be a prophetic voice on the side of the oppressed and the poor. In the case of the Ainu people, the Anglican Church openly challenged the Japanese state's claims to cultural hegemony on its isles, effectively punctuating its projected nationalist ideology in defence of the rights of a people who were not culturally, socially or even ethnically Japanese. This is a living example of how Anglican ecclesiology can be contextualised within a conception of “nation” (the Ainu nation) that is culturally, ethnically and anthropologically wholly different from that of a nation state. Moreover, both the nascent Anglican Churches in Japan and Malawi had to learn to work in entirely new realities, far removed from the established ecclesiological model of the Church of England. The Anglican missionaries in Japan had to accept and function within the pre-existing authoritarian governmental structures of the Meiji era.

In contrast the Church in Malawi had to create its own structures due to the missionaries' perception that Nyasaland lacked government beyond the tribal societies of the region. The high ecclesiology of the Oxford movement in combination with its conservative scepticism towards the changing social order of the Victorian era, allowed for the Anglican Church to play an almost duplicitous role. On the one hand, the Church chose to ally itself with the colonial government, on the other the Church challenged the colonial government, on occasions speaking up against it, as illustrated by the disagreements over education and marriage law. However, the Church always did so within the confines of the colonial ethos of the Crown. Consequently, the study clearly shows that the more the Anglican Church became assimilated into the power structures of the state (Crown) the more difficult it became for it to remain faithful to its ethos of contextualisation and indigenisation.

However, Malawi and Japan are not the only non-Anglo-Saxon Churches explored in this thesis. In 1958 the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference described Latin America as “the neglected continent”, in so far as the Anglican Communion is concerned. As in the cases of Japan and Malawi, when it comes to Latin America, neither British colonialism nor the widespread use of the English language played a major role in the development of Anglicanism. Therefore, almost all of the Anglican Churches of Latin America fall into the category of being a “double minority”. However, the Anglican Churches of Latin America can hardly be considered a single ecclesiastical entity; they represent a broad spectrum of ecclesiologies, theologies, and cultures. Hence, one of the most important realisations arising from this study is that in order to understand Latin American Anglican ecclesiology one must constantly bear in mind this plurality, a valuable lesson in the development of an ecclesiology for the whole of the Anglican Communion. In addition, as demonstrated by this thesis, Latin American Anglicans are going through a radical process of questioning their consciences and ransacking their traditions to find out what and who they are. The questioning has reached the point where several Anglican theologians are recommending a process of total dissociation from what they perceive to be Anglo-Saxon cultural impositions. Some even suggest that the name “Anglican” should be dropped in order to preserve the Communion’s ethos of pluralism and contextualisation. All these factors have exerted an enormous pressure on Latin American Anglicans, touching not only how they shape the particular forms their religion takes throughout the region, but also on how they perceive their own local Church’s relationship with the Communion at large. This quest for self-comprehension unites the Latin American Anglicans with their sister minority Churches across the world. Thus, they constitute a great source of inspiration for the development of an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, one which is born not out of the classical spheres of influence within the Communion, but out of the fringes, inspired by a wholly different experience of what it means to be Anglican, one less burdened by some of the limitations of Anglo-Saxon-centred ecclesiology that currently permeates much of the Communion.

Another thing that becomes clear from the study of Latin American models of the Church is their plurality and variousness. Even diametrically opposed positions seem to be upheld by the different models of the Church. In that sense the “neglected

continent” is very much in harmony with the rest of the Communion, in its endeavour to keep plurality alive and flourishing, whilst maintaining a reasonable degree of unity. For example, the Ecclesiology of God’s people and the Eschatological model both promote the concept of belonging by faith alone, and advocate a personal (individual) union with Christ. Thus, they put little emphasis on the idea that the Church expresses its faith through its liturgy and collective, corporate life of worship, which is what the model of a Distinctively Anglican Ecclesiology proposes. On the other hand, the model based on the Latin American liberation theology is founded upon a different kind of collectivism and a corporate understanding of the Church. This model has the prophetic ministry of the Church as its main purpose of existence. Nevertheless, one of the most important understandings that has arisen from this study is that, much like with the Communion at large, these models cannot be and perhaps *should* not be integrated into a single synthetic vision of the Church. Consequently, in order to do justice to the various aspects of Anglican ecclesiology/ecclesiologies alive within the Communion today, and to facilitate the incorporation of the many valid elements of the different models, it seems necessary to work simultaneously, and perhaps even in parallel, with the different models, in a kind of juggling act; or perhaps a better expression would be a “perichoretic Samba”, something that would be in harmony with the Anglican ethos of keeping irreducibly distinct theologies alive within the same ecclesiastical Communion. Maybe the whole of the Anglican Communion should be invited to join the perichoretic Samba, to the tune of the Lord of the Dance?

This suggestion may perhaps not be as quixotic as it first seems. As demonstrated in this thesis, the origins of the Anglican Communion lie within a theology that sought to transcend the limitations imposed upon the ecclesiological identity of the Anglican Church, both by theological traditions but also by the notion of nation states. For though the actual formation of the international structures of the Anglican Communion did not begin to take form until 1840s–60s, the origins of the idea that the Church of England and its daughter Churches had a collective identity and a common ecclesiastical reality originated half a century earlier, as a transnational movement among the High Church traditions of England, Scotland and the Americas. A proto-concept of an Anglican Communion was born amongst the theologians of the Hackney Phalanx, who viewed the Church of England, the Scottish Episcopal and the

Protestant Episcopal Church of the USA as forming parts of what they viewed as the Reformed Catholic Church, a middle road between Roman Papalism and Protestantism, both perceived as “deviations” or spin-offs from the one true faith of the ancient Church. Inspired by the legacy of Hooker's *via media*, these theologians claimed that the Church of England and its daughter Churches were both Catholic and Reformed: Reformed because they had rid themselves of the “medieval superstitions” and abuses of Rome, but Catholic because, unlike the Protestant Reformations of Luther and Calvin, the Anglican fathers had never added or subtracted from the original teachings of the ancient Church, nor had they ever formulated creeds or confessions of their own.

Thus the Church of England’s link with the ancient and undivided Church remained intact. As result, from its very beginnings Anglicanism has been a transnational movement. It took partial root in Ireland, Wales and Scotland (albeit under a different, non-established form, in the latter case), and did not, as it has sometimes been suggested, spread beyond Britain only as an ecclesiological aspect of English culture, a mere transplant of “home” wherever the English settled, part and parcel of British Colonial rule. In addition, the Anglican Churches of Scotland and Ireland were influential in the spread of Anglicanism beyond the British shores during the 18th century. While the Church of Ireland served as an early example of how necessary it was for Anglicanism to be identified with a local cultural context, using the local language and recruiting its clergy locally, the Episcopal Church of Scotland (founded in the 16<sup>th</sup> century) demonstrated that Anglicanism did not have to be identified with the English Crown in order to survive. This is vital aspect of the origins of the Communion, something which an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion needs to establish as a core element of its being.

However, this not the only dimension of the origins of the Communion that needs to be re-discovered and re-embraced. Since the times of the Elizabethan settlement (and its subsequent solidification by Richard Hooker’s ecclesiological designs) the Church of England and Crown were two inseparable aspects of Anglican ecclesiological reality. This hegemony between Church and State changed when Britain became an increasingly religiously pluralistic society. The state-run monopoly on religion could no longer be upheld within such a reality. Consequently, during the 1830s several steps were taken to accommodate this new reality. Two such examples are the

repeal of the Corporation Act of 1661 and Test Acts of 1673, as well as the passage of the Roman Catholic Relief Act in 1829. However, from the perspective of some theologians, especially amongst the Oxford movement, the government's natural role in ecclesiastical matters had ceased to exist the moment it stopped being an exclusively Anglican body. Why should non-Anglicans be allowed to pass laws concerning the Church of England? It is almost impossible to over-emphasise how much the reshaping of the established Church–State symbiosis in England, during 1830s–40s, influenced the birth of the Anglican Communion. In many respects the decay of the old ecclesiastical hegemony in England acted as a catalyst for the conceptualisation of the Communion. In the eyes of the Oxford movement the state had abandoned the Church. At the centre of the Tractarian conception of the world lay an ordered cosmology, with order, degree, hierarchy and delegated authority at its core. This perspective collided with the progressive and independently democratic ideals of the modern and industrialised state, which were increasingly gaining ground across Europe and the western world. Consequently, in the minds of the Oxford movement, a new socio-philosophical and theological base was needed as a basis for this universal order. Thus, they turned to the rediscovery of the ancient doctrine of Apostolic succession, in which Bishops, as the successors of the Apostles, became the guarantors of the truth and the doctrinal integrity of the Church.

This model also proved to be fertile ground for the kind of transnational, non-Crown/state based ecclesiology that was to give birth to the idea of an Anglican Communion. This is evidenced by a series of ecclesiological developments of that era that were aimed at increasing the self-sustainability of Anglican Churches beyond British and North American shores. These developments often took place in defiance of the will of the British government and other nation states. One such example is provided by Bishop Blomfield of London, and his reaction to the denial of funds for the Anglican Church in Canada (which at that time was part of the British Empire). Bishop Blomfield stated that if the State refused to provide for overseas bishoprics, it would become the duty of the Church itself “to take the work in hand, and do which in no case may be left undone”. His words were backed by the actions of Archbishop Howley of Canterbury, who called a public meeting to discuss “the defective provision hitherto made [by the government] for planting the Church in the distant dependencies of the British Empire”

and what effort could be made to “extend them the full benefit of its [the Church of England's] apostolic government and discipline”. This was an ecclesiological development with potentially global repercussions for Anglicanism. The Archbishop was publicly rallying for the Church to apply pressure on the government for it to align its ecclesiastical policies according to what the Church wanted, and not the reverse. Should the state refuse this notion, then his office would set up a way for the Church to take this matter into its own hands; in other words, “apostolic ministry beyond British shores”, regardless of what the government wanted. Consequently, the establishing of the Colonial Bishops Fund was a critical step towards the conceptualisation of the Anglican Communion. It demonstrated that although the Church of England was officially the established Church, it had started to look elsewhere for its legitimation. As part of this reinvigorated search of identity, High Church theologians brought to the forefront of Anglican ecclesiology the notion that the Anglican Church stood in direct continuation of the ancient Catholic Church, truly Reformed but also truly Catholic. As demonstrated in this thesis, in the end, the longing for a shared Anglican ecclesiological reality outweighed the wishes of the British government. In other words, the shared ecclesiological legacy of these different Anglican Churches superseded their individual national identities.

In conclusion, it can then be established that the origins of the Anglican Communion lie within a longing for the Anglican Churches to conceive of themselves as not being limited to a nation state, nor to be the Church *of a* state or a nation. Consequently, an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion needs to incorporate into all aspects of its existence the notion that the Communion originates from a belief that the Church is by its very nature an institution that transcends any worldly national, ethnic or cultural boundaries.

It is against this background that a methodological approach such as the one proposed by William Patrick Palmer could be of vital importance. In the formulation of an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, there are three major concepts, brought forward by Palmer that should be incorporated into its DNA. One is that there is no prophecy in scripture about avoiding division in the Church, nor is there promise of a perpetual and perfect union within the Church, at least not on this side of the Eschaton. Hence the second concept, the validity and faithfulness of a Church, cannot be assessed

by a set catalogue of doctrinal fundamentals, but rather through its commitment to comply with Christ's commandment of unity within the Church universal. Thirdly, short of devil worship, separation can never be truly justified, even under the most severe of doctrinal differences. Based upon patristic theology, particularly on St Augustine of Hippo, Palmer writes that no sin could be more heinous than voluntary schism or voluntary separation. Nevertheless, Palmer is aware that the visible communion of the Church can be broken. However, this need not necessarily imply a perpetual disruption in the spiritual fabric of the universal Church, because the spiritual unity of relations with Christ exist even if external unity is interrupted. According to Palmer, the fact that Christ so imperatively impresses upon the Apostles the value of perfect unity seems to suggest that there was a real danger of division within the Church. Consequently, in Palmer's ecclesiological model the commitment to unity is one of the foremost and vital signs of the true Church of Christ. As Palmer states, there is no promise that external communion shall never be interrupted within the universal Church. Thus, the Church is ultimately not defined by the purity of its beliefs but by its devotion to comply with the divinely ordained obligation of external communion of the Church. Nevertheless, Palmer also stresses the difference between doctrinal disagreements and disagreements over morality, the latter being secondary (at best) in relation to the former. According to Palmer, perceived differences on the subject of morality (or the alleged lack of it) make a very poor case for schism; in fact, Palmer emphatically argues that tolerance in order to safeguard the integrity of the ecclesiological Communion always and in all cases outranks the need for separation on grounds of moral purity.

That said, argument over homosexuality in the Anglican Church has revealed a crisis of identity and governance that is not easily resolved. However, this is only the tip of the iceberg; under the surface lies a much larger, veritable mountain of issues. A complex spectrum of interlinked subjects ranging from mutually exclusive world views and interpretations of reality (e.g. a static moral universe versus a dynamic one) to radically different comprehensions of what constitutes human nature and what the essentials of Christian obedience might be. As a result, the current conflict has developed beyond the area of sexual ethics, and turned into a crisis of identity.

From an ecclesiological point of view, much of the current dispute arises from differing comprehensions of what it means to belong to an ecclesial Communion. This



has created an escalating state of strain between those who wish for a more coherent and interdependent Communion and those who favour a looser federation-based model of Anglicanism. In broad terms, those who uphold a traditionalist view of homosexuality as idolatrous and immoral tend to favour a more cohesive model of Communion based on increased legislation, while those with liberal tendencies, who argue for same-sex marriage and the ordination of non-celibate homosexuals, lean more towards a looser and more independent model of Communion. A prominent dynamic of the current conflict has been the conviction of some Anglicans in the Global South that they are rejecting cultural influences from the global North. In this context, opposing same-sex marriage and the ordination of openly homosexual persons becomes symbolic of the struggle to take power and influence away from the numerically inferior Churches of the North and transfer it to the Churches of the South. Anglicans of the Global South argue that contrary to the assertions of many liberal (western) Anglican clergy, their adherence to what they view as core, biblically based Christian values, does not stem from the fact that they have not as yet lived through the Enlightenment, but rather from the perception that some form of idolatry has infected those Churches that strive for equal-rights based logic for inclusion of LBGQT people. Consequently, the current tensions over homosexuality are not limited to the realm of moral theology, but are intricately linked with issues such as politics, social and cultural dynamics, and post-colonial pressures, all of which in turn are linked to the shortcomings of the current ecclesiological structures within the Communion. Conclusively then, a viable ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, must incorporate this plurality of elements into its own formulations. It must seek to accommodate within its framework theologies that are based on a view of the moral universe as both static and dynamic. Only then can such an ecclesiology truly hope to endorse the rich plurality of patterns of Christian obedience that exist within Anglicanism today. However, such an endeavour is much more complex than simply finding a compromised balance between *hyper* and *hypo* orthodoxy. Theological truth is seldom the product of a compromise between two differentiating propositions. Another conclusion, then, must be that a viable ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion cannot simply have “moderation” as a guiding theological principle. This would only lead to ecclesiological lukewarmness, and as such would fail to incorporate many of the core elements of the traditions that are



alive within the Communion. In other words, if balance is defined as the be all and end all of the Church, then compromise and not orthodoxy becomes the main pillar of doctrine.

Another reason why moderation cannot be an end to itself is exemplified by the extent to which Anglicans have formed ideological coteries over the issue of human sexuality. The impulse to separate on the basis of presumed moral impurity- which is apparent in the conflict over homosexuality- is something that has burdened the Church since its origins. This is illustrated by Sachs analogy between the Donatist split and the current Anglican divide. There are a number of mechanisms at work behind the current threat of schism that are similar to those that triggered the Donatist split. For example, most Anglican Churches face social pressures from a variety of angles. In some parts of society, the Church is expected to act as a defender of traditional social values, to not do so would be to fail the contexts within which they exist. Simultaneously, Anglican Churches are under pressure to ascertain their relevance the 21<sup>st</sup> century, in those cases a policy of radical inclusion becomes an important marker of ecclesiological relevance and identity. Of course, there is also an element of post-colonial tension in that the current squabbles are often depicted as a split between the Global North and South. In addition, there is also an element of class and distribution of wealth involved, since the Churches of the Global South are often poorer in terms of financial resources than their northern counterparts. It should not go unnoticed that the split between the Donatist and the traidores, also a had a dimension of social class. One of the insights provided by this study is how there have been displays of Donatist on both sides of the issue. As a conclusion, a sustainable ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion must make explicit the risk for Dontatist tendencies in cases of profound disagreement, and highlight how to avoid it. Which again brings us back to the methodology of Palmer as well as the need for Anglican Churches to transcend their ecclesiological links to nation states.

For a number of Anglican theologians, especially amongst those working within an Anglo-Saxon context, the link to the concept of nation states is one of the main strengths of Anglican ecclesiology. However, as the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century draws to a close, this model has become increasingly difficult to uphold. Although there are several benefits to such a privileged position, it may also have become irrelevant for many of the Anglican Churches, especially the minority ones. The concept of national

identities has been strongly questioned in light of such developments as pan-European federalism (as well as in the aftermath of its counter-movements, e.g. Brexit), as well as by the increasing number of Anglicans whose sense of anthropological belonging tends to be more tribal than national, especially in the Global South. In addition, it is a matter of historical fact that most nation states originated out of violent and bloody processes, such as wars, colonisation and ethnic cleansing. From a perspective of Christian doctrine, in which peace and reconciliation are God-given moral imperatives, it seems antithetical to link the identity of the Church to such political constructs. In eschatological terms, nation states represent a concept that is only temporary. One day nation states will most likely cease to exist and be transformed into whatever lies next in turn for humanity, in much the same way that European city states and feudalism once metamorphosed into something different. However, the Church will remain. In the meantime, the identity of Anglican Churches is tied to a political construct with an inherent drive to always increase its own financial interests and protect its sovereignty, with violence if need be.

One of the most destructive features of nation states is the modern economic theory which assumes that we live in a perpetual situation of scarcity. In this economic philosophy, we are told that there are only a limited number of goods and resources to go around, so we have to compete and fight for them, capitalism being the most vivid and widespread contemporary expression of this philosophy. On the contrary, Christian theology offers a totally different vision of the world and humankind. The true good is given by God, and is always abundant. The Christian view of creation recounts that the Triune God is eternally self-emptying (*kenosis*) and as such is an endless source of life and love for His creation. There is always more than enough. Hence our lives are not defined by competition but by grace! It cannot be overstated how vital this theological point is for a sustainable ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion. It establishes that the Church offers a unique life and model of Communion and of being in community, which is *essential* to the Christian faith. The Christian community mirrors what God is like; hence, the community seeks to embody an alternative to secularism and its philosophy of economics. It is at this point that the Christian view of the world becomes incompatible with the modern concept of the nation state. Christian doctrine teaches that humanity's natural state is that of a living in relationship of participation with God. It is

sin which distorts that natural relationship with our creator and thwarts it into establishing *contractual* relationships with each other, under the paradigm of competition for limited resources. Unlike in most pagan religions, Christian doctrine states that God makes the world *ex nihilo* (out of nothing), simply as a free expression of love; there is no pre-existing force, chaos or evil with which God had to fight to bring the world into being. Creation is perfect, peaceful and sufficient for all life. It is not characterised by scarcity but by fullness. Thus, the nation state or any other man-made, power-hungry institution, such as a mega-corporation, or any for-profit business movement, that operates out of a philosophy of scarcity, becomes a burden upon humanity. By necessity, such a construct is driven by the anti-gospel principle of competition, feeding off scarcity, pitting human beings against each other in a continuous race for resources and efficacy. Hence the usefulness of *Eucharistic Anarchism* as an integral element of an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion, the anarchy of which is not chaos, but a challenge to the false *religio* and soteriology of the state. Eucharistic Anarchy offers a true *religio*, which is not bound by the concept of the nation state, and thus binds all of humanity, regardless of nationality or ethnicity, to the salvific Body of Christ which is present in and through the Church. As the Body of Christ, the Church offers the Eucharist as a diffusion of the false theology and the false anthropology of will and right. It does away with the distinction of mine and thine, and offers a radical questioning of property and *dominium*. Thus, Eucharistic Anarchism offers a true integration of the individual and the group. Through resolving the dilemma of the many and the one, and by unmasking the falsity of the antithesis of local and universal, the Eucharistic community redefines boundaries, citizenship and earthly practices of peace and reconciliation. As result, even though Eucharistic Anarchism may not be fully realisable in the world in time, what is absolutely essential to an ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion that is capable of transcending the current links to nation state is the tenet that the Church has the potential to live out a true *religio*, beyond the temporary political construct of the nation state.

As pointed out throughout this thesis, this is not just a matter of theory, but a notion that carries weight within the actual life of the Communion. One such example is the case in Japan. In order for the NSKK to be formed, the diversity and pluriform nature of a wide range of Anglican traditions had to be transcended in a way that

allowed for their main features to remain intact. Ecclesiologically speaking, their common identity as Anglicans was given ontological priority over other aspect of their identities, such as nationality and theological partisanship (e.g. Evangelical, Anglo-Catholic or broad Church). The result was not an unrecognisable syncretism, a Frankenchurch if you will, but an ecclesiological reality, in which multiple traditions could flourish and co-exist, without having to give up their most vital particularities. The case of the Malawian Church, provides further evidence of why Anglican ecclesiological identities should embrace a transnational ethos. In Malawi, the Church became an ally of the colonial powers, and was later assimilated into the political machinery of dictator Kamuzu Banda. However, through the establishment of relationships that reached beyond the local, national ecclesiological structures, the Anglican Church in Malawi was able to get away from under the thumb of Banda's dictatorship. This seems to indicate that a realistic and sustainable ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion must embrace a transnational ethos, and promote it within the ecclesiastical structures of the Anglican Churches. Perhaps, then, further fractionalisation, such as that which is taking place in Central Africa at the moment of writing, can be stopped.

That said, the case of the Anglican Church in Chile, demonstrates that it is not enough for a Church to be free from the structures of nation states if it is to live out its mandate as an agent of God's liberation. The choice of the IACH to remain "neutral" in the face of the atrocities committed by the military coup of 1973 makes this clear. For, although the IACH has never had any close ties to the government, and has a clear self-understanding of being part of a larger and transnational ecclesiological reality (e.g. Anglican Communion, GAFCON/FCA and the Anglican Covenant) there are, nevertheless, other elements of its ecclesiological identity that have hindered it from embracing some of the other principals proposed in this thesis, principles that are meant to accompany a potential transcendence of a national identity. For example, due to its tendency towards and individualised faith, and a dichotomisation of social issues (human rights) and evangelization, a process of radicalisation similar to that of the Anglican Church in Malawi has not been possible. Neither has the Chilean Church been able to confront the state and government in a similar way to its Japanese counterpart. Consequently, this demonstrates the need for the Churches of the Anglican Communion

to embrace an ecclesiology that not only roots them in a transnational reality, but also brings to the forefront of Anglican thought a comprehension of the Church as a radical institution that transcends the political, cultural and geographical boundaries of the world, and also questions the status quo, acting out its divine mandate to be an agent of God's liberation.

Another important dimension of why a (re)-discovery of a radical and transnational origins of the Anglican Church needs to take place is the challenge imposed upon the Church by the so-called postmodern world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Social identities, national culture, and sense of belonging are now more fluid than perhaps ever before. As previously stated, the nationalist backlash which Europe and the USA are undergoing as the 2010s move to an end are nothing if not a reaction to the destabilisation of national identities brought about by such project as the European Union and pan-European federalism, and Trans American trade deals, which have drastically increased people's freedom of movement. But perhaps most importantly for the indigenous peoples of the world, and this is by no means a new phenomenon, their socio-cultural belonging and anthropological identity tends to be tribal rather than tied to the nation state. For some this is the result of many years of feeling disenfranchised by their own nation states, and thus they have recently begun to rediscover their indigenous identities; for others, this has always been the case, especially when their tribal identity precedes their national one by several centuries. In conclusion, Anglican ecclesiology needs to engage with the fact that for a large portion of the global population, its main ethnic, cultural and social allegiance is not to that of the political construct of the nation state. As a result, it may become a missiological and doctrinal necessity for the Churches of the Anglican Communion to move beyond their current ecclesiological link with nation states.

To finalise, this thesis has been about a journey of rediscovery of the nature of the Anglican Communion. It may be that not all the answers have been found yet, but some certainly have. Thus, while the road ahead may not yet be fully clear, we must tread on. Where there is no path, we must make one. Hopefully we now have enough rediscovered treasures of Anglican ecclesiology that is possible to formulate a (new) radical and transnational ecclesiology of the Anglican Communion.

## Bibliography

### Althaus-Reid, Marcella

2000: *Indecent Theology: Theological perversions in sex, gender and politics*  
New York: Routledge

### Anglican Church in North America (ACNA)

2009: “About the Anglican Church in North America”  
Anglican Church in North America  
<http://anglicanchurch.net/?/main/page/about>  
(2009.12.19; 16:13hrs)

2009: “Our Genesis”  
Anglican Church in North America  
[http://anglicanchurch.net/media/acna\\_our\\_genesis\\_june\\_2009WITHLINKS.pdf](http://anglicanchurch.net/media/acna_our_genesis_june_2009WITHLINKS.pdf)  
(2010.02.17; 11:27hrs)

### Anglican Church of the Province of the Southern Cone

2010: “¿Qué Es La Comunión Anglicana?” Anglicanons.net  
Unofficial site of the Anglican Church of the Province of the Southern  
Cone. (currently under reconstruction).  
<http://74.125.77.132/search?q=cache:http://anglicanos.net/portal/breve-descripcion-de-la-iglesia-anglicana/e-%C2%BFque-es-la-comunion-anglicana/>  
(2010.02.03; 12:56hrs)

2008a: “Quick facts the Anglican Church of the Southern Cone of America”  
Anglicanons.net  
Unofficial site of the Anglican Church of the Province of the Southern  
Cone. (currently under reconstruction).  
<http://anglicanos.net/portal/>  
(2010.02.03; 12:43hrs)

2008b: “J.I Packer se refiere a la crisis de la Comunión Anglicana”  
Anglicanons.net  
Unofficial site of the Anglican Church of the Province of the Southern  
Cone. (currently under reconstruction).  
<http://74.125.77.132/search?q=cache:http://anglicanos.net/portal/notas/2008-ji-packer-se-refiere-a-la-crisis-de-la-comunion-anglicana/>  
(2010.02.03; 12:56hrs)

2008c: “Crisis en La Comunión Anglicana”  
Anglicanons.net  
Unofficial site of the Anglican Church of the Province of the Southern  
Cone. (currently under reconstruction).

<http://anglicanos.net/portal/notas/crisis-en-la-comunion-anglicana/>  
(2010.02.03; 13:04hrs)

- 2008d: “Breve Descripción de la Iglesia Anglicana: Es Católica?”  
Anglicanons.net  
Unofficial site of the Anglican Church of the Province of the Southern Cone. (currently under reconstruction).  
<http://anglicanos.net/portal/breve-descripcion-de-la-iglesia-anglicana/la-iglesia-anglicana-%c2%bfes-catolica/>  
(2010.02.03; 13:11hrs)
- 2008e: “Breve Descripción de la Iglesia Anglicana: Es Evangélica?”  
Anglicanons.net  
Unofficial site of the Anglican Church of the Province of the Southern Cone. (currently under reconstruction).  
<http://anglicanos.net/portal/breve-descripcion-de-la-iglesia-anglicana/la-iglesia-anglicana-%c2%bfes-evangelica/>  
(2010.02.03; 13:16hrs)

### **Anglican Communion, The**

- 2010: “The Anglican Communion Covenant”  
The Anglican Communion  
[http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/docs/The\\_Anglican\\_Covenant.pdf](http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/docs/The_Anglican_Covenant.pdf)  
(2011.03.01, 13:45hrs.)
- Updated 2010: Provincial Directory:  
“Iglesia Anglicana del Cono Sur de America”  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/tour/province.cfm?ID=S5>  
(2011.02.22; 17:53hrs)
- Updated 2010: Provincial Directory:  
“Churches in Communion with the See of Canterbury”  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/tour/index.cfm>  
(2011.12.22; 18:24hrs)
- 2017: “An Anglican Covenant: Responses”  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/identity/doctrine/covenant.aspx>;  
(2017.01.3; 21:42hrs)
- 1958: ”The Lambeth Conference of 1958, 2.68-2.73.”  
Cited in The Anglican Communion and Latin America (Province of the Caribbean of the Episcopal Church in the USA  
(undated)

### **Anglican Communion News Service (ACNS)**

- 2005: “Latin American theological group: Panama Declaration”

ACNS: ACNS4054

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2005/10/21/ACNS4054>  
(2009.11.03; 16:44hrs)

2004a): “Statement from the Province of the Southern Cone”

ACNS: ACNS3735

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2004/1/12/ACNS3735>  
(2009.11.03; 16:50hrs)

2004b): “An Open Letter From the Most Reverend Martin Barahona”

ACNS: ACNS3780

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2004/2/13/ACNS3780>  
(2009.11.03; 16:55hrs)

2004c): “Declaration of the House of Bishops of the Anglican Church of the Central American Region (IARCA)”

ACNS3807

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2004/3/26/ACNS3807>  
(2009.11.03; 17:01hrs)

2014: “James Tengatenga Appointed to The School of Theology Faculty”  
Anglican Communion Office (ACO)

<http://www.anglicannews.org/news/2014/05/james-tengatenga-appointed-to-the-school-of-theology-faculty.aspx>  
(2016.02.15; 14:40hrs)

2017: “Sudan announced as a new Province within the Anglican Communion”

<http://www.anglicannews.org/features/2017/03/sudan-announced-as-a-new-province-within-the-anglican-communion.aspx>  
(2017.03.23; 16:40hrs)

### **Anglican Communion Office (ACO)**

1958: ”The Lambeth Conference of 1958, 2.68-2.73.”

Cited in The Anglican Communion and Latin America  
(Province of the Caribbean of the Episcopal Church in the USA  
(undated)

2005: “Lambeth Conference Resolutions Archive from 1998”

Anglican Communion Office, Anglican Executive Council  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/76650/1998.pdf>  
(2017.09;12:04hrs)

2009: “A message from the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Anglican Communion Covenant” (2009.12.17)

ACO: Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams  
<http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/2687>



- (2011.03.17; 10:04hrs)
- 2010: “The Windsor Process – An Anglican Covenant”  
The Anglican Communion Office  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/index.cfm>  
(2011.03.07; 12:47hrs.)
- 2014: “James Tengatenga Appointed to The School of Theology Faculty”  
Anglican Communion Office (ACO)  
<http://www.anglicannews.org/news/2014/05/james-tengatenga-appointed-to-the-http://www.anglicannews.org/news/2014/05/james-tengatenga-appointed-to-the-school-of-theology-faculty.aspx>  
(2016.02.15; 14:40hrs)
- 2014: Provincial Directory:  
The Nippon Sei Ko Kai  
(The Anglican Communion in Japan)  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/tour/province.cfm?ID=J1>  
(2014.03.11; 00:03hrs)
- 2016a: “Standing Committee Members”  
Anglican Communion Office (ACO)  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/structures/instruments-of-communion/acc/standing-committee/standing-committee-members.aspx>  
(2016.02.15; 16:19hrs)
- 2016b: “Church of The Province of Central Africa”  
Anglican Communion Office (ACO)  
[http://www.anglicancommunion.org/structures/member\\_churches/member-church.aspx?church=central-africa](http://www.anglicancommunion.org/structures/member_churches/member-church.aspx?church=central-africa)  
(2016.02.15; 16:39hrs)
- Updated 2010: Provincial Directory:  
“Iglesia Anglicana del Cono Sur de America”  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/tour/province.cfm?ID=S5>  
(2009.11.22; 17:53hrs)
- Updated 2010 Provincial Directory:  
“Churches in Communion with the See of Canterbury”  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/tour/index.cfm>  
(2009.11.22; 18:24hrs)

### **Anglican Communion Primates' Meeting, The**

- 2005: “Primates' Meeting Communiqué” (05.02.24)  
The Anglican Communion Primates' Meeting in Newry, Northern Ireland  
For an onlie version of the Communiqué see:  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2005/2/24/ACNS3948>  
(2011.03.05; 18:47hrs)

### Anglican Communion Website

- 2014 Provincial Directory: The Nippon Sei Ko Kai  
(The Anglican Communion in Japan)  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/tour/province.cfm?ID=J1>  
(2014.03.11; 00:03hrs)

### Anglican Consultative Council (ACC)

- 1997: *The Virginia Report: The report of The Inter-Anglican Theological Doctrinal Commission.*  
The Inter-Anglican Theological Doctrinal Commission.  
<http://www.lambethconference.org/1998/documents/report-1.pdf>  
(2011.03.10, 10:17hrs)
- 2004a: *The Windsor Report.*  
The Lambeth Commission on Communion.  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/downloads/windsor2004full.pdf>  
(2011.03.10; 09:35hrs)
- 2004b: “An Open Letter From the Most Reverend Martin Barahona”  
ACNS: ACNS3780  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2004/2/13/ACNS3780>  
(2009.11.03; 16:55hrs)
- 2004c: “Statement from the Province of the Southern Cone”  
ACNS: ACNS3735  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2004/1/12/ACNS3735>  
(2009.11.03; 16:50hrs)
- 2005: *Resolutions of ACC-13 (22-23.06.2005)*  
Anglican Consultative Council (ACC)  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2005/6/23/ACNS3995>  
(2011.03.09; 13:03hrs)
- 2006a: “The Archbishop sets out thinking on Lambeth Conference 2008”  
ACNS: ACNS4127  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2006/3/9/ACNS4127>  
(2011.02.27; 22:15hrs)
- 2006b: “The Challenge and Hope of being an Anglican Today: A Reflection for the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of the Anglican Communion.”  
ACNS: ACNS4161  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2006/6/27/ACNS4161>  
(2011.03.08; 15:43hrs)
- 2006c: “Communiqué from the Global South Primates' Meeting in Kigali”  
ACNS: ACNS4193

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2006/9/22/ACNS4193>  
(2011.02.22; 16:20hrs)

- 2006d: *Towards an Anglican Covenant: A Consultation Paper on the Covenant Proposal of the Windsor Report* (TAAC)  
Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consecutive Council  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/commission/covenant/consultation/index.cfm>  
(2011.03.13; 13:49hrs)
- 2007: “Report of the Covenant Design Group”  
ACNS: ACNS4252  
<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/news.cfm/2007/2/19/ACNS4252>  
(2011.03.05; 17:59hrs)

### **Anglican Life and Witness Conference**

- 1997: “The Dallas Statement” (1997.09.24)  
Anglican Life and Witness Conference.  
Meeting in Dallas, Texas (USA) 1997.09.20-24  
An online version of this document is available at:  
<http://www.theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/32Ang/Epis/DallasStmt.htm>  
(2011.03.01; 21:33hrs)

### **Anglican Network in Canada (CANiC)**

- Updated 2010 “Who we are”  
Anglican Network in Canada  
<http://www.anglicannetwork.ca/who.htm>  
(2010.03.18; 16:22hrs)

### **Anglicantaonga**

- 2011.11.05 “Maori Quash Anglican Covenant” ;  
<http://anglicantaonga.org.nz/News/Tikanga-Maori/Maori-quash-Anglican-Covenant>;  
(2015.03.23; 11:21hrs)
- 2012.07.09 “This church is 'Unable To Adopt' the Covenant”  
<http://www.anglicantaonga.org.nz/News/General-Synod/gentle>  
(2015.03.24; 13:48hrs)

### **Arnold, Alfreda**

- 1905: *Church Work in Japan*.  
Boston: Harvard College Library. Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

### **Avis, Paul**

- 1998: "What is 'Anglicanism'" *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition*, ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight.  
London: SPCK/Fortress Press, pp 459-476
- 2002: *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective, Revised and expanded edition.*  
Edinburgh: T & T Clarck LTD
- 2007: *The Identity of Anglicanism, Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology*  
London: T&T Clarck

### **Awdry, William**

- 1907 "The Contribution of the Church of Japan to the Body of Christ"  
*Mankind and the Church Being an Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races To the Fulness of the Church of God by Seven Bishops.*  
Edited by H. H. Montgomery  
London, New York, Bombay and Calcutta: Longmans, Green and Co.

### **Baker, Colin A.**

- 2001: *Revolt of the Ministers: The Malawi Cabinet Crisis 1964-1965.*  
New York: IB Taurus & Co, LTd

### **Baneerji, Neela**

- 2007: "US Bishop making it official: Throws in Lot with African Churchman"  
New York Times, 2007.05.06

### **Bazley, Barbara**

- 1985: *Hidden Gold: A spiritual adventure in South America*  
Basingstoke: Prisca Books/Pickering & Inglis
- 1988: *Hearts Aflame: Stories from the Church in Chile*  
Basingstoke: Pickering & Inglis
- 1995: *Somos Anglicanos: Hitos y anécdotas*  
Iglesia Anglicana de Chile
- 2005: *Light Over the Andes: A Story of The Church*  
Wirral: Emmaus Bible School UK

### **British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)**

- 2003.10.16 "Anglican Leader's Statement"  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/3198992.stm>

(2017.03.30; 14:54hrs)

2012.03.24: “Half of the Church of England's dioceses reject unity covenant”

<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-17500144>

(2015.11.04; 17:42hrs)

**Bickersteth, M. H.**

1908: *Handbooks of English Church Expansion, Japan.*  
Oxford: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd.

**Bicknell, E.J**

1955: *A theological Introduction to The thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.*  
London: Longmans, Green and Co.

**Blaising, Craig A.; Darrell L. Bock**

1993: *Progressive Dispensationalism.*  
Wheaton, IL: BridgePoint

**Blomfield, C.J**

1840: *A letter to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, upon the Formation of a Fund for Endowing Additional Bishopricks in the Colonies.*  
London

**Boff, Leonardo**

1985: *Church, Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*  
New York: Crossroad Publishing

**Book Of Common Prayer (BCP)**

1662: *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of England together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons.*  
London: Everyman's Library

**Bosher, Robert**

- 1962: *The American Church and the Formation of the Anglican Communion, 1823-1853*  
 Monography Harvard:  
 Harvard University Press

### **Bradshaw, Paul**

- 2001: "A Companion to Common Worship, Volume 1" ed Paul Bradshaw,  
 London: SPCK/Alcuin Club.

### **Brooks, Ashton Jacinto**

- 2005: "Estado Actual de la Iglesia: Responsabilidad y Justicia socio-económica a la luz del impacto del Tratado de Libre Comercio en la América Latina"  
 La Globalización y sus implicaciones en América: Un desafío para la Iglesia Episcopal Anglicana en América Latina y el Caribe, ed Comisión de Educación Teológica para América Latina y el Caribe, Costa Rica (CELTAC). San José: CELTAC

### **Buber Martin**

- 1946: *Moses*  
 New York: East and West Library-Harper Torchbooks.

### **Butler Perry**

- 1998: "From Early Eighteenth Century to Present Day" *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition*, ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight.  
 London: SPCK/Fortress Press, pp30-51

### **Calvani, Carlos Eduardo**

- 2008a): "From Modernity to Post-Modernity: Inclusiveness and Making the Myth of Anglican Communion Relevant Today", *Anglican Theological Review*, 90.1 (2008), pp. 103-117
- 2008b): "Theological Education in the Brazilian Context", *Anglican Theological Review*, 90.2 (2008), pp. 239-54

### **Cantor F, Norman**

- 1995 *The Civilization of the Middle Ages: A Completely Revised and Expanded Edition of Medieval History Revised ed. Edition*  
 New York: Harper Collins

### **Carr Michael**

- 1994 “Yamato-Damashii ‘Japanese Spirit’ Definitions” (Abstract)  
*International Journal Lexicography*, 7 (4), pp. 279-306  
 Oxford: European Association for Lexicography (UERALEX)  
 Online version available at:  
<http://ijl.oxfordjournals.org/content/7/4/279.abstract>  
 (2014.03.04; 22:08hrs)

### **Catholic Bishops of Malawi**

- 1992: *Living Our Faith, Pastoral Letter from the Catholic Bishops of Malawi, Lent 1992*  
 Online Version:  
[http://www.afcast.org.zw/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=246:living-our-faith-&catid=48:malawi&Itemid=22](http://www.afcast.org.zw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=246:living-our-faith-&catid=48:malawi&Itemid=22)  
 (2016.02.16; 19:19hrs)

### **Catholic Encyclopedia**

- 1913: "Japanese Martyrs".  
 Catholic Encyclopedia.  
 New York: Robert Appleton Company. 1913.

### **Cavanaugh, William T**

- 1999: “The City: Beyond Secular Parodies” in *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology*, John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock, Graham Ward (eds).  
 London: Routledge, 1999

### **Chapman, Mark D.**

- 2008: “Introduction: What is Going on in Anglicanism” *The Anglican Covenant: Unity and Diversity in the Anglican Communion*, pp. 1-33.  
 (Ed) Mark D. Chapman  
 New York: Mowbray, A continuum Imprint.

### **Church of England**

- 2012.05.25: “General Synod Report GS 1878”  
<https://www.churchofengland.org/media/1477814/gs%201878%20anglican%20communion%20covenant%20report%20by%20the%20business%20committee.pdf>  
 (2016.10.14; 15:46hrs)

### **Church of Nigeria**

- 2005: *Canons of the Church of Nigeria*  
<http://www.anglican-nig.org/canons.htm>  
 (2012.05.15; 15:07hrs)

- 2005: “Prees briefing by the Primate of All of Nigeria, The Most Reverend Peter J Akinola, Thursday September 29 2005”  
[http://www.anglican-nig.org/primate's\\_pressbrief.htm](http://www.anglican-nig.org/primate's_pressbrief.htm)  
 (2012.05.15; 15:09hrs)
- 2007a: “Primates Explain Absence at Holy Eucharist”  
 Press realese: February 16<sup>th</sup> 2007  
<http://www.thinkinganglicans.org.uk/archives/002203.html>  
 (2012.05.15; 15:13hrs)
- 2007b: “Letter to Rt Katherien Jefferts Schorri from Archbishop Peter Akinola”  
 2<sup>nd</sup> of May 2007  
 Church of Nigeria, The Most Reverend Peter, J Akinola D.D, CON  
<http://www.anglican-nig.org/response2KJSmay2007.htm>  
 (2012.05.15; 15:50hrs)
- 2007c: “Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams from  
 Archbishop Peter Akinola”  
 6<sup>th</sup> of May 2007  
 Church of Nigeria, The Most Reverend Peter, J Akinola D.D, CON  
<http://www.virtueonline.org/portal/modules/news/article.php?storyid=5955>  
 (2012.05.15; 15:57hrs)

### Church Times

- 2005: “Venables takes Brazilian diocese under his wing”  
*Church Times* (Issue 7439), 2005.10.07  
 London: G.J.Palmer & Sons Ltd

### Clatworthy, Jonathan

- 2005: “Inclusiveness and Unity” *The Windsor Report: A Liberal Response*, ed Jonathan Clatworthy and David Taylor.  
 Winchester UK: O Books and Imprint of John Hunt Publishing Ltd
- 2006: “Covenant and Theology” *The Modern Church Peoples Union Response to: Towards an Anglican Covenant: A Consultation Paper on the Covenant Proposal of the Windsor Report*, ed MCU  
 Liverpool: MCU Office  
<http://www.modernchurch.org.uk/file/publications/cvr/mcu-towards-covenant-response-nov2006.pdf>  
 (2011.03.08: 12:51hrs)

### Corsi, Pietro

- 1988: *Science and Religion: Baden Powell and the Anglican Debate, 1800-1860*.  
 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



**Countryman, William L.**

- 1988: *Dirt Greed & Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implications for Today.* t  
Minneapolis: Fortress Press

**Derechos Chile**

- 2002: *VICTIMS: TARGETS OF REPRESSION, POLITICAL PARTIES Persecution by Decree: The Religious Community,*  
Derechos Chile  
[http://www.chipsites.com/derechos/dictadura\\_victimas\\_3\\_eng.html](http://www.chipsites.com/derechos/dictadura_victimas_3_eng.html)  
(2009.10.12; 14:30hrs)

**Davage, William**

- 2009: “Anglo-Catholicism and Aristocracy”  
A Lecture given following the Annual Requiem Mass for the repose of the soul of Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Pelham-Clinton in The Chapel of S. Mary the Virgin, Clumber.  
[http://www.puseyhouse.org.uk/uploads/8/8/7/8/8878330/anglo-catholicism\\_and\\_aristocracy.pdf](http://www.puseyhouse.org.uk/uploads/8/8/7/8/8878330/anglo-catholicism_and_aristocracy.pdf)  
(2016.06.13; 20:26hrs)

**Davies, C.S.L**

- 1999: “International Politics and the establishment of Presbyterianism in the Channel Islands: The Countance connection”  
*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50, 1999, pp.517-21  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

**Davies, Matthew**

- 2006: “More objections voiced to Kigali communiqué”  
*Episcopal News Service Archive (ECUSA)*  
[http://archive.episcopalchurch.org/3577\\_78199\\_ENG\\_HTM.htm](http://archive.episcopalchurch.org/3577_78199_ENG_HTM.htm)  
(2012.05.15; 15:37hrs.)

**Delanty, G.**

- 1996: “Beyond the Nation-State: National Identity and Citizenship in a Multicultural Society - A Response to Rex,”  
*Sociological Research Online*, vol. 1, no. 3  
<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/1/3/1.html>  
(2015.10.23; 16:22hrs)

**DeLima, Glauco Soares**

- 1989: "The Sacraments of the Church" *We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*, ed John L. Kater, Jr  
Panama City: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama, pp 49-48.

### **De Lubac, Henri**

- 1938: *Catholicism: Christ and the Common Destiny of Man* translated by Lancelot C Sheppard and Sr Elizabeth Englund OCD  
San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988

### **Desueaza, Edmundo**

- 1989: "Towards the Future: Projections and Obstacles" *We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*, ed John L. Kater, Jr  
Panama City: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama, pp 103-115.

### **Dladla, Themba**

- 1996: *Kairos '95: At the Threshold of Jubilee: A Conference Report*.  
Johannesburg: Institute for Contextual Theology

### **Doe, Norman**

- 2008: "An Anglican Covenant: Theological and Legal Considerations for a Global Debate".  
London: Canterbury Press

### **Drogin, Bob**

- 1995.05.21: "Malawi Tries Ex-Dictator in Murder: Africa: Ageing autocrat is one of few among continent's tyrants to face justice for regime's abuses."  
*Los Angeles Times*  
Los Angeles: Richard T. Schlosberg III (publisher)

### **Dulles, Avery S.J**

- 2002: *Models of the Church [Expanded Edition]*  
New York Image Books/Doubleday

### **Ehrman, D. Bart**

- 2000 *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*.  
Second Edition  
New York: Oxford University Press

### **Elwell, Walter A.**

1984: *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*  
Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House

### **Episcopal Church of The United States, The (TEC), General Convention**

2012: General Convention 2012: Resolution B005 ;  
[http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/acts/acts\\_resolution-complete.pl?resolution=2012-B005](http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/acts/acts_resolution-complete.pl?resolution=2012-B005)  
(2015.04.03; 19:32hrs)

### **Encyclopaedia Britannica**

2012: “Natural Law”  
*Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*  
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/406283/natural-law>  
(2012.05.15; 10:29hrs)

2014a: “Daimyo”  
Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc  
Online Version available at:  
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/149919/daimyo>  
(2014.02.20; 20:55hrs)

2014b “Kirishitan”  
Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc  
Online Version available at:  
<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/319166/Kirishitan>  
(2014.03.08; 15:27hrs)

2016: “David Kamuzu Banda” *Encyclopædia Britannica (Online)*  
<http://www.britannica.com/biography/Hastings-Kamuzu-Banda>  
(2016.02.15; 16:22hrs)

### **Episcopal Church of the USA, The (TEC)**

2006: *Resolution A166*  
TEC:75<sup>th</sup> General Convention of the TEC

### **Every, Edward Francis D.D.**

1915: “The Anglican Church in South America”  
*Project Canterbury*  
London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.  
<http://anglicanhistory.org/sa/every1915/sams.html>  
(2009.12.17; 09:13hrs)

### **Fernandez, Hugo M**

- 1989: "Authority of the Church", *We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*, ed John L. Kater Jr.  
Panama City: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama.

### **Fogarty, Philippa**

- 2008: "Recognition at last for Japan's Ainu".  
BBC News (BBC).  
Page last updated at 2008.06.06, 01:37 GMT  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/7437244.stm>  
(2014.02.26; 16:27hrs)

### **Foord, Martin**

- 2000: "Recent developments in Anglican Ecclesiology",  
*Churchman* 115 (2001) pp 316-349. London: Church Society

### **Foster, Charles, B.U**

- 1835: *THIRTY YEARS' CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN JOHN J EBB, D. D. F. R. S. BISHOP OF LIMERICK, ARDFERT, AND AGHADOF, AND ALEXANDER KNOX, ESQ M.R, I.A.* Volume 2  
Philadelphia: Carey, Lea And Blanchard

### **France, W.F**

- 1941: *The Overseas Episcopate: Centenary History of the Colonial Bishops Fund 1841-1941*  
Westminster: The Colonial Bishops Fund

### **Furlong, Monica**

- 2006: *The C of E: The State It's In, The Past and the Present, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*  
London: SPCK

### **Gascoigne, Bamber**

- 2001(ongoing): "History of Malawi: Independence from 1964"  
History of The World, Gascoigne, Bamber (ed)  
<http://www.historyworld.net/wrldhis/PlainTextHistories.asp?historyid=ad48>  
(2016.02.16; 17:09hrs)

### **Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON)**

- 2008: "The Way, The Truth and the Life: Theological Resources for a Pilgrimage to a Global Anglican Future" by the Theological Resource Team of the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON)  
Jerusalem: Latimer Trust (2008)

- 2017: “Response from Bishop Andy Lines to the Primates’ Communiqué”  
By Bishop Andy Lines, 6<sup>th</sup> of October 2017  
<http://www.gafconuk.org/news>  
(2017.10.19, 18:28hrs)

**Goddard, A**

- 2008: “Unity and Diversity, Communion and Covenant”*The Anglican Covenant: Unity and Diversity in the Anglican Communion*, pp 47-80.  
(ed) Mark D. Chapman  
New York: Mowbray, A continuum Imprint.

**Gomez,Drexel & Akinola, Peter & Venable, Gregory**

- 2003: *Claiming our Anglican Identity: The Case Against the Episcopal Church, USA: A Paper Commissioned For the Primates of the Anglican Communion.*  
The Anglican Communion Institute  
Beaumont, TX:The Anglican Communion Institute

**González, Justo L.**

- 2004: *The Story of Christianity*, 3rd edition.  
Edinburgh: Prince Press/Hendrickson Publishers.

**González, Odina. E & Gonzales, Justo L.**

- 2008: *Christianity in Latin America, A History*  
New York: Cambridge University Press.

**Goodhew, Harry & Sinclair, Maurice**

- 1999: *The Way of Faithfulness*,  
Carrollton (TX): Ekklesia Society

**Hall, Caroline**

- 2009: *Homosexuality as a Site of Anglican Identity and Dissent*  
Leeds: The University of Leeds, Department of Theology and Religious Studies
- 2010a: “The Anglican Covenant- Part 2: What's in it?”  
Walking with Integrity Blog spot:  
<http://walkingwithintegrity.blogspot.com/2010/11/anglican-covenant-part-2-whats-in-it.html>  
(2011.03.04; 12:17hrs)

- 2010b: “The Anglican Covenant: Where Did It Come From?”  
Walking with Integrity Blog spot:  
<http://walkingwithintegrity.blogspot.com/2010/11/anglican-covenant-where-did-it-come.html>  
(2011.03.04; 14:14hrs)

### **Hakluyt, Richard**

- 1926a: “The Second Voyage of Master Martin Frobisher, made to the West and Northwest Regions, in the yeere 1577, with a description of the Countrey, and the people, by Master Dionise Settle” *The principal Voyages & Trafficques & Discoveries of the English Nation Made by Sea or Over Land to The Remote & Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth at any time within the compasse of the 1600 Yearse*, ed Richard Hakluyt (8 vols),  
New York: J.M Dent & Sons ltd (1926), volume 5, pp 137-154.
- 1926b: “The World Encompassed by Sir Francis Drake, Carefully Collected Out of the Notes of Master Francis Fletcher, Preacher in this Imployment, and Divers Others His Followers” *The principal Voyages & Trafficques & Discoveries of the English Nation Made by Sea or Over Land to The Remote & Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth at any time within the compasse of the 1600 Yearse*, ed Richard Hakluyt (8 vols),  
New York: J.M Dent & Sons ltd (1926), volume 5, pp 156-173.

### **Harrison, Mark**

- 2000: *The Economics of World War II: Six Great Powers in International Comparison*.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### **Hastings, James**

- 1901: *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel (DCG)*  
Edinburgh: Clark Books

### **Hill, Richard**

- 2003: *Hitler Attacks Pearl Harbor: Why the United States Declared War on Germany*.  
Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

### **Hobbes, Thomas**

- 1651: *Leviathan or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Common Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil*.  
New York: Collier Books (1962)

**Hodges, Benjamin**

- 2009: "Church of Nigeria in full communion with Anglican Church of North America"  
*Dallas Morning News Online Edition*  
 Dalasnews.com  
<http://religionblog.dallasnews.com/archives/2009/03/church-of-nigeria-in-full-comm.html>  
 (2012.05.03; 16:34hrs)

**Hook, WF**

- 1825: *An attempt to Demonstrate the Catholicism of the Church of England and other Branches of the Episcopal Church.*  
 Sermon preached in the Episcopal Chapel at Sterling, Sunday 20<sup>th</sup> of March 1825 At the Consecration of the Right Rev. Matthew Luscombe.  
 London

**Hooker, Richard**

- (1554-1600): *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, I-VII, Cambridge Mass and Binghampton: Harvard University Press and Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1977-1998, referred to in the main text as Hooker *Works*.
- (1594-1600): *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*  
 In the The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker, I-VII, Cambridge Mass and Binghampton: Harvard University Press and Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1977-1998, referred to in the main text as Hooker *Laws*.

**Howell, David**

- 1997: "The Meiji State and the Logic of Ainu 'Protection'", *New Directions in the Study of Meiji Japan*, edited by Helen Hardacre with Adam L. Kern. Leiden and Boston: Brill's Japanese Studies Library, Brill Academic Publishers

**IARCA/Anglican Church of the Central Region of America**

- 1997: "A covenant between The Anglican Church of The Central Region of America (IARCA) and The Protestant Episcopal Church In The United States Of America (ECUSA)" IARCA & ECUSA  
[http://www.episcopalchurch.org/documents/AGR\\_IARCACovenant.pdf](http://www.episcopalchurch.org/documents/AGR_IARCACovenant.pdf)  
 (2010.01.04; 11:25hrs)

**IASCER**

- 2006: "Responding to the Idea of an Anglican Covenant" (2006.12.08.)

The Inter Anglican Standing Committee on Ecumenical Relations.

### **Iglesia Luterana en Chile (Lutheran Church in Chile)**

Undated: “TEMPLOS (HISTORIA & DIRECCIONES)”  
<http://www.iglesialuterana.cl/templos.php>  
 (2009.11.12; 09:45hrs)

### **Igreja Episcopal Anglicana do Brasil (IEAB) (Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil)**

2009: “A Statement From the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil (IEAB) on The Anglican Covenant Ridley- Cambridge Draft.”  
 Igreja Episcopal Anglicana do Brasil (IEAB).  
 For English version see:  
<http://anglicanfuture.blogspot.com/2009/11/brazil-on-anglican-covenant.html>  
 (2011.03.12; 19:27hrs)

For original in Portuguese see:  
[http://www.ieab.org.br/documentos/Ridley%20Cambridge%20Draft%20090402\\_PT%5B1%5D.pdf](http://www.ieab.org.br/documentos/Ridley%20Cambridge%20Draft%20090402_PT%5B1%5D.pdf)  
 (2011.03.12; 19:28hrs)

### **International Theological Commission**

1993: “The Search for Universal Ethics: A New Look at the Natural Law”, n. 46. *Papal Encyclica: Veritatis Splendor*  
 Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana

### **Ion, A. Hamish**

1993: *The Cross and the Rising Sun* (v.2 ed).  
 Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

### **Jacob, W.M**

1997: *The Making of the Anglican Church Worldwide*  
 London: SPCK

### **Jones, Gareth**

2005: “Thy Grace Shall Always Prevail” *Gays and the Future of Anglicanism: Responses to Windsor Report* (eds) A. Lindzey and R. Kirker  
 Winchester: O Books

### **Johnston, James M**

1979: “Lutheran Bishop Loses Fight For Human Rights in Chile”  
 The Milwaukee Sentinel, 1979.11.29



Milwaukee: Journal Communications, p 18.  
<http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=1368&dat=19751129&id=p9IVAAAAIIBAJ&sjidAAAAIIBAJ&pg=7263,54890>  
 (2010.01.21; 15:45hrs)

### **Kalluveettil, Paul**

1982: “Declaration and Covenant A comprehensive review of covenant formulae from the Old Testament and the ancient Near East”  
 Rome: Biblical Institute Press

### **Kasuka, Bridgette**

2012: *Independence Leaders of Africa*  
 Dar el Salaam: New Africa Press

### **Kater, John**

1988: “At home in Latin America: Anglicanism in a New Context”  
*Anglican and Episcopal History*, 57 (1988), pp 4-37.  
 [Article appears in English and Spanish in every other page]

### **Kaye, Bruce**

2002: “Social context and theological practice. Radical Orthodoxy and Richard Hooker”  
*Sewanee Theological Review* 45.No.4, Michaelmas 2002 (2002), pp. 385-98.  
 Online version:  
<http://www.brucekaye.net/files/AAJ/Social%20Context%20and%20Theological%20Practice.pdf>  
 (2011.04.17; 10:41hrs)

2007: “Highs Speed Conflict and Anglican Identity”,  
*Journal of Anglican Studies*, 5(2007), pp. 135-143  
 Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications

### **Kaye, J.M**

1841: “Letter from J.M Kaye to [J Beaven?], October 27<sup>th</sup> 1841 ”  
 Liddon Bound Volume 72, fol. 32  
 Oxford: Pusey House

### **Koshiishi, Samuel Isamu**

1998: “The Nippon Sen Ko Kai: Today and Its Future Task”  
*Anglicanism: A Global Communion*, ed Andrew Wingate [et al.]  
 New York: Church Publishing Incorporated

### **Lambeth Conference, The**

- 1930: “Resolution: 49 “  
 Online version available at:  
<http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/downloads/1930.pdf>  
 (2011.03.19; 22:28hrs)

**Larom, Margaret S.**

- 2006: “Brazilian Diocese of Recife begins new chapter, installs fourth bishop  
 Anglican Church of Brazil provides 'model of leadership’”  
*Episcopal News Service Archive* (ECUSA)  
[http://www.episcopalchurch.org/3577\\_78841\\_ENG\\_HTM.htm](http://www.episcopalchurch.org/3577_78841_ENG_HTM.htm)  
 (2009.12.17; 19:45hrs)

**Leonard, Gary S.D**

- 2010: *Kairos, The Moment of Truth “The Time Has Come, The Moment of Truth Has Arrived” The Kairos Documents*  
 Leonard, Gary SD (ed)  
 Natal: Ujamaa Centre For Theology and Community Research  
 University of Kwazulu-Natal  
[http://ujamaa.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/manuals/The\\_Kairos\\_Documents.sflb.ashx](http://ujamaa.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/manuals/The_Kairos_Documents.sflb.ashx)  
 (2016.02.16; 18:02hrs)

**Living Church News Service, The**

- 2007a: “Mass depositions in Recife” *The Living Church News Service, of The Living Church Foundation*, 2007.12.11.  
<http://www.livingchurch.org/news/news-updates/2005/8/25/mass-depositions-in-recife>  
 (2010.04.12; 19:42hrs)
- 2007 b: “Brazilian Diocese Received Into Province of the Southern Cone”  
*The Living Church News Service, of The Living Church Foundation*,  
 2007.12.11  
<http://www.livingchurch.org/news/news-updates/2007/12/11/brazilian-diocese-received-into-province-of-the-southern-cone>  
 (2010.04.12; 21:05hrs)

**Maraschin, Jaci C.**

- 1989: “Liturgy and Latin American Anglicanism”,  
*We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*,  
 ed John L. Kater, Jr.  
 Panama City: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama, pp 31-47.

**MacCulloch, Ian**

2009: *A History of Christianity*  
Penguin Books: London

**McCracken, John**

2008: *Politics and Christianity in Malawi 1875-1940*  
*The Impact of the Livingstonia Mission in the Northern Province*  
(3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)  
Malawi: Kachere Series

**McGrath, Alister**

2001: *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 3rd ed.  
Oxford: Blackwell

**McCord Adams**

2004: "How to Quench the Spirit"  
*Church Times*, 2004.10.29  
London: G.J. Palmer & Sons Ltd

**McQueen, Glenda R**

1989: "Anglicans and the Problematic Situation of Latin America", *We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*, ed John L. Kater, Jr  
Panama City: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama, pp 95-102

**Melander, Veronica**

1999: *The Hour of God? People in Guatemala Confronting Political Evangelicalism and Counterinsurgency (1976-1990)*  
Uppsala: Uppsala University. This [This work was originally presented as Melander's doctoral thesis (PhD).]

**Milbank, John**

1997: *The Word Made Strange: Theology, Language and Culture*  
Oxford: Blackwell

2003: *Being Reconciled: Ontology and Pardon*  
London: Routledge

2006: *Theology and Social Theory (2nd ed.)*, John Milbank.  
Oxford: Blackwell

**Modern Church people's Union, The**

- 2006: “Response to Towards an Anglican Covenant”  
The Modern Church people’s Union  
<http://www.modernchurch.org.uk/file/publications/cvr/mcu-towards-covenant-response-nov2006.pdf>  
(2011.03.05; 16:36hrs)

**Mufuka, K.N.**

- 1977: *Missions and Politics in Malawi*,  
Kingston, Ontario: Limestone

**Muscato, Cristopher**

- 2015: “Nation State: Definition, Examples & Characteristics”  
Lesson Transcript  
<http://study.com/academy/lesson/nation-state-definition-examples-characteristics.html>  
<http://study.com/academy/lesson/nation-state-definition-examples-characteristics.html>  
(2015.06.09; 13:48hrs)

**New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia**

- 2009: “Natural Law”  
*New Advent Catholic Encyclopedia: Online Edition*  
<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09076a.htm>  
(2012.05.15; 09:29hrs)

**Nishihara, Renta**

- 2013: “The Nippon Sei Ko Kai (The Anglican Communion in Japan)”  
*The Wiley Blackwell Companion to the Anglican Communion, First Edition*. Edited by Ian. S. Markham, J. Barney Hawkins IV, Justyn Terry, and Leslie Nunez Steffensen.  
New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

**No Anglican Covenant Coalition**

- 2010a: “Ten Reasons Why the Anglican the Proposed Anglican Covenant Is a Bad Idea”  
No Anglican Covenant Coalition (2010.12.15)  
<http://noanglican covenant.org/docs/10reasons-a4-c.pdf>  
(2011.03.05; 17:41hrs)
- 2010b: “News Release (2010.03.11)”  
No Anglican Covenant Coalition (2010.03.11)  
<http://noanglican covenant.org/pr1.pdf>  
(2011.03.5; 23:28hrs)

**Nockles, Peter B.**

- 1996            *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857.*  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### **Noel, Gerard**

- 2003:            “World- Wide Christianity Hopes for the Future”  
*Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity; Change and the Search for Communion.*  
Platten, Stephen (ed)  
Norwich: Canterbury Press.

### **Northern Rhodesia Journal Online, The**

- 2015:            “Memories of Abandoned Bomas - No. 11: Old Ndola”  
*Vol III No 3 (1957)*, Ian Singer (ed), pp 200-205.  
<http://www.nrzam.org.uk>  
(2016.02.16; 15:39hrs)

### **Oskin, Becky**

- 2013:            “Japan Earthquake & Tsunami of 2011: Facts and Information”  
On Line Document: Live Science  
<http://www.livescience.com/39110-japan-2011-earthquake-tsunami-facts.html>  
(2014.03.05; 13:26hrs)

### **Ottley, James H**

- 1989:            “The Mission of Anglicanism in Latin America”  
*We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latin American Anglicanism*,  
ed John L. Kater, Jr  
Panama: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama, pp 29-30

### **Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004 ed.)**

- 2004:            "Banda, Hastings Kamuzu"  
Oxford: Oxford University Press

### **Pachai. B.**

- 1973:            *Malawi: The History of the Nation*,  
London: Longman

### **Packer, J.I**

- 1955:            “Baptism: A Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace”  
*Churchman* 69/2 (1955)  
London: Church Society

[http://www.churchsociety.org/churchman/documents/Cman\\_069\\_2\\_Packer.pdf](http://www.churchsociety.org/churchman/documents/Cman_069_2_Packer.pdf)

Online version: (2011.04.18; 11:35hrs)

### **Patric, John**

2005: *Why Japan Was Strong: A Journey of Adventure* (reprint ed.).  
White Fish, MT: Kessinger Publishing.

1943: *Why Japan was strong* (4 ed.).  
New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc.

### **Patrick, Downes**

2000.02.14: “Kakure Christians”  
*Hawaii Catholic Herald*  
Online version available through the Catholic Education Resource  
Centre:  
<http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/religion/re0452.html>  
(2014.03.10; 21:18hrs)

### **Paul II, John**

1993: “The Search for Universal Ethics: A New Look at the Natural Law, n. 37”  
Papal Encyclicla: *Veritatis Splendor*, n. 44;  
*International Theological Commission*, Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana

### **Pearce, C. C. A**

2003: “The offshore establishment of religion: Church and nation in the Isle of  
Man”  
*Ecclesiastical Law Journal*, no7 (2003), pp. 62-74  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

### **Percy, Martyn**

2006.11.04: “Face to faith”  
*The Guardian*  
Online version available:  
<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2006/nov/04/comment.religion>  
(2017.03.09; 20:50hrs)

2013: *Anglicanism: Confidence, Commitment and Communion*.  
Part of Ashgate Contemporary Ecclesiology Series  
Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited

### **Pike, J.G**

1969a: *Malawi: A Political and Economic History*,  
London: Pall Mall Press, pp. 25–6. pp.173, 176–8, 18

- 1969b: "Malawi Slave Routes and Dr. David Livingstone Trail".  
*UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Malawi: A Political and Economic History*  
 London: Pall Mall Press

**Pickstock, Catherine**

- 1998: *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consumption of Philosophy*  
 Oxford: Blackwell

**Phillips, Earl H.**

- 1976: "H.B.M. Chipembere, 1930-1975, Malawi Patriot"  
*Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*, 7(1), pp.5-18  
 Los Angeles: University of California, African Activist Association

**Pobee, John S**

- 1998: "Non Anglo- Saxon Anglicanism" in *The Study of Anglicanism*,  
 ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight.  
 London: SPCK/Fortress Press

**Podmore, Collin**

- 2005 *Aspects of Anglican Identity*  
 London: Church House Publishing

**Pritchard, Gemma**

- 2007.09.11 "Anglican Bishop Calls LBGTQ People Inhuman"  
<http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2007/09/11/anglican-bishop-calls-lgbt-people-inhuman/>  
 (2017.03.30; 15:35hrs)

**Radner, Ephraim**

- 2010: "Holy Communion"  
*The Anglican*, January 2004, p. 10

**Radner, Ephraim & Turner, Philip**

- 2006: "The Fate of The Communion, The agony of Anglicanism and the Future of a Global Church".  
 Cambridge UK: William B Eerdmans Publishing Co

**Rowlands, Chris**

- 2001: "My Kingdom is Not of This World" in *Setting the Church of England Free: The Case for Disestablishment*. K. Leech (ed)  
Croydon: The Jubilee Group

### **Roberts, Simon**

- 1966: "The Malawi Forfeiture Act 1966--A Surfeit of Discretion" in *Journal of African Law*. Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer, 1966), pp. 131-134  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### **Rotberg, R. I.**

- 1967: *Strike a Blow and Die: A Narrative of Race Relations in Colonial Africa* by George Simeon Mwase.  
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

### **Rugh, Nathan A.**

- 2011: "The Case Against the Anglican Covenant"  
Address delivered by the Rev. Nathan A. Rugh, from Calvary Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Presented at St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as part of the presentation "The Anglican Covenant: Point-Counterpoint. Held in March 13, 2011.

### **Ruether, Rosemary Radford**

- 1992: *Gaia & God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing*  
New York : Harper SanFrancisco a division of HarperCollins publishers.
- 2000: "Ecofeminism: The Challenge to Theology"  
*Christianity and Ecology*, ed Dieter T. Hessel och Rosemary Radford Ruether, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University press, pp. 97-112.

### **Sacks, Jonathan**

- 2008: "The Relationship between People and God" Speech delivered at the Lambeth Conference (2008.07.28). Transcript available at:  
<http://www.lambethconference.org/daily/news.cfm/2008/7/29/ACNS4484>  
(2005.03.17; 22:08hrs)

### **Sachs, William L.**

- 2009: "Homosexuality and the Crisis of Anglicanism"  
Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

### **Short, Philip**

- 1974: *Banda*



London: Routledge & Kegan

**Shriever, Frederich**

1998 “Councils, Conferences and Synods” *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition*, ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight. London: SPCK/Fortress Press, pp 202-216.

**Smelser, N. J.**

1994: *Sociology*  
Oxford: UNESCO. Blackwell. UK

**Smelser, N. J. and Baltes, P. B.**

2001: *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Vol. 15.  
Oxford: Elsevier. Oxford Science Ltd

**Soares Gameleira, Sebastião A.**

2005: “Globalización y desafíos de la Communion Anglicana en América Latina y el Caribe.” *La Globalización y sus implicaciones en América: Un desafío para la Iglesia Episcopal Anglicana en América Latina y el Caribe*, ed Comisión de Educación Teológica para América Latina y el Caribe, Costa Rica(CELTAC). San José: CELTAC, pp-113-169.

**Sokwanele**

2010: “Zimbabwe President Mugabe Pours Fuel on Debate Over Homosexual Rights”  
Sokwanele, July 20th, 2010  
Sokwanele is the name of regime critical movement in Zimbabwe:  
<http://www.sokwanele.com/node/1709>  
(2012.05.15; 16:56hrs)

**Southgate, Horatio**

1847: “Letter from Rt Rev Horatio Southgate, November 12<sup>th</sup> 1847”  
Colonial Church Chronicle 1, p 386  
Oxford: Pusey House

**Spong, John Shelby**

2005: “Foreword” *The Windsor Report: A Liberal Response*, ed Jonathan Clatworthy and David Taylor.  
Winchester UK: O Books and Imprint of John Hunt Publishing Ltd

**Standing Commission On Music and Liturgy of The Episcopal Church**

2010: Paul Shinji Sasaki and Philip Lindel Tsen, Bishop of Mid-Japan, and of Tokyo, 1946, Bishop of Honan, China, 1954

**Stevenson, Taylor W**

1998: “Lex Orandi—Lex Credendi” *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition*, ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight. London: SPCK/Fortress Press, pp. 187-202

**Stuart, R.G**

1974: “Christianity and the Chewa: The Anglican Case”  
*Ph.D. Dissertation*  
London: University of London

**Suggate, Alan M.& Yamano, Shigeo**

1996: *Japanese Christians and Society (Studies in the Intercultural History of Christianity)*.  
New York: Berne & Lang.

**Takeda, John M**

1996: “The Experience of Japanese Anglicans”  
*Anglican and Episcopal History* 65.4 (December)  
Austin, TX: Historical Society of The Episcopal Church

**Taylor, Bruce David**

2005: “Do as I say, and not...” *The Windsor Report: A Liberal Response*, ed Jonathan Clatworthy and David Taylor. Winchester UK: O Books and Imprint of John Hunt Publishing Ltd

**Tengatenga, James**

2006: *Church, State and Society in Malawi: An Analysis of Anglican Ecclesiology*  
Zomba: Kachere Series

**Tenthani, Raphael**

2000.05.17: “Mystery of the Banda millions”  
BBC News: Africa (Online)  
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/752462.stm>  
(2016.02.16; 21:34hrs)

**Thomas, Philip H.E**

- 1998: "Doctrine of The Chrch" *The Study of Anglicanism Revised Edition*, ed Stephen Sykes, John Booty, Jonathan Knight. London: SPCK/Fortress Press, pp 249-262

### **Quash, Ben**

- 2005: "The Anglican Church as Polity of Presence"  
*Anglicanism The Answer to Modernity 5th edition*;  
ed Dormor, McDonald & Caddick  
New York: Continuum

### **Uchoa, Miguel**

- 2005: "History of Recife Diocese: Thousands of Faithful Anglicans"  
*Anglican Mainstream*  
<http://www.anglican-mainstream.net/history-of-recife-diocese-thousands-of-faithful-anglicans>  
(2010.03.19; 12:35hrs)

### **UN, United Nations**

- 1974: RESOLUTION OF THE 29th UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY:  
3219 (XXXIX). Protection of Human Rights In Chile  
<http://daccess-ddsy.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/738/21/IMG/NR073821.pdf?OpenElement>  
(2010.04.25; 21.35hrs)

### **UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization**

- 2016: "Nation Sates"  
<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/nation-state/>  
(2016.12.09; 15:06hrs)

### **U.S. Department of State**

- 2007: "Malawi" *International Religious Freedom Report 2007*  
Washington DC: U.S. Department of State  
<http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/irf/2007/90107.htm>  
(2016.02.15; 16:32hrs)

### **Van Engen, Charles E**

- 2005: "Toward a Contextually Appropriate Methodology in Mission Theology"  
in Kraft, Charles H., *Appropriate Christianity*  
Pasadena: William Carey Library

### **Vasey-Saunders, Mark**

2015: *The Scandal of Evangelicals and Homosexuality: English Evangelical Texts, 1960–2010.*  
Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

### **Wakatsuk, Yoko**

2014: “New radioactive water leak at Japan's Fukushima Daiichi plant”  
CNN Edition: International  
Page last updated 2014.02.20, 12: 28 GMT  
<http://edition.cnn.com/2014/02/19/world/asia/japan-fukushima-daiichi-water-leak/>  
(2014.03.01; 17:18hrs)

### **Walton, Andy**

2016.02.11 "Evangelical college stands by decision to invite liberal professor to preach" Christiantoday.com  
<http://www.christiantoday.com/article/evangelical.college.stands.by.decision.to.invite.liberal.professor.to.preach/79383.htm>  
(2017.03.09; 20:39hrs)

### **Ward, Kevin**

2006: *A history of Global Anglicanism*  
New York: Cambridge University Press.

### **Ward, Michael**

2007: “Epilogue ”  
*Heresies and How to Avoid Them* (ed) Ben Quash and Michael Ward  
London: SPCK, pp. 131-141

### **Vilar, Jose E.**

1989: “What is Latin American Anglicanism?” *We Are Anglicans: Essays on Latinamerican Anglicanism*, ed John L. Kater, Jr.  
Panama City: Episcopal Church- Diocese of Panama, pp 9-20.

### **Wholers, Charles**

2008 “Book of Common Prayer in Ainu  
*Justus Anglican Online Resources: The Book of Common Prayer*  
New York: Society of Archbishop Justus  
<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/index.html>  
(2014.03.10; 22:34 hrs)

### **Williams, Rowan**

- 2004: *Anglican Identities*  
London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd
- 2006: “Plenary on Christian identity and religious plurality: Address to the World Council of Churches”,  
Porto Alegre, Brazil, 2006.02.17  
World Council of Churches  
<https://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/assembly/2006-porto-alegre/2-plenary-presentations/christian-identity-religious-plurality/rowan-williams-presentation>  
(2017.03.19; 22:20hrs)

### **Williams, Rowan & Kasper, Walter**

- 2003: “Foreword”  
*Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity; Change and the Search for Communion.*  
Platten, Stephen (ed)  
Norwich: Canterbury Press.

### **Williams, T. David**

- 1978: “Malawi, the Politics of Despair”  
(Published on line 2008)  
*The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Volume 19 / Issue 02 / June 1981, pp 348-350  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

### **Wills, A.J.**

- 1967: “Three Territories”. *An Introduction to the History of Central* (2nd ed.),  
Durban: Oxford University Press.

### **World Council of Churches**

- 2014 Member Churches: Anglican Church in Japan  
<http://www.oikoumene.org/en/member-churches/anglican-church-in-japan>  
(2014.03.10; 23:54hrs)

### **Quash, Ben**

- 2007: “Donateism: Do Christian Ministers need to be faultless for their ministrations to be effective?” in *Heresies and How to Avoid Them*  
(ed) Ben Quash and Michael Ward  
London: SPCK.

### **Web links:**

**Anglican Church of North America (ACNA)**

<http://www.anglicanchurch.net/?/main/page/1149>

(2017.03.30,15:19hrs)

**Anglican Communion News Service (ACNS)**

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/>

(2012.01.03; 17:50hrs)

**Anglican Communion Official Website**

<http://www.anglicancommunion.org>

(2012.01.03; 14:06hrs)

**ACNS**

<http://www.anglicannews.org/news/2011/03/easter-will-be-a-time-of-hope,-a-small-shoot-amongst-the-rubble.aspx>

(2014.03.13; 22:13hrs)

**CNN**

<http://edition.cnn.com/2014/02/19/world/asia/japan-fukushima-daiichi-water-leak/>

2014.03.01; 17:18hrs)

**Derechos Chile (Human Rights in Chile)**

[http://www.chipsites.com/derechos/index\\_eng.html](http://www.chipsites.com/derechos/index_eng.html)

(2013.10.12; 14:30hrs)

**Iglesia Anglicana del Cono Sur de America (unofficial webpage)**

<http://anglicanos.net/portal/>

(2010.02.03; 12:43hrs)

**Iglesia Anglicana de México**

<http://www.iglesiaanglicanademexico.org>

(2010.02.03; 11:45hrs)

**Iglesia Luterana en Chile (Lutheran Church in Chile)**

(2009.11.12; 09:45hrs)

**Igreja Episcopal Anglicana do Brasil (IEAB)/Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil**

<http://www.ieab.org.br>

(2010.03.19; 13:17hrs)

**International Journal Lexicography**

<http://ijl.oxfordjournals.org/content/7/4/279.abstract>

(2014.03.04; 22:08hrs)

**Live Science**

<http://www.livescience.com/39110-japan-2011-earthquake-tsunami-facts.html>

(2014.03.01; 16:44hrs)

**Sokwanele**

<http://www.sokwanele.com/>

Webpage of a movement critical to the Mugabe regime in Zimbabwe

**World Council of Churches (WCC)**

<http://www.oikoumene.org/>

(2009.10.12; 10:45hrs)

**Multimedia:**

**BBC: Hard Talk**

**Interview with Archbishop Venables (2008.07.10):**

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/hardtalk/7499395.stm>

(2009.08.27; 09:30hrs)

**Crisis in the Anglican Communion:**

(produced by the Diocese of San Joaquin, USA)

<http://video.google.se/videoplaydocid=8537805218963625191&ei=iNleS4eqKIyM2AKN6O2SAq=Gregory+Venables&hl=sv#>

(2010.4.17; 10:15hrs)