A Vision to Fulfill:
"Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence"
in the Anglican Communion

R. David Cox

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

Yale Divinity School

Yale University

in

Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Sacred Theology

May 1987

Table of Contents

Frequently Used Abbreviations

ACC	Anglican Consultative Council
AEO	Anglican Executive Officer
CIPBC	Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon
CMS	Church Missionary Society
IMC	International Missionary Council
IRM	International Review of Missions
LCB	Lambeth Consultative Body
MRI	Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence
PECUSA	Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America (The Episcopal Church)
SPG	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel
WCC	World Council of Churches

In British style, bishops formally sign their names using the name of their dioceses, often in its Latin abbreviation: Hence, "John Bath & Wells," or "Michael Cantaur" --A. Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury. This is, to a point, extended to dioceses and Provinces outside the United Kingdom.

A New Mind for Mission:

An Evolving Anglican Intellectual Synthesis 1945-1958

In April 1945 as guns in Europe began to quieten, trumpets of the BBC orchestra raised a joyous noise in Canterbury Cathedral as a new Archbishop was seated in the chair of St. Augustine. As Primate of All England, Geoffrey Fisher thereby became the spiritual leader to 37 million Anglicans,[1] a fact which would gain new meaning during his tenure.

With Britain a shambles and the world still in turmoil, he reminded his Church of some first principles to guide it through reconstruction, and beyond:

> Fidelity to the apostolic faith, and freedom in its apprehension and application; liberty of the spirit and obedience to the disciplined life of the Church; the corporate unity of a divinely constituted people of God, and the free response of each man in his own person to the grace and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

From his vantage point on the ancient throne, he challenged the Communion he now led to "hold together...the wholeness of the Gospel of God."[2] In his Primacy a more vivid theoretical awareness of the Church would evolve, an awareness which sought to hold together that "wholeness."

Twenty months later, the scene shifted to another cathedral and a different context. Canterbury's had been damaged by war; Washington's was being built. The 99th Archbishop of Canterbury spoke from an ancient pulpit to a nation reconstructing itself; the new Presiding Bishop, Henry Knox Sherrill, was the first full-time Primate of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America--PECUSA. His country had become the most potent on earth, and its churches shared a national energy to help rehabilitate the world into a new order. So Bishop Sherrill gazed from the present to the future in which he believed the Church must play an urgent and active Christian role. "Let us have done with easy going, thoughtless complacency," he declared. "We of the Church face an heroic and tremendous struggle in the name of Christ."[3] During his twelve years in office a new awareness of the world would evolve.

In 1958 another fanfare of trumpets in Canterbury sounded, this time greeting a long line of bishops processing into the opening service of Lambeth Conference. Through one Lambeth Conference and an Anglican Congress, Fisher and Sherrill had become great friends.[4] Now they met for one more great assembly of the Communion's bishops, before each retired.

The two had overseen a subtle evolution in a Communion whose chief constituents they headed. Those who remembered how few non-white faces donned rochet and chimere for Lambeth 1948 might notice how many filed in for 1958. The world had changed, too. In 1948 bishops struggled with postwar privations in London--Gray of Connecticut noted his troubles in getting a good meal[5]--and severer problems of reconstruction in Europe, confrontation between East and West, and a too-prevalent emotional and spiritual exhaustion. By 1958 they addressed a world which had seen nationalistic movements, the chill of Cold War, advances in biblical and liturgical studies, new views of the family, and substantial reevaluation of the Anglican Communion and its mission.

So by Lambeth 1958 the Communion was moving energetically toward a new and vibrant redefinition of itself and its workings. Then in 1963, after another splendidly memorable service--this one not in a church but in a Canadian stadium--what had been growing for nearly two decades would flower into something which would enliven the Communion in ways that affect it still. The "rebirth of the Anglican Communion" had to wait until Toronto's Anglican Congress and its promulgation of "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ."[6] But like most organisms, it grew with time. MRI sprouted over a decade marked by these gatherings and budded at Lambeth 1958. Its seeds had been planted much before in soil repeatedly fertilized by a diversity of factors, some religious, some secular and each influencing the other.

What developed was a worldwide perspective of Anglicanism in which its sister churches shared a partnership with each other, in what was perceived as a common mission. That was the thrust of MRI. But that perspective depended upon an intellectual synthesis which combined a breadth of aspects to produce this new view of the Communion and its purpose.

The perspective reflected the twofold emphases of two of its Primates: Attending to the world, while holding together the "wholeness of the Gospel."

A. Attending to the World

"When one views the entire globe, Christianity is stronger in A.D. 1947 and in a better position to influence the human race than it was in A.D. 1914." So reckoned Kenneth Scott Latourette, the day's leading scholar of the international missionary scene.[7] In the United States at least, churches which had "showed no reluctance in supporting the national effort" in war[8] now expressed a commitment to reconstruction in Europe and to a new world order embodied by the United Nations. The war had broadened many horizons. When a Burmese Christian ministered to a soldier from Bristol, or if a Yankee picked through the ruins of Coventry Cathedral, the perspectives of each inevitably widened. Indeed, the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism was a reality made increasingly manifest in the postwar years. Meanwhile, an intellectual breadth of scope took advances in biblical and historical scholarship, liturgy, and especially ecclesiology in a manner which perceived the ramifications of one for another, and for the way which the Communion pursued its mission, and its missions.

Before that reevaluation began in earnest, the needs of a recuperating world were pressed upon the Church by its leadership. Henry Knox Sherrill took up the challenge in his installation sermon.

> We live in a world not only of starvation and want, but more dangerous even, of suspicion and hatred. With new and terrifying weapons of destruction, without a new understanding and spirit, man stands on the verge of not divine but self destruction.[9]

Whether on global issues or domestic, he chastised complacency, and signalled instead an aggressive participation in national and ecclesiastical life on the part of his church and its new Primate. "If there are stern realities to be faced courageously and realistically, it is equally true that there are firm grounds for encouragement. Never before has the cause of Christian missions been so justified by the march of events." Though by "missions" he implied the sweep of Christian activity, he focussed specifically upon the search for a wider unity.

> It is not so long ago that the Christian who talked of the family of nations, of human brotherhood, of the world community of interest was considered to be an impractical dreamer. Now we know that such a Christian talked hard common sense.

With optimism in the Latourette style, Sherrill could point to the United Nations as one proof of "the essential correctness of the Christian view of the world and human nature."[10]

Sherrill's rendition of "Christ for the World We Sing" found an echo in the General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society in England, Canon M.A.C. Warren. Addressing a British Missionary Societies conference in 1950, he cited five realities of the postwar situation: First, "the loss of the initiative by western Europe," which he noted opens up the increasing role of other nations, some of them former colonies in what he termed "a fulfilment and not a frustration. Having fellowship with people is a far more creative and rewarding relationship than having authority over them." Second, nationalism was increasing. This too he saw primarily as a positive pride fostering a healthy diversity rather than a divisive self-centeredness. He perceived, third, an idealism among people which distinguishes "between what is and what ought to be." Against that, Warren feared "a race against the clock" not meaning as Sherrill did the atom bomb so much as increases in population, dangers to the environment [presciently], and problems with food supply. Finally, he cited Communism as a rival to Christianity, and the American role as a barrier to its

expansion.[11] Warren would rephrase and restate his position at meeting after meeting, until finally he was heeded.

The parallel of efforts to establish the United Nations and to inaugurate the World Council of Churches was not lost on Bishop Sherrill, an enthusiastic booster of each.[12] During the Fisher/Sherrill years, the WCC finally sprang to life: Before the first World War, it was to have been a counterpart to the League of Nations.[13] A few Anglicans meanwhile explored how their Communion could interrelate much as denominations were doing on the WCC. R. O. Hall, Bishop of Hong Kong, in 1940 proposed an "Interprovincial, or International, Council of Cooperation" composed of perhaps five representatives of each province, clergy and lay, along with a permanent secretariat to effect cooperation, sharing of personnel and resources, and a central college. He was a decade ahead of his time on the college, two decades on the secretariat, and three on the council.[14]

But that presented some tensions. Canon Warren welcomed the contribution of churches in newly-independent nations to Anglicanism's diversity but noted both its challenge to Anglican unity, and the question which that unity posed for wider ecumenical involvements[15]: Would Anglican unity preclude ecumenical unity? He wondered too what effects Inter-Church Aid, an effort under the World Council of Churches to rehabilitate postwar Europe, would have on missionary work.[16] Ecumenism, in this case, could detract from Anglican unity.

One tension, then, lay within Anglicanism: How could it maintain a unity within an ever-growing diversity? And, to reverse the question, how could diversity be affirmed, while also finding ways to promote unified cooperation?

Another tension evolved in a larger framework: How could Anglicanism find a place in an ecumenical context, remaining true to its own identity while also being faithful to a claim "that all should be one"? How could it promote mission within its own life while participating in a larger life? Was it wise, for example--and could it work--for Sherrill to push the newly-established

Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief in 1948[17], or should Episcopalians support ecumenical ventures such as Inter-Church Aid directly?

Finally, how could the Church effectively minister to the world, while also proclaiming its Gospel and promoting its own life?

The world clearly had changed since 1940, and at least some recognized that the Church had to respond accordingly even as it absorbed the lessons of that change for itself.

B. Developing and Holding the Wholeness of the Gospel

As a changing world swirled around the Church, new concepts within it opened doors to different practices and constructs. On many sides, new studies and new recognitions, often with an ecumenical fragrance, wafted into the Church's life, bringing a reevaluation of theological, liturgical, and ultimately missiological presuppositions.

Ideas of missions expanded from new trends in Biblical studies. At war's end a trickle of publications turned into a torrent: commentaries, monographs, dictionaries, lexicons and translations, churned out by an ecumenical coterie of British scholars (Americans were less prominent, and less appreciated at least in Britain). Finding the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 perked interest, excited scholarship and confirmed biblical texts.[18]

The Revised Standard Version, done in America but well-received in Britain, began appearing in 1946. It availed itself of the Quaran scrolls and other advances in scholarship. The New English Bible was conceived that same year to be a well-researched but readable translation so as, C. H. Dodd hoped, "in some measure [to] remove a real barrier between a large proportion of our fellow-countrymen and the truth of Holy Scriptures."[19] Its New Testament arrived in 1961.*

* As with most things new, the NEB was not universally applauded. T. S. Eliot found that it "astonishes in its combination of the vulgar, the trivial and the pedantic.... Must we not look forward to the day when the

A revival in Biblical study boded well for the Church's life. "Is it not fact that every fruitful reformation of the Church has started from a fresh study of Biblical theology, from a new freedom of study revealing an old truth anew?" asked Archbishop Fisher.[20] A minor reformation had begun.

The view of the Bible was changing. The work of continental scholars became better known. Form criticism was at its height. Views of the Gospels evolved from that of biographical memoirs to historical documents with an authenticity of their own.

Biblical theologians incorporated these studies into works which underscored the Bible's unity, its theological themes, and after taking their scholarship into proper account, its reality as the Word of God. Authors such as William Barclay, C.H. Dodd, A. G. Hebert, Alan Richardson, R. H. Fuller, Vincent Taylor, A. R. Vidler and Michael Ramsey maintained that through careful scholarship "you would [in Vidler's phrase] find that [the Bible] has something startling and unexpected to say to us in our contemporary situation."[21]

In some cases, it truly was startling. Arab Christians, for instance, found that reading Old Testament themes of ancient Israel's role in God's saving history confronted, if not contradicted, their prejudice against a new Middle-Eastern neighbor. Africans wondered why, if David and Solomon collected wives, they had to sacrifice polygamy for Christianity.[22]

By and large, what Anglicans heard from their reading took a pragmatic bent. Bishop Wand of London observed, "The typical Anglican, if there be any such, is generally a practical person, even when he is a theologian."[23] Liturgy and sacrament provided a field for just such practical questions, and one with clear ramifications for missions.

Collects of Cranmer are revised for use in Anglican churches, to make them conform to 'contemporary English'?" From a review of December 12, 1961 reprinted in the London Telegraph Sunday Magazine, May 20, 1984.

Before the war an English-based reevaluation of Anglican worship initiated with the publication of A. G. Hebert's Liturgy and Society in 1935 and Evelyn Underhill's Worship a year later. Then Dom Gregory Dix's seminal work The Shape of the Liturgy (1945) "transformed Anglican liturgiology almost overnight from a remote and academic branch of scholarship into a study whose immediate relevance became evident to multitudes of parish priests."[24] By examining the fourfold pattern of Jesus' action at the Last Supper, Dix influenced Prayer Book revision throughout the Communion.[25] He also spurred Eucharistic practice within the Church of England and beyond, a trend already arising from a series of essays edited by Hebert in 1938. One evolution of this trend was the "Parish and People Movement" which encouraged the Eucharist as the main parish service on Sunday mornings enhanced by extensive reading of Scripture and participation of the laity in a corporate act of the entire Body of Christ.[26] In PECUSA Massey Shepherd propagated his ideas in a volume of the officially-sponsored Church's Teaching Series, The Worship of the Church (1952).[27]

Laity became more visible in the Church's liturgy and its life, a point which would influence the "who" of missions. C. S. Lewis, Dorothy Sayers, Charles Williams and from an earlier era Evelyn Underhill broke a clerical monopoly in theology, raising fresh and effective voices to communicate with more ordinary folk than the academic sorts could reach.[28]

Laity took new prominence simply by attending. Participation in America and to a lesser extent Britain increased.[29] The Cambridge Christian Union invited the newly-famous American evangelist Billy Graham to foster a revival which despite its sometimes scorned approach and fundamentalistic views thrived among some undergraduates and prompted an increase in men seeking orders.[30]

The Church consciously reached out to laypeople more vigorously than any time perhaps since the Reformation. Both RSV and NEB were designed to speak "directly to the man in the pew in language he can reasonably be expected to understand."[31] Liturgists, theologians and increasing numbers of clergy labored to transform spectators into actors, the "empewed" into the "empowered."[32] That meant beefing up their education: Barclay applied his

historical research to his "Daily Bible Series" in this era, and also for adults, the Episcopal Church produced its sequence of volumes collectively titled "The Church's Teaching Series" (1949-1957). Publishing the series was the Seabury Press, founded after World War Two and charged as well with the Seabury Series curriculum for church schools. These two comprised the first attempt to produce and employ officially-sponsored didactic materials for the entire Church.[33]

It also meant deepening the spiritual nurture of laity and clergy alike, as priests like Martin Thornton realized toward the end of this period.[34]

All this led to a revivification of the Church as a whole and in its parts--and parties. Max Warren traced renewed vigor among English Evangelicals, particularly in their theological writing: Whereas Free Church and Anglo-Catholic writers dominated the pre-war period, Evangelicals published themselves into increasing post-war prominence.[35] The Catholic wing, meanwhile, explored the nature of the Church and its unity, which sent it searching after basics--especially Christ--with an eye toward the wider Body.[36] So at the same time that these influences nurtured discrete elements within the Church, it prodded those elements toward each other. Because of party differences, the Seabury Series took ten years to produce; but the process of hammering out distinctions also reduced tensions between American High and Low churchmen, while simultaneously laying a basis for even greater theological and liturgical unity.[37]

Finally, the search for ecumenical unity, a key to both Archbishop Fisher's and Presiding Bishop Sherrill's visions for the Church,[38] became an international focus with clear meaning for Anglican relationships and missions. Already well initiated, it was fed by many influences: Biblical scholars and theologians spanned ecumenical barriers (Ramsey, Moule, Richardson, Hebert, Fuller and Vidler were Anglicans; Tayler and Barrett, Methodists, Dodd a Congregationalist, John and Donald Baillie and William

Barclay from the Church of Scotland). "It has been in biblical and historical studies that denominational walls of partition have been broken down as all churches have rediscovered the importance of the Bible," notes Welsby;[39] and the RSV was lauded "as an important instrument in the ecumenical dialogue between Christians."[40] The liturgical movement shaped Reformed as well as ritualistic denominations[41] while the very thesis of the unifying effects of the Eucharist upon the Body of Christ would broaden a layman's, theologian's, pastor's and bishop's understanding of the nature of Christ's Church.

Nothing lives in isolation. As liturgy both grew from and promoted unity, so other aspects fed and fed on each other. The Parish and People movement, for one, was acutely aware of the interrelationship. It put on Lay Conferences, urged modern translations in the liturgy which should meaningfully "cut," and explored what was involved in efforts toward reunion. One of its leaders, Ernest Southcott of Leeds, pioneered in developing the "house church" within his large urban parish. Home meetings for prayer, Bible study and discussion concluded with Holy Communion. Spiritual growth, liturgy, Biblical study, ecumenism, lay ministry and growth, and social concern all meshed.[42]

Not only the ideas themselves but the proponents of them provided a cross-fertilization between what too often had been walled-off gardens. Michael Ramsey, for instance, began as a Biblical scholar and theologian whose best-known work emphasized liturgy; he became the Archbishop of Canterbury who presided over the "MRI Congress." His successor at York and Canterbury, Donald Coggan, taught Bible, chaired the NEB committee and presided over conferences which set new directions for missions for Latin America, and read out the MRI document to the Toronto Congress. They typified a host of scholar-bishops on the English bench who employed their positions to implement this developing synthesis in pragmatic ways. The bishops epitomized a broad phenomenon.

Thus, a "wholeness to the Gospel," and certainly of the faith, found new expression in the postwar period.

C. The Gospel and Mission

Nowhere is this unity in both ideas and proponents--this intellectual synthesis--more increasingly evident than in a renewed emphasis on missions which both derived from and contributed to this emerging new consensus.

Missions had already played a vital role in the development of an ecumenical understanding--and indeed in the ecumenical movement itself. The 1910 World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh inspired Charles Henry Brent, for one, to seek a deeper unity among Churches. Giving leadership to the Faith and Order Movement arose from the same motivation which guided his pastoral priesthood in Boston and his missionary episcopate in the Philippines. Just prior to his death in 1929, he reflected on how

> the missionary ideal is the one great motive and effort of the human race that, ideally at any rate, has never known the limitation of race or country, but would appeal to all men on the basis of a common manhood with a common Fatherhood.[43]

The work of A. G. Hebert not only picks up this theme, but directs liturgy and biblical theology toward the Christian mission. Scholars, he wrote, question whether the "Great Commission" in Mark 16 was written down by Mark or in Matthew 28 was spoken by Jesus. "It is no longer possible to produce any indisputably authentic text which conveys a plain command of His to preach His Gospel to the whole world. His own mission was to Israel." However--he hastens to clarify--we can see such statements as Mark 16:15 as "a summary of the whole Gospel."[44] In short, it still applies.

That mission, he wrote the next year, arises directly from "the life of the believing and worshipping community" whose center is "a life given and offered in sacrifice"--indeed, in union with its Lord. But

> it cannot be a life of union with Christ without being a sacrificial life. The eucharistic worship of the Church is the seal of this union.... As regards this world, the Christians are thereby equipped [through the sacrament] to go out and live as members of Christ in this world, as lights of the world, as a city set upon a hill....[45]

The Eucharist thus <u>obligates</u> mission. Douglas Webster restated the point twenty years later. "The inwardness of eucharistic worship, which is centered

is the reality of Christ and of his sacrifice, should itself lead on to the outwardness of mission."[46]

But Hebert went further.

> Here is the mission of the Church of God, to proclaim the universal Gospel, and to bring people within the visible Church, that they may become members of the Body of Christ and be trained up in the ways of Christian worship and living. For the visible Church does exist, in spite of the divisions of Christendom, in spite of its broken unity. The divisions of Christendom mar and spoil the witness of Christians to the Gospel, and hamper the mission of the Church. Yet the visible Church does exist as a fact: Therefore its reunion must come about, however long it may take and whatever be the difficulties.[47]

These points bear directly upon both mission and ecumenism as central purposes of the people of God.

Though few Americans matched Hebert's inclusiveness of vision in their writings, he was not alone. The paramount American liturgist Massey Shepherd entreated General Convention in 1955 to "put all its energy of thought and prayer to its major business--the missionary task.... If ever General Convention is called to bold, decisive, responsible missionary action it is now."[48] And Stephen Bayne, who would figure prominently in the refiguring of Anglican practice, wrote "The Church's Teaching Series" volume on Christian Living (1957), also spoke extensively on liturgical renewal.[49] His missionary consciousness had not fully formed, though, for while underscoring a twofold obligation to deepen and develop a commitment to the ecumenical task and to "know [one's] neighbors and to share as much common life with them as it is possible for him to do conscientiously" (a paraphrase of the WCC's "Lund Principle"), he avoids citing the individual's responsibility for the Church's specifically missionary role.[50] That would await the 1958 Lambeth Conference, which held high consequences not only for Bayne's views (and the Church's), but Bayne himself.

As thoughtful leaders traced, scrutinized and braided various aspects of the Church's life, they perceived an underlying catholicity not only in the Church's thought but in the Church itself. They saw its ecumenical dimension

clearly. They could see it too on a map of the Anglican Communion. Numerous books appeared, especially before Lambeth Conferences or Anglican Congresses, explaining for the common reader the new scope of what had grown from the Church of England.[51] They signified an urge toward a deepened unity among the growing number of geographical provinces.

They pursued it too among theological parties, so that the topic of missions performed a unifying service. For instance, a missionary-minded Methodist evangelical used what was for him an uncharacteristic term:

> The modern missionary awakening grew out of that new accent on catholicity which the Evangelical revival helped to recover. ...It is now universally recognized, in theory at least, that the missionary obligation of the Church is an obligation resting on the whole church. It is recognized that...the church has become universal in fact as well as in faith.[52]

The Catholic-minded, such as Hebert, Ramsey and Shepherd, found common cause with the Evangelicals like Warren, Neill and Webster; and in the process they discovered something to appreciate in the natural inclinations of the other.

Concern for unity within the Church paralleled concerns for unity among churches. The World Council of Churches was in process of being born. It held its first general assembly immediately after the 1948 Lambeth Conference. Missions having led to the initiation of the ecumenical movement, now the ecumenical movement was a factor in reevaluating missions. At a 1938 gathering, "it became abundantly clear that the divisions of Christendom were seen in their worst light in the mission field." Competition could be fierce, and disgraceful, wasteful, and counterproductive.[53]

So as the decade of the 1950's began, attention was given to the nature of the global missionary task in light of this changed world and changing ecclesiastical perspectives. The nature of the missionary obligation, the purpose of missions and the role of the missionary was subjected to new scrutiny. The ecumenical International Missionary Council led this process in its International Review of Missions. Starting in 1950 it published studies

exploring the missionary obligation as deriving from the Bible and as seen in the current context; the personal vocation of the missionary; the purpose of missionary societies and boards; and the missionary task of both older and younger churches and their interrelationship. What was happening within Anglicanism found a not-very-coincidental parallel in the World Council of Churches.[54]

Mission was forcefully reaffirmed, but not as some department segregated from the rest of the Church's life. "Worship and service must be completed with bearing witness to the truth near at hand and far away. The action of the Church culminates in mission work," wrote a Swiss missionary with oft-repeated sentiments. "It is a mistake to-day to separate the Church from the Mission, for both are due to the same prompting of the Spirit, that the witness to the Lord and His Truth may shine throughout the world."[55] Nor could the Church relegate missions to a few societies, no matter how successful. Mission and Church were one. As the Willingen conference heard, "Let the Church be the Mission"--and later, "let the mission be the Church."[56]

But neither Church nor Mission were what they once were. World had changed, and so had both Church and Mission. Clearly the "younger" churches were growing up. At the Edinburgh Conference in 1910, not a single African native could be found among the 1,200 participants.[57] By 1956 the International Missionary Council held its conference in Ghana, and non-Western delegates caucussed.[58] But even in 1910 omens of change could be heard. V.S. Azariah, soon to be India's first native Anglican bishop, spoke respectfully of an older style of missionary relationship while calling for something else:

> Through all the ages to come the Indian Church will rise up in gratitude to attest the heroism and self-denying labors of the missionary body. You have given your goods to feed the poor. You have given your bodies to be burned. We also ask for <u>love</u>. GIVE US FRIENDS.[59]

Friendship was what was appropriate, especially after the war. Political independence was increasingly matched by local ecclesiastical independence: India's nationhood was paralleled in the Church of South India. The Province of West Africa achieved independent status in 1951; one of its components, Nigeria, had been seeking ecumenical connections with earnestness since 1933.[60] What Azariah hinted at needed to become a reality.

Friendship with the church of an independent nation, though, presumed an independent church. That meant an end to certain concepts, some of which ran deep. Liturgical uniformity, for example, might no longer be appropriate, though that meant loosening one tie that binds. And authority would need to be transferred from foreign missionary organization into the hands of the Church in a given place, meaning the local church with indigenous leadership.[61] Ironically, the theologian who brought old Anglican ideas to new light--Henry Venn had set self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating Churches as the goal of mission[62]--had died in 1947, predicting that no one would understand his ideas until he had been dead ten years.[63] Beginning in 1949, works of Roland Allen began reappearing in print after an absence of several decades,[64] but reached wide audiences only after 1956--right on schedule. Though ahead of his day in the writing, Allen's thoughts fit the mood of the day. He too looked back to the Bible. From probing the New Testament he developed concepts of indigenous churches which relied little on supporting "mothers," made maximum use of their freedom, propagated themselves, and depended upon the ministry of all baptized Christians. He was still ahead of his day, but his ideas were consistent with the emerging synthesis.

Churches, then, needed new patterns of relationships to fit new realities and new philosophies. Max Warren recalled a vitally important word at the 1947 I.M.C. conference at Whitby: Partnership. That gathering

> linked it not merely to institutional devices but to <u>expectant evangelism</u>. It saw consciously or unconsciously that what the world was looking for was a demonstration of unity. It believed that the Gospel could produce partnership and that that partnership in action

> would be an expectant preparation for the coming of God in power and great majesty. This expectant evangelism would seek to call out men and women who should be ready for His coming and who in their common life as well as in their individual witness would constitute cells of constructive revolutionaries preparing for the new revelation.[65]

Such a partnership required a new kind of missionary. This was not perceived at first. Bishop Sherrill sensed a need for missionaries. "From every field comes the call, 'Give us men,'" he declared at St. Augustine's College in 1948. "We have the physical means and the environment for a tremendous missionary advance if we have the essential personnel and physical resources to move forward." But his concept of the missionary does not much differ from that of a century before. "We can only afford to send our best as ambassadors of Christ to other nations and peoples."[66]

Canon Warren proposed a different view, arising from the "partnership" concept: That not only might missionaries go from England to India, China or Africa, but from India, China and Africa to England, with a fourfold benefit:

> They will be symbols of the Universal Gospel and the Universal Church and as such essential to the life of the whole Body. They will have a peculiar contribution to offer by way of helping the Church at any one place or time to explore the dimension of depth in its life. They will be pioneers of new ways of living.... And in the fourth place, they will be concerned in any one time or place to be foot loose and so able to pioneer evangelism whether in geographical or sociological terms.

Furthermore, this new style would depend more on "non-professional missionaries --including laity.[67]

Warren's point makes another presumption, which IRM articles articulated: that England is a missionary territory.[68] England, the U.S., Canada, the "sending Churches," have something to receive. Bishop Sherrill was not quite ready to accept that. But he did admire "the great contribution these same peoples [in, say, India, China or Africa] make to our common cause. We need the contribution of the East to our better understanding of the Gospel. ...If there is a need for us to give there is equal need that we should learn."[69] And from what a colleague recalls, Sherrill realized the shift from

"mother-daughter" relationships to one "of partnership in missions, that we had to treat our missions as brothers rather than as children." Archbishop Fisher seemed to agree.[70]

By 1952, the I.M.C. had already absorbed many of these concepts. One student calls that year's meeting in Willengen a "watershed between the missionary era, from 1787 onwards and the new perspective of world mission by the Churches." Willengen made three key points. First, the world had been shaken, and features which had been familiar to the missionary movement had largely disappeared. Second, new emphasis had been given that mission was a responsibility of the Church as a whole, not segregated into some special agency. Third, though "younger" churches remained directed by foreigners, often connected with missionary societies; the time was coming for indigenous leadership. It was significant that forty "nationals" attended, and held a special caucus of their own.[71]

Yet Canon Warren had gone further in his 1951 article. Whitby had given him a vision of partnership which, like Allen's, was about ten years before its time. In words which would become increasingly familiar a decade hence, he described

> the radical new relationship for which the Christian Church must provide...between East and West, or Europe and Africa, is the relationship, not of independence over against dependence, but of a joyfully accepted interdependence. Much the most encouraging feature of that meeting [in Whitby] was the prophetic way in which leaders of the younger churches there saw this and, in the seeing, transcended that very natural state of emotional thinking which imagines that the next stage from dependence must always be independence. In the Christian life mutuality is the slow-growing development out of depenence into maturity. What we are seeking to show the world is a Society whose pattern is the divine one of His body the Church which lives by mutual interdependence. 'We are many members but of one body.'[72]

That vision would point the way for the Anglican Communion as it redefined the relationships between its ever-increasing components. But that redefinition was slow in coming. It could be marked by successive Lambeth Conferences in 1948 and 1958, and Anglican Congresses in 1954 and 1963, with

meetings of the World Council of Churches often coordinated with them. But that vision, which unified so many elements, ultimately became the guiding principle of the Anglican Communion in 1963 when, borrowing Canon Warren's phrase--perhaps lent by Warren himself as he helped draft the statement[73]--it aimed toward "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ."

Thus between 1946 and 1958 an intellectual synthesis created a climate in which a new kind of Anglicanism could find expression.

It paid high respect to the Bible on its own terms, devoting painstaking scrutiny not just for scholarship's sake but to rediscover the word of God.

It sought to theologize on the basis of the Scriptures as God's word.

It respected the Church's liturgy in a new way as the central point of Christian community, both unifying and sending forth the people of God.

It regarded the laity in much higher terms, realizing anew the Church's dependence on the 99 per cent who do not wear the clerical collar. As part of that it saw the need to nurture their growth, and foster their service.

It perceived an underlying unity to the Christian Church, both within Anglicanism and more broadly with other communions which call Christ Lord.

Finally, it understood missions in terms more appropriate to post-war realities and to this emerging synthesis: Mission was a central, inseparable activity of the Church; it respected the independence of churches; it sought partnership; it tried to permit diversity while maintaing unity.

To take a simple example: In the closing pages of his book Dom Gregory Dix cited the "divergent local traditions of thought" within the Catholicism of the "dark ages." Yet he also waxes poetic on the unity which Eucharist always provided. "We shall not fully grasp [the sacrament's] meaning until we take much more seriously...the biblical and patristic teaching on the solidarity of the human race as one entity."[74] Diversity within unity.

In 1958, recounts one bishop, he was surprised to see so many prelates from third-world nations attired in the gaiters and spats then going out of fashion among the British hierarchy. He realized these had been sent out in "mission boxes," the equivalent of "CARE packages" for impoverished churches. This is what they received; and this is what they presumed is what every properly-dressed bishop should wear.[75]

But also in 1958, a relatively new program was being discussed in which dioceses in Canada, Australia, the United States or Britain might link up with dioceses in India, Asia, Africa--Latin America still was not much mentioned--as partners. They would become "companion dioceses," sharing with each other.[67] It was a qualitatively different view from the "mission boxes" of a previous age.

No one expressed these ideas more consistently, fervently, widely, or with such applicability as the American bishop who became the first Anglican Executive Officer, Stephen Bayne. As the agent of the Lambeth Conference's two "continuing arms," the Lambeth Consultative Council and the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy, he thereby shared with the Archbishop of Canterbury a unique Communion-wide perspective. He also became a leading apologist for--and developer of--the new theses as they moved toward formal expression in 1963.

Early in 1961, he set down "four notes of mission." First concerned the "changing character of the missionary himself." Today's world discouraged a nineteenth century style, demanding instead a more inclusive view.

> It is increasingly difficult now for Christian men and women, ordained or not ordained, to move freely into other nations and set up their ecclesiastical shops. But men and women will always be going from one nation to another, and...on many errands. And as the time comes when it may be difficult or impossible to send the officially religious missionary, it may be that we shall then look with new eyes on the opportunity and vocation of the man or woman who goes not because he is a Christian missionary but because he is in military life or diplomatic life or...in business, or a student abroad, or an exchange professor...that we will recapture something that we have lost of the ministry and witness of the laity. In discovering this we shall be rediscovering the essence of the missionary.[77]

Though thinking mostly of laity from "sending" churches, a second note lends importance to an indigenous ministry in independent but related churches.

> When we are talking about overseas missions, we are really talking about inter-church relationships.... The report of the Gray Committee quite rightly stressed the fact that we have reached the point in which we must learn to look at over overseas commitments not in terms of largesse from home but in terms of comradeship, church-to-church.[78]

Thirdly, "you cannot talk about inter-church relationships" within the Anglican Communion "without coming to the third note or condition of mission which is that of the overwhelming sense of mission and brotherhood and unity within which every Christian must work." He earlier declared, "Missionary strategy and ecumenical strategy are inseparable.... The part our Communion will play in the world mission of the Church cannot be understood apart from our part in ecumenical life."[79]

This led to a final "note." "Our mission is to help establish, among 'every people, tongue and nation,' the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ, fully rooted in the local community, yet fully sharing the life of the whole Body."[80] That implies an "autonomous united Church," and more, to become the earthly body of its Lord. It "is not...to do something but to be something."[81] The title of the 1963 paper stated his thought: "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ."

Bayne's views, and the MRI paper, by no means arose in a vacuum. They developed over a long period of time, punctuated by sequences of meetings in which Anglicans strived to adjust their structures and practices in ways that strived to be consistent with new realities and their emerging theoretical synthesis. The 1958 Lambeth Conference began to canonize these understandings, and to explore how to apply them in ways as diverse as the ideas themselves. Then, the 1963 Anglican Congress gave them perhaps their clearest expression both in the speeches and in the MRI declaration.

After that culmination, the synthesis declined, at the same time that the world changed yet again. Nevertheless, its theses continue to be integral to Anglican understandings of itself and its mission. For, in the end, those understandings do not depend so much on a particular school of thought as a concept even more basic: "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it."[82]

NOTES

1. Henry Knox Sherrill, Among Friends (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1962), 202; statistics estimated in Walter Henry Gray, "The Future Course of the Anglican Communion: An Outline for Discussion," Church Congress Syllabus No. 41, n.d. [ca. 1946], 2.

2. Enthronement sermon, April 19, 1945, quoted in Paul A. Welsby, A History of the Church of England, 1945-1980 (N.p.: Oxford University Press, 1984), 1f.

3. Installation Sermon, January 14, 1947, Box 17, folder 439, Henry Knox Sherrill MSS, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Ct.; 4.

4. Sherrill, Among Friends, 240, 246f.

5. Diary of Lambeth Conference 1948, File 10, Drawer 4, Walter Henry Gray MSS, Archives of the Diocese of Connecticut, Hartford, Ct.

6. Stephen F. Bayne, ed., Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ (New York: Seabury Press, [1963]), 24. [Afterwards, MRI.]

7. Quoted in Dewi Morgan, Lambeth Speaks (London: A.R. Mobray, 1958), 102.

8. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1972), 949.

9. HKS Installation Sermon, 2f.

10. Ibid., 10f.

11. M.A.C. Warren, "The Missioanary Obligation of the Church in the Present Historical Situation," International Review of Missions [afterwards IRM], XXXIX (1950), 395-398.

12. HKS Installation Sermon, 10. Sherrill served as president of the Federal (later National) Council of Churches, and later as a president of the World Council of Churches.

13. Willem Adolph Visser't Hooft, "The Genesis of the World Council of Churches," chapter 16 in A History of the Ecumenical Movement, eds. Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (London: SPCK, 1954), 697.

14. R. O. Hall, The New Church Order (Evanston, Ill.: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1941), 18.

15. Warren, Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion (London: SPCK, 1957), 5, 23f.

16. Ibid., 23.

17. David E. Crean, "A Ministry of Hope," Anchor '86, no. 1 [1986], 2.

18. Robert J. Page, New Directions in Anglican Theology: A Survey from Temple to Robinson (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), 23; Welsby, 58f.

19. F. F. Bruce, History of the Bible in English (New York: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed., 1978), 186; Dodd quoted in Bruce, 237.

20. Opening Sermon at the 1954 Minneapolis Anglican Congress. Powel Mills Dawley, ed., Report of the Anglican Congress, 1954 (Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury Press, 1954), 15.

21. Vidler quoted in Welsby, 57.

22. J. G. H. Baker, "Lambeth '58," IRM, 446.

23. J. W. C. Wand in a paper presented to the Anglican Congress 1954, in Report, p. 32; cf. Welsby, 56.

24. E. L. Mascall quoted in Welsby, 68.

25. Welsby, 69.

26. Welsby, 69; cf. Peter J. Jagger, A History of the Parish and People Movement (Leighton Buzzard, Berks.: Faith Press, 1978), passim.; David M. Paton, The Parish Communion To-Day: The Report of the 1962 Conference of Parish and People (London: SPCK, 1962), passim.

27. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., The Worship of the Church (New York: Seabury Press, 1952).

28. Welsby, 66.

29. Ahlstrom, 950; cf. Welsby, 60.

30. Michael Ramsey, then Bishop of Durham, questioned the "crudity of the doctrine presented, so that the act of decision and coversion may involve the stifling of the mind instead of its liberation into a new service of God and man." The evangelical vicar John Stott also had his reservations. Welsby, 60.

31. T. W. Manson quoted on the RSV in Bruce, 187.

32. Emma Lou Benignus, "The Laity Today," in John B. Coburn and W. Norman Pittenger, eds., Viewpoints: Some Aspects of Anglican Thinking (Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury Press, 1959), 108f.

33. William H. Petersen, "Anglican Identity," Historical Magazine, XLVII, 4 (December 1978), 442f, n. 31.

34. Page, 17.

35. Max Warren, Crowded Canvas, 223.

36. Report of the Sixth Anglo-Catholic Congress. Subject: The Church. July 1948 (Westminster: Dacre Press, [1948]), ixf.

37. John Neuss, The Implications of the Toronto Manifesto (Evanston, Ill.: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1965), 13.

38. Fisher, Enthronement Sermon, quoted in Welsby, 4; cf. Cambridge Sermon, quoted in Welsby, 78f.

39. Welsby, 56.

40. Herbert G. May & Bruce M. Metzger, Foreword to The Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), [ii].

41. Ahlstrom, 960f; Page, 60-64.

42. Jagger, Parish and People, 49f.

43. Quoted in John Booty, The Church in History (New York: Seabury Press, 1979), 199.

44. A. G. Hebert, "The Missionary Obligation," IRM, XXXIX (1950), 386, 387.

45. A. G. Hebert, "The Mission of the Church," IRM, XL (1951), 392.

46. Webster, in "The Mission of the People of God," in Paton, Parish and People, 115.

47. Ibid., 390.

48. Massey H. Shepherd Jr., "Honolulu and the Missionary Task," Anglican Theological Review, XXXVII (1955), 165f.

49. E.g. "The Eucharist and the Church," pp. 1-20 in Massey H. Shepherd Jr., ed., Eucharist and Liturgical Renewal (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), originally an address to the San Antonio Liturgical Conference, San Antonio, Texas, November 1959. Stephen Bayne, A Bibliography (N.p., 1978), 9, 33.

50. Bayne, Christian Living (New York: Seabury Press, 1957), 195f.

51. J. MacLeod Campbell, Lambeth Calls (London: SPCK, 1948); John S. Higgins, The Anglican Communion Today (Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, [1949], and One Faith and Fellowship: The Missionary Story of the Anglican Communion (Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury press, 1958); J. W. C. Wand, The Anglican Communion: A Survey (London...: Oxford University Press, 1948).

52. Charles Ranson, "The Church Is the Mission," Christianity and Crisis, XI, no. 22 (1951), 173.

53. Quoted from the Madras Conference in David P. Gaines, The World Council of Churches: A Study of its Background and History (Peterborough, NH: Richard R. Smith, 1966), 26.

54. Norman Goodall, "First Principles," IRM XXXIX (1950), 257.

55. Alex. L. Berthoud, Church and Mission," IRM XXXIX (1950), 267.

56. Norman Goodall, ed., Missions Under the Cross (London: Edinburgh House Press, 1953) [afterwards MUC], 141, 195.

57. Elliott Kendall, The End of an Era: Africa and the Missionary (London: SPCK, 1978), 69.

58. Gwyneth Hubble, "Report on Ghana Group Discussions," IRM XLVII (1957), 143-152.

59. Quoted in Morgan, Lambeth Speaks, 105; emphasis in original.

60. Higgins, One Faith, 113, 119. The inauguration of this province marked also the first time an Archbishop of Canterbury had set foot in Africa.

61. Cf. Lambeth '58, 2.81f; Warren, "Obligation," 408.

62. Stephen Neill, A History of Christian Missions (n.p.: Penguin Books, 1964), 260.

63. Gerald Charles Davis, ed., Setting Free the Ministry of the People of God (Cincinnati, O.: Forward Movement, 1984), 14.

64. Michael Hollis, "A Doctrine of the Church," IRM XXXIX (1950), 461f.

65. Warren, "Obligation," 408.

66. HKS papers, Box 17, folder 440, 13, 12, 13.

67. Warren, "Obligation," 407.

68. Goodall, 257.

69. HKS papers (Address to the American Assembly of the Division of Foreign Missions, WCC, Toronto, January 4, 1952), Box 18, folder 444, 6.

70. Interview with Roger W. Blanchard, HKS Oral History Program, HKS papers, Box 1, 36f.

71. Kendall, 75.

72. Warren, "Obligation," 406.

73. Bayne, ed., "Minutes of the Meeting of the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy, Huron College, London, Ontario, Aug. 5-8, 1963," p. 1.

74. Dix, 738, 748.

75. David Rose, retired Bishop of Southern Virginia, personal interview with the author, Washington, D. C., February 5, 1986.

76. David B. Reed, Bishop of Kentucky, personal interview with the author, Washington, D. C., February 8, 1986. He oversaw the Companion Diocese program in the late 1950's.

77. Bayne, from an address to the Overseas Mission Society, January 1961, in TP, 200f.

78. Ibid., 202.

79. Bayne, "The Anglican Communion and the World Mission of the Church," CFR, III, no. 3 (Whitsunday 1958), 8.

80. Ibid., 8.

81. Bayne, An Anglican Turning Point: Documents and Interpretations (Austin, Texas: The Church Historical Society, 1964), 205.

82. I Corinthians 12:27.

II. Coping With a Changing World

Though reaffirmed as part of the intellectual synthesis which developed in post-war Anglicanism, concerns for missions, like all others, confronted a changed and changing world which shaped the evolution of Anglicanism as much as it re-formed the Anglican pursuit of its work.

Even as World War II raged on, a few foresaw a radically different world. In a 1945 leaflet, the Conference of British Missionary Societies projected an uneasy future with profound influence on missions:

> Africans will expect and in good faith will require that in the Peace Settlement the United Nations will bind themselves to make Africa free, in the shortest possible time, to rule herself....and in those countries where there are large numbers of white settlers,...the danger is not so much that the challenge to face the situation will not be accepted, but that it will be tackled with the philosophy of an age which is dying.[1]

To begin turning the Church Missionary Society away from an older philosophy to one more appropriate to an era he too saw dawning, its General Secretary Max Warren in 1945 traced a new context in the world in which mission would be pursued. That context had four notes: (1) the emergence of a social service state in Great Britain and elsewhere in which "state interference" would challenge Christians to cooperate while "doing our best to sabotage every effort of human society to find an end in itself"; (2) a "burgeoning nationalism" which revolted against colonialism, both political and economic; (3) the rise of indigenous churches with a nationalist temperament, sensitivity to independence, and a consciousness of being economically underdeveloped; (4) the inadequacy of numbers, training, and quality of missionary personnel.[2]

For two decades he preached a doctrine of an emerging era to a congregation broadening well beyond the CMS. As he left the Society for the wider platform of a Westminster Abbey canonry, he reflected,

> My major preoccupation was with the political issue of nationalism and the quite certain emergence of independent nations, previously part of the Colonial world. I was convinced that this development would be

far more rapid than was though possible even by Government authorities. Also I knew well that Churches in Asia and Africa had benefited enormously by the "umbrella" provided by Colonial Governments which did cherish a liberal idea more particularly with minorities. The Church in Asia and Africa, wherever they did grow, owed much to the fact that life and property were safeguarded for minority communities. Now this tradition had lulled the thinking of missionaries and of local Church leaders and the rank and file of Church membership into a negative attitude to politics. Only rarely did missionaries show active sympathy with the desire for political independence.

My primary task, as I saw it, was to warn them of what was going to happen and to try to prepare them and the Churches they served for the very different political climate which would follow independence.

How foresighted were those early projections, Howard Johnson made clear as that climate warmed to its fullness. A canon of New York City's Cathedral of St. John the Divine, he took a two-year "global odyssey" to explore first-hand the Anglican Church at work in 80 countries. In a widely-read report written just prior to the 1963 Anglican Congress, he aquainted Anglicans with the breadth and scope of their Communion--and provided plenty of examples of what Warren had foreseen.

By the time the Primates issued the MRI document in 1963, they had two decades' experience in coping with the effects of these realities on their Churches. They called for a new relationship within Anglicanism. But such a relationship depended on understanding a new set of dynamics, dynamics which Warren foretold and Johnson illustrated. In some cases it took a long time for the points to sink in.

A. A New World Context

In 1956, Primates and Metropolitans--leaders of individual Provinces--assembled as the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy for only the second time since 1948. They found a long memorandum from Canon Warren who honed his points of a decade before in the clearer light of post-war developments.

Reflecting on how Anglicans did their work in each province, Warren described the new context in which this mission was taking place. Three developments in particular held "very far-reaching effects: First, the changed economic, social and political position of Great Britain after World War II; second, the "revolt of Asia and Africa against the West"--nationalism; finally, "the emergence of the United States as the dominant power" of the free world, and thus the advanced role of its Episcopal Church as it grew in numbers, prominence and mission potential.[4] As if to underscore Warren's points, in November Egypt seized the Suez canal--humiliating British power, proclaiming third-world nationalism, and in insisting that Britain back off, manifesting American might.

The transfer of political and economic power across the Atlantic paralleled a shift of influence of the respective Churches. They were different, to be sure: Because PECUSA comprised a tiny percentage of its nation it "is not to be expected...to fulfil a role in any way comparable to that to which the nation as a whole finds itself committed." But, Warren predicted, "it may well be that the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. will, in terms of missionary outreach, become the senior partner in the Anglican Communion."[5]

Yet both U.S. and U.K. had first to comprehend the radical evolutions--and revolutions--occurring in most all of the traditional "mission fields." The rise of nationalism, of non-Christian faiths, of native cultures, of the urgency to develop and the frost of Cold War, like resurgent ideas within Anglicanism, interrelated with each other and held widespread ramifications.

1. Nationalism

As Warren observed, the movement toward independence around the globe became the era's most consistent, far-reaching force. At first, many agreed with the postwar bishop who groused that it was "everywhere a menace."[6] Westerners frightened by the Mau-Mau revolt in Kenya could only agree.

In time, more reflective voices of influence such as the Bishop of London's cited the often salutary influence of local culture on art, architecture and

music, and even on the Church's structure, as in the selection and role of bishops. In freedom, though, lay the danger of overdoing nationalism. "We cannot for that reason deny freedom; we must trust in the guidance of the Holy Spirit and exercise that eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty."[7]

Anglicans gradually realized what growing diversity could result from nationalism. At the 1954 Congress, some were astounded at what they saw.[8] A Church accustomed to bishops in gaiters and aprons blinked to find Japanese women in kimonos and African priests in flowing native dress.

They were surprised, too, at what they heard. Nationalism, they were told, involved a coming-of-age deeper than attire or administration. Kathleen Bliss, sole woman to give a major speech to the 1954 Congress, related a conversation with Jawaharal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, over whether Westerners really understood the enormous changes in Asia.

> He thought the West, or the informed minority there, had a very good understanding of the economic, social and political changes in Asia, but he found no awareness of the greatest change of all, which was going on in the hearts of men. "Millions of people all over Asia," he said, "are saying 'the things we have suffered and endured for centuries we will suffer and endure no longer'; this is not a material but a spiritual change, and I do not think the West understands either its nature or its extent."[9]

Warren reiterated the point to the Primates in 1956. "The emotional nature of the revolt of Asia and Africa against the West is not yet being taken seriously enough in the thinking of our church." The phenomenon extended much farther than ceding authority to native leadership. Rather, how could national Churches be linked in a trans-national association without prejudicing either their roots in their homeland on the one hand, or their Anglican roots on the other? And, Warren continued, how could these Anglican links be maintained without "prejudicing the increasingly strong national demand for united Churches in the several nations"?[10] These were challenges to the nature of both Anglican and ecumenical endeavors.

By decade's end the concept of nationalism was receiving a better press. Bishop Stephen Neill even waxed theological in lauding it.

> Without yielding to any exaggerated ideas of race or nation, it may yet be held that race, language, and nation are part of God's providential ordering of the world; and that, just as diversities of language and culture have been the means of drawing out to expression the varied riches and potentialities of the human spirit, so contact between the gospel and varied national and cultural traditions is needed for the full explication of its treasures.[11]

By 1960, when seventeen colonies replaced European flags with their own as independent states, writers struggled to explain what was happening, often in sympathetic terms as in an essay preparing for the 1963 Congress:

> Try to understand African nationalism. Many of these nations are jerry-built, the result of colonial land-grabbing deals made during the last two centuries. ...They have little history and are searching desperately for unity and identity. When the winds of nationalism blow wildly, this is a sign of how difficult that search really is. Let the Christian accept their nationalism. Let him seek identification with the nations which are struggling to be born. Let him also encourage the development of structures of genuine national unity. Anglicanism has done this before. It must not be slow in doing it now.

He urged what Nehru found lacking. "We must bear with the 'growing pains' of these new nations... The Church should work to moderate the violence, to influence the growth of these nations by becoming a forum for the exchange opinions, a laboratory for the training of leaders" while transcending nationalism.[12]

"There is perhaps no more lethal word in our day than nationalism," Dewi Morgan summarized in 1963. "It has, usually rightly, been held responsible for all the griefs we suffer." But, he argued, something is not inherently sinful because someone makes it an occasion of sin. "Christians who criticize nationalism forget that their own Old Testament (and sometimes the New) is among the most nationalistic books ever written." So nationalism can become a creative force as "a positive love for your own nation, and love is always creative. But love, too, can be twisted into an excessive, arrogant and aggressive pride and then it is sin." The answer? "The more a National Church sees the vision of God, the more aware it will be that its nation exists not for its own sake, but for the sake of God and, therefore, for the sake of all other nations."[13]

Indeed, wrote India's Metropolitan, nationality (if not nationalism) is "a sacred thing, because it was chosen for us by God himself."[14] As Christians

appropriate the art, music and cultural heritage of their own homelands, the Church can be accepted on its own soil; and as Christians of one land share with those of another, the Church can be enriched throughout the world as it becomes truly catholic.

So Anglicanism had to minister effectively to new nations, to build up indigenous churches, and to relate those churches effectively as a Communion. As broad as that challenge was, other factors complicated it further.

2. The Resurgence of Non-Christian Faiths

Christianity faced revived rivals. Howard Johnson saw an impressive example in Islam.

> For every one West African who becomes a Christian, ten become followers of the Prophet. It is as simple as that and as drastic as that. Already we are outnumbered. Shortly we shall be overwhelmed. I see no way of arresting the trend. I can only recommend ways of adjusting to it--and it worries me supremely that the West African Church seems so little aware that adjustments will be called for.[15]

Not only Islam but others gleaned strength from nationalism. In one case Christianity became a victim of its own success: Nationalist sentiment and independence strengthened Indian Hinduism while Christian doctrine and example influenced it to develop a greater moral force. Reported the SPG, "Attempts are now being made to regain for Hinduism Indian converts to the Christian religion." Buddhists strived to reverse the West-to-East pattern by opening a college in Ceylon to train missionaries for work "in darkest Europe."[16]

Though the modern world generally discouraged pagan religions, technology actually spawned one: The "cargo cult" of New Guinea and the South Pacific.

> Where this delusion originated and how it got around is unknown, but thousands of these people are honestly convinced that their ancient gods have beneficently sent shipload after shipload of wonderful presents to them but that wicked white men, pirates, have hijacked the cargoes at sea and appropriated the whole loot to their own selfish use. The "Cargo Cult" is the dominant religion here today.

Christians could counter the "Cargo Cult" by showing off crates being unloaded marked "Made in U.S.A.," "Made in Japan."[17] That was simple compared to competing with, say, Islam. With its uncomplicated monotheism, its unambiguous

ethics, its permission of polygamy, its alliance with nationalism--and no color bar--Islam appealed to Africans in ways that Christianity could not, or would not, do. That it was enticing, Johnson saw; he also saw Christians refusing to understand its appeal. Once he asked school leaders if courses in Islam were held to explain what their students' friends and neighbors believed.

> Not until the moment of asking it did I realize I had dropped a bombshell. There was a stunned silence. Then, by delayed action, an explosion. "What?" The tone was incredulous, as if the questioner could not have heard aright. "That we should teach Mohammedanism in a Christian school!" They looked at me as if I had said something indecent.[18]

To Johnson it seemed common sense to learn what a soon-to-be majority believed.

Others perceived a prod to Christianity to live up to itself. Not only because younger churches live in their midst, declared a European mission leader, "but also because the fast-growing interdependence of the whole world forces the existence and vitality of these religions upon us, makes them a challenge to the Church to manifest in new terms its spiritual and intellectual integrity and value."[19] There was also the question of what it means to be a Christian. Indians were exploring ways to relate more effectively within their own culture. "They are seeking to approach other believers in positive rather than negative terms. They are asking that Christians in the West should not only pray with them but *think* with them in this adventure. What, for instance, does it mean to be a *churchman*?" As Bishop Neill pointed out, many Hindus puzzled over why, "if they acknowledge Christ, must they join the Church?"

There, too, the challenge emerged. "Resurgent Hindus and Buddhists can and do appreciate resurgent Christians. What they cannot appreciate is the Christian who is neither hot nor cold!"[20]

3. The Clash of Cultures

The presumption that Christianity implied Western culture weighed heavily upon nations striving to establish their own identity.

Johnson perceived the dilemma. In Uganda he attended a Confirmation.

> At the conclusion of the service the joy of the congregation was so great that it issued in spontaneous dancing. We were barely outside the church before it began. Somebody grabbed a five-gallon tin, and with this for percussion the people, in pefect rhythm, jumped higher and higher, pulling their legs up under them...: a congregation of one hundred people in levitation, three feet from the ground! It all seemed natural and right, a typically African way of expressing happiness. I congratulate this part of the Province of Uganda on permitting it.

Yet what he saw in one place was strictly forbidden elsewhere in Uganda.[21]

In Accra, he watched laymen arrive at the Gothic-style cathedral wear striped trousers and cutaway coats--Edwardian attire for an English experience. And what, he wondered, was a Gothic cathedral doing in tropical Africa? Apparently, two sets of blueprints were sent from London; the one bound for Newfoundland ended up in Accra. But why was London designing Ghanian or Canadian cathedrals?[22] Asserted Max Warren,

> there is no merit in a Church looking and, what is more serious, 'feeling' foreign, that is culturally not 'at-home'. Anglican chants in African Cathedrals speak of the insularity of Anglicanism and not of its catholicity![23]

Western--and especially English--preeminence could no longer be presumed. "We simply cannot imagine God, ourselves, or the world in precisely the same manner as do those who belong to a culture different from our own," wrote a Canadian;[24] and different cultures were raising their voices. Stephen Bayne attacked the "culture confessionalism" which in allying Christianity with Western values "can be quite as paralyzing in its erosion of the liberties of the younger church as any theological confessionalism can be."[25] On the other hand, old presuppositions die hard. A canon of Canterbury scored the Church of England for equating itself with Anglicanism in a Lambeth report which took no account of Wales or Ireland, much less Australia or Nigeria.[26]

On the other hand, presuppositions bequeathed to erstwhile colonies could not easily be dismissed. If some cherished local custom, others favored an imported heritage. Not far from Accra's Gothic cathedral Johnson visited a

school chapel impressive both for its elegance and for its suitability to Ghana's climate: sweeping eaves to keep out the rain; open sides to capture every breeze. Yet the local populace despised it for not looking like a "proper church." Their objection ran deeper than the brand of conservatism common to Western parishes. The Africans felt it was cut-rate, second-best, and thus "apartheid architecture."[27]

At the same time, third-world progress depended at least upon some amount of Western culture. Pointing to his wristwatch, Johnson asked an English theological college warden, "Is it really necessary that we bring this along with Christ?" "Yes," he responded, "we must shackle the African to our conception of time--and to the straight line as well--if he is to make progress." The clock was there to stay.[28]

But someone such as Johnson understood that not only was the West shaping Africa, African culture might well force Western Christians to rethink their assumptions. Polygamy offered a prime example.

> Africans believe in simultaneous polygamy. Our preference, apparently, is for successive polygamy. But in this discussion, it matters not what our preferences and practices are. The one question at issue is: What does Christianity require?

Hard questions arise when a polygamist presents himself for baptism: Does he take his favorite and dismiss the rest, or retain the first wife? How do the dismissed ones fare? At what point does he receive baptism? and what is the status of the rejected wife? Johnson suggested no conclusion, but reckoned that "many Anglicans in positions of leadership fail even to recognize it as a problem"--including Lambeth 1958 when a black African bishop scorned the superficiality of its paragraph on the issue, and in 1963 when a Nigerian pleading for serious attention to the question met with a frivolous retort.[29]

The issue of cultural imperialism, then, cut two ways. In seeking independence, third-world Christians had to evaluate anew the question of culture. But as they became familiar with third-world issues, Westerners had

at least to begin to perceive challenges to their own preconceptions as well. For the most part, as at Lambeth in 1958, that part of things was ignored.

4. National Development

Nearly everywhere Johnson travelled, he noticed enormous needs as nations tried to build themselves. Development of economies, educational systems, health care, infrastructure--all posed tremendous hurdles which left countries reeling under the endless reality of constant change, and no less so the Church. The Bishop of Mombasa projected a simple case in point.

> It is very likely that on the south mainland opposite Mombasa Island there will be a very considerable economic expansion, possibly in terms of an oil refinery or something of that order. This will mean an influx of population, black, white and brown, of at least as many people as are already on the Island of Mombasa itself.... The diocese has not at its disposal resources which can be moved in to deal with that situation....[30]

Though Bishop Beecher did not specify the immense sociological implications this held, Johnson spotted an example in a training center in Nairobi.

> Wives who have newly come to town to join their husbands find the city baffling. It is no small service to them, therefore, that the Church Army Centre provides a course in domestic service. They are taught how to keep house in a dwelling very different from what they have been used to, how to cope with the supermarket, and how to cook with gas. Sometimes education has to start by explaining that there is no need to recoil in horror from the can on the supermarket shelf which shows a picture of a bland infant: "Baby Food" is food <u>for</u> babies, not adult food made <u>of</u> babies!

--a logical mistake for those who see tins labeled with pictures of beans and beets.[31]

Without a doubt, these developments had immense spiritual repercussions. Johnson cited the problem of a rural Christian--presuming, of course, he had been touched by the Gospel at all--who migrates to the city. That in itself is a shock. If he looks for the Church, he may find one--and maybe not. In the Philippines, for example, "people keep streaming in from the Provinces in search of a city of gold. Those who were Episcopalians in the mountain and rural districts are often lost to us in the moving, for we are unprepared in Manila to receive them." For that there could be many reasons, one of which

was a decision by Episcopalians to follow Anglican tradition in not "competing" with other denominations. Either their own Church was not there or else was "too much in the nature of Yankee outposts to assimilate the new-comers."[32]

Clearly the Church had to evaluate its role in development, and what resources it could commit. Neither issue was readily resolved.

3. East-West Confrontation

In addition, the "Cold War" had its effect. The 1952 Willingen meeting of the International Missionary Council heard speaker after speaker underscore it. The revolutionary demands of their age resulted in part from nationalism, said one, in part from Communism. There was even some hand-wringing over "who lost China"--and some breast-beating: "We did not give [the Chinese] a doctrine of the Church in the purpose of God. Let us not make the same mistake in other parts of the world, while there is time."[33]

Johnson dealt with the tension as well. A friend at home, hearing Johnson describe education in Melanesia, exclaimed, "'Don't you realize that the children of these children will all be Communists?' He may, of course, be right. Almost certainly he is right--unless we organize for action." Some championed Christianity as "our best defence against the Communist menace." Johnson met a powerful theologian, himself suspected of being "pink," who knew better than most the havoc that Communism could bring. "It is not, however, for that reason that he contends with Communism. He fights for Christianity--in the conviction that it is right, the salvation of the human race."

Johnson added a final note on his friend. "He wonders--if rightly--if the flaccid Christians of today can be a match for the tough-minded, superbly disciplined foes they face."[34] Indeed, a grudging respect for Communism had emerged by 1963. Warren shocked the Congress by perceiving God's presence under the bo tree with Gautama Buddha and in the British Museum with Karl Marx. Howard Johnson approvingly quoted Nikolai Berdyaev's comment, "We Christians have no right to struggle spiritually against Communism unless we

are prepared also to struggle spiritually against evils to which Communism is an attempted--though mistaken--answer."[35] Anglicans were being told that Communism was not necessarily the totally evil force that they--especially the North Americans among them--had presumed.[36]

Each of these forces, then, posed challenges to all of Christianity and Anglicanism in particular: The challenge of understanding the dynamics, the challenge of reconsidering long-held preconceptions, the challenge of responding appropriately, the challenge finally of invigorating its own life so as to present an effective witness to its Lord, not only through its word but also by the example of its life. It had no choice but to become more open.

B. Looking Inward

As many observed, what the Communion confronted in the world forced a new view of the world around it, but also a reevaluation of what the Church itself was doing. The "who, what, when, where, why and how" of its missions needed a thorough review.

1. The Nature of Missions: "Why"

Throughout the 1950's, the very purpose of missions was questioned by most mainline denominations. Walter Freytag, a leading missionary statesman from the German Free-Church tradition, contrasted the International Missionary Council's attitude in 1958 with 1928:

> Then missions had problems, but they were not a problem themselves. There was no question that the initiative in witness and action was with western missions as they stood. Today we do not speak of the initiative of western missions but only of their contribution. But more than this: we are uncertain about their patterns as they are, and even more, the historic, basic conceptions of missions are being questioned.[37]

As the 1950's began, the IMC led a broad, ecumenical review of the status and prospects of missions, to which Max Warren and other Anglicans contributed. Freytag himself, in an important contribution, alleged "a self-assertion" which had guided missions to that point. He wondered if it still had an effect on

the apparent "preference for pioneer work in the most untouched area possible and which presents many supporters of missions from finding a right relationship to service in younger churches which have become self-supporting." Missions, he feared, still meant white Westerners stepping into African wilds to enlighten the savages by creating what the UMCA a century earlier had called "centres of Christianity and civilization" (a view reiterated as late as 1968 by the UMCA general secretary who claimed "Livingstone was right"[38]). Not only might this contradict current international realities, it belied an arrogant sense of superiority by then utterly inappropriate. He continued, "Missions more and more cease to be missions 'from above to below' in the sense that the bearers of the message are superior to those who receive it in culture or at least in civilization. In this respect a long period of missionary history has come to an end." Like Roland Allen, he pleaded for a look at earliest Christian missions as described in Acts to foster a better understanding. Like so many, he turned back to the Bible.

He noted, too, the recurring problem in perspective in which the "home" view diverged from the reality in the "field."

> The real situation in the lands of the younger churches is becoming increasingly remote from the picture of missions which prevails among the parishes and congregations at home. In spite of honest presentation of the fact that missionary service is now for the most part service to the younger churches, the parishes at home either do not take it in or do not, on the whole, feel the same obligation towards it as that which pioneer missionary service inspired in them.[39]

Fifteen years later, a mission leader found the dichotomy still alive and fully able to discourage support from older churches. An English lady, long a supporter of overseas missions, visited East Africa. She was shocked by what she saw, selective though it was.

> I have been wasting my time all these years, knitting clothes for people who have no need of them, giving money for a Church which has plenty of rich members, with better houses and better cars than we have, who only put a penny in the collection on Sunday. Not another gift for missions, not another working party![40]

Discouraging words were plentiful enough. Wrote an Indian scholar and diplomat, "It will hardly be denied that, in spite of the immense and sustained effort made by the Churches with the support of the lay public of the European countries and America, the attempt to conquer Asia for Christ has definitely failed."[41] Johnson cited plenty of examples of weak or failing missions.

The fundamental urge toward mission continued nonetheless. How one went about mission, and what its purpose might be: These questions evolved with the decades, often in response to the wider dynamics at large.

Nationalism and the advance of other faiths demanded a revised concept of mission which ended up revising a theological precept. Where once an old-line missionary set forth from London or New York in fervent desire to "bring Christ" to the heathen--as if the Lord was a commodity to be shipped, or a culture to be conveyed--now he stepped out expecting to find Christ already present as Lord of all the world, including that land and, ultimately, of that faith. "The Mission of the Christian is not to take Christ to some place from which he is absent but to go into all the world and discover Christ there, and, in a Christly way, there to uncover the unknown Christ," wrote Max Warren. To find Christ present amidst--or among--Buddhists or Hindus is as much a surprise to the Christian as to the Buddhist or Hindu, he observed. But that approaches the land and the non-Christian with far greater respect. It also broadens Christology more adequately to express his Lordship. In that, added Warren, is a kind of prevenient unity through a God who has already acted.[42]

Warren broadened horizons in another way. He urged a "theology which believes in one God, but also rejoices in religious pluralism." The Spirit, he maintained, works in the "history of mankind outside the covenant of Christ and his Church as well as within it." Incarnation, for instance, can be expressed within the background of religious and cultural inheritances of non-Western people.[43] Thus an African artist could depict the Crucifixion using Black figures, his Church could accept it, and Canon Johnson could admire it.[44]

Such a view opened the way for a more pluralistic Church.

Anglicanism had long accepted Henry Venn's standards for what he termed the "euthanasia of mission": Self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating Churches. Already the Communion had seen independent daughter provinces develop in the U.S., Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Southern Africa who in some ways outshone the mother. But the ideas were given new force and meaning by the urge toward autonomy in areas which retained foreign-born leadership, which might not so easily become self-supporting, which would find it difficult to extend themselves and which surely would not be nearly so British. The American-born Bishop of the Philippines helped consecrate the first Filipino bishop as suffragan in 1958--after more than a half-century of Episcopal work there. "It is better," he wrote, to anticipate this move rather than to delay it," for in Anglican polity it is a mark of the true church that it be self-ordering. Thus that must be a goal of mission. "The local structuring of society, the peculiar and particular currents of nationalism in the land, local culture or cultures, the role of women...--all will play a part in determining how these initial seeds will mature."[45]

"The seeds for the self-supporting and self-sufficient character of the younger church must be in the luggage of the first foreign missionary to arrive on new soil," he continued. It cannot depend upon the older, "sending" church to grow; if so, "this younger Christian community is less than a church and will never grow beyond its infant, dependent, and parasitical stage."[46]

That article of Anglican creed implied indigenous leadership. "It may well be thought that the indigenous episcopate is the most important plank of any Anglican missionary platform," reacted an observer to Lambeth 1958. That conference gathered more bishops than ever before who were natives of the land of their dioceses: After 1940, all bishops in Japan were Japanese; likewise in China since 1949--if only from geopolitical necessity; in Brazil, two of three were Brazilians. But Lambeth contained no Korean, no Egyptian; and as the

British-born Archbishop of Central Africa noted, "With things moving so fast it is positively dangerous for the Church to move slowly." Not only the pace of the transfer but the quality of personnel mattered too: The qualities needed in a bishop for India or a Pacific island was not necessarily what was most important on the English bench or the American House of Bishops.[47] A self-sufficient ministry, in short, needed the self-identity to define itself in ways which may well diverge from its missionary past.

Finally, the local church must be self-supporting, at a standard "determined for the local scene and by the local church," and broadly construed. It "encompasses the whole canvas of Christian stewardship--of time, talents, and treasures; of faith, order, and worship; of holy mysteries and redeeming truth."

Within that too lay complications. Ogilby observed the tension when the "foreign missionary arrives from one of the rich and powerful western nations."[48] Johnson perceived the dynamic in Ogilby's own territory, where the plethora of American typewriters in an upcountry Philippine mission school contrasted sharply with the absence of any machinery at all in a British-founded theological college in Lusaka.[49]

Yet as part of the IMC review early in the decade, someone asked,

> Can a church ever be really self-supporting? ...From the religious point of view, the church cannot be a church if it does not feel dependent on its Lord and on the fellowship of the children of God. A self-satisfied Church is anything but the Church of Christ.[50]

Lesslie Newbigin put the matter positively in a way that anticipated MRI. When a church perceives and exerts a missionary role, "there is a deep sense of mutual responsibility and brotherhood, of the obligation resting upon the Church in one place to bear the burdens of others, and of the need to proceed in brotherly concord on questions." Self-sufficiency does not imply isolation, not when the mission advances under the Spirit's guidance. Nor does it lead to conflict. "When division appears about the circumcision question," Newbigin

recalls from Acts, "the matter is settled by the coming together of 'the apostles and elders' at Jerusalem to learn together what the Holy Spirit would say." Therein is the model for the Church through the ages.[51]

He reiterated the centrality of the effort. "The Church is the mission, that it is essentially something dynamic and not static, that (as Emil Brunner has said) the Church exists by mission as fire exists by burning."[52]

2. The Purpose of Mission: "What"

If mission is so important, what does the mission say and do? Everyone agreed it was bound up with the proclamation of Christ; but that covers a multitude of messages. It was, as so often, so early and so succinctly, Max Warren who marked a shift in thought. To the 1952 Willingen IMC assembly he asserted,

> Our theology of missions has been much too much concerned with the rescue of souls and the floating of little arks of salvation, and all too little with the assertion of the Crown rights of the Redeemer in all parts of His dominion. We have taken too poor a view of grace and too limited a view of sin.

Works of mercy which were central to Jesus' ministry, he observe, provide "a point of meeting" for traditional missionary activities with "responsibility for our technological society": "Ignorance, ugliness or suffering" can become sources of evil; to work at transforming them takes on "the essential character of forgiveness," and that is a work of the Cross.[53]

Warren thereby opened a way of reconciling the proclamation of salvation with the equally proclamatory work of building new societies. Of course this had long been standard practice. The SPG listed its efforts: Pastoral, evangelistic, educational, medical, agricultural, literary; it also added a less familiar role, "Community development."[54] If missionaries set forth to "save souls," they found they had no option but to heal bodies and educate minds; and those who saw them off could imagine both Billy Graham and Albert Schweitzer. "Christian mission in Africa from the beginning included both ends of the spectrum, a deeply personal experience of the spirit and a commitment to transform the communities in which people live," concludes Elliot Kendall.

But how extensive was that "transformation," and how intensive should the Church's involvement be? "Mission had to be not simply growth and expansion, but liberation too," Kendall added from the perspective of the '70's.[55] "Liberation," as Latin Americans would use the term, was far from the mind of the American Bishop of Liberia who described the task to the 1954 Congress without mentioning political, social or economic involvement on any systemic level. The closest he came to deal with national issues was in urging help for underdeveloped nations to produce more to cure their lack of wealth.[56]

Still, Anglicans had long been at work in diverse fields of concern--even the political--as Howard Johnson realized in his journey's first days. Arriving in the Dominican Republic, he was settling into a rectory abandoned for twelve years.

> In bidding me good-night, the missionary assigned to look after me said, "The last priest to sleep here was murdered. Do you mind?" "Well, no," I said a little uncertainly, "but what were the circumstances?" The account I then heard of a brave man who alone had had the courage to withstand the Transcendental Benefactor when the latter had committed a particularly heinous crime involving the slaughter of several thousand innocent persons was not a bedtime story conducive to peaceful slumber![57]

South Africa too exemplified a Church which sought--and seeks--to save souls, heal limbs, teach brains, and if needed, confront authorities.[58]

Eventually the United States would face the same issue of social involvement when concerns for civil rights, urban crises and Vietnam preoccupied the nation, and when the World Council of Churches became more active in supporting "liberation" movements. But that followed MRI; if not everyone agreed on its necessity, much less its wisdom--as events would show--it was not as controversial an issue as it would become.

3. A Redefined Locus of Mission: "Where"

For years Anglicanism had drawn maps of mission fields to include those areas untouched, or only recently touched, by Western civilization. That comprised the American and Canadian West, the Australian Outback and portions

of New Zealand.[59] It meant primarily Asia, Africa, the West Indies, and the occasional Pacific isle. Although once the definition specified areas where the British Empire thrived, this had to be increasingly qualified by examples of work in the Philippines, Japan and China.[60]

In an early spirit of ecumenical cooperation and good stewardship, Anglicans had long agreed not to compete with other denominations. If Roman Catholics were dominant, then Anglicans went elsewhere. In the Philippines that meant leaving Manila to Rome and bringing Canterbury to the Igorot mountain people.[61] It meant avoiding South America altogether but for the occasional tribe of Chilean pagans or clique of Anglo-American businessmen.[62]

Through the 1950's this policy was increasingly scrutinized. "Charlie Chaplain is better known in South America than Jesus Christ," griped a bishop of Brazil to the 1955 General Convention. Though scolded for breaching ecumenical chivalry,[63] he heralded a chorus of concern. The 1958 Lambeth Conference branded Latin America "the neglected continent" and won the particular attention of the Bishop of Bradford, Donald Coggan.[64] If Rome was doing such a poor job, then Anglicans could step forward in good conscience. Johnson reckoned Anglicans could help Romans in fact do a better job--and vice-versa.[65] So the point of view evolved that though proselytising remained tabu, when people were searching, Anglicans had just as much right to help them out as anyone else, and indeed had some unique directions to suggest.

Besides, was "mission" to be confined to the third world alone? A bishop in Madagascar resurrected Warren's point to Archbishop Fisher. "I would at once put in a plea for the whole world being regarded as a missionary sphere." Few are the places which are entirely converted. Thus "England--and probably Europe in general--is a field for missionary endeavor." In areas such as his, mission meant "starting from scratch." England needed outright "reclaiming."[66] Johnson's travels reiterated a continuous need for work even in historic Anglican strongholds.

Gradually the needs for mission of the entire world became increasingly to light. No longer would mission be "out there," but as near as one's own town.

4. New Styles of Missionaries: "Who"

The post-war period saw a dramatic shift in the nature of the missionary. What he--or she--did, where he or she came from, under whom he or she functioned, whether or not he (and this time, not "she") were a priest, even the explicit reason for going might be very different in 1965 than 1945.

When the Conference of British Missionary Societies projected very different world in 1945, it put out a call for missionaries to pour forth from Britain. The call was traditional, for "many more men and women with the highest qualifications sent out by the missionary societies to serve the Church in Africa." But their task had a modern twist in light of the dynamic toward autonomy. "In so far as the missionaries serve Africa for the love of God and of mankind, and for the building up of the church of Christ, so far is the freedom of Africa assured, for surely many Africans will follow such leadership."[67] Yet striving for liberation had always been part of the missionary job, given the totality of their involvement. To be sure, they brought the evangelical message of the eighteenth-century revival in seeking to plant worshipping churches. To varying degrees, they also set up schools for primary education, trade and handicraft training. They sought to improve local agriculture. They brought medical services. In general they provided "a manifest championship of those who were exploited and oppressed,"[68] sometimes causing them to protest the harshness of systems their own governments imposed. The missions influenced local culture, structures, even attire. Though criticized as excessive, the Church demonstrated an influence far beyond the increasingly constricted roles it exerted in the countries whence the missionaries came.[69] As Elliot Kendall writes,

> In almost all areas of Africa there is a remarkable record of missionary work undertaken when the foundations of modern societies were being laid. ...From whatever tradition, men and women have contributed in depth to human relations and development. The nations and

> churches are what they are in Africa today because of that period of immense human effort. The much maligned missionary invasion, with all its compromises and limitations, managed to do some exceedingly useful work. In many instances it began when conquest and colonialism had destroyed traditional social systems, but it usually provided the positive and creative element in the new community.[70]

Yet missionaries had become controversial figures by 1963. So identified had they become with their homelands that Johnson fantasized himself an Anglican Pope who would replace the English in West Africa with Mexicans, Brazilians, Filipinos, Japanese, Melanesians, and Arabs "to show the Africans that Anglicanism is something more than, and something totally different from, the ecclesiastical arm of an imperial power." The English he would transfer to Mexico to discourage the equation of Episcopal with Yankee.[71]

Through the 1950's in India and into the 1960's in Africa, Christian leaders questioned the need or desirability of missionaries altogether. By 1961 an Indian consultation agreed on the need but clarified that "the role of the missionary is not a static one but evolves in relation to the changing historical situation." Even should the practical need be less, missionaries still would express "the universal and ecumenical character of the Church of God." As it was, their need remained to help the "enormous unfinished task" ahead of Indian Christians.[72a] In Africa, where independence lagged by a decade, so did the criticism; by 1963 it was very evident. The All Africa Council of Churches at its first assembly in April submitted

> that missionary activity on this continent has not followed the New Testament pattern where the Apostle, whose weakness in lack of support from some foreign conquering power was really his strength, planted the seed of the Evangel, trained a few indigenous leaders, and left the Church to develop according to local genius, initiative, and intuition. Ours has been a too-prolonged hot-house kind of atmosphere, and the good and well-planned organization for the Christian nurture of the African by the missionaries and their socieities far away, has perhaps been the greatest weakness of Christianity on this continent.[73]

Later that year, on a sweltering Canadian day before the Anglican Congress, the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, Michael Ramsey, dismissed with some irritation the word "missionary" as obsolete and nowhere appearing in the New

Testament. With trepidation masked by humor, Max Warren reminded the biblical theologian in the chair and the assembled ACMS ecclesiarchs who claimed descent from the Twelve that indeed such a word existed--the Greek term "Apostle."[74]

For all his defense of the term, Warren led in revising the concept. In 1952 he asked Willingen to consider a shift in attitude about the missionary and his task. The age of technology, to take one element, required "a new kind of ministering to the world: with an attitude of "great humility" on the part of missionary and Church alike who do not usually understand science and largely ignored development. He perceived an extension of the missionary concept to include those who can assist developing countries as "ordinary salaried officials" who bring expertise in science, technology or organization but whose Christian commitment is not marginal but deliberate. He envisaged a missionary brotherhood who would step forward into largely unexplored situations as a new sort of missionary pioneer. "Denominationalism is totally irrelevant," he asserted. "Distinctions of national culture and tradition are also irrelevant." Such a

> new step forward in the whole task of the Christian mission in our time" could...provide for the ecumenical movement a 'frontier' enterprise which would do for that movement what the missionary societies did for their separated churches in the last century."[75]

In a primitive way, Warren suggested what many would articulate. Missionaries had new roles to play. A speaker at the 1963 Congress suggested they should become involved with refugee and development programs; they might be seconded--as the "Anglican Pope" had in mind--from one Church to another; that they might work for the United Nations or other agencies.[76] They might well be from Churches other than traditionally "sending" countries: The Melanesian Brotherhood from the Solomon Islands provided an example of new countries energtically sharing the Gospel.[77]

Without doubt, the frequent role of the missionary as chaplain to an alien elite, devoid of significant connection with or responsibility to the local

church, had to end. An American priest serving a club of Yankees in Quito sorely limited expansion in Ecuador. Johnson stated an alternative. "A church can well have chaplains and missionaries, but they must be ministers sent out by the one Church in a particular land if that Church is to have any claim to the title of being the Church of that land."[78]

To disregard the local Church, then, was nothing less than scandalous. How the sensitive missionary related to a Church increasingly led by indigenous bishops could become more problematic, as Max Warren explained.

> Some years ago a European bishop in an African diocese died. He was succeeded by an African bishop. That European bishop had had one of our missionaries as his Chaplain. The African bishop...assumed that the CMS would never allow him, an African, to have a white man as his Chaplain. He was genuinely astonished as well as gratified when the first letter he received from me...contained both an enquiry as to whether he would wish to have a missionary as his Chaplain, and the assurance that if he did so wish we would be happy to provide him with the very best man we could find. The appointment proved, in the mercy of God, brilliantly successful. The Society saw this as indicating a new way in which we might be allowed to serve the Church in Africa.... There was never the slightest idea in any of our minds that these missionary chaplains would be anything but workers under their bishops' authority.
>
> Yet recently the student body of one African theological college presented a memorandum of grievances against the Society, one of which was that in their view the appointment of missionaries as chaplains to African bishops was clearly designed to enable the Society to control from below![79]

"There has been far too little recognition that the changes in the political shape and colour of the world have profoundly affected the position of missionaries," reflected Douglas Webster.

> Once the missionary was a key figure because he was foreign, often a member of the ruling European race; now he is a marked man because he belongs to the race that formerly ruled. Once the missionary was popular and highly respected because he brought with him western ways...; now he is often despised or suspect because what he represents has been largely rejected and his motives for being there at all are questioned.... Once the missionary was needed, wanted and welcomed; now in many places he is only needed. Once the missionary was invariably in the lead or in junior partnership to other missionaries who held final responsibility; now the missionary is seldom in the lead, often working under nationals of the country and church in which he serves, nationals who may have qualifications much lower than his own, very different ways of doing things and a different set of priorities."[80]

With such heightened sensitivities on the part of both missionary and host, a new attitude became essential if any kind of partnership was to evolve.

4. Confusion over Agencies—Society or Church?: "How"

As new Provinces developed, tensions heightened in how "sending" Churches did their work. Anglicanism had evolved two different formats, each with advantages but each with severe limitations which became increasingly apparent.

Britain conducted its entire missionary program through societies. From the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge in 1698, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in 1701 and the Church Missionary Society in 1799, the English founded one missionary society after another. Some were general in approach, some specific. Often they reflected territorial interests, as the South American Missionary Society or the Universities Mission to Central Africa embodied in their names. Often they were guided by a particular party within the wider Church: CMS was as ardently evangelical and "low" as SPG was Anglo-Catholic and "high." They shared two bonds: One, they all derived from the Church of England; and two, they had no incorporated connection with the Church structure. Bishops consecrated for overseas fell under the Archbishop's jurisdiction. But societies themselves were mutually independent, voluntary agencies which found their support from parishes and parishioners throughout England, but not from the funds of the Church itself. Similar societies grew in Scotland, Australia and New Zealand.[81]

American Episcopalians had their own society: "The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America." Titled like a British cousin, it had one major difference: By definition, all Episcopalians belonged to the Society. It was the official missionary arm of the Episcopal Church. Embodied in the Constitution(?), funded by the proportionate shares requested of the dioceses by the national organization, it was entirely incorporated by the Episcopal institution.[82]

In consequence, after the war a double tension had to be faced: First, in the nature of the serving agencies; second, in the resources they could offer.

The number and diversity of missionary societies provoked a certain amount of theological, liturgical, and organizational chaos. Though his cathedral in New York tended toward the "high" side of ritual, Canon Johnson yearned for a book of ceremonial explications to get him through a Maundy Thursday Zanzibari celebration which would have mystified the Orthodox of Istanbul. This was UMCA territory. By contrast, he found SAMS "valiant, well-intentioned, but slightly eccentric." He called them "'Anglo-Baptists', for they told me, without batting an eye, and as if no question of theology or ecclesiology were involved, that they had given up baptizing infants." Such extremes he found all too common.[83] However, meshing dioceses into new Provinces often meant creating a brotherhood of widely divergent heritages--much as Europeans had carved colonies--without regard to the history of who evangelized whom. Johnson credited East Africans for making a go at uniting CMS evangelicals with SPG Catholics. He considered it an example of Anglican unity within diversity and a lesson for ecumenism. But it instituted tension and required careful diplomacy from 1960 to this day.[84]

The plethora of societies made coordination a daunting endeavor. From the field, bishops hardly knew where to start; yet they could also send out as many appeals as it took to achieve what they wanted, for if one society turned them down another might oblige. Ecclesiastical panhandling, though, was a questionable, time-consuming and ultimately demeaning process.

Furthermore, resources diminished along with Britain's economy, at the same time that demands increased. Leonard Beecher of Mombasa shared with Fisher his dilemma over what to do about a 28-year-long ministry of the Bible Churchmen's Society to nomads in northern Kenya. Its staff withered and missionaries grew frustrated over how to evangelize the wandering tribes. Suddenly, the government decided to provide dams, bore-holes and controlled grazing, confronting

the bishop with needs for staff, housing and travel facilities costing £8,000. If the BCMS had not found support, Beecher would have had to ask it to leave an area imperfectly staffed by them, and at the same time to come up with an alternative organization which could move in--if he could find one. His proposal moved beyond the missionary societies themselves. "It would be of great benefit if the Anglican Church had at is disposal machinery for rapid task force action in face of sudden challenge to new evangelism."[85]

By contrast, the American Church held a more unitary principle. In theory it should have worked more efficiently. In practice, not necessarily. Funds remained limited. Much of the western United States was covered by missionary districts still needing assistance as they worked toward self-support.[86] Parishes and dioceses could provide funds in addition to--or in lieu of--New York, and because of a personal connection might prove to be more generous. To lessen the risks of ecclesiastical panhandling, and to bring some order, the national church evolved the "Companion Diocese" program which officially sanctioned links between an American diocese and one or more dioceses in different parts of the world.[86] Yet that program in itself recognized a point not lost on the British societies: That people will give, and give generously, if they know and commit to that to which they give. The societies had built up longstanding relationships with parishes and parishioners which, they feared, would otherwise be lost in some amorphous funds drive.[78]

Moreover, the dichotomy was confusing to those seeking help and to those seeking results. How to approach one of the large donor Churches depended on which one was being asked. What the Church expected, too, varied; Americans wanted quick results and tangible achievements; Europeans were more cautious in expectation and more gradual in style. These were profound differences.[78a]

So the debate recurred for years on various levels. Recalls a CMS leader,

> The place of voluntary societies of all kinds, which was a characteristic feature of church life in all the European countries, was challenged in favour of a unitary and centralised church

> organizations. Third World churches in newly independent nations called for a 'church-to-church' structure to replace the societal principle.

It was reflected in ecumenical circles in efforts from 1947 onward to unify the International Missionary Council with the World Council of Churches, finally implemented at third-world urging in 1961.[89] It was manifested at the 1958 Lambeth Conference which, while waffling on the IMC/WCC merger, both commended the societies' work and--at the admitted risk of meddling in a matter internal to the Church of England--reminded that

> 1. The mission of the Church is a mission of the whole Church to the whole world.
> 2. Missionary societies came into existence to recall the Church of England to a task which had been neglected: indeed, many Provinces of the Anglican Communion would not have come into being, had it not been for thir work. They have done and are doing a missionary task as handmaids of the church.
> 3. Any plan by which the societies would be drawn into even closer co-operation should be welcomed.[90]

The societies took the hint: They organized themselves into an Overseas Council to coordinate their efforts; the SPG and CMS began appealing jointly for funds in 1960; by 1963 the SPG and UMCA were planning to merge.[91]

The issue, though joined, had not been closed, for what counted was not just convenience but authority, and relationship. As Warren implied in his example of the white chaplain to the black bishop, who controls what was a sensitive matter. In the 1950's the CMS began ceding responsibility from London to the local Church, but retained on-the-scene secretaries. Missionaries were paid by the CMS representative, and the diocese received a block grant from the Society.[92] Later, as Warren's example indicates, even that became a sore subject, and made the societies (or national church) suspect.

At the same time, Warren underscored the need for personal relationships. Institutions notwithstanding, records his biographer, "of the continuing need for <u>personal</u> offers of assistance and cooperation he had no shadow of doubt." This extended "the <u>personal</u> reference and the <u>personal</u> relationship in every approach to God and in every stretching out to our contemporaries."[93] The

personal incarnated the abstract. "Burma becomes a Burmese with whom you had lunch. Hungary becomes a Hungarian to whom you listened. The Gold Coast becomes the sound of laughter from the mouth of a new-found friend."[94] So missionary support must include prayer which, like giving, is quickened when one knows for whom one prays.

Warren saved another word to those as Ramsey who questioned the expatriate missionary. He becomes a <u>personal</u> link between Christians in one land and those in another, thereby forging a link which is stronger than constitutional bonds, the episcopacy, Lambeth Conference or even the liturgy itself.[95]

So extending the personal while tackling a job, remaining cognizant of national sensitivities, became a key element in supporting growing churches.

Redefining the locus of mission at the same time as exploring the personnel of mission led to another recognition: That not all missionaries were those who were officially designated, nor even necessarily ordained. Howard Johnson accompanied a sanitary engineer in a clerical collar as he ventured among the junks of Hong Kong harbor to teach of hygeine and Jesus. In a city with 500,000 squatters and another 75,000 dwelling on tenement rooftops, the diocese had but 30 priests who fit in pastoral work around labors as principals of schools. To augment them, the Bishop sought out laymen of good character who are sound in their faith and showed ability in a secular calling. After a short night-course in theology, they were ordained to serve after hours and weekends without remuneration while continuing as lawyers, schoolteachers, accountants, shipping magnates or sanitary engineers. Because of their secular knowledge they command a respectful hearing on one subject and therefore another.[96] The presuppositions about ordination are broadened.

So is the concept of ministry in order to include the vast majority of the Church--the laity. An Indian writer urged

> de-professionalizing the ordained ministry by disentangling the threefold functions of prophet, priest, and pastor, that these functions will not necessarily be bound up together in one person, but

> will be seen as the functions of the Church which the Church fulfils through different persons and in several ways.[97]

Kathleen Bliss noted the talk of lay roles in Church life; now, she claimed, is time to apply it as "the Church in the world. At last the fact that the layman spends the main part of his time in industry or commerce or television is being treated as something more than incidental."[98] At the Anglican Congress, a layman refashioned the theme address on the Church's mission to the "cultural frontier" into an exhortation to laity to fulfill an obligation to permeate, address, and minister both in and to an increasingly secularist society, in partnership with all Christians regardless of denomination, vocation, gender--or order.[99]

Who "does" mission, where and how, all received scrutiny; but in the process, the need for a new level of partnership was increasingly understood as essential to working out the tensions and to freeing both missionaries and Churches to function effectively together.

E. Supporting the Mission: "How"

Circling the Anglican world, Howard Johnson reeled off one imperative after another, physical needs that would further the Church's mission or, lacking them, would hamstring it.

To function on the "neglected continent," Anglicans who depend upon prayer books necessitated materials in Spanish, both translations but also materials tailored to the Latin American culture. No one published them, until 1961 El Centro de Publicaciones Espanolas opened through a grant from the United Thank Offering of U.S. Episcopal Churchwomen. The need for comparable centers was universal in developing lands, and urgent.[100]

When the warden of the Seminary of St. John the Baptist in Lusaka, Nyasaland [now Zambia], arrived in 1952, twelve books comprised its library. In 1960 it lacked a typewriter. Students left wives and families for the years of their training, so that deepening their Christian nurture could also create

a "culture gap" which divided the family because the wife did not share in it. In Nigeria Johnson saw one result of poor training. "The local clergy have hearts of gold, but all too seldom are they the intellectual equals of the best-trained men and women in their congregations. If they cannot command the intellectual respect of their people, how are they going to be able to attract the more gifted young men to the Ministry?"--and how can they effectively minister? He feared--and says he expressed the anxieties of local clergy themselves--an ever-descending spiral into mediocrity. Max Warren listed the training, maintenance and pastoral care for the clergy as of first priority, when outlining missionary needs to the executives' conference at Huron just prior to the Toronto Congress.[101]

In Kenya Johnson awarded gave "honourable mention" to St. Julian's Centre. Housed in a lovely mansion overlooking splendid African vistas, endowed with a fine library, conducive to good conversation and reflective thought, more than rest or retreat it provided a place for renewal. Johnson asked: "Why are there so few such places? Why is the idea so slow in catching on? Is this not a form of missionary activity par excellence for our century?" Max Warren wondered the same thing. This too was a major priority in his list at Huron.[102]

Bishop Chandu Ray of Pakistan drove Johnson to Korangi, a large-scale development for refugees being built by the government. The state had begged the Church to open twenty schools, and, though officially Muslim, even offered all the assistance it could. But the Bishop could find neither the funds nor the manpower adequate to accept the offer. Already, building seven new schools forced cancelling other diocesan priorities. "Anglicans are rarely able to strike when the iron is hot, because we never have funds in reserve." Warren pleaded for a means to fund exactly this opportune "spiritual initiative."[103]

So often the question was one of funds, but the funds were always for something else. Money, though, was an issue.

One element was how the funds were raised. A million pounds left England each year for overseas work; but it supported its own clergy through endowments built up over centuries. When English visitors arrived in Minneapolis for the 1954 Congress, they became "guests of a prosperous and generous church, one which would be ashamed to be shabby; they returned to look ruefully at parochial buildings and to wonder whether English congregations might be led to grasp the implications of stewardship." Suddenly Americans and Canadians provided the model for the Mother Church.[104]

North America was not the only source for ideas of stewardship. If self-support was one of the three goals for new churches, they had to contemplate how to pay their own way. In 1932, V. S. Azariah, the first native Indian bishop, published a book Christian Giving, first in Tamil, then in 32 other languages. It "caused congregations all over the world to study afresh--if not for the first time, the Scriptural reasons for giving.[105] The Chinese refused all aid. South Africans received, but also gave.[106]

But as Warren foresaw, the American Church attracted eager international interest. An Australian bishop records an attitude: "England gave us the faith, but America gave us the works." One noticed at the 1958 Lambeth Conference how "missionary dioceses of English descent and leadership were facing innumerable problems which had their root in penury, whilst those of American and sometimes Colonial descent were developing and rejoicing in increased self-support."[107]

This had deeper ramifications. Warren detected a loss of confidence in the West when dependent churches found the post-war supply of dollars (or, even more, pounds sterling) diminishing.[108] Johnson found the opposite problem. Of Brazil he exclaimed, "PECUSA has dollared the place almost to death. I mean, the American Church has habituated the Brazilians to an attitude of perpetual dependence." But there was another angle. "Our intentions were always the best, but there was an unconscious arrogance in them. The early

missionaries were all on the giving side. It did not occur to them that the Brazilians had any other role than that of receiving."[109] Not only did that discourage stewardship, it discouraged any sense of mutuality. Those who always gave after awhile would believe they have nothing to receive, and those who consistently receive cannot perceive what they can give.

Furthermore, money caused divisiveness. The flow of dollars to an American-associated region like Liberia next to a British-connected area such as West Africa which had to content itself with plainer living, did not enhance the "finer virtues." So, too, an economic dependence perpetuated denominationalism whether the local Church wanted to or not. A Pakistani complained, "We dare not lose the support of the divided churches of the West."[110]

It was becoming a chronic problem, a cycle which only a dramatic shift in attitude could break.

6. The Urgency for Cooperation

Addressing so many of the problems demanded a level of cooperation on every level that was increasingly perceived as utterly inadequate.

One level was ecumenical. Chandu Ray of Pakistan recalled a story of Bishop Azariah visiting an Indian leader. "Who has done more for the depressed classes than Christians?" asked the Bishop. The leader agreed. "Yes, everyone else treated them as mud, Christians treated them as human beings. But if I advise them to become Christians, they will be divided; now they are at least a unified group."[111] Developing nations could scarcely avoid divisiveness.

Nor could the Church's mission. Beyond duplications of effort and denominational tensions, it could bring shame. Canon Johnson was appalled by the story of two Indian brothers he met.

> Early in life they were separated, though always maintaining close contact by mail. One of the brothers, after a long, agonizing intellectual struggle, fought his way thorugh to faith in Christ. This happened to him in a section of India which, because of the comity of missions, had been assigned to the Methodists. He was radiant in his new faith. Meanwhile, his brother, who had gone to seek his fortune in that portion of the land which had been assigned to Anglicans, had also fought "the long dialectical wars of faith" and had finally found

> victory and liberation when his mind was taken captive by Christ. After many years of separation, there was to be a family reunion. The brothers, transformed in character and transported by joy, met. The date was 24th December. They saluted each other with an holy kiss. Brothers they now were not only after the flesh, but also after the Spirit. But they were informed by the local Anglican priest that they could not communicate together at the same altar on the eve of that wondrous night on which the Saviour was born. One was a Methodist. One was an Anglican. Supposedly, this was sufficient ground for dividing them.[112]

"If there is one thing which the history of the modern missionary movement has taught us, it is that you cannot engage in world mission without being compelled to face questions of unity." Leslie Newbigin's point was constantly iterated by reports and speakers. Newbigin could reverse the point too. "A movement which is not missionary has no right to use the word "ecumenical."[113] He found increasingly full agreement.

Yet within its own Communion, much less with others, cooperation among Anglicans was far from the ideal "of a family of Churches all with equal status, tied in with, but not tied down to, the see of Canterbury. These Churches are in voluntary association, and they are united in the doctrine, faith and practice contained in the Book of Common Prayer."[114]

First of all, the family did not know one another very well. African bishops met as a group for the first time at the 1958 Lambeth Conference--in London. West Africans had no idea that their South African brethren so adamantly opposed apartheid. English-oriented Uraguyans could not figure out why Johnson would visit Brazil, where efforts were sponsored by Americans. Jamaican Anglicans had no knowledge of work in Cuba, which happened to be in Spanish, nor did they know of missions of a French or Creole voice. He concluded, "We are still strangers to each other."[115]

Geography and money made for quirks in organizing. At least through 1958, the Provincial Synod of the West Indies was limited to bishops because they could meet more easily and cheaply on their own--in London or New York.[116] But complexities and distinctions within regions created problems as well.

Often a province would merge divergent theological or national heritages, such as in East Africa. In their liturgies, canons and practices, vastly differing points of view would show through, making life confusing if not difficult for those who were already in the Church, not to mention those who considered it.

> A man who resides on one of the Virgin Islands, which happens to belong to Great Britain and is part of the Diocese of Antigua, rises from his bed on a bright Caribbean morning and finds that by the canon law respecting marriage and divorce in the Church of the Province of the West Indies he is not permitted to make his Communion. He steps into a motor launch, as he does every working day of his life, and crosses a short stretch of water to another of the Virgin Islands, where he has his place of business. Thois island belongs to the United States and is under the canon law of the American Episcopal Church. Here he can make his Communion, for the canon law is different. But this is chaos![117]

Yet it underscored the need for regional councils and provincial cooperation.

For the most part, Anglican strategy had aimed at spinning off independent provinces as quickly as possible. Even here was division, for the first autonomous Church, the United States, adopted the policy of retaining dioceses, even on other continents, as full members of PECUSA,[118] regardless of anomalies such as Liberia belonging to an American province though encircled by the Province of West Africa. That in itself was controversial.[119]

The Provincial structure at least had the hope of promoting the "three self-" objectives. An Indian pointed out as well that by joining dioceses together in often international provinces (as in CIPBC), one can recognize the breadth of the Kingdom of God. At the same time, the weakness lay in how easily a national church can affiliate and "bless" a nation at war,[120] though at least the Church could avoid the fate of Egyptian Anglicans being tainted during the Suez crisis as English puppets despite fully supporting Egypt.[121]

In 1948 or even 1954, it had been possible to speak blithely of "Christendom."[122] No longer. Once, Anglicans comprised an ethnic club of British stock. Not necessarily any more. The composition and ministry of the Communion had changed as drastically as the world in which it ministered.

With all of these realities to face, Anglican leaders had much to address. How could a national Church be truly independent when its dependence on dollars or pounds posed an outright contradiction?

How can mutual decisions on resources be made?

Who can speak for the Anglican Communion on issues ranging from ecumenical conversations to crises such as South African apartheid?

How can the Communion's constituent parts cooperate with each other, maintaining independence on the one hand but collegial unity on the other?

By 1963, those in the center of missionary life realized that, in the face of a truly modern age, something was missing. More than just resources or even necessarily commitment--though neither is ever in adequate supply--Anglicanism lacked vision. It had its ideals; it long ago established its objectives, but despite fifteen years of conferences, congresses and efforts, the lack remained. What was needed was a vision which could give coherence to policy, inspiration to commitment, dynamism to relationships.

NOTES

1. Quoted in Elliot Kendall, End of an Era, 74f.

2. Quoted in F. W. Dillistone, Into All the World: A Biography of Max Warren (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1980), 85-87.

3. Quoted in Dillistone, 188f.

4. Warren, Missionary Commitments, p. 4f.

5. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 6.

6. Edmund R. Morgan, "The Church in Secular Society," in Edmund R. Morgan & Roger Lloyd, eds., The Mission of the Anglican Communion (London: SPCK & SPG, 1948), 31; cf. Dewi Morgan, Lambeth Speaks, 22f.

7. JMC Wand, The Anglican Communion: A Survey (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), 327-329.

8. Nelson M. Burroughs, interview with the author, Cambridge, Massachusetts, July 21, 1986.

9. Kathleen Bliss, "The Church and the Citizen," in Powel Mills Dawley, ed., Report of the Anglican Congress, 1954 (Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury Press, 1954) [afterwards AC'54], 132.

10. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 5.

11. Stephen Neill, quoted in Morgan, Lambeth Speaks, 32f.

12. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 5.

13. John G. Rowe, "Accepting the Political Challenges," Chapter 5 in P. C. Jefferson, ed., The Church in the 60's (N.p.: The Anglican Congress, [1962]), 76.

14. Kenneth Anand in E. R. Fairweather, ed., Anglican Congress 1963: Report of Proceedings (N.p.: Editorial Committee, Anglican Congress, 1963) [afterwards AC'63], 140.

15. Howard Johnson, Global Odyssey (New York & Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963), 56.

16. Memorandum from the Secretary and Staff of the SPG to Committee III of the Lambeth Conference of 1958, January 31, 1958, in WMC MSS, p. 1.

17. Johnson, 298.

18. Ibid., 58.

19. Hendrik Kraemer, quoted in Dillistone, 196.

20. R.H.L. Slater, "Reaching the Non-Christian Faiths," chapter 3 in Jefferson, ed., Church in the 60's, p. 51. Emphasis in original.

21. Johnson, 126.

22. Ibid., 55.

23. Warren, "A Paper Read to the Conference of Missionary Executives of the Anglican Communion at Huron College, Ontario, on Monday, July 29, 1963," mimeo in ACC Archives, London, p. 3.

24. W. R. Coleman, "Confronting the Cultural Challenges," in Jefferson, Church in the 60's, 84.

25. Bayne, in AC'63, 188.

26. H. M. Waddams, in AC'63, 240f.

27. Johnson, 55.

28. Ibid., 128.

29. Johnson, 60-62; cf. The Lambeth Conference 1958 (N.p.: SPCK & Seabury Press, 1958) [afterwards Lambeth 1958], res. 120, p. 1.58 & pp. 2.154f; cf. AC'63, 251. This issue may well be on the agenda for Lambeth 1968.

30. Letter of Leonard Beecher to Fisher, October 18, 1957, WMC MSS, p. 2.

31. Johnson, 115.

32. Ibid., 315.

33. E. J. Bingle, "The World Mission of the Church: A Survey" in Missions Under the Cross, p. 145; John Mackay, "The Great Commission and the Church Today," in ibid., p. 139.

34. Johnson, 305f.

35. Warren, AC'63, 21; quote on p. 225.

36. Peter Whiteley, Frontier Mission: An Account of the Toronto Congress, 1963 (London, Toronto, New York: SPCK, Anglican Book Centre & Seabury Press, 1963), 19.

37. Quoted from The Ghana Assembly of the IMC (1958), 138, in Douglas Webster, Yes to Mission (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1966), 10.

38. Gerald Bloomfield, "Commerce or Christianity OR Back to Livingstone," in Morgan & Lloyd, 66, 73.

39. Walter Freytag, "The Meaning and Purpose of the Christian Mission," IRM, XXXIX (1950), 153.

40. Quoted in Webster, Yes to Mission, 9.

41. Ibid., 10.

42. Warren, in AC'63, 21.

43. Quoted from a Modern Church article as a rejoinder to John Hick, in Dillistone, 203.

44. Johnson, Plate 28.

45. Lyman C. Ogilby, "The Church's Mission II," in John B. Coburn & W. Norman Pittenger, eds., Viewpoints: Some Aspects of Anglican Thinking (Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury Press, 1959), 251f.

46. Ibid., 250f.

47. J. G. H. Baker, "The Anglican Communion and its Missionary Task: Lambeth 1958," IRM, XLVII, 4 (1958), 450f.

48. Ogilby, 251f.

49. Johnson, 317, 102.

50. Alex. L. Berthoud, "Church and Mission," IRM, XXXIX (1950), 268.

51. Lesslie Newbigin, One Body, One Gospel, One World: The Christian Mission Today (London: 1958), 19.

52. Ibid., 42.

53. Warren, in MMC, 36ff. His argument relies on passages from Leonard Hodgson, The Doctrine of the Atonement (1951), which he quotes.

54. SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958, 5.

55. Kendall, Era, 60.

56. Bravid W. Harris, "The Missionary Task," AC'54, 151.

57. Johnson, 18.

58. E.g. cf. Johnson, 70-77.

59. cf. Max Warren, Missionary Commitments, 13-18; cf. also Higgins, One Faith and Fellowship, passim.

60. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 13-20.

61. Johnson, 315

62. Cf. Adrian Cacarce, "Anglican Communion in Latin America," in Philip Turner & Frank Sugeno, eds., Crossroads Are for Meeting (Sewanee, Tenn.: SPCK/USA, 1986), 279ff; David Pytches, "Anglicanism in Chile Today," The Churchman, LXXII, No. 2 (Summer, 1967), 115; Bayne, ATP, 260; Neill, History of Christian Missions, 391.

63. Bishop Louis C. Melcher, quoted in William A. Clebsch, "Episcopalians in Latin America," CHR, I, no. 2 (Epiphany 1956), 6.

64. Lambeth 1958, p. 2.71.

65. Johnson, 34, 49f; cf. Higgins, One Faith, 91.

66. [T.R. Parfitt,] Bishop in Madagascar, "Memorandum on Missionary Strategy, n.d. [1957 or 1958], WMC papers, 1.

67. Quoted in Kendall, Era, 75.

68. Ibid., 75ff.

69. The Archbishop of Kampala, Uganda, Silvanus Wani, told a group of which I was a part in 1981 that he and some colleagues visited President Obote to complain about the treatment by soldiers of civilians. After a face-saving delay, said the Archbishop, matters improved. Bishop Arthur Walmsley reports that Latin American bishops do not comprehend how little influence the Episcopal Church has over Washington.

70. Kendall, Era, 69.

71. Johnson, Global Odyssey, 63.

72. Webster, Yes to Mission, 28; cf. AC'63, 141.

73. Quoted from "Drumbeats from Kampala" in Kendall, Era, 8f. The sting of the comment might be modified by the fact that a Briton known for his service in India made a comparable comment, based on Roland Allen's observations years before: "The modern missionary movement has not been successful in following the example of St. Paul who could leave behind a living church at the end of a few months or years of work, and move on to new

regions. The profound theological reasons for this failure have been brilliantly analysed by Roland Allen in his well-known books. Those have been much studied in recent years; but we have been slow to learn their lessons." Newbigin, One Body, 45.

74. Letter of John V. Taylor to the author, 2 July 1986; Warren, Crowded Canvas, 132; cf. Warren's Journal quoted in Dillistone, 123-5.

75. Warren, in MMC, 31f.

76. Janet Lacey, AC'63, 78.

77. Johnson, 308f.

78. Ibid., 70.

79. Warren, Missionary Executives paper, 4f.

80. Webster, Yes to Mission, 25.

81. Cf. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 7-17.

82. The 1832 General Convention extended "The Domestic & Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" from including bishops, convention deputies and dues-paying members to comprehend "all persons who are members of this Church." James Thayer Addison, The Episcopal Church in the United States 1789-1931 (N.p.: Archon Books, 1969), 132.

83. Johnson, 107, 37.

84. Ibid., 106-108. As late as 1981, when I visited Tanzania, by then a separate Province, the "high church" dioceses along the coast and "low church" dioceses in the interior maintained a delicate balance. Each had its own seminary, both struggling; the two rotated the Archbishopric. I am told that in 1986 the Province assumed oversight of both seminaries with joint curriculum and a mixture of students, and is preparing a single Book of Common Prayer. For a recent report on progress, cf. [Martin Mbwana, ed.,] "An Account of the Partners In Mission Consultation, 20-22 August 1986, Dodoma, Tanzania."

85. Beecher to Fisher, 18 October 1957, WMC papers, p. 2.

86. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 13f.

87. David Reed, interview with the author, Washington, D. C., February 8, 1986.

88. WMC to K. C. H. Warner, February 27, 1958, WMC MSS

89. Letter of John V. Taylor to the author, 2 July 1986. Stephen Neill seems to commend the decision; cf. History of Missions, 554-558. Max Warren spoke for those in Europe "with considerable misgivings" at the Ghana IMC assembly and did so "with passionate conviction, while recognising that it had now become a minority opinion" (Taylor).

90. Lambeth 1958, p. 2.68.

91. Johnson, 136.

92. R. W. Stopford, "Tropical Africa," in Wand, Anglican Communion, 226.

93. Dillistone, 87, 95.

94. Warren, Partnership: The Study of an Idea (London: SCM Press, [1955]), 60.

95. Dillistone, 123.

96. Johnson, 327f.

97. D. T. Niles, Upon the Earth (1962), 174, quoted in Douglas, Yes, 60.

98. We the People (1963), 21, quoted in Douglas, Yes, 60.

99. John Lawrence, Theme Address on "The Church's Mission to the World: On the Cultural Frontier," AC'63, 87-94.

100. Johnson, 29; cf. SPG memorandum, January 31, 1958.

101. Johnson, 101f, 54; Warren, Missionary Executives paper, 10.

102. Johnson, 117f; Warren, Missionary Executives paper, 11.

103. Johnson, 206; Warren, Missionary Executives Paper, 11.

104. H. G. G. Herklots, Frontiers of the Church: The Making of the Anglican Communion (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1961), 138.

105. Ibid., 137.

106. Baker, "Lambeth 1958," 451.

107. Ian Shevill, quoted in Herklots, 138.

108. Warren, Missionary Executives paper, 7.

109. Johnson, 44.

110. Warren, Partnership, 91f.

111. "The Image of Christianity in the Modern East," AC'63, 99.

112. Johnson, 205.

113. Newbigin, One Body, 53f.

114. John S. Higgins, The Anglican Communion Today (Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1949[?]), 4.

115. Johnson, 64, 40, 21f.

116. Higgins, One Faith, 79

117. Johnson, 24, 26.

118. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 13ff.

119. Cf. PBCUSA, Journal of General Convention 1961 (n.p.), 776.

120. John Sadiq, in AC'63, 57.

121. Johnson, 193

122. Cf. J. P. Higginbotham address, AC'54, 52ff.

III: Getting Organized

A series of international meetings gave substance to the intellectual synthesis that was developing at the same time. From the Lambeth Conference of 1948 to the Anglican Congress of 1963, the Communion's leaders could articulate and promulgate an energetic idealism. Meanwhile, though, they had to confront the problems which the world presented them on the missionary platter, a chore which proved to be more difficult than crowing over Anglicanism's glories. But they could, and did, try to bring their ideals to bear on the situation at hand. While little might have officially changed, what did emerge was a structure which could lead to greater cooperation--and deeper change. It opened the way for the more radical proposition of MRI.

A. Lambeth Conference 1948

Lambeth, 1948 made for a veritable homecoming for 326 prelates who "were strangers to each other." War had interrupted the decennial sequence. For eighteen years the bishops had not gathered. Few were even consecrated before 1930; neither Archbishop Fisher nor Presiding Bishop Sherrill had attended a Lambeth Conference.[1] At last, the separation had ended, and the episcopal family discovered each other. Strong friendships began (not least of which was between Fisher and Sherrill) and bishops were in a mood to celebrate. Despite ration-books and mediocre food, they were thankful. Although they worshipped at St. Paul's Cathedral around an altar bearing the scars of war, Wren's dome still soared above them, miraculously spared from the Blitz to be a continuous symbol of Christian as well as British survival. Lambeth Palace Chapel fared worse; but so expert was the craftsmanship that Geoffrey Fisher had to point out the restorations.[2]

In their encyclical, they greeted the 40 million Anglicans with "thankfulness to Almighty God for the profound and joyful experience, in this

meeting, of our unity in the faith of Christ and in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit." Because "God has knit us together in heart and mind," they asked their people "to expect that, by our interchange of friendship and counsel, all the Churches and congregations, which we represent, will receive strength and encouragement."[3]

They voiced the confidence of victory, and the hope of renewal. "Whatever man may do, God is undefeated. God reigns. ...His is the cause that has life and hope in it."[4] Furthermore, "the tide of faith is beginning to come in,"[5] which the Church must foster for the sake of a world which nearly destroyed itself because "it has forsaken or never known the true God and is defying His moral law." Therefore, "the supreme task of the Church to-day is to win the nations of Christendom back to the knowledge of God revealed in Jesus Christ as Judge and Saviour, and to take the good news to those who have not yet heard it."[6]

Yet such a goal harkened back to earlier eras, as if hierarchical craftsmanship could restore the world as effectively as woodworkers refitted Lambeth Chapel. The bishops decried Communism, lauded peace, pledged support of the newly-emerging United Nations and called upon states to uphold it "even at the price of their own sovereignty," which they mistrusted anyway.[7] Some said they knew a different world swirled about the Palace gates; but in references to a "Christendom" which even if it still existed was rapidly disintegrating, and in prescribing remedies inherited from yesteryear, the bishops operated with an understanding which was at best pre-war, if not nineteenth-century.

When it came to the Church, Lambeth turned more progressive. The Communion had grown more international and, still more surprisingly, interracial than many expected. Perhaps that assured a broader point of view.[8] Amidst a more

distinctive group, and after so long a separation, unity was the theme: Unity of Anglicanism, and unity of Anglicans with others. Bishops were cautious in dealing with ecumenically-consecrated Church of South India prelates, or the Japanese who consented to a government-enforced wartime amalgamation of denominations. They were more positive about bishops of other communions, the "Wider Episcopal Fellowship." With the World Council of Churches about to hold its first Assembly in Amsterdam as the Lambeth Conference finished, the Ecumenical Movement generally received much attention.[9]

Discussing other ecclesiastical houses meant Anglicans had to insure their own was in order. "It is our duty to make the life and witness of our own Communion strong and effective for its own work." That demanded exploring the tension between diversity and unity: the freedom and the limits of national expression, for one, and the authority and structure of common elements of Prayer Book, consultation, and strategy. The forthcoming 400th anniversary of the Book of Common Prayer gave one focus for unity; they authorized a central college in Canterbury, a mission strategy group to meet between Lambeth Conferences--the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy (ACMS)--and a Congress in 1953 to include "representative leaders, clerical and lay"--and not just bishops--"from all parts of the Anglican Communion."[10]

Lambeth 1948 announced themes which subsequent meetings would develop. If it had the feel of a homecoming for the college of bishops hearkening back to good old days for inspiration, at least it scanned the present convinced that Christianity--and Anglicanism in particular--had something vital to offer; and that to do so Anglicans must clarify convictions and solidify relationships. Then, but only then, they could address its world and its sister denominations toward attaining hopes for a new world order and a unified Christian Church.

B. Anglican Congress 1954

To Minneapolis in August of 1954 came "a happy gathering of friends who had first met at Lambeth"[11] six years before. This time, priests, laymen, even laywomen came too. Together they explored the Anglican tradition in the twentieth century, clarifying the distinctiveness and importance of what they had to offer. The first congress since 1908, and the first substantial Anglican meeting outside Britain, it was a testimony to the rising Anglican spirit of the time.[12]

A key figure was Walter Henry Gray, Bishop of Connecticut and chairman of the organizing committee. He had long argued, cajoled, and labored for the Congress out of a wider vision for the Anglican Communion which he articulated as editor of the Pan-Anglican. In 1946, he had proposed reviving the Pan-Anglican Congress, which had met only in 1908 but advised meeting at ten-year intervals. Urgent needs posed by ecumenism and the "vast alterations in missionary frontiers" demanded a much higher degree of united action, which in turn warranted new channels for Anglican relationships. Lambeth posted a "bishops only" sign. Another Congress would gather bishops, a priest and a layperson from each diocese; if 7,000 could meet in 1908, 650 would not be unwieldy. Such a Congress, meeting decennially, could lead to further means of promoting unity: A permanent consultative body--in addition to Lambeth's; a permanent secretariat; a staff college. In time, every one of his suggestions would find some form of substance.[13]

Organizers were stunned by the tremendous response. Gray had predicted 650 in 1946; the committee foresaw about three hundred, but registrants numbered 457 delegates. Ten thousand people jammed the Minneapolis Auditorium on August 4 to hear the Presiding Bishop and Archbishop of Canterbury extoll the virtues of ecumenism and Anglicanism's role within it.

Indeed, that set the major theme. Over ten days, delegates contemplated four topics: Our Vocation, Our Worship, Our Message, Our Work. In keynote

addresses and in small discussion groups, they recalled the Anglican heritage while tackling new ideas and wrestling with practical problems, from the pieties of Anglican identity to the difficulties of centralizing authority. Though disagreements inevitably sparked controversy, quarrels were kept within the confines of a family reunion.[14]

For that was what it was, like Lambeth but on a larger scale. Friendships forged among bishops in 1948 found countless parallels among priests and laity in 1954. The racial and cultural diversity which bishops had seen became even more apparent when laity appeared in flowing African robes or elegant Japanese kimonos, demolishing stereotypes of Anglicanism as an English ethnic club.[15] As the Communion's scope became evident in hallways and massed gatherings, an ethos of pride and potential developed. From the opening service on,

> the sense of the vastness of the Anglican Communion began that night to awaken, and day by day to grow and deepen in the minds of the delegates. A sense of dignity, of thankful pride, of responsibility came to us. 'To be an Anglican is to be something.'[16]

Planners had projected four main goals. They wanted to give wider circulation to the ideas, plans and methods then making the rounds--broadening the effect of the still-emerging synthesis. They hoped for international friendships to grow. These factors, they hoped, would promote closer collaboration especially regarding missionary areas in "a more statesmanlike missionary policy for the entire Anglican Communion." Finally, they expected the Congress to help leaders and members of the Communion to understand its mission.[17]

They largely succeeded, and discovered some unanticipated benefits too. Though little from the podium was new or revolutionary, the Congress provided a forum to air the ideas being propounded; Massey Shepherd, for example, conveyed some of the liturgical discoveries of the previous decade. The vast and diverse extent of the Communion became evident to delegates in their myriad encounters and to a wider public--mostly Americans, of course--in the large

services. The Congress pointed out, even more clearly than Lambeth could, that Anglicanism had become international, interracial, but still a family. Women were in unaccustomed evidence. The Congress demonstrated, too, that leadership was shifting: Not only the wealth but the generosity and dynamic vision of the American church made a profound impression on many a delegate from abroad. The quality of Church facilities and the level of lay giving were strongly noted.[18] What once was a daughter church was now outshining its mother.

The Congress, then, gathered a family to reaffirm and celebrate its relationship. It found itself far more diverse than any realized, forcing Anglicans to revise their preconceptions about their nature and their roles. It continued a process of redefinition and reorientation which would culminate in the next Congress, nine years later.

C. Preparing for Lambeth 1958

If the 1948 Lambeth Conference provided an ecclesiastical homecoming for the college of bishops to forge personal ties within the hierarchy, then the 1954 Anglican Congress became a family reunion which celebrated and strengthened the bonds of kinship. By contrast, Lambeth 1958 rolled up its bishops' sleeves to tackle more directly the questions of the post-war era. It tried to apply the intellectual synthesis to Anglican life in an effort to bring the Communion into the fulness of the postwar world--and receive the influences of the world into the Communion.

Four years' time brought a different era. Crises in Hungary and the Suez, and the Soviet launching of Sputnik, cast shadows over the rosy glow of four years earlier. What the Communion's leadership read in the newspapers and heard from their own provinces sobered them on the world. Though the Congress had bolstered their confidence in what Anglicanism could offer, they knew they had to look outward to grow, even to survive. And they had to act.

Max Warren underscored the point. In 1956, the Primates and Metropolitans on the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy met. They found Canon Warren's long memorandum exploring the threefold developments of a changing role of Britain, new position of the U.S., and the revolt against the West. So compelling did Archbishop Fisher find his observations, and the implications he drew from them, that he had S.P.C.K. print it up for all the bishops and a host of others too.[19] Fisher wanted to get the word out that the world was changing.

Fisher decided too that "Progress in the Anglican Communion" would comprise a major component of the 1958 Conference. One committee would review the Prayer Book, Ministries and Manpower, and "Missionary Appeal and Strategy." He first asked Bishop K. C. M. Warner of Edinburgh to oversee this vast area but, when Warner took ill, he turned to Gray of Connecticut. Gray would specifically chair Committee 3A, on Missionary Strategy--"a topic which can take up almost anything or everything touching the Anglican Communion."[20]

Warren's words, Fisher's concerns, and more general hopes for the Conference elicited a deluge of thoughts, suggestions, comments and dreams from books, letters, pamphlets and memoranda from bishops, missionaries, missionary societies, even provinces. They raised a host of questions about the nature and purpose of Anglican mission in an era of change which was catching up with the Communion. They were remarkably consistent with Warren's analysis.

This outpouring forced the bishops to contemplate the ramifications of worldwide change. Nationalism's influence might be perceived as a "great hindrance" to a bishop in Madagascar, but to a missionary in Uganda it forced a distinction between the faith and western culture.[21] This, together with ecumenical developments and the shift in power, made problems in missions all too evident. The task, strategy, personnel, resources and their coordination demanded rethinking.

What was the missionary task to be? Some shoved it aside as an obsolete vestige of colonial imperialism.[22] Others felt a call to a Gospel

imperative, but perceived that proclaiming the faith in the present day might well require revising long-practiced activities in light of new realities. Evangelistic work, for instance, was "difficult to maintain...and to extend" because of decreased support from Britain, reported the SPG. Medical efforts not only suffered from inadequate staffing but also from local nationalistic sentiment which, combined with the development of the welfare state may, "in countries such as India, lead to the exclusion of medical missions based on the United Kingdom." South Africa had already nationalized educational work; hospitals might be next. How important, it asked, were medical, agricultural, literary, and community development aspects of the missionary task?[23]

While the variety of roles might be questioned in "sending" countries, claims on resources poured in from the "receivers." As the Bishop of Mombasa watched a petroleum refinery arise across from his island, he knew it posed economic and social ramifications for his people.[24] The CIPSC appealed for help in reaching students and a reading public with hostelries, Christian literature, and scriptures.[25] The SPG might ask theoretical questions from London, but the Provinces' questions were pragmatic.

What was the locus, the <u>place</u> of mission? Donald Coggan keenly urged more aggressive work in "neglected" Latin America; so did some Americans.[26] But filling in blank territories was not sufficient when supposedly Christian countries were spiritually ill, not only in the Philippines or the Sudan but, as the bishop of Madagascar pointedly observed, England too.[27]

Who should "do" mission? Warrer cited increased numbers of missionaries flowing not only from Britain, but, in the face of enormous needs within their borders, from the U.S. and the "White Dominions"--Canada, Australia, New Zealand--in some cases spurred by missionary societies formed within those countries. At the same time he welcomed at least the perception of a wider responsibility on the part of third world churches, such as India's, and the

first stirrings of response.[28] Mission, he implied, was a duty of every Anglican province.

Both nationalism and Anglican principles demanded that mission in a given place ultimately depend upon the Christians of that place. Rural deans in Uganda had been Africans since the 1930's; in Madagascar, native priests soon would take over as archdeacons.[29] Too often, though, authority remained with expatriates. In Uganda "the real power still lay with the district missionaries, whose word (try they their utmost to make it no more than an advisory word) carried the final authority simply because it was a European word."[30] Mombasa's three suffragan bishops were African-born--but not its diocesan.[31] Warren noted that in China and Japan the transition to local leadership was complete, and India had a native Metropolitan and three diocesans. "But it may be seriously questioned whether the pace at which the 'passing' is taking place is adequate in a situation as tense as that which obtains in most of Asia and much of Africa." Furthermore, transitions at the top obscured a weakness, common in Asia and Africa, from a "lack of an adequate supply of subordinate leaders both amongst clergy and laity." They need deeper training. "This is a matter which calls for serious attention."[32]

Was there then a role for the expatriate missionary? Yes, but certainly not in the old style. "There is no overall slackening in the demand for foreign missionaries," observed Canon Warren, who from the CMS was in a position to know.[33] Madagascar no longer needed the "pioneering priests...who penetrated into depths of forests where no white man had been before." Rather, "more and more the priests or other missionaries from the dispatching countries have to be people with special powers to train others to take the lead." So, too, elsewhere.[34] Yet this supportive if not subordinate position demanded a particular attitude among both expatriate and native in order "to use the foreigner to the best advantage." Those sent out to third-world missions "should be men and women capable of adjusting themselves rapidly to a climate

of opinion in which to be white and western is no longer an asset, and in which those with whom they will be serving are enjoying the first sweets of national independence, whether political or ecclesiastical or both."[35]

Training, then, for both foreign worker and native, lay and clergy, loomed as an urgency. Bishop Warner of Edinburgh proposed stationing theologians overseas; Canon Warren foresaw inter-provincial training centers along the lines of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.[36] Bishop Beecher wanted task forces to train local people to meet new circumstances.[37] The SPG extended the CIPBC notion of the need for literary development which would place heavy reliance on the SPCK.[38] For foreign-born missionaries to learn local languages was urged as crucial.[39]

How should Anglicans relate to other communions in furthering the Gospel? Might Anglicans associate with churches of the Wider Episcopal Fellowship, or as in South India, with non-episcopal churches? The CIBPC thought so, commending "all possible help" to the Mar Thoma Church for its energetic work among Indian youth.[40] That, though, required a new outlook; Anglican missions would not necessarily be Anglican.[41]

How then could the Communion's resources be coordinated in order to meet its needs? Problems were obvious. Often competative missionary societies in Britain had only begun cooperating through the Overseas Council. Now other provinces, and their societies, were becoming "senders."[42] Mission was being promoted, but dangers increased for "spheres of influence" which forged loyalties between "home" church and "mission" church. It was easier, noted Bishop Gray, to raise money for an effort supported by one's own Church than for one that was not.[43] But bilateral ties often superseded wider loyalties, leading to jurisdictional peculiarities such as PECUSA's Diocese of Liberia entirely surrounded by the Province of West Africa, or the hodgepodge of the West Indies.[44]

Furthermore, no overall policy guided the use or distribution of resources, either financial or personal, and no effective organization could make choices regarding their redeployment: Who, for example, would decide to close an ineffectual mission in order to bolster a more promising one?[45] Nor was there a competent means to gather and share information to guide such decisions.[46] Although the broadening of Provincial outreach widened the basis from which resources could come, too few congregations regularly gave their support.[47]

Advanced ecumenical participation such as Inter-Church Aid had also obliged coordinating the resources of denominations[48]; but Anglicans were hampered by lacking a central coordinator.

The impetus toward greater integration of resources and decision-making reflected an increasing sense of Anglicanism as a worldwide entity. As the English Evangelical leader Gordon Savage put it,

> Minneapolis 1954 and Lambeth 1958 both point to the growing conviction of the Anglican Communion that it is a unit with world-wide commitments, and that it must share its responsibilities and resources in the best way possible, using the missionary societies and boards but not being hindered by their particular background and limited interests.[49]

The primary, and nearly only, instrument for coordination was the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy. The 1948 Lambeth Conference created it to bear responsibility for periodic surveys of the range of Anglican work, planning and challenge. It was to ask questions as, "Is the Anglican Communion making the best possible use of its resources? Is there a reasonably balanced distribution of its missionaries? Is there a focal point demanding a concentration of focus? Is a vast problem such as Islam being tackled peacemeal or with some co-ordination?" It was not authoritative but advisory; it was a council, a group of equals.[50] And it was not working. It met only once, at the 1954 Congress, until 1956. "Unfortunately little evidence has been produced to show that the Council has so far exerted much influence on developments or on policy," alleged the SPG.[51] Americans criticised it more sharply. John

Higgins groused, "While this is better than the former haphazard approach to the problem [of coordination, the ACNS] is obviously an inadequate solution for a staff which calls for full-time staff work." He likened the Communion's central governance to the United States' under the Articles of Confederation, utterly unable to withstand "constant centrifugal forces."[52]

From PECUSA's headquarters, Bishop Bentley was at once more gentle and more visionary. The ACNS has been "helpful" as a clearing house for information and for encouraging "cooperation and common support in several areas of interest and concern. But its work could well expand.

> If it could meet more often, perhaps annually, and if it had a full time secretariat, even a single executive officer, with a small secretarial staff, it might gain a more complete picture of the total missionary enterprise being carried on...within the Anglican Communion, could formulate a common strategy for the allocation of areas of responsibility, and could encourage and guide the unification, development and prosecution of the missionary task of the churches which form the Anglican Communion, both as that task is related to sister churches within the Anglican Communion, and as it is related to those Christian bodies which are not in communion with Canterbury

--and, for that matter, with the World Council of Churches. "At present," he concluded, "I fear there is not much coordinated, or centralized, leadership being given in these matters."[53]

Archbishop Fisher began thinking of similar needs when a crisis broke: The South African government in 1958 extended <u>apartheid</u> to schools. The Bantu Education Act "may have profound implications for the whole course of our Church's witness among coloured and dark people thoroughout the continent of Africa," charged Gordon Savage. If the Anglican Communion was to have a worldwide scope, how could it respond effectively to immediate crises?

> It is at such a juncture that it ought to be made possible for quick action to be taken to bring the need before the whole Church in its various provinces, and for some small co-ordinating committee to gather together the offers and pledges of help. I suppose the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy is the body of act, but of course it is too big and scattered to meet quickly.... What I am feeling after is some method whereby we as a free association of Churches in one Communion could quickly respond, other than by appeals through the Press, to a situation which our Communion recognized was of cardinal importance.[54]

The SPG proposed something a bit different: A "Central Office of Information." Distinguished from the ACMS lest it be confined to specifically "missionary" matters, this would be "identified with nothing short of the Lambeth Conference itself"—thus able to appeal to the broad range of Anglican concerns. Staff members would abdicate provincial membership in favor of the wider body, neither speaking for or devoting their time to a specific area. Servants of the Communion, they would inform each province of "the main activities, needs and achievements of each other province and of the Anglican Communion as a whole," publicising trends through secular media, and serving the Conference, LCB and ACMS by collecting and digesting information for their use. It could also function as a "clearing house" for resources developed around the Communion, and as a press office in relating to the media.[55]

Archbishop Fisher meshed these ideas into a "Lambeth Exchange." It would bring resident representatives of the Provinces together in London under a secretary responsible to him. It would not "take top level decisions, or indeed...initiate anything at all. Its business is to be a kind of spider at the centre of the web so far as receiving and disseminating information and advice is concerned."[56]

Americans disliked the idea. They objected to the difficulty of obtaining "a top level person, with wide knowledge and experience," and if such were available he "would soon be out of touch with the situation at home." Sherrill's advisory council preferred Bentley's yearly meeting of Metropolitans as "no more expensive and much more authoritative than having representatives reside in England."[57]

Fisher persevered. Primates from Australia or New Zealand would hardly welcome yearly treks to London, nor did he look for an Anglican Summit Conference. Despite Savage's point, he doubted the frequency of major, immediate, high-level decisions. Instead, he predicted general policy reviews

in response to a changing world, which low-level secretaries could do better than metropolitans.

> It is the Secretaries who need to keep in touch with one another so as to get common thinking in operation in various parts of the Anglican Communion: and the right kind of Secretary is more useful if he could come to England for a year or two to take his part in the 'Lambeth Exchange' where he would be in touch with representatives of all other parts of the Anglican Communion. This would be far more valuable than any annual meeting which would be short and open to all the evils of brief Conferences.[58]

He agreed with She...ll that the Metropolitans should discuss it when they gathered for Lambeth, and referred the entire matter to Gray's committee.[59]

The SPG wanted to improve the means of collecting and disseminating information. The Archbishop, Presiding Bishop and Bishop Bentley wanted improved coordination. They all perceived that the Communion had outgrown its lackadaisical structure. Anglicanism demanded a higher degree of organization. Seeds had been planted, some of which would wither, some of which--such as the yearly meeting of primates--would take twenty years to germinate; and some would soon blossom.

By the time it assembled, Gray's committee faced a diversity of questions, from the nature of the missionary task to the role played by the provinces and missionary societies, their support, coordination, and challenges. Beyond questions of centralization, though, were issues which the Minneapolis Congress had tried to address: What does it mean to be part of this spiritual community?

As so often happens in Anglicanism, focus turned increasingly on an institutional question, a question of ministry; but at heart it was a question of mission, and of identity, not only of maintaining and extending the Anglican Communion but of fulfilling its mission in a way appropriate to its self-understanding. Concerns of centralization and dispersal of authority were at issue, and the place of Anglicanism in the ecumenical scene would be a related and major topic at the Conference. Not only was the mission of Anglicanism at stake, but its integrity as well.

b. Lambeth Conference 1958

When they finally convened, 320 bishops anxiously poured forth issues to discuss. "When the cellar is in flames," warned George Tyrrell, "it is no time to discuss the wallpaper in the attic."

For two days, the bishops chanted a litany of world problems. Moyes of Armidale, Australia spoke of nuclear tensions. "We cannot do, and upon deterrence as a means of achieving peace. Peace must become a positive fact in our minds and not just the absence of desire of war." Carlisle pleaded for attention to the causes of war and not only with weapons; among the greatest causes "are those in the field of economics." Baghalpar declared, "We must learn to answer the questions--who comes first, God or my country, God or my church, God or myself?"

They mulled over divisions within societies. The Archbishop of South Africa called his nation "the outward expression of the disintegration of human society." Baghalpar described India's 586 native states each with wealthy maharajah, India's 250 languages and dialects, its 82% illiteracy rate. "We thought when the British left all our problems would cease; but we have found that our problems were just beginning." For a Moslem who recalls the Crusades, related the Bishop in Iran, Christianity is "a thing he despises at the hand of the man he hates." Meath of Ireland observed, "The Englishman never remembers, and the Irishman never forgets." Ottawa depicted Canadian speakers of French and of English as "two solitudes"; and he cited racial dissension between Eskimos and Indians.

And what is the Church's place? Armidale recalled, "When a group of Australian clergy met in a museum, the speaker said that they were in a place where many people thought they should be permanently." But Panapa of Aotearoa, New Zealand told a different story. The remnant of a Maori regiment had returned home after World War II with the motto, "I was there also." Christians, he said, "should be able to say that about situations where their presence is needed."

The presence of Christians was surely needed, the bishops agreed. But how? Allen, assistant bishop of Oxford, reflected the decade's understanding. "The appeal of missionary work should be on a definitely theological basis bearing in mind that the Church as such is the mission, and the mission as such is to build the Church." But what happens to even the most fundamental endeavor of missions when the government, as did Sudan's, declare, "We are free to practice, but not to propogate"? Sadiq of Nagpur relayed the Indian Church's dual conviction that (1) "Missionary obligation is essential. Sharing the Good news comes first. (2) Various communions were allocated specific areas in which to work. What shall a man do when he moves from one area to another?"

How does the Communion prepare a national church for true independence? Chinese bishops were notably absent from Lambeth, as they had been from Minneapolis. Allen of Oxford concluded that "(1) The Chinese Church was not helped adequately to become indigenous quickly enough; (2) the different strands of tradition even within the Anglican Communion made it difficult for the Chinese Church to coordinate its efforts when left alone." He added, "Missionary strategy must always be kept clear of political implications."

What too was the role of the erstwhile "sending" churches, especially when they are not as strong as surmised? Warned Barry of Southwell,

> By the year 1961 56% of the clergy of the Church of England will be 65 years old. By '63 a still higher proportion will have reached retirement age of 70. In some colleges today there are more people reading for honours in theology who are going later into secular work than there are those who are going into the ministry.[60]

Some could rejoice in accomplishments of the Church: Kurunagala pointed out that all Maori leadership emanates from Church schools "where they learn a fourth R--religion." But not all were impressed. During the Nigerian's impassioned plea for local opportunity, Gray spotted the Lord Bishops of Norwich and Rochester catching a nap.[61]

How little Anglicans knew either of their Communion or their world became clear, too. Ondo Benin said that wherever he goes white children ask him

about elephants and monkeys, associating him with animals. He said that...the only place he had seen elephants and monkeys was in the London Zoo."[62]

And Christian unity required attention. The American Presiding Bishop wanted a "warm-hearted" statement "with a note of urgency": A visitor to a tiny village, he related, "asked how many churches were there. The reply came, 'We formerly had two; then we had a unity movement and now we have four.'"[63]

Against the impossible task of confronting the ills of the world, the Lambeth bishops adjourned to committees to decide how Anglicans could respond. Gray's group on "Missionary Strategy and Appeal" faced a job almost as daunting as the entire Conference, so it had to narrow its focus. They began by discussing a broad (and wordy) topic, "The Theological Basis of the Church's Mission and the need to Re-Call the Whole Church to a Sense of that Mission to the Whole World." That implied "the changed attitude to the missionary task in recent years and of the comparative loss of the sense of its importance and urgency." It set the bishops along lines which they would follow to the conclusions they recommended to the Conference, and the word "strategy" in their committee's title was the key.

Confronted with concerns ranging from dealing with political influences to developing information to adjusting provinces, one overall issue emerged: Anglicanism needed a higher degree of coordination. Gray had said so for years. Writers from Madagascar to New York had agreed. Now something could be accomplished.

First, though, the present had to be faced. Anglican, especially British, missionary activity centered around the missionary societies. They could not be dismissed without sapping the central organs and their countless supporters of their enthusiasm, indeed their role. At the same time, the committee pressed for a more coordinated mechanism which reflected the Church of England as an entity. "With thanksgiving for the great achievements of the missionary societies and with awareness that their dissolution at present is not possible

or wise, it was nonetheless thought desirable that steps should be taken to co-ordinate their work more adequately and eliminate costly duplication in organization and administration," then adding a sentence which changes the nature of missionary support in England entirely, "to the end that the Church in England might accept its missionary responsibility directly as soon as possible."[64]

Then, Gray introduced three possibilities for improving "Anglican strategy":

i. representatives of overseas Provinces resident in England [from Archbishop Fisher];

ii. Regular meetings of Metropolitans [from PBCUSA];

iii. The appointment of an official concerned solely with this responsibility [a variant of the SPG/Bentley idea].

Beyne recalled a fourth, expanding the Archbishop's personal staff to allow him to carry an additional load of inter-Anglican concerns. This was rejected by consensus as making his Grace "too much a potentate."[65] How they could avoid that pitfall, and thus coordinate policy without overcentralizing authority, brought lively debate until the whole matter was referred to committee.[66]

Other matters--and lunch with Prince Philip[67]--drew their attention. First, the Committee discussed plans for another Anglican Congress. Canada's Primate had already issued an invitation for Toronto. Representatives of South Africa, Japan, Australia and Uganda wanted to be considered; the drafting committee [Hughes, Archbishop of Central Africa, and Coggin of Bradford] were asked to bring in a resolution affirming the desire for a conference, proposing 1963, and as topic, "The World Mission of the Church."[68]

Next, the Committee on Strategy in the Anglican Communion reported on merging the ACMS and the LCB. The full body agreed with Bishop Gray's suggestion[69] to recommend "that a full-time Secretary of the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury with the

approval of the Advisory Council." This was the birth of the Anglican Executive Officer.[70]

By Friday, the work of the committee was beginning to emerge. Resolutions crafted by Coggan and Hughes included statements on the Church's mission, communication, stewardship, migration, regional groups, religious freedom, the Anglican Congress, the Anglican Cycle of Prayer, and Literature--in short, calling attention to and/or commending each one.[71] Most far-reaching were those on Anglican strategy; for they would transform the organization of the Communion by beefing up its central committees, calling for another Congress, and establishing a secretariat.

This became the central focus of Gray's two-day report to the entire Conference.[72] Question after question forced bishops to ponder the quandaries of a committee which raises issues it could not resolve, but which moved them forward simply by the asking.

> [The] Fundamental question is '<u>What is to be [the] nature of missionary appeal in present era and future</u>?
>
> Should we continue to talk about 'missionary work' as though it were a thing apart from the task of the church at home? Should we not see work of the Church simply as being evangelization of [the] whole world, starting at home and reaching out therefrom? What should be done about work of reclaiming lapsed Christians? What should be done about evangelization among people in what we now think of as 'home countries'? Should we not see work of Church as a unit whether at home or abroad?
>
> How are financial problems involved in [the] worldwide work of [the] Church to be resolved? What re-alignment of financial responsibility for mission areas seems called for? What is our responsibility financially and otherwise for churches which move out of the Anglican Communion and into new alignment, like the church of South India? Is there [a] possibility of seeing missionary work of the Anglican Communion as a unit insofar as finances are concerned? How can the missionary financial appeal be personalized? What should be the standards covering requirements for self-support in missionary dioceses?

How could new provinces grow, in the face of differing churchmanship, nationality, interests, and source of finances? How could missionary work continue "in view of governmental hostility in some areas, rising tides [of] nationalism and resurgence of religions like Buddhism, Mohammedanism" and such? "How can we present Christianity as not being associated exclusively with [the] west, white race, or particular nations?"

There were ecclesiastical questions: "What should be our relationship between our missionary enterprises with that of other communions? How far should we cooperate with them? How far should we support [the] work of other communions in areas where we have none?"

Finally, Gray broached the committee's central point. How could the Communion do its work, together? "No machinery for carrying on [the] work of the Lambeth Conference other than the Consultative Body exists." Inter-church dealings, such as with Moravians, atrophied for lack of anyone charged with following through on them. The ACMS was "useful but inadequate." Too much relies on autonomous missionary societies and the Archbishop and his staff carry "too heavy a burden." How, therefore, "can a co-ordinated strategy of missionary work in the Anglican Communion be achieved?"

Gray recited the three proposals, citing impediments to two: Resident representatives in London keeping in touch with home developments and communicating to their metropolitans any recommendations from the joint group were suggested, but "representatives would quickly lose touch with home, could not easily be given authority, and [the] plan would be expensive." Second, the annual meetings of Metropolitans at Lambeth under the Archbishop's leadership would be difficult to gather because of great distances. Finally, the executive officer:

> a single coordinator who would be executive for [the] whole Anglican Communion, serving possibly under [the] present Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy and seeking continuously to maintain communication with all sections [of the Communion]. He would necessarily be [a] man of considerable stature, already well known throughout [the Communion], and would receive support from [the] whole Anglican Communion. He might also serve as [a] continuing executive of Lambeth Conference and of [the] Anglican Congress.[12]

These key ideas Gray placed in the context of another Lambeth report, on the Bible. "Amid all these needs, none is greater than that the Message should be brought by Christians with a burning love for God and for their fellows out of the experience of the power of Christ in their lives."[13]

> Our Committee reviewed the work [of] our Communion with particular reference to what is called 'the mission field'; yet we have recognized fully that 'the mission field' is the world starting with our own dioceses where there is so great a need for evangelism among both those who are not yet in Church and those who are only nominal members.
>
> Factors which, among others, condition our Church's program are these:
>
> The Rise of nationalistic spirit.
>
> Distrust among the people of the world.
>
> The growth of industrial areas.
>
> Resurgence of some non-Christian religions.
>
> The rapid spread of what may perhaps most easily be called "Christian deviations."
>
> All these present conditions of urgency.

Against this, he posited an emphatic message:

> 1. THE TIME IS NOW. GOD CALLS. WE MUST LISTEN AND ANSWER.
> 2. THE FIRST NEED IS FOR THE PRAYERS OF THE FAITHFUL, FOR TRAINED AND DEVOUT MEN, AND FOR ADEQUATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT.
> 3. THE NEXT NEED IS FOR COORDINATION OF OUR WORK IN ORDER THAT PRIORITY OF NEEDS MAY BE ESTABLISHED AND COOPERATION SECURED IN MEETING THE NEEDS.

The Committee reiterated the goals of encouraging each national church to become "truly indigenous, of achieving self-support, and of having nationals as its Bishops," so that in a world of "cataclysmic changes" the Church everywhere can rely upon roots in the life of the people "and be able to sustain itself regardless of changes of government or of national outlook." The teachings of Henry Venn and Roland Allen, and lessons of China and the Suez, were not lost.

Given the task ahead, and given the ineffectiveness of the ACMS, the Committee recommended a new structure.[75]

First, it would have a full-time secretary for the ACMS. As the SPG had recommended, he "would collect and disseminate information," but his role went further; he would "keep open lines of communication and make contact when necessary with responsible authority." The sketchiness of a job description --what lines of communication? what "authority"?--should be noted.

Second, the ACMS should be redefined in membership and scope Clergy and laity might join as representatives of the Primates and Metropolitans. Their purpose "is to enable the whole Anglican Communion to deal effectively with matters of world-wide strategy and the welfare of the whole Communion." Again, lines are widely drawn. But the Committee did specify that the ACMS advise on

questions of new areas for missionary activity, of forming new provinces, of strengthening areas where the Church faces opposition or difficulties, of fostering vocations for service and cooperation among missionary societies, and of preparing and disseminating information. As an advisory body within a non-authoritative system, it could not settle policy; but it could raise questions and recommend actions working through the leadership. It would be funded by the Communion as a whole.[76]

Gray denied such steps would create a bureaucratic curia. Appointing a secretary simply met a long-standing need for coordination, he said, while removing from the Archbishop, as President of Lambeth, and his staff the burdens of administering the conference.

He reiterated the recommendation for another Anglican Congress, in a non-English speaking country to emphasize that Anglicanism had become more than a "Church of English speaking people," and that its topic be the "Missionary Strategy of the Anglican Communion." It rightfully must include priests and laity, in order to call the entire Church to recognize the

> inevitable missionary responsibility and to proper stewardship [of] our lives and material resources....God's call to us is not to be answered by [a] gift [of] anything less than all that we are. We believe that He is calling us now with even greater urgency than ever before in view of [the] great dangers of [the] apocalyptic age in which we live.

He minced no words. "The Church is frequently accused of being asleep. We feel that the tremendous amount of missionary work which has been carried on is a refutation of that charge; yet...during one of the most stirring appeals by [a] Bishop of one of [the] younger Churches...certain Bishops were sound asleep. We pray that this is not symbolic."

"God grant," he concluded, "that we of the Anglican Communion may be alert to the conditions of the world in which we live and to the needs and opportunities before our Church--that by prayer and sacrifical service and by

our triumph over narrow provincialism and petty prejudices we may respond to God's call to us today and serve Him with gladness and effectiveness."[77]

The Conference approved all the Committee's proposed resolutions with minor changes if any. The bishops appealed to "every Church member, clergy and laity alike, to take an active part in the Mission of the Church"--and that meant "to the whole world, not only in area but in all the concerns of mankind. It has no frontiers between 'home' and 'foreign' but is concerned to present Christ to people everywhere.... Each generation needs to be evangelised."

With that plea the Conference added one that "every Church should endeavor to share fully in the life of the people in the country in which it exists," rejoicing that indigenous leadership was truly growing.[78] The outlines for a future philosophy were becoming clearer.

The Conference fully accepted the Committee's recommendations on the ACNS, including its request for a secretary, asking "His Grace the President" to act as soon as possible.[79] It redefined the Lambeth Consultative Body to allow it more actively to assist the Archbishop in planning for future Conferences and advising him between decades on matters of faith, order, policy or administration referred to it by the Archbishop or any bishop(s). Significantly, it provided for an appointed secretary "who may, if the Advisory Council so agrees, be also the Secretary of that Council."[80] The way for an Anglican Executive officer was now open.

Two motions especially pleased Gray. Another Anglican Congress would convene in 1963, preferably "outside the English speaking countries," on "The World-wide Mission of the Church."[81] The bishops also praised his Pan Anglican review.[82]

Few resolutions confronted in practical ways the pressing issues of the world which the bishops had discussed. Most pragmatic were the institutional decisions--on what would become an Executive Officer, and the Congress which could potentially extend the bishops' concerns and discussions to a broader

audience. But Lambeth 1958 clarified issues, and made clear the need for redefinitions among Anglicanism's component bodies. Sherrill conceded,

> Today in a deeper sense those who go to another land must go not as supposedly superior teachers or technicians but as Christian brethren eager to receive as to give. Between all our Churches and provinces there should be closer ties, a greater pastoral responsibility to another. Only so can we reach out to the many sheep who belong to no fold.

And, he concluded, "all of the great issues of the day in the last analysis have to do with personal relationships."[83]

The way was open for deepening those relationships, and that responsibility, within the Communion.

Lambeth 1958 was the first forum with both breadth and weight to contemplate the myriad questions raised by new understandings and realities of Church, mission, and world. They were more than the poor bishops could possibly resolve. Yet in their asking, they gave apostolic blessing to the questions themselves. Others, then, could and did explore the issues.

Furthermore, Lambeth established a new structure which, depending upon how it was utilized, might well provide a vehicle to pursue these questions. The character of the person chosen as first Anglican Executive Officer, Bishop Stephen Bayne of the United States, assured that the Communion would, if not resolve them, at least not avoid them. On the other hand, the conference left unclear what he was precisely supposed to do, and given the paltry resources, how he was supposed to do it. Bayne would use the office's vagueness to advantage, but he would be constrained by finances.[84]

Finally, the bishops authorized a forum which because of its topic would bring international focus onto the questions they were asking, and which because of its worldwide scope and its depth in including clergy and laity, would assure an even wider participation.

Lambeth's response may have been incomplete and, as years raced by, tardy. But the bishops did what no other group in the Anglican Communion could do.

B. A First Foray: General Convention 1961

By the nature of the Anglican Communion, any Lambeth Conference can only inform and advise, it cannot dictate to the constituent provinces and dioceses. It does, though, carry an influence, so that what it says does matter. The bishops can recommend, and, because they are bishops, can lead their home Churches toward the collective wisdom.

The American Church provides a case in point of how well Lambeth's concerns might have been heard.

American bishops moved from Lambeth to Detroit in 1958 for their Church's triennial General Convention. They had indeed learned something at Lambeth.

> The call to the missionary outreach of the Church confronts today a revolutionary and changing world--one in which resurgent non-Christian religions are offering new challenges to the Gospel, in which the emergence of autonomous younger Churches demands a recasting of many of our traditional policies and methods, and in which our Church in particular is entering a new era of enlarged responsibilities as partners with sister Churches in the Anglican Communion....

Because of the demand for a "greater vision of the missionary need with much greater support and understanding,"[85] a committee was requested to return with recommendations for the 1961 Convention. Walter Gray, fresh from chairing a Lambeth counterpart, was the logical choice as chairman.

By 1960 the report was in hand. It reviewed the poor response to overseas mission of the Episcopal Church: In 1958, of 30,000 American missionaries abroad, just 237--12--came from PBCUSA. In Africa after 110 years of effort, Episcopalians sponsored one missionary district with one bishop and 8,087 souls; the Church of England could point to 38 dioceses, four autonomous provinces, 50 bishops and nearly 3 million baptized members. Queried the Committee, "Is the Episcopal Church doing its fair share in the task laid upon all Christians by our Lord? If not, why not?"[86]

Americans, concluded the committee, were simply shirking their duties. "The task laid upon the Episcopal Church at this moment by its Lord is to take is proper share of the leadership of the world-wide missionary effort." For

vent prayer, self-examination, and "a readiness to use every legitimate means for the proclamation of the Gospel" must be supplemented by "changes in policy, legislation and administrative structure...together with the fearlessness, the imagination, and the will to give whatever is needed in thought, time and money to accomplish God's work." It looked for "further thought and study, leading to prompt and decisive action."[87]

Among suggested proposals were ideas of a permanent advisory council and staff to evaluate the mission of the church, a counterpart to the [illegible]. In light of Lambeth concerns, it advocated allowing American-sponsored dioceses to "participate in the life of existing and adjacent Anglican provinces," such as Liberia with West Africa; to encourage new, autonomous provinces (e.g. Brazil) and work more closely with sister provinces in missionary planning and effort. Taking a page from Roland Allen, it encouraged teams of workers headed by a bishop to start new work, in coordination with other Anglican Churches and with other Communions. In a day of increasing international awareness, the report urged promoting such awareness in schools and, through prayer for, and "personalization" of, mission, among its own membership. This extended to "relating its many communicants who go abroad to the overseas work of the Church and for using their talents" to propagate the Gospel. It included widening clerical horizons. It demanded upgrading the training of missionaries, and publishing of Christian literature other than in English.[88]

By the time Convention met in September, some ideas had already been instituted. An advisory council was appointed. The overseas bishops "in the spirit of the Lambeth Conference of 1958" stated themselves "eager to communicate and co-operate with other Anglican Churches" especially when proximate in geography or interest, welcoming regional councils but resisting independence from their American mother.[89] The Overseas Department, bureaucratic arm at the national headquarters for the Church, reported its overall agreement, disputing a few recommendations, and describing what had been or was then

being done.* "Admittedly the Church has not been aroused to a full sense of its missionary obligation. The education of the clergy and the people of the Church in this regard cannot be the responsibility of the Overseas Department alone, nor even of the National Council," but of the entire Church.[90]

Convention then proceeded to accept most of Gray's points, especially the structurally-oriented ones. The advisory body appointed by the Presiding Bishop was to become permanent, and staffed. Developing autonomy in missionary dioceses was commended. Because "work is actively progressing," no legislation was needed, it was decided.[91] This left some of the more theoretical, and sweeping, suggestions for others to institute as they wished. Perhaps it could not have been otherwise.

In any event, the structure had been altered, and it would have imminent effects. From the new institutions, especially the new office in London, would emanate a vital new energy which collated and dispersed diversities of opinions, facts, and above all an endless flow of information about the Anglican Communion. The time was ripe for a renaissance.

---

*The Gray Committee urged appointing regional secretaries, especially for Latin America; the Department thought that a waste of money (Journal 1961, p. 812). Interestingly, Presiding Bishop Browning instituted just such an idea in 1986, and his first appointment was for Latin America.

Notes

A. Lambeth 1948

1. Office of the Director of the Overseas Department of the National Council [PECUSA], "Our Overseas Missions: Anglican Assistance," March, 1963, J. Warren Hutchens MSS in Archives of the Diocese of Connecticut, Hartford, p. 2.

2. Walter Henry Gray, Diary of Lambeth Conference, WHG MSS.

3. The Lambeth Conference 1948 (London: SPCK, 1948) [afterwards Lambeth 1948], I.15.

4. Ibid., I.16.

5. Ibid., I.15.

6. Ibid., I. 17.

7. Ibid., I.20.

8. WMC Diary (cf. Bordem W. Painter, "Bishop Walter M. Gray and the Anglican Congress of 1954," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XLIX, 2 (June 1980), 164.

9. Lambeth 1948, I.21-23.

10. Ibid., I.23-24.

B. Anglican Congress 1953

11. "Our Overseas Missions," a report by the Overseas Department to the National Council [PECUSA], Appendix G, March, 1963, p. 2.

12. Painter, 177ff.

13. Gray, "The Future Course of the Anglican Communion": Church Congress Syllabus No. 41, WMC MSS, passim.; cf. Painter, 163.

14. AC'54; Painter, 178.

15. John Steward Moyes, America Revisited (Sydney, Australia: Church Publishing Co., 1955), 34; Burroughs interview.

16. Ibid., 35f.

17. AC'54, 251.

18. Moyes, 35

C. Lambeth 1958

19. Warren, Missionary Commitments, p. iv.

20. Two letters of Geoffrey Fisher to WMC, April 10, 1958, WMC MSS.

21. Parfitt letter to Fisher, p. 3; F. B. Welbourn, "The Missionary Culture," in David Paton, ed., Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism (London: SCM Press, 1958), 59.

22. E.C.M. Warner to WMC, 28 May 1958; WMC papers.

23. SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958, 4-6.

24. Letter of Leonard Beecher to Fisher, 18 October 1957, copy in WMC MSS.

25. Memorandum on Missionary Strategy (submitted by the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon), n.d., 1, WMC papers.

26. Cited in letter of Warner to WMC, 26 May 1958; and "Our Overseas Missions," pp. 6-8, quoted in letter of J. B. Bentley to E.C.M. Warner, January 30, 1958. Both in WMC MSS.

27. [T.R. Parfitt, Bishop in Madagascar,] Memorandum on Missionary Strategy, n.d., 1. WMC papers.

28. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 13-19.

29. Welbourn, 64; Parfitt memo, 2.

30. Welbourn, 64.

31. Beecher letter to Fisher, 1f.

32. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 37.

33. Ibid., 37.

34. Parfitt memo, 2.

35. Warren, Missionary Commitments, 38, 37.

36. Warner to WMC, May 19, 1958; Warren, Missionary Commitments, 37.

37. Beecher to Fisher, October 18, 1957.

38. SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958, 5; Warren, Missionary Commitments, 35f; Warner to WMC, May 19, 1958.

39. Eric Tripp letter to Warner, February 27, 1958 in WMC MSS.

40. CIPSC memo, 2.

41. Earliest Anglican missionaries, however, were not Anglicans, but often Continental Lutherans hired by the SPG. Cf. e.g. Neill, History of Missions, 267.

42. SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958, 3.; cf. Warren Missionary Commitments,13-17.

43. Ibid., 3.; WMC to Warner, January 22, 1958.

44. Warner to WMC, 19 May 1958.

45. SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958, 3, 6; Beecher to Fisher, October 18, 1957, 2.

46. SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958, 7.

47. Ibid., 9.

48. Warner to WMC, Jan. 13, 1958.

49. Copy of a letter from the Ven. Gordon D. Savage to the Bishop of Peterborough, 6 May 1958, in WMC MSS, p. 1.

50. Dewi Morgan, The Bishops Come to Lambeth (London: A. R. Mobray & Co., Ltd., 1958), 123f.

51. SPG 6; cf. Warner to WMC, 19 May 1958 p. 2.

52. Higgins, One Faith, 204.

53. Bentley to Warner, 30 January 1958, 2.

54. Savage to the Bishop of Peterborough, 2.

55 SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958, 8f.

56. Fisher to Gray, 13 May 1958, WHG MSS.

57. Sherrill to Fisher, April 15, 1958; copy in WHG MSS.

58. Fisher to Sherrill, 13 May 1958, copy in WHG MSS, p. 1-2.

59. Fisher to Gray, 13 May 1958, WHG MSS.

D. Lambeth Conference 1958

60. Gray, Diary of Lambeth Conference, July 7, WHG MSS, pp. 2-4.

61. Ibid., July 11, 5-6.

62. Ibid., July 11, 5-6

63. Ibid., July 11, 6-7.

64. Gray, Minutes of Sub Committee III A, July 14, WHG MSS, pp. 1-3.

65. Bayne, "After Bayne, What?", memorandum to A. Michael Ramsey, n.d. [1963?], Bayne MSS, p. 1.

66. Gray, Minutes, July 14th, 3f.

67. Gray, Diary, July 15, 7.

68. Gray, Minutes, July 15, 5-6.

69. WHG to F. H. Wilkinson, April 29, 1960, WHG MSS. Bishop Gray takes credit for proposing the idea, presumably at the committee level but possibly in his report to the full Conference.

70. Gray, Minutes, July 15, 5-6.

71 "Proposed Resolutions," proof copy in WHG MSS, pp. 1.18-20.

72. Gray, Diary, July 29th-30, 8.

73. Gray, notes for his presentation to Lambeth Conference, n.d. [July 29, 1958], pp. 1-4, WHG MSS. Emphasis in original; abbreviations spelled out.

74. Lambeth '58, p. 2.18, quoted in Gray, notes, 1.

75. Gray, notes, 1-4.

76. Lambeth 1958, p. 2.70.

77. Gray, notes, 1-4.

78. Lambeth '58, Resolutions 58, 59, p. 1.43.

79. Ibid., Resolution 60, p. 1.43.

80. Ibid., Resolution 61, pp. 1.43-45.

81. Ibid., Resolution 68, 1.46.

82. Ibid., Resolution 70, 1.46.

83. Press release, n.d., WMS papers, Box 19, folder 453.

84. Whitely, Frontier Mission, 4.

E. General Convention 1961

85. Journal of the General Convention, 1961, Appendix 33, p. 761.

86. Ibid., 762f.

87. Ibid., 801.

88. Ibid., 763-767.

89. "A Response by the Overseas Department of the National Council to Certain Recommendations of the Committee of Conference on Overseas Missions," Appendix 34 to Journal 1961, 804.

90. Ibid., 802-815; 815.

91. Ibid., 232.

IV: Preparing for a Renaissance

On a dazzling January morning so bright that it blinded the old poet from reading the prologue to his composition, Robert Frost heralded the inauguration of the first American President born in the twentieth century.

> It makes the prophet in us all presage
> The glory of a next Augustan age
> Of a power leading from its strength and pride
> Of young ambition eager to be tried,
> Firm in our free beliefs without dismay....[1]

It was a new decade, and a new era over which John F. Kennedy was elected to preside. New policies redefined what the nation hoped to accomplish, and new programs tapped an idealism which Kennedy fervently articulated. Moreover, he voiced a commitment to attend to new realities abroad.

> ...The revolution of national independence is a fundamental fact of our era. This revolution will not be stopped. As new nations emerge from the oblivion of centuries, their first aspiration is to affirm their national identity. Their deepest hope is for a world where, within a framework of international cooperation, every country can solve its own problems according to its own traditions and ideals.[2]

That meant a world of "diversity and independence" which the United States, out of its own pluralistic unity, could and must foster. Accordingly, the Kennedy administration redefined foreign aid and Food-for-Peace programs to send American dollars and wheat to developing countries. It launched the Alliance for Progress for Latin America. Most visibly, it created the Peace Corps, with three objectives in mind:

> It can contribute to the development of critical countries and regions.
> It can promote international cooperation and good will toward this country.
> It can also contribute to the education of America and to more intelligent participation in the world.[3]

The United States was not alone in expressing its idealism in energetic ways. Canadians had a parallel to the Peace Corps in "Student Service Groups."[4] It was, if not worldwide, an international phenomenon.

If the ideas sounded rather like what Anglicans were developing for their own communion, the parallels ran deeper. There was new leadership. In early 1961 Geoffrey Fisher yielded the throne of St. Augustine to Michael Ramsey, a shy man of faith whose "rare combination of learning, depth and wisdom with simplicity, humility and love, sometimes disguised both the shrewdness of his mind and the depth and strength of his utterances." [Time described him as "the world's youngest octagenarian" with "wig-wagging ginger eyebrows" and a "gaitered waddle."[5]] Donald Coggan succeeded Ramsey at Yorkminster. Both men of deep spirituality and scholarship, Ramsey emerged from the Catholic wing and Coggan from the Evangelical; the new Canterbury was called the "clergyman's archbishop" and York, a pastor with "the common touch," became "the laymen's archbishop."[6] The new American Presiding Bishop Arthur Lichtenburger, elected like Pope John XXIII in 1958, wore a different cut of clerical cloth: Sherrill the Boston Brahmin handed the primatial cross to this grocer's son. He varied too in administrative style: Where Sherrill "ran the show out of his noggin,"[7] Lichtenburger took a more organizational approach. He attracted an adminstrator from the National Security Council to reorganize Church headquarters, which moved into spanking new Manhattan offices--"815."[8]

Underlying changes at the top was new vigor in the pews. A "boomlet" in Britain showed life in the old Mother Church yet: Twice as many priests offered themselves to the SPG in 1961 for overseas missions than in any year of its history.[9] Innovative approaches tried--without complete success--to compensate for the stereotypical "Bishop of Bulwark" depicted by Punch: "Advanced churchman. Believes the word 'not' to be an interpolation in several commandments. Makes Marxist speeches in Lords. Dislikes being called a Christian. Collects butterflies."[10] Across the "pond," American parishes

were prosperous and well-filled. But the wonder was increasingly in Africa, where in provinces as newly autonomous as their nations the Churches were showing up their ecclesiastical elders: On a typical Sunday in 1963, more African Anglicans went to church than in the U.S. and Canada combined.[11] The East African Revival which began in the 1930's continued apace.[12] Concern for spiritual life appeared in vibrant ways from Uganda to Hong Kong, guided in part by religious orders.[13]

Furthermore, economic prosperity in the United States, Canada and to a lesser and somewhat deceptive extent Great Britain [14] spilled over into the churches too, and thus at least the potential of greater resources for mission. Although the American Church gave but 3% of its total income for mission work (compared with 8% for Great Britain), an increasing number of parishes were adopting a goal of pledging 50%: A dollar for others for every dollar on themselves.[15]

In 1958, the year that cardinals elected John XXIII, bishops at the Lambeth Conference had heard the challenges of the day expressed in forthright ways. Though they did little more than rearrange institutional furniture, they opened up some room to move over the five years to come, especially as their efforts were locally adapted (as at PECUSA's 1961 General Convention). Meanwhile, various elements in the Church pressed toward more radical renovations of their lifestyles in order to address the situation the bishops heard described, in part spurred on by the new Anglican Executive Officer and the prospect of another Congress in 1963. Alterations gave way for a call to rebuild virtually from the ground up. By the 1963 Anglican Congress, initiated at Lambeth 1958, the Archbishop himself called for "nothing less than the rebirth of the Anglican Communion."

a. The Anglican Executive Officer

The decade's turn saw a new coalition spring to life, and with it a prominent new leader with a pan-Anglican scope. Bishop Stephen Bayne became the first Anglican Executive Officer.

The Anglican Communion, like the world, was growing ever more complex. Coordinating the Communion, even just preparing for an ever-more-numerous throng of bishops at Lambeth Conference, was placing strains on the Archbishop and his palace staff. So, the 1938 Conference approved the Gray Committee's proposal for a full-time officer to serve both the ACNS and the Lambeth Consultative Body.[16] It had been recognised that any such officer, to command respect from Churchmen worldwide, would have to be a person of established stature.[17] When first choice Bishop Ambrose Reeves of Johannesburg declined,[18] Fisher sought out the American Bishop of Olympia, Stephen Bayne, who accepted. Bayne had impressively chaired the major Lambeth committee on "The Family in Contemporary Society," and was known among adult Episcopalians for writing the volume on ethics in the Church's Teaching Series.[19] He quit his see and set up shop in London in 1959.

"Bishop Bayne created his job ex nihilo," recalled a churchman years later.[20] No precedent indicated what he should do, or be. He wore three hats: As executive secretary of the ACNS, he held a particular concern for coordinating mission. As secretary of the LCB, he oversaw concerns peculiar to the Lambeth Conference. As bishop-in-charge of the Convocation of Churches in Europe, he oversaw American Episcopalians on the continent. He also lived through an early change in bosses, for barely a year after his arrival in London the Archbishop who brought him there, Geoffrey Fisher, departed into unquiet retirement and Michael Ramsey took to the throne of St. Augustine. To York came Donald Coggan, who had drafted the report recommending Bayne's job and who became a confidant.

The job he created reflected the gifts he brought as much as the anticipations of Lambeth. To an extent greater than any Archbishop of Canterbury thus far, he travelled so constantly to nearly every province of the Communion that a saying emerged: "Archbishops come and archbishops go, but not as much as Bishop Bayne." Countless groups heard him speak, and he tried to report on what he saw: A prolific writer, he produced monthly articles for The Living Church in the U.S. and occasional items for innumerable other publications, published six books and maintained an enormous correspondence.[21]

Needing stronger communication was one reason for his office.[22] Bayne's Chester Street quarters became an information center on what was happening in the Anglican Communion. Moreover, he tried to link people of different provinces but similar in interests by circulating lists of those with particular abilities so they could correspond with each other.[23]

He brought not only ideas but also his own strong personality. Bayne was "a very, very careful listener," recalls Margaret Chisholm, his long-time assistant, who could keenly voice what was on groups of people's minds and where that might lead. After he left London to return to the U.S., an African said, "We're very sorry that Bishop Bayne no longer comes to meetings because he always told us where we were and where we were going." When leading committees, he sought to glean a consensus which reconciled different points of view into a cohesive whole.[24]

To his insight into the Anglican mission, over the years Bayne added an unmatched intimacy with the Communion's scope. "Bishop Bayne had a very intense personal experience of the Anglican Communion and the ways in which we might relate," concludes Margaret Chisholm.[25] In those days not even the Archbishop of Canterbury had travelled so far.

Though initiative for the 1963 Congress arose from others, Bayne gave high priority to a gathering central to the purposes for which he functioned.

> It is most important [he told the Canadian planners] that we continue to establish a true dialogue within our Communion between the Younger

> and Older Churches, the East and the West, with the Younger Churches taking their full part.... The heart of the Congress is a sharpening and deepening of our sense of mission. We must be concerned with mission on all fields within the dialogue of the whole Communion. ...We must get more and more people involved as part of this dialogue. How important is it for us to talk about liturgical unity in this context? This may not be as important as it is to talk about the witness of the Christian Church in the face of rising nationalisms, and the impact of the older religions and modern political ideologies.[26]

Bayne's greater role evolved in taking advantage of the Toronto assembly. People from the lists he circulated had indeed corresponded, and "found that they had so much to talk about" that they wanted to meet; as they were coming to Canada anyway, it was the perfect chance.[27] As early as 1960, Bayne told the organizers that leaders of missionary societies and of theological colleges wanted time of their own. And with the primates and metropolitans flying in, the ACMS and LCB could meet too.[28] Coincidentally, the WCC Faith and Order Commission was planned for New York just prior to that. As one participant recalls, it was a summer full of conferences.[29]

All that insured a full schedule. The missionaries had three substantial areas to discuss: First, general strategic plans pertaining to specific areas of the world--Africa, the Middle East, South America, the South Pacific. Secondly, specific problems encountered in missions--theological education, pay standards of missionaries, the place of medical and other specialized ministries, the recruitment and training of workers, providing adequate literature--many of the same problems identified for Lambeth in 1958. Finally, Bayne told them, "we shall need to spend some time in looking at our whole present structure of consultation and coordination," including the work of his office. A "very full agenda" indeed.[30]

To prepare, Bayne oversaw the production of a series of reports which reviewed Anglican work and prospect in each of the geographical areas he cited. Some reported on full-fledged conferences, such as an important one on Latin America in early 1963; it embodied a variety of strategies aimed at developing Anglican work on the continent. Others such as Africa's, developed

by the English overseas department, provided general background on the cultural and ecclesial challenges. They gave a survey of global efforts, and especially in the case of the Cuernavaca conference, gave an exercise in regional self-study and planning in a manner which would become more highly developed in the Partners In Mission consultations of twenty years later.[31]

B. Preparing for Toronto

At Lambeth, Canadians invited the Communion to visit them. Though the bishops preferred a non-English-speaking locale to underscore their growing diversity,[32] no site proved as practicable or as affordable; and surely no African or Asian Church could foot the bill for the Congress (not to mention providing $150,000 more for travel expenses). So the welcome to Toronto was accepted and planning began.[33]

It was primarily a Canadian enterprise. Advice was gleaned from others such as Walter Gray who organized the 1954 Congress.[34] But this would be a different experience. It would not be so Western-oriented. The Canadians strenuously sought third-world speakers (though none came from Latin America), and a travel fund assisted those unable to pay their own way.[35] Following Lambeth's instructions, the program would focus on "The Church's Mission to the World." Canada's Primate stated the purpose in extending

> an invitation for meeting and frank discussion between Bishops, Clergy and laypeople, drawn from a wide variety of nations and peoples; an occasion not only for listening to addresses, but for voicing opinions and ideas which will in due course take root and germinate in corporate action.[36]

Where 1954 had concerned the nature of Anglicanism, 1963 addressed its work. "Minneapolis stressed the family nature of the Anglican Communion," wrote Canada's program chairman, "and Toronto will seek to confront the family with its responsibilities beyond itself."[37] As he pointed out, the two years marked two very different worlds.

Delegations would be similar as before in makeup: The bishops, one priest, one layperson from each diocese. But there were more dioceses, especially in non-Western provinces such as fast-growing Africa. Here, unlike Lambeth, presbyters and laity had a voice, their only forum for international Anglicanism. "Even the women of the Church are well represented in the Congress assembly,"[38] marvelled one organizer over what was still a novel idea.

But the Canadians had an even bigger vision. They hoped

> the Congress will help each province to become a living and loving part of the whole Church, warm-hearted, well-informed, inspired by the Holy Spirit for our World-Mission, and living thoughtfully and intelligently with our neighbours through the new and strange era in which we are called to minister and to witness.

That would depend on more than three or four people per diocese. That was too limiting. Instead, "the whole Church must now be alerted, informed, and called to prayer."[39]

To accomplish this, Ramsey's initial reservations notwithstanding,[40] they hatched the idea of a Communion-wide preparatory year. It had two purposes:

> First, it will alert churchmen to the fact and intent of the Congress, recruiting among the Churches on every continent groups that will study and pray about the Congress, and about the subjects that will be explored by it. ...Our hope is that in every province and in every National Church, our brethren in authority will call every Anglican to some period of study and to much prayer.

They hoped for a million "students and intercessors" for the Congress[41], who would "begin to pray and think along the lines of the Congress programme."[42]

> Secondly, this exercise of study and intercession will lift the minds and hearts of our people above the separating barriers of our world-church, and add to the unity of the Anglican Communion and to the unity of all Christendom. We must find a larger measure of brotherhood and understanding within our own family circle, or else we shall have little to contribute towards the unity of Christendom. [Rather than seeking to glorify Anglicanism, the preparatory year should develop] a new understanding of our world-church, a closer affection for our Anglican neighbours across the seas, and a deeper hunger for that fuller unity towards which God is now leading us.

So an unprecedented surge of publications and publicity ensued. The Canadians published a collection of essays evaluating The Church in the 60's. An American glued descriptive essays based upon "The Friendship Series,"

monthly packets of descriptions, notes, maps and photos about various provinces, into Anglican Homes depicting the Communion's scope.[44]

These were written and initially produced specifically with local levels in mind, that both series "be vigorously applied to parish life." In keeping with that aim, the originators left to each province or diocese how to utilize and disseminate this material: That only made good sense, given the realities of Anglican diversity, the limits of Canadian funds, and the broad scope of their hopes. Already they were looking ahead:

> We are confident that many special and novel and unexpected means will be explored and used in different areas, so that the...objectives may be realized, and the whole Church prepared, informed and excited by the prospect of the Congress, and ready for the follow-up programme that we shall be submitting for parish use.[45]

A Canadian diocese evolved a plan to provide these resources to every Rector with suggestions on using them in sermons, women's, men's and young people's groups in hopes of "lighting a fire of interest and concern in the minds of our people" and giving them

> fresh views of our Anglican Communion, her history, her outreach, her uprising over the barriers of nationality, language and colour, and her destiny as a World-Church, and as an instrument in God's hands for the unity of all Christendom.

Because so few Anglicans understood their own history, much less the need for a Congress or any connection between Church and global issues, a sequence of film strips was proposed.[46]

In England, the Church's Board of Education asked its Adult Committee and Study Centre to make available three inexpensive publications for use throughout the country by clergy and lay discussion groups as well as for those bound for the Congress. These included study outlines of the major themes of the Congress, studies on relationships between the World Council of Churches and the Anglican Communion, and a bibliography for further reading.[47]

Meanwhile, H.C.G. Herklots published Frontiers of the Church, reviewing "The Making of the Anglican Communion" using a term the Congress would

frequently employ.[48] Dewi Morgan, chronocler for the masses of Lambeth, put out an Agenda for Anglicans which concentrated on Anglicanism's role within the ecumenical scope.[49] Magazines devoted series and entire issues to views of the Communion and the Congress.[50]

Howard Johnson's Global Odyssey provided a uniquely valuable resource, rich in local color, spiced with candid observations from one who spent 730 consecutive days exploring the Anglican Communion as no one had ever done before--or since.[51] Through his eyes, innumerable Anglicans became acquainted with themselves. And through Howard Johnson, the Congress was introduced to at least some. Quickly had the Canadians appointed him a kind of roving evangelist who brought information about the congress to the countries he visited,[52] and whose book would be utilized in preparing for the Congress.

These works sought not only to inform about an event; they tried to help Anglicans deal effectively with the world. On occasion, they strayed from long-held views. Nationalism, for example, ceased to be a bugaboo.

> Try to understand African nationalism. Many of these nations are jerry-built, the result of colonial land-grabbing deals made during the last two centuries. The traditional unit is the tribe, not the nation. They have little history and are searching desparately for unity and identity. When the winds of nationalism blow wildly, this is a sign of how difficult that search really is. Let the Christian accept their nationalism. Let him seek identification with the nations which are struggling to be born. Let him encourage the development of structures of genuine national unity. Anglicanism has done this before. It must not be slow in doing it now.
>
> Further, we must bear with the "growing pains" of these new nations. ...The Church should work to moderate the violence, to influence the growth of these nations by becoming a forum for the exchange of opinions, a laboratory for the training of leaders. ...The Church must continue to transcend the nationalism of the new nations.[53]

Christianity, many began saying, could no longer be considered monolithic: "We simply cannot imagine God, ourselves or the world in precisely the same manner as do those who belong to a culture different from our own."[54] This has positive possibilities not only for theology but for mission. Coming into serious contact with non-Christian faiths presents a challenge not simply to be

feared or avoided, as formerly, but welcomed as a means to address more effectively both the non-Christian person and the non-Western culture. "Resurgent Hindus and Buddhists can and do appreciate resurgent Christians. What they cannot appreciate is the Christian who is neither hot nor cold!"[55]

Did that challenge traditional Anglicanism? Then traditionnal Anglicanism warranted a new view. "The essence of Anglicanism is to be expressed in terms of what is now visibly becoming, and will more and more become.... Protestantism is a great historical event; Anglicanism is a great historical process," assured the respected writer Langmead Casserly, in a point Ramsey would pursue in Toronto.

> The grandeur of Anglicanism is not to be found in the original Anglican via media; though pregnant with promise of what was to come, it is in every way inferior to the Anglican synthesis which we can now see to be emerging.... Anglicanism is at its best when it takes the form of an 'onwards to the Anglican synthesis' movement.[56]

Summarized a Canon of Winchester, "The historic definition of Anglicanism needs renewing."[57]

Together, they reviewed the history, life, work, and prospects of the Anglican Communion in individual countries as well as worldwide, with views especially on its mission, interrelationship, and ecumenical prospects. Moreover, they manifested a struggle in the early '60's to confront and understand the new situation presented the Church by nationalistic, cultural, economic and sociological forces. A new appreciation of what some of those forces could contribute combined with a new-found wariness of what previously welcomed influences, such as technology, could bring; at the same time, some of those developments were put to use. Finally, through means of the Preparatory Year, these ideas seeped toward a vastly wider audience than they had ever before been approached.

To the extent that people received them, they were at least somewhat prepared not only for the Congress, but for MRI, and what followed.

C. The Idea of Mutuality

When representatives of the International Missionary Council gathered for their first post-war meeting in Whitby, Ontario, they introduced in their report a phrase, "Partnership in obedience." They called for a new relationship in which, together in response to Christ's command, the Gospel might be preached to every creature.[58] That idea, of course, was by no means new, or even recently rediscovered: "Partnership" was to have been the theme of the 1940 Lambeth Conference, had the world not fallen apart.[59]

Max Warren developed the concept in a series of lectures at Ohio Wesleyan University. A true partnership, he explained, implies "mutual involvement and the mutual acceptance of responsibility and liability."[60] It operates (quoting Tillich) through "listening, giving and forgiving," by each toward the other.[61] It can be illustrated by effective marriage, management, and democratic politics. Partnership reflects the very nature of God; it "speaks of God's relationship with man," and "indicates the true relationship between man and his fellow-men."[62] The concept can benefit relationships within multi-racial societies, denominations, and those who work together in Christian mission. It underscores how unity within the Church relates to unity within the nation.[63] It certainly held implications for how Christians--and, though unspecified, how Anglicans--work together toward their common mission.

> Partnership means involvement between real people in real situations. It means committal of oneself in trust to the genuine integrity of the other person. It calls for a responsible attitude to the other by each. It means the acceptance of a host of liabilities. And all this is completely mutual or it is not partnership.[64]

Such a partnership required sensitive understanding by each for the other: The Asian or African who looks beyond the money from abroad to perceive the "prayer-inspired sacrifice that often makes of that money a sacrifice." The European or American must grapple with the deep and intricate dynamics into which his money is sent, and how that gift might be received.

> Prayer, informed by an imagination which has been nourished by an assiduous use of all the information so readily available in the West,

> will be the first involvement of partnership. From this will follow a sense of responsibility for exploring every possible means of service which will reduce the embarrassment of the Christians of Asia and Africa to the minimum.

That, in turn, will lead to recognizing the freedom of the Asian or African "to decide between the saving essentials of the Christian Gospel and the paraphernalia whether in worship or in organization with which the West has introduced it," and then, finally, "to invest the unchangeable gospel with a dress which will make it so local as to be unmistakably universal."[65]

Stephen Neill underscored one point. Partnership, especially in the sense Whitby had, is "not in the least interested in human arrangements for closer fellowship, which might be dissoluble at will, but only in a common submission to the will of God such as can result only in a divine and permanent fellowship among men."[66] Warren would hardly disagree. However, while well aware of the need for mutual listening, mutual giving and mutual forgiving, Warren does not much explore what or how Asian or African Christians can give to the West. Even as he developed a rationale for redefining "giver/receiver" relationships in new patterns of mutual standing, he does not transpose the concept into the concrete.

Sprinkling Warren's lectures were soon-to-be-familiar words: "Mutuality," "responsibility," "interdependence." He did not put them together; often he cited them from earlier works, such as one on industrial relations emphasizing the need for "mutual responsibility" or from a lecture by Adlai Stevenson on an interdependent world. Warren used the terms to describe relationships within the British Commonwealth of Nations, between married couples, between ecumenical partners.[67]

Whether or not the words were used, a mutually interdependent world was increasingly perceived as a fact of life. Decisions made in a New York office could affect workers in Peru, the Congo or Indonesia; and, no less, a strike or revolt there could influence the course of the business which the New York

officeworkers pursued. No one, and no endeavor, was an island. "What Christians do or do not do in Canada, Australia, Jamaica or South Africa affects profoundly what Hindus and others in Asia may think about Christianity."[68]

Psychiatrists meanwhile were noting the importance of "mutuality." Erik Erikson explained, "I would call mutuality a relationship in which partners depend on each other for the development of their respective strengths." It begins early. "The mutuality of adult and baby is the original source of hope, the basic ingredient of all effective as well as ethical human action." Though parent and child are clearly unequal, the parent, alleged Erikson, "will be strengthened in his vitality, in his sense of identity, and in his readiness for ethical action by the very ministrations by means of which he secures to the child vitality, future identity, and eventual readiness for ethical action." But as the child grows and relationships become more complex, so must the sense of mutuality. In applying these observations in a religious--or at least ethical--sense by exploring the Golden Rule, Erikson ventured

> that truly worthwhile acts enhance a mutuality between the doer and the other--a mutuality which strengthens the doer even as it strengthens the other. Thus, the "doer" and "the other" are partners in one deed. Seen in the light of human development, this means that the doer is activated in whatever strength is appropriate to his age, stage, and condition, even as he activates in the other the strength appropriate to his age, stage and condition.

The Golden Rule, thus translated, suggests "it is best to do to another what will strengthen you even as it will strengthen him--that is, what will develop his best potentials even as it develops your own."[69]

Erikson applied his thesis primarily to personal relationships; yet he noted a connection with Gandhi's principles. He also perceived a significant implication for international relations. In a Cold War era in which the rule seemed to become, "Do not unto others--unless you are sure you can do them in as totally as they can do you in," he proposed an alternative:

> to activate in the historical partner what will strengthen him in his historical development even as it strengthens the actor in his own

> development--toward a common future identity. Only thus can we find a common denominator in the rapid change of technology and history and transcend the dangerous imagery of victory and defeat, of subjugation and exploitation which is the heritage of a fragmented past.[70]

Implications were equally clear for how churches dealt with one another. They needed new ways of relating to each other, new forms of working together, new possibilities for both receiving and giving. Bishops of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon in 1962 affirmed sending and receiving help in the form of personnel and resources across national boundaries. "Where there is need, it becomes incumbent upon the whole Church to respond and overcome the situation." The Body of Christ, in short, knew no borders.[71]

Already in fact some had broken out of their frontiers. Once-young churches had begun sending missionaries to new mission lands, not necessarily contiguous; Australia, for example, sponsored the highly-successful Diocese of Central Tanganyika.[72] But not only were the "white dominions" doing the sending: The Melanesian Brotherhood in the Solomon Islands pioneered in gathering, training and sending workers.[73] The Diocese of the Philippines managed to spare two Filipino priests for North Borneo, and its sister, the Philippine Independent Church, reversed the normal pattern by dispatching one to Honolulu.[74] Small, halting steps though they were, they headed toward what was more and more seen as essential.

Bishop Lesslie Newbigin encapsulated the notion. Speaking in Kuala Lumpur at the East Asian Christian Conference, he called for more such regional patterns of fellowship and mutual aid. Then he continued,

> The crying need of our time is for fresh advance. Our resources have been too much and too long exhausted in the task of keeping us where we are. Our need, the very purpose for which we need a new pattern of relationships is that our dilemma...may be resolved in a new forward movement of evangelism, a movement in which all the resources of all the churches are deployed in full strength and in mutual interdependence.

He confirmed the phrase "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence" the following year in his book A Faith for This One World.[75]

Arguably, even Newbigin defined "interdependence" in a pragmatic, workaday sense, missing the depth of Erikson's explication. But, the response had a name.

Through the years after Lambeth, seeds were planted which would bear fruit at the Anglican Congress, thanks to the preparations being made for the Congress. Some were personal, as the Communion sought consciously to widen the horizons not only of its leadership but also of its laity. Some were in the ideas being conveyed, which provoked a higher awareness of the problems in the world and also the beginnings of solutions.

Although they could not realize it, the Canadian sponsors were preparing for something else, for what became "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence" and what amounted to the rebirth of the Anglican Communion. But MRI grew out of the context of its day; and that had been shaped, at least to some extent, by the way in which the Communion prepared for the Congress. Furthermore, MRI would in turn be conveyed along similar lines and with similar principles as had guided the Year of Preparation: Of local initiative and leadership, of diocesan oversight, of worldwide scope brought down to the most firmly-rooted levels of the Church's life. Preparation thereby became prologue.

Notes to Chapter III

1. Robert Frost, quoted in Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., A Thousand Days (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965), 3.

2. Ibid., 616.

3. Ibid., 807. See chapter XXII, "The World of Diversity," 584-612.

4. Anglican World Mission Committee, "Resume of the Programme and Timetable," Oct. 15, 1963, Gray MSS, 2.

5. Time, 16 August 1963, p. 59.

6. Welsby, 108f.

7. Arthur E. Walmsley, Interview with the author, Hartford, Ct., June 2, 1986

8. Walmsley interview; Gray, "PBCUSA," East and West Review, XXVIII, 4 (October 1962), 111. Warren H. Turner, Jr. was appointed Vice-President of the National Council.

9. Johnson, 138.

10. Time, 16 August 1963, 60.

11. Ralph S. Dean, "Toronto 1963," E&WR, XXIX, 3 (July 1963), 3.

12. Cf. Warren, Partnership, 123.

13. Baker, "Lambeth 1958," IRM, 452f.

14. Cecil Northcott, "Rebirth of a Church?," Christian Century, September 4, 1963, 1071; Richard Emrich, in AC'63, 169.

15. Peter Lewis, The Fifties (New York: J. B. Lippencott Co., 1978), 32. Harold Macmillan could campaign on the restrained positivism of the slogan, "Some of our people never had it so good."

A. The Anglican Executive Officer

16. Lambeth 1958, Resolutions 60, ol, pp. 1.43f.

17. Bentley to Warner, January 30, 1958.

18. Welsby, Olf. Welsby dates the Anglican Consultative Council from the 1958 Conference. Rather, that year saw the reaffirmation of the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy and a Consultative Body which prefaced its name with "Lambeth." It began to function, but not as fully as planned, so that in 1968 the ACC as it now exists replaced both the ACMS and the LCB. cf. John Howe, Highways and Hedges (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1985), 73-91 for a discussion of the evolution.

19. Christian Living (New York: Seabury Press, 1957).

20. Quoted by Margaret Chisholm in an interview with the author, London, June 13, 1980, p. 3.

21. Cf. Bayne Bibliography, 4, 17-23, etc.; and Bayne MSS in General Theological Seminary, New York.

22. SPG memo, Jan. 31, 1958.

23. Chisholm interview, 1.

24. Chisholm interview, 9, 3; John V. Taylor, letter to the author.

25. Chisholm interview, 9.

26. Anglican Church of Canada, General Synod Committee minutes, November 11, 1960 (copy in WMC MSS), 4.

27. Chisholm interview, 1.

28. General Synod Committee minutes, November 11, 1960, 4.

29. David M. Paton, interview with the author, Gloucester, England, July 2, 1986.

30. SPB, letter of invitation to Missionary Executives Conference, January 22, 1963, ACC Archives.

31. "Latin America: The report of the Consultation on 'The Anglican Communion and Latin America,' Cuernavaca, Mexico, January 20-24, 1963," ACMS doc. 63/1; "Missionary Strategy in relation to Africa," [1963], ACMS doc. 63/2.

B. Towards Toronto

32. Lambeth '58 Resolution #68(c), p. 1.46.

33. Whitely, Frontier Mission, 6; Dean, "Toronto 1963," 3.

34. E.g. WHC to Ven. W. J. Gilling, secretary of the Programme Committee, August 8, 1960, WHC papers.

35. Dean, E&WR, 3; Howard Clarke, [Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada], Letter to the Archbishops and Diocesan Bishops of the Anglican Communion, November 1960, WHC MSS, p. 2.

36. Clarke, ibid., p. 1, quoting J. G. H. Baker.

37. Dean, "Toronto 1963," 4.

38. G. N. Luxton, "Why an Anglican Congress?," E&WR, XXVIII, 4 (October 1962), 106 (emphasis in original).

39. Ibid., 105 (emphasis in original).

40. Minutes of General Synod Committee on the Anglican Congress, 1963, November 11, 1960, 2. He felt clergy "would not be too eager to become involved in it as there are so many 'Years' being named it would have no special effect."

41. George Luxton in introduction to Anglican Mosaic, 18.

42. Anglican Congress Editorial Committee, "An Outline of a Preparatory Year," n.d., p. 1, WHC papers.

43. George Luxton in introduction to Anglican Mosaic, 18.

44. Jefferson, ed., Church in the 60's; Leidt, ed., Anglican Mosaic; William E. Leidt, undated memorandum enclosing third monthly Friendship Series packet, JWH MSS.

45. Anglican Congress Editorial Committee, "An Outline of a Preparatory Year," n.d., WHC MSS, p. 1.

46. G.N.L. [George N. Luxton], "A Sample Diocesan Plan for the Preparatory Year of the Anglican Congress of 1963", July 1962. JWH MSS.

47. E&WR, XXIX, 2 (April, 1963), 7.

48. London: Ernest Benn & Co. 1961.

49. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1963.

50. E.g. The East and West Review, XXVIII, no. 4 (October 1962) and XXIX no. 3 (July 1963) [published by S.P.C. and C.M.S]; Pan-Anglican, Easter 1963 [published in Hartford, edited by Bishop Grey].

51. Johnson's work seems generally to have been welcomed. Inevitably in such a personal book, his more acidic observations were questioned (and in one case vociferously challenged on the floor of the Anglican Congress by a Middle-east bishop who resented Johnson's insinuations). The most salient comment came from a reviewer who noted that Johnson saw little outside of the Anglican; he did not explore a given situation's ecumenical or inter-faith context. J. G. H. Baker, F&WR, XXIX, 1 (1963), 6.

52. General Synod minutes, November 11, 1960, 3.

53. John G. Rowe, "Accepting the Political Challenges," Chapter 5 of Jefferson, ed., The Church in the 60's, 76.

54. W. R. Coleman, "Confronting the Cultural Challenges," Chapter 6 of Jefferson, ed., The Church in the 60's, 84.

55. R.H.L. Slater, "Reaching the Non-Christian Faiths," Chapter 3 in Jefferson, ed., The Church in the 60's, 51.

56. Langmead Casserly in Christian Community [1960], quoted in Morgan, Agenda, 67.

57. Roger Lloyd, quoted in Time, 16 August 1963, 53.

C. The Idea of Mutuality

58. Cf. Stephen Neill, Unfinished Task, 154, 165.

59. Partners: The Seventh Unified Statement, 1939-1960 (London: Published for the Missionary Council..., 1939).

60. Warren, Partnership, 113; cf. 12f. for a fuller definition.

61. In ibid., 12.

62. Ibid., 35.

63. Ibid., chapters 5, 3 and 4; 72.

64. Ibid., 92.

65. Ibid., 93ff.

66. Neill, Unfinished Task, 154a.

67. Ibid., (quoting George Goyder, The Future of Private Enterprise [1954]), p. 25; (quoting Stevenson, Call to Greatness [1954]) p. 33; 108, 23, 85.

68. R.H.L. Slater, "Reaching the Non-Christian Faiths," ch. 3 in Jefferson, ed., The Church in the 60's, 51.

69. Erik H. Erikson, "The Golden Rule in the Light of New Insight," in Insight and Responsibility (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1963), 231-233. The essay derives from ideas developed in a lecture in Harvard and given in final form in New Delhi in January 1963. Italics in original.

70. Ibid., 242. Italics in original.

71. Kenneth Anand, in AC'63, 140.

72. Johnson, 109f.

73. Ibid., 309f.

74. Olgilby, in Coburn & Pittenger, 246.

75. Quoted in Barry Till, Change and Exchange: Mutual Responsibility and the Church of England (London: Missionary and Ecumenical Council of the Church Assembly, 1964), 51; emphasis in original.

76. Ibid., 52.

V. "The Rebirth of the Anglican Communion": Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence

As delegates from throughout the world wended toward Toronto, they anticipated an exciting, thought-provoking Anglican Congress would spur the Communion's mission. They could not anticipate what Michael Ramsey would term "the Rebirth of the Anglican Communion." Not even the self-styled obstetrician, Stephen Bayne, realised what was already in process of being born.[1]

A. The Executives Struggle

Already, various "pre-meetings" had begun. A Missionary Executives' Conference from July 29-August 5 at Huron College in London, Ontario gathered representatives of seventeen provinces, including two archbishops, twelve bishops, deputies of English missionary societies, delegates from Africa (four of the nine from Southern Africa), Asia (six), and the Jerusalem Archbishopric (one, the sole layman). But it was predominantly Western in membership. Twenty would stay for the meeting of Primates as advisors, plus three who were dual hats. Stephen Bayne was vocally present throughout.[2]

It was a group keenly and intimately concerned with mission. They were acutely aware of the problems of mission; indeed, they were among those who first voiced them.[3] Not having gathered before, they had much to discuss. They wasted no time. Leading off was Max Warren, who after two decades was leaving the CMS to John Taylor as he headed for Westminster Abbey.

He cited the quandries of how to support Churches in newly-independent countries who cherish independence but plead for assistance. He suggested a distinction. "In the deepest sense of the word there is no question of independence for a Church. There is autonomy. But if we are indeed in our togetherness [in] the Body of Christ, then our relationship is one of interdependence."[4]

On that basis he began defining a new relationship. "No one can question the rightness of a relationship of 'asking and receiving,'" he said, "though we must all work hard toward the day when there can be such a mutuality in this that we shall all know ourselves to be, what, in principle, we all most certainly are, each others[']s debtors."

This held direct implications for Western Churches.

> How this sense of indebtedness can be best promoted among the affluent members of our Communion is one of the most urgent tasks facing us in the days ahead. For only as it is so promoted and becomes part of all our thinking and praying, giving and serving, will the hopes of our brethren of the 'young' Churches become realistic and realisable and perhaps refashioned.

Third-world expectations were changing, he said, both of themselves and their "elders," bringing about a discovery of their own self-hood and of a relationship between themselves. In light of that, Warren proposed five priorities: "The better training, the more adequate maintenance, and the pastoral caring for the clergy"; lay training for evangelism; "organs of spiritual initiative...which are not under clerical control"; retreat and conference centers, and, just as important, a form of capital improvement and endowment to make possible the other four. Wealthier churches could provide

> some measure of help whereby the newly established dioceses and provinces could have even a margin of resource over and above their present income by which to take some of those spiritual initiatives... initiatives which those working in those dioceses and provinces are in so many cases eager to take if only they had such a margin."[6]

When he finished, a Japanese-based delegate asked whether the Conference consisted of "a group of older churches inviting younger churches to listen in, or whether we were a group of the whole church thinking together." Beneath his question lay the issue of the nature of the Anglican Communion: Did it consist of senders and receivers, or instead, of partners in the Church's mission?

innocuous at the time, it transformed the conference, encapsulating what Warren tried to say and redirecting the focus of the gathering altogether. Bayne noted in his journal how the comment "actually did us an enormous service in getting our relationships straight, as the days went on." He too had perceived the disparity between encouraging provincial responsibility over and above diocesan endeavors to meet the needs of the Church as a whole, while at the same time lacking "much idea about planning and priorities." The comment also echoed his experience as APO which drew him to the idea of "mutuality of planning. No one is independent. We must find ways in which this mutual planning can be developed. Each Church has something to teach the others."[7]

Bayne later noted "how--in those first two hours--almost every note was struck which finally emerged, two weeks later, as 'Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ.'"[8] It took two tedious, meeting-filled weeks to compose, but the theme had been sounded by Max Warren, as he had done, solo, in 1956 before the Primates but this time with a chorus to back him up of Stephen Bayne and anonymous voices from the floor. Missionary executives labored on Warren's four priorities and especially the fifth, which would fund the others. But as one conference turned to another, his most basic point, on relationships of interdependence, became the paramount concern.

For two days, wrestling with particular issues in specific regions kept bringing these back to key matters. One concerned personnel exchanges. Bishop Bentley of 815, perhaps recalling a recent glowing Time cover story,[9] suggested a Christian parallel to the Peace Corps to tap the energies and excitements of young people for limited periods of time. Meanwhile "there was also a clear feeling that we should not lose sight of the ideal of the lifelong ministry of the missionary who identifies himself fully for life, with the area to which [he] goes." This in turn questioned how one Church should relate to another, and how it should train and support its emissaries--and more basically the nature of Christian service.[10]

A second concerned planning within the collegial Anglican structure. "No one Church or mission is its own affair," a South African bishop reiterated. "Only in following this line shall we find reality and reciprocity." Yet this returned the executives to the question of assistance, in personnel but even more in money, and whether an overseas church should help with "missionary" or with "administrative" aid--if those two could be distinguished.[11]

These and related themes--literature, engagement of other faiths, diocesan and provincial structures--comprised a kind of polyphony, distinct yet related; and all building to a grand climax which caught everyone by surprise. As Bayne remembered,

> Although we attempted to reach no final answers, we were beginning to see both the usefulness and the problems of a capital fund program. Our attention had begun to focus on the reality of the responsible freedom of the younger church. We had tackled the ecumenical issue for the first time, and were ready to tink about the resolution on continuing aid which ultimately emerged. We were beginning to grapple with the question of Christian service to emerging societies, which meant, in turn, taking a fresh look at the secular needs of a society. Finally, we had encountered, in some depth, the whole question of the relationships and obligations of one Anglican church to another--how can we help, where should we help, and all the rest of

--suddenly Bayne's journal ends, mid-sentence, as if on the verge of something so new and unforeseen he could not yet express it.[12] For all their reports, the missionaries could not quite voice an ineffable theme. "Certain deep hopes, discontents, determinations, and insights kept welling up to the surface," Bayne later explained. "By the end of the first week at Huron, it was clear that we were at a major turning point in Anglican life, whatever direction it might take."[13]

They tried. They poured out a stream of papers and recommendations to primatial superiors announcing their concerns. Organization, they felt, would improve by appointing regional officers for Africa, India, Latin America, Pakistan and the Middle East, the South Pacific, and South East Asia. A variant on Fisher's initial idea, these officers would assist "in developing mutual life and planning, in ecumenical relationships, and in communication

with other Anglican regions and churches," while representing "the whole life and unity of the Anglican Communion" and extending the work of the Executive Officer.[14] They proposed regional councils and suggested strengthening the provincial structure, including channelling appeals to older churches for resources through a province rather than directly from a diocese.[15]

"One of the most significant and helpful" documents in Bayne's eyes[16] explored new dimensions of planning within a decidedly spiritual context. It had four headings. First, "education for Mission." This section cited

> a universal need...to awaken in the Church a realization that the world has a claim upon us, and we are only discharging a small part of our debt. Each diocese, each congregation has to become aware of its missionary function and develop a genuine concern for it. This applies equally to the world in its immediate environment and the world in distant parts. Such concern must lead to costly and regular intercessory prayer.

It also must lead to literature which presents "the biblical motivation of mission" and the "re-thinking of mission in New Testament terms" as a means of freeing mission from culturally-bound (read "Western") associations. In turn, "the Church in every place has to learn to think of itself as part of the whole church, engaged in a total mission, and must be prepared to learn from other parts as well as to teach them about its own work." Sharing information becomes the more important.[17]

"Study for Mission" too assumes greater priority. For the missionaries, that included "expert studies by social scientists," "self-studies by congregations, under expert guidance, using local leadership," and mutually-undertaken efforts by local and overseas churches on broader influences on given areas, for example the role of the United Nations, effects of governmental policies or particular needs and resources. "These kinds of study," they emphasized, "are not expensive luxuries, but necessities for effective missionary work."[18]

Machinery for planning, they observed, demanded "reappraisal in the light of new developments, political and ecclesiastical, Anglican and ecumenical." They cited the evolution of provincial structures in which all bishops are

associated, the amalgamation of the SPG and USCA toward promoting closer relationships among missionary agencies, and the proposal for regional officers under the Executive Officer and ACMS.[19]

For "Mobilization of Resources," the executives emphasized a relationship of giving and receiving. They summoned

> each of our churches to make full use of the resources within itself and its Anglican tradition; through fuller use of the Bible and the liturgy, through vocational training of lay men and women and adaptation of the working methods of the ordained ministry, and through fresh understandings of the nature of episcopacy.

Resources, they stressed, should be shared--between neighboring provinces, from the whole Communion--"and not only in those directions from which financial support has hitherto come": Brazil or India are capable of exporting spiritual insight to North America, for example. "In the exchange of missionaries between our churches we believe that every church needs to give and to receive." Of course common action and planning would be necessary in training and orienting missionary personnel and in sharing both experience and facilities; training workers in the lands where they shall serve furthermore builds up international teams and diminishes "relics of special privilege." "In the sharing of money...we all have a contribution to make, and we are convinced that a common effort will multiply our resources." In this, as in all things, ecumenical cooperation is urged.[20]

As Bayne noted, "Although it was written before the major proposal of 'Mutual Responsibility' had been drafted, it is interesting to note how many of the elements stressed in the central manifesto are echoed in this more detailed study of planning."[21]

Other studies followed, on education, training and literature, ecumenical ramifications, and of special ministries.

Their masterwork, though, was what they called "Mutual Responsibility for Mission." A forthright statement to their primates, the executives stated the problem and implored an immediate response led by the primates by the entire

Communion. "Our churches in many parts of the world are carrying the load of our common mission with wholly inadequate resources," it began. "They need to be freed from the penury which keeps them from carrying out their mission and ours to the world in Christ's name, and to seize opportunities of evangelism which lie before them." The Communion had the assets; it was not effectively distributing them. Of $400 million in annual revenue, only $10 million went from one Province to another. Meanwhile, as countries switched from subsistence to cash economies, costs rose more rapidly than the resources of many local churches. They could not keep pace.

The first step, they said, was a survey of work being done, of manpower, facilities, and financial resources, to discover areas of most urgent need.

But the crisis could not await a study. Priorities which Max Warren identified--for training of clergy and lay leaders, for new buildings, conference centers and retreat centers, for literature centers--were too dire. New Provinces required administrative and travel provisions, and so did bishops of new dioceses. Projects to meet ever-changing situations needed emergency funds to launch them, such as from a revolving loan fund within the Province.

The ACMS executive office warranted strengthening so as to evaluate crises, new horizons, and possibilities of growth. "Our mutual responsibility will then be expressed by each church and missionary agency in our Communion adopting such projects from the total programme of advance as the ACMS shall invite them to undertake."

They cited needs for clergy pensions.

All of this arose from five convictions:

> First, that a new level and programme of mutual responsibility in mission is now a supreme necessity.
> Second, that every church and churchman of our Communion should share in this programme in proportion to ability.
> Third, that this appeal should be presented as part of the mutual and equal brotherhood of the Anglican Communion, within the single mission which commands us all.
> Fourth, that the Metropolitans and Diocesan Bishops should give the clearest lead to their dioceses and people to fulfill more than what is required of them, calling on the churches--especially in the

> more affluent nations—to put mission first in their planning, to judge their own priorities so that they do not place secondary needs of their own ahead of the primary needs of their fellow-churches, even to forego the fulfilment of some of their own projects so that the essential needs of brother churches can be met.
>
> Finally, that greatest emphasis now be laid to adequate, thorough, mutual planning so that the necessary long-range programmes can be developed and shared as quickly as possible.

They called their Churches "to mutual responsibility in an immediate programme of new projects amounting to $43 million (£15 million) over the next five years, over and above our present overseas commitments." As "an immediate necessity, not a final goal," it would not even meet what the various churches required. "We do not now know even the scope of such fundamental needs. But we do know the immediate emergency needs of the explosive frontiers of the Church; and we know our own need to move forward in brotherhood in mission."

> At least $15 million is needed now, to hold ground already won, to train clergy and lay leadership better to meet the requirements of new social frontiers and to preach the Gospel there, to set churches and bishops free for their true witness and ministry, to give provinces the tools to make their autonomy real, to reach toward a level of responsible partnership appropriate to the present life of the church and the world, and to enable the churches of the Anglican Communion to express more adequately their true brotherhood in mission.

They urged the Anglican Congress to challenge "our people...to respond to this call for a world-wide effort and to carry the same through to fulfillment."[22]

So the missionaries recommended what many had predicted with a sigh: a capital funds drive.[23] But they stood on the threshold of something very new, for their documents, especially the last, opened doors through which winds could blow that could potentially change the Anglican Communion. It was not for them to step through the door. Their ideas needed refashioning, their vision reshaping, and their hopes announced by authority. But those who would provide what the executives lacked could work from the document the executives prepared. That would become, in its fullness, "MRI."

E. The Primates Take Over

As the missionaries disbanded, their bosses, the 31 bishops and archbishops representing the provinces worldwide, took their place in Huron. As a group they had not met since Lambeth. Ramsey, the "new boy," was in the chair. They fell into predictable groups: "Five African bishops were huddled together," recalls one attendee. "Wales, Scotland, Ireland and Australia sat as a bloc. Jerusalem, CIPBC were backed up by Singapore and Malaysia. Japan slept next to New York. Canada and six of us from the [US] provinces behind." As presidents of American provinces usually just chaired regional meetings of diocesan representatives, equality with archbishops was a rare role; but Lichtenburger wanted them to share the responsibility, and he was not feeling well.[24]

Bishops from "receiving churches" caucused as had the executives for the first time. They had much to discuss. They also had much to convey, for, unlike the missionaries, older-church leaders often had little notion of new realities elsewhere. So the bishops of new provinces gave a quick lesson on world realities as they outlined their problems. Because "until this time apparently there was no communication of any depth between these people, they almost exploded in frustration," Bishop Nelson Burroughs remembers. "The Africans were extremely vocal, spoke extremely well, and poured out their hearts. Africa burned itself into our consciousness."[25]

Statistics streamed out, as well as emotion: Advisors--some of them veterans of the missionaries' conference--"impressed and depressed" their fathers-in-God with the number of overseas workers from Canada (63), the U.S. (290), Australia (473) and England (2,000). Mission societies work in the same place, often confusingly; theological seminaries are weak; changes in Africa switch schools from Christian to national auspices; a "pulsating upsurge" of Muslims confronts "our God with a long face" on a cross. African Anglicans outnumber North and South American Anglicans. "For the first time it dawned on us that the Anglican Communion is no longer an English Church."[26]

West African bishops detailed urgent needs: For preparing men for Orders, for training laity to "witness within modern society," for primary evangelism, for resources to cope with agricultural and industrial development and social upheaval; for more, and more manageable, dioceses; for strengthening Church work in education, medicine and literature: for improved coordination, and, a longstanding problem, for providing pensions.[27] They wanted to rethink how teachers from established Churches could aid younger seminaries, how retreat centers could help, how regional officers might help to coordinate efforts.[28]

Stephen Bayne, as ACMS secretary, saw his opening. Briefly he related how the executives confronted "many perplexities and difficulties" as the ACMS was now facing, and how these led "to a new understanding of brotherly, mutual relationship." For him the "crowning gain" was the draft paper on "Mutual Responsibility for Mission" which "envisioned a very great step forward in responsible partnership within the Anglican Communion."[29]

Immediately questions arose. Should a financial goal be mentioned or not? Was $15 million adequate? More basically, what was envisioned, a new "appeal" or a new level of relationship? Ramsey said it was above all a new process.

> It was the conviction of the Conference and the ACMS that the Anglican Communion must tackle mission in a totally new way. This would involve new procedures[30] which would take time. But mostly it would involve new attitudes.

As the Primates adjourned for Compline and a night's rest, they had plenty of issues to ponder and a potential response still to articulate. Even more, they had some dilemmas to resolve, some held over from Lambeth. For one, how was mission to be conducted: on an independent basis as through autonomous voluntary societies, or through more centralized coordination? What was the nature of mission, and missionary commitment? The "who, what, when, where, why and how" questions plagued the conference with issues that could not be resolved by the entire group. The Archbishop appointed a drafting committee* to see what it could do at least with the Mutual Responsibility paper.[31]

---

*Leonard Beecher of East Africa, R. R. Roseveare of Accra, I. A. Norris of Brandon, Canada, Dr. John Moore of the U.S. and John V. Taylor, newly appointed general secretary of the C.M.S.

As days wore on in Canada's summer heat, the issues kept arising: Whether or not to pursue work in "neglected" Latin America, whether "regional officers" to supplement the AEO might improve mutual responsibility in meeting needs or whether they would breed "curialism," how to develop lay abilities and mass media outlets, how to improve partnership with sister denominations.[32]

When the ACMS tackled the paper on planning, issues came to a head. It became clear that "mutual responsibility" was beginning to permeate the ideas of the Primates as it had the missionaries. The planning paper, while repeating much of the "mutual responsibility" ideas, was crucial, Bayne explained, because it would cause each Church to educate for mission and develop machinery for planning. It was a necessary undergirding for what they all hoped would begin to happen. That Wednesday morning was particularly hot, and--after weeks of endless meetings--nerves may have been on edge. Bayne cited "a spirited exploration of the words 'mission' and 'missionary,' as to their validity and relevance." This was the point of the Warren-Ramsey wrangle over not just terms but concepts, deep convictions, and directions for the Communion.[33]

But how mutual could planning be?

> Here the consensus seemed to be that we were moving and must move into a new area of inter-church relationships, in which strategic planning will grow not from considerations of national interest or the attractiveness of certain fields of work or the decisions of some central body, but from the self-study of each church to determine where its own missionary involvement should lie. This required a mutual relationship in planning, no matter how complicated such a process appeared.[34]

A way forward was emerging. By shared planning relying on careful study at the provincial level as to what the province's own priorities should be, the dilemma could be resolved. But how could that be expressed?

And what of resources? On the one side, Africans--among many--had cited pressing priorities needing immediate funding. On the other, long-term development demanded money and manpower on a sustained basis. The primates realised the two were not inconsistent, but still required working out.[35]

The drafting committee met with Bayne, their work cut out for them. "In the plenary sessions no one seemed able to resolve the fundamental differences," recalls John Taylor, so the burden fell upon the committee. They talked until 2 a.m. and broke up "fairly chaotically," though "we did perceive some lines for advance in which the opposing parties might co-operate." Bayne agreed to "knock together what we had been discussing. He must have stayed up the rest of the night, because by breakfast we had a draft" which summarized what was becoming MRI. "It was a remarkable achievement in drafting," Taylor concludes. "It was not unfaithful to our discussion, but it certainly introduced new ideas and gave a coherence which was quite fresh, and its sheer brilliance won the acclaim and endorsement of the whole conference."[36]

By its Thursday, August 8 adjournment, the ACMS approved the idea of regional officers. It commended the Wider Episcopal Fellowship and the Anglican Cycle of Prayer. It urged the Archbishop to appoint a study-group on pensions. It explored how to fund what they were voting. Finally, it heard Leonard Beecher read out Bayne's magnum opus. What was first conceived as a capital funds campaign was, after two drafts, something quite different. "Capital Funds had, in effect, disappeared; and the principal emphasis now lay on the element of mutuality." Twice more it had been redone. "Mission" had now been deleted; and what was now proposed was nothing less than a new form of the Anglican Communion."[37]

First reactions were predictably divided. It needed expansion. It needed abbreviation. It would complicate the Congress program. It would be disasterous if it were not presented to the Congress. Emanating from the particular experience of the Conference, it might not be understood by those who had not been there. The final word: "That the proposal represented a major "break-through" in Anglican life."[38] One thing was clear: No longer would this be a bishops' crusade for funds; that was the wrong way.[39] Nor could any one campaign meet the needs that existed. The question, Bayne later wrote,

was decreasingly what other churches needed and increasingly "what we needed--what all churches needed. And as God led us to see this (for I truly believe this was his doing), one by one all the possible alternatives dropped away."

A larger point was at work. Works-righteousness, in the guise of an appeal, could not encompass it. "To ask ourselves, of our generosity or piety, to give a little extra to help God out was an absolute degradation of the truth about mission, of our own mature responsibility for one another," asserted Bayne.[40] Rather, this marked something strikingly new, something more profound and farther-reaching than any had imagined when they came--including Stephen Bayne himself.[41] They stood on a threshold watching a birth.

Archbishop Ramsey agreed to lead the presentation himself, and his colleague, Coggan of York, along with the Bishop of Singapore and Malaya, would join the drafting committee for final editing. With that, the ACMS adopted the "Mutual Responsibility" paper as "a fundamental statement of policy," to be reported to the Congress and to the Communion. Then it adjourned.[42]

As ACMS broke up, the Lambeth Consultative Body took over the same meeting room--with many of the same people.[43] Then the Congress began, but as it did, on August 13, the drafting committee gathered once again for a fifth redaction.[44] They readied what Archbishop Donald Coggan read to the Congress on Saturday, August 17 in the Royal York Hotel, the mouthful called "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ."[45]

C. The MRI Document

What did this piece of workmanship say?

A product of the Primates and Metropolitans, it was a manifesto of Communion's leaders. It did not come from a synod of bishops (though that is what all were). However respectable its parentage, the document carried no authority of its own. What it said, therefore, had to carry its weight on its own merits.

It sought, first, to reflect that the world had changed, and that the Church had to do more than just catch up. The primates were confronted by the "critical needs for money and manpower needed even to keep the Church alive in many areas." This did not indicate paucity of resources so much as poverty of imagination. "The ideas, the pictures we have of one another and of our common life in Christ, are utterly obsolete and irrelevant to our actual situation." Old concepts of "givers" and "receivers" had become totally inadequate; a new world demanded a new world view. No less did a new Communion require a new understanding.

Second, that demanded a new quality of relationship among Anglicans. "The keynotes of our time are equality, interdependence, mutual responsibility."[46]

Three truths stood at the heart of this: First, the reiteration that "The Church's mission is response to the living God Who in His love creates, reveals, judges, redeems, fulfills," moving through history to teach, save, and call to obedience and service. The second expounded what binds Anglicans. "Our unity in Christ, expressed in our full communion, is the most profound bond among us, in all our political and racial and cultural diversity." So, then, what now? A third truth pointed ahead. "The time has fully come when this unity and interdependence must find a completely new level of expression and corporate obedience." The need was not alone for greater generosity, but for a deepened understanding of "how God has led us...to see the gifts of freedom and communion in their great terms, and to live up to them."[47]

How?

The document called first for a comprehensive analysis of what the Communion needed and could offer--of needs and resources of every type.[48]

Second, because "we cannot wait for the results of such long-range studies," the primates asked each province to affirm its share of an overall commitment to increase financial support by at least $15 million (.5 million) over five years above and beyond current budgets. Rather than a one-time

measure, this marked a first step toward enhanced, sustained, expanding patterns of giving "if our churches' work, born of the devotion of countless faithful Christians, is to survive."

Instead of creating a central fund, these resources would flow through current channels or newly-developed ones, from church to church and thus "intensifying the awareness of responsible partnership which is of such cardinal importance in our time." Each church would determine what it could give, without quotas being assigned. There would be no coercion.

A central collecting-point would provide ideas of what is already needed, such as training of clerical and lay leadership through existing or enlarged centers, travel and scholarship aid, conference and retreat centers, and centers for communications. They included construction of churches and necessary buildings in new areas of Christian expansion. Finally, they included support of the new provinces "if they are to be rescued from the humiliation of beggary and given the means to make their freedom real."[49]

Third, "we ask a parallel commitment as to manpower. The absolute shortage of priests in our Communion is measured in thousands. Their training is one of the primary needs our increased support will meet." No less important were the laity "longing everywhere to be involved more deeply as Christians in the life and service of their nation."[50] The ACMS had passed a report which outlined how laity away from their homelands could serve their Church more fully; it was printed with the MRI document for distribution worldwide.[51]

Fourth, inter-Anglican consultation, deepened over the years, must be extended. The AEO had been one step; regional officers were now approved. The primates agreed, too, to gather more frequently among themselves. But it could not stop there. It had to descend to more local levels. Thus they urged Churches to plan when possible on inter-provincial levels, and utilize teams from elsewhere in the Communion. The primates, for their part, would study issues of pay, pension and educational standards to facilitate sharing.[52]

Because true mutuality meant reaching to each level of Anglican life, the Primates made a fifth plea. "Each church must radically study the form of its own obedience to mission and the needs it has to share in the single life and witness of our church everywhere." This is what made MRI truly unique.

> Mission is not only a giving to others, it is equally a sharing and receiving.... Each church has both resources and needs. If planning and responsible partnership are to be truly mutual, we must everywhere ask ourselves...what we have, what we need, and where we are called of God to share in major partnership with our fellow Christians.[53]

Finally, the document called for a new concept of both Anglicanism and mission. Terminology of "older" and "younger," "sender" and "receiver" churches "is unreal and untrue in the world and in our Communion"--especially when each has something to offer and something to receive. "Mission is not the kindness of the lucky to the unlucky; it is mutual, united obedience to the one God Whose mission it is. The form of the Church must reflect that."[54]

What then was the Communion to do? The Primates had some answers.

First, that each Church commit to the funds campaign, each setting its own timetable, methods and goals, but mindful that "in many parts of the world we have little time left for this kind of partnership--some doors have already closed."[55]

Second, that each Church "begin at once a radical study of its own obedience to mission": of its structures, its theology, its priorities in light of realities in world and church; of its training of laity and clergy "asking whether in fact God's mission is central in our teaching"; of the very use and understanding of the word "mission." Priorities needed reconsideration: Building a new organ in Lagos or New York might mean training twelve fewer priests in Asia or Latin America. Funding inherited institutions in England or India long past their usefulness may deprive Uganda or the South Pacific of teachers.[56] What questions Howard Johnson was asking, the Primates now put to the entire Communion.

Third, "That every church seek the way to receive as well as give." Another church or culture has much to share when openness receives it. "Full communion means either very little, if it be taken as a mere ceremonial symbol, or very much if it be understood as an expression of our common life and fortune."[57]

Fourth, "that every church seek to test and evaluate every activity in its life by the test of mission and of service in others, in our following after Christ." This was the essence of the Christian Church and the Anglican Communion, not "to be a club or an association of like-minded and congenial people," nor a collection of Anglophiles scattered across the globe. Instead, "the Church exists to witness, to obey and to serve. All our planning must be tested by this."[58]

Finally, that each Church develop "every possible channel of communication with its companions" both Anglican and ecumenical. Partnership grows with communication, especially of a type which promotes "deep and deliberate involvement in one another's affairs and life." This too had local ramifications, reorienting parish teaching, restructuring prayers, renewing exchange programs, and redesigning ways by which "common life and mutual interdependence may be expressed."[59]

What they asked was truly revolutionary, as they well knew. Seeing the program in its true spirit "will mean the death of much that is familiar about our churches now. It will mean radical change in our priorities--even leading us to share with others at least as much as we spend on ourselves. It means the death of old isolations and inherited attitudes. It means a willingness to forego many desirable things, in every church." They summarized,

> In substance, what we are really asking is the rebirth of the Anglican Communion, which means the death of many old things but--infinitely more--the birth of entirely new relationships. We regard this as the essential task before the churches of the Anglican Communion now.[60]

Bishops were astounded at their own thoughts. "It never occurred to people at home as receiving anything from those who were 'receiving,'" recalled Bishop Burroughs. To "give away at least as much as you spend on yourself--that was a very revolutionary idea."[61]

The needs which were cited, of course, were not. They had accumulated over many years, as has been seen; the Huron conferences brought them out and gave them urgency. There were concrete needs--for clergy, money, buildings, books; but there were institutional needs too--for coordination, planning, cohesion. Underlying them all was the deeper need for Anglicans to grow up, both in what they did, how they did it, and most fundamentally how they understood it all.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. Chisholm interview.

2. Bayne, ed., Minutes of the Missionary Executives' Conference, July 29-August 5, [1963,] ACC Archives, pp. 1-2.

3. Bishop Eric Trapp headed the SPG group who sent the lengthy memorandum to Committee IIIA of the 1958 Lambeth Conference; Canon Warren, of course, had spoken frequently and freely. Cf. Chapter 3, above.

4. M. A. C. Warren, "A Paper Read to the Conference of Missionary Executives of the Anglican Communion at Huron College, Ontario, on Monday, July 29, 1963," mimeo in ACC Archives, p. 5.

5. Ibid., 6.

6. Ibid., 9-11.

7. Bayne, Notes on Meetings of Missionary Executives, ACC Archives, July 29, 1963, p. 3.

8. Bayne, "Journal of the Missionary Executives' Conference, Huron College, July 29-August 5, 1963," ACC Archives, p. 2.

9. "By any reasonable standard, the U. S. Peace Corps has been a fine overall success." Time, July 5, 1963, 18ff.

10. Bayne, Journal, July 31, pp. 4-5; Notes, p. 18f.

11. Quoting the Bishop of Grahamstown [J. E. Taylor] or Johannesburg [L. E. Strading], Notes, July 30, 1963, p. 7; Bayne, Journal, p. 2.

12. Journal, July 31, p. 6.

13. Bayne, ed., MRI, introduction, 11.

14. "Regional Officers," in MRI, 28f.

15. "Province, Council and Diocese," in MRI, 31.

16. Bayne introduction to "Planning," MRI, 33.

17. "Planning," MRI, 35-37.

18. Ibid., 37f.

19. Ibid., 38ff.

20. Ibid., 49f.

21. Bayne, in introduction to "Planning," MRI, 33.

22. "Statement from Missionary Executives Conference to ACMS on Mutual Responsibility for Mission," Appendix B to ACMS minutes, pp. 1-3.

23. Bayne, Introduction to MRI, 12 [quoting the primate of Canada].

B. The Primates Take Over

24. Burroughs interview.

25. Ibid..

26. Ibid.

27. Bayne, ed., Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy, Minutes, Meeting at Huron College, London, Ontario, August 5-8, 1963 (ACC Archives, Stencil Book 5, #158), Appendix A, "Resolution from the African Archbishops' Conference," 5 August, 1963, 2.

28. ACMS Minutes, August 5, 1963, 3.

29. ACMS Minutes, August 5, 1963, 2.

30. ACMS Minutes, August 5, 3.

31. Ibid., August 6, 1963, 4.

32. Ibid., August 6, 1963, 5-7.

33. Cf. above, 40f.

34. ACMS Minutes, August 6, 1963, 8

35. Ibid.

36. Taylor, telephone interview with the author, July 1, 1986, and letter to the author, July 2, 1986.

37. ACMS Minutes, August 8, 1963,. 11-14.

38. Ibid., 14.

39. Burroughs interview.

40. Bayne, Introduction to MRI 10.

41. AC'63, 128; Chisholm interview, Taylor interview.

42. ACCB Minutes, August 8, 14.

43. Bayne, ed., Lambeth Consultative Body, Minutes, Meeting at Huron College, London, Ontario, August 8-10, 1963 (ACC Archives, Stencil Book 5, #134), p. 1. The LCB approved the presentation of MRI to the Anglican Congress, seeking to arrange details in such a way "that the proposals themselves be made the center of the presentation." Minutes, 15.

44. Undated memo, ACC archives; Bayne, MRI, 11. Max Warren and Canon David Paton also included as well.

45. AC'63, 117ff. The report clearly lists August 17; Bayne in his introduction to MRI mentions August 10, obviously an error as the Congress had not yet begun.

C. The Document

46. Bayne, MRI, 17f.

47. Ibid., 18.

48. Ibid., 18f.

49. Ibid., 19f.

50. Ibid., 20.

51. "The Christian Vocation of the Anglican Layman Abroad," ibid., 66ff.

52. Ibid., 20f.

53. Ibid., 21.

54. Ibid., 21f.

55. Ibid., 22.

56. Ibid., 22.

57. Ibid., 22f.

58. Ibid., 23.

59. Ibid., 23f.

60. Ibid., 24.

61. Burroughs interview.

VI. From Vision to Process to Progress: MRI in Practice

One document changed the entire tenor of the Congress. The speeches and services continued precisely as planned. But MRI had "electrified" the delegates. The topic, it was reported, "dwarfed all other discussion"[1]—somewhat to the chagrin of the program's Canadian sponsors. Suddenly, what the speakers had written that spring had become completely obsolete.[2] In another sense, their words took on a new life.

The Congress had created a climate highly conducive to the vision of MRI; and for those with an urge to "do" something, it provided an outlet for action which generalized exhortations could not provide. Speaker after speaker trotted out the problems of the age to center stage, sometimes controversially so. It was one thing for Bishop Sadiq to urge political action because "nothing that is human can be outside the Church's mission," or for John Lawrence to observe that the laity's role is so central that should the Church ever get around to taking its obligations to the world seriously, the burden falls on them.[3] These thoughts lay in the realm of an orthodoxy (even if a new one) being explained to the faithful. It was quite another for Max Warren, in the opening address no less, to praise Marx and Freud as veritable gifts of God, or to commend Bishop J.A.T. Robinson's recently-published and already controversial book Honest to God. Warren raised hackles but got people listening—and debating.[4] And applying principles to specifics raised inevitable flaps: Some Virginians vocally resented the intrusions of statements on civil rights.[5] New ideas were fine as long as they remained at arm's length.

MRI gave all the more opportunity to debate. More significantly, it provided a focus which had not been, and could not be, present beforehand. It also insisted that principles find practical application. Coggan observed that the wide-ranging discussions "could degenerate into an interesting debate on

culture, pacifism, racialism, what have you." They could also "constitute a background for carefully planned strategy."[6]

Although something that originated within two weeks of promulgation could hardly be termed "carefully planned," and though its progenitors eschewed any notion that MRI was "strategy," still the Congress had something concrete, challenging and even inspiring to mull over and, typically, to debate. Anglicans being a denomination which prizes words and books, the family debate continued for years, as it moved from a vision to a process to a program.

A. First Reactions

When his brother primate had finished reading the statement, Michael Ramsey stepped to the podium, recalled and paraphrased the passage from Romans 14 with which he had opened the Congress, and gave it its most memorable phrase: "The Church that lives to itself will die by itself." For him (expanding on Langmead Casserly's observation about the Anglican way), MRI implied not so much a program as a process, and not so much a sequence of actions as much as a spirit. The document "aims at generating the sharing of common responsibility by all our churches with one another, so that o w picture gives place to another picture." That, he said, is a process, one which must grow through many years but which must begin from that point--indeed it had already begun, but it must continue "within the interior life of each one of our Anglican churches," toward a spiritual health the essence of which is sacrifice, following in Christ's way, and summarized in Paul's words.[7]

One by one, third-world primates echoed their leader. Goto of Japan lauded MRI for redirecting visions from "the sterile and dreary goal of autonomy and self-support" and toward what purpose those serve. He welcomed the hope of newer, maturer relationships.

> Formerly a giver and receiver faced each other, each preoccupied with the reactions of each to the other, each ashamed, both with anxious eyes fastened on the gift. Now we are released from this, for we are to stand hand in hand facing one great missionary task.

Bishop Roseveare of Accra, a Briton twice ousted from Ghana as a "vicious insinuationist" (he hinted Kwame Nkrumah's personality cult was idolatrous[9]) noted how MRI repudiates "ecclesiastical neo-colonialism" while promoting the new "imperialism" of the transcendent Imperium Christi.[10] John Sadiq of Nagpur justified planning as a deeply theological enterprise: God "is not a God of unfinished business." On the contrary, Jesus had advised his followers to count the cost of discipleship like a king going to war or a builder planning a tower. Mission as discipleship occurs through the presence of the beholder. "When we think of our missionary task," he said quoting a young minister, "we imagine our Lord saying to us, 'Go there or there or to the other place.' That is all wrong. What he is saying to us is not 'Go there,' but 'Come here,' for he is already there." Many would remember that point years later.[11]

For the moment, delegates had reservations, and having received copies of the report the night before, they had time to develop them. Mark Gibbs, the English proponent of lay ministry, worried lest MRI seem to exclude ecumenical cooperation, a matter which is "particularly necessary when we undertake the training of the laity." Others criticized the proposal for "regional officers." One discussion group regretted that "mutual responsibility" had not been applied in planning the very Congress they attended, rather than leaving one country in charge.[12]

Enough questions had arisen by Tuesday to cause Bishop Bayne to rewrite his theme address on "Organizing for Action" into an explication of what MRI was and was not. He composed another variation on a theme of his years of office: "How the churches of the Anglican Communion organize themselves must be determined by what we are, by the terms of our own existence"[13]--but that the purpose of organizing is to act. This was crucial. MRI proposed no radical restructuring, no revolutionary reformulation of the Communion; Prayer Book, Lambeth Conferences and the historic episcopate assured continuity. To those

who savored the Anglican way of "muddling through," for whom talk of a central office might smack of curial bureaucracy, the Executive Officer reassured,

> This perplexing lack of neatness--this cloudiness of definition--is a necessary condition of organizing for action. If we were a unitary world denomination, with a central executive and administrative structure, the tasks of organization would be relatively simple. But we are not that. If we were a body of Christians united by common doctrinal convictions, which clearly marked us off from other Christian bodies and gave us an easy intensity of inner coherence, again our organizing tasks would be relatively simple. But we are not that.[14]

Instead, Anglicanism draws unity from national and regional forces, not denominational, not supranational. "We rejoice, and rightly, in the free, world-wide brotherhood we share, and in the privilege of free movement and communication which full communion means." That is Anglicanism's "cardinal principle" which MRI must both reflect and foster, as must the ACNS, AED, and regional officers who, far from assuming "curial power...will be the precise opposite to this" as servants of the churches in their area.[15] Whatever they would do had to conform to the nature of the Anglican fellowship.

Second, their actions demanded travelling light, as a "pilgrim people." "A pilgrim carries with him only those things that are essential for his life. It is a characteristic mark of the Anglican tradition, at our best, that we recognize how few and how important the essential things are." He called for austerity, not just in finances but even more in doctrine (relying on the Lambeth Quadrilateral, for example), and in culture (distinguishing between the little that is essential and the great mass of cultural inheritances).[16]

Anglicanism, he reiterated, must never become an end in itself. Bayne allied himself with those who worried lest the Congress' goals of promoting Anglican awareness and effort end up boastfully glorifying the Communion.[17] To the many who emphasized ecumenism, Bayne agreed their purpose must be "to abandon, not our diversities, but our <u>separateness</u>." Following Christ's self-emptying example, "it means obedience to our given unity in Christ." MRI, he hoped, "will be seen as a command to ecumenical obedience." Why? He pointed first to the document's "central thrust....to set churches free from

any control by others" by promoting "equality, interdependence, mutual responsibility." Second, MRI hands leadership to individual churches for ecumenical as in other matters; the ACNS had at the same meeting pledged continued support to churches seeking wider relationships while those ties evolved. Third, promoting deeper unity among Anglicans would inevitably lead toward recognizing deeper bonds with other Christians. As Anglicans discovered among themselves "the brotherhood of the Bread and the Body, they would also discover that brotherhood includes many more as well.[18]

The tie that binds must be as consistent with Anglican principles as the officers who help to embody them. Although decision-making would not become "curial," it would need greater centralization: More frequent ACNS and LCB meetings for "brotherly dialogue" (as opposed to an Anglican equivalent to the College of Cardinals), gatherings of "consultants" such as the Missionary Executives, and the AEO's office would all provide that.

In the same light he broached the bugaboo of money. Mutuality implies that "all are involved in everyone's plans, and we stand or fall together. But the simple necessities of freedom and dignity require that all our churches be treated as brothers and not beggars." Manifestly not all enjoyed the same prosperity. Thus, Bayne proposed three forms of aid. First was a "dowry"--not endowment but "the essential tools, without which a newly independent church cannot go forward in freedom." Second was for loan funds from one church to another. Third, he envisioned an "inter-church development fund," a pool of resources "representing the common treasury and mission of the whole household." The MRI document cited all three, commending immediate action on the first. Parallel forms of sharing must be developed for missionary forces.[19]

He concluded with a vital point. "We must organize ourselves around our mission, at home as well as abroad. Our commanding need is to stop thinking so much about ourselves, and turn our eyes outward." Such a re-visioning needs to occur on every level of the Church, about every aspect of the Church's life.

Rayne applied this MRI imperative across the board. The parish, the diocese, the province must first take responsibility for its own "brotherhood," and do so in structural, institutional, financial, practical terms so that it becomes concrete as well as abstract. After such a "preface to mission," the unit must go forth with eyes turned outward. "A church organized around mission is a church whose centre of gravity is outside itself." Mission should "be in the centre of its structure, the primary thing in its budget, the first claim on its manpower and time." That, he said, included decision-making processes, financial structures, theological education from church school through seminary, study and planning, spiritual life ("our interior discipline"), inter-church relationships within the Communion, and preparation for unity. Yet to do this, he concluded, is simply to "be true to the living God."[20]

As the Congress wound to a close, enthusiasm grew. Howard Johnson gladly felt "scooped" by MRI; it embodied many of his recommendations for more centralized decision-making.[21] The discussion groups, which had been meeting to reflect upon each theme presentation, readily accepted MRI's principles--no doubt in part thanks to the addresses. Despite Rayne's assurances, some had reservations on its apparently insufficient attention to ecumenical concerns, to the inclusion of a financial goal, and to what the Regional Officers might lead[22], as if the spirit of the document was too important, too exciting to be lost in a bureaucracy or its infighting. The spirit of Mutual Responsibility, on the other hand, so captured the overall imagination that Michael Ramsey squirmed in explaining that the Congress could not appear to cram something down the throats of provinces which cherished their autonomy, to delegates panting to pass a commendatory resolution then and there.[23] This was a non-legislative Congress, "the authority of which is technically nothing, legislatively nothing, but morally in God's hands may prove to be very great."[24]

If moral authority was what the Congress held, then that could be exerted. Since the Congress gathered the uppermost echelons of the Anglican Communion,

their influence could carry for the MRI word as they returned home. Archbishop Coggan gazed over "two thousand ambassadors going back to their various parts of the Anglican Communion, carrying the essential message of this document with them." That message will not be universally acclaimed, he cautioned; saying that for every dollar spent in one's own parish, one should be spent elsewhere might make for a "most unpopular church strategy." At heart, he reminded them solemnly, MRI embodied a call to prayerful activism whose message ends, "May the disturbance of the Holy Ghost move you."[25]

The Anglican Communion might have been reborn, but its old life clung on. Many felt the oddity. The Missionary Rally on the very night after MRI's presentation pointed out to the Bishop of Montana the absence of relevant hymns for mission. "All we sang about were heathens bowing down to wood and stone in their ignorance,--and this definitely was not true of the Church today,"[26] surely not of what he had been hearing. The closing Evensong struck some as stuffily old-fashioned: Eighty men and boys of the Royal School of Church Music sang a pre-war anthem straight from the English cathedral tradition.[27] But the Archbishop of Cape Town, already controversial for opposing apartheid, pointed toward the awesome challenge but even more awesome vision which God in Revelations had placed before his people[28]; and the Congress Message, affirming the Church's need to serve, to listen, to be one, to affirm the unity of mankind (especially in matters of race) and the unity of clergy and laity in ministry, concluded, "The power of the Lord Christ be with you all."[29] Mark Gibbs told the folks back home, "This is quite simply a message that will revolutionize the Anglican Communion, if it is taken seriously."[30]

B. After the Congress

As the Congress had been preceded by a sequence of conferences, so it was followed. Some delegates went home. Others fanned out to other meetings, a few (like Ramsey) to Rochester for the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches[31] (no wonder ecumenical sensitivities ran so high); some to a

colloquium on the works of Roland Allen. This late British missionary had been at least silently present at the Congress: His works were being republished after many years out of print, encouraged by men such as Lesslie Newbigin, the Presbyterian bishop of the Church of South India who by then ran the WCC mission department. Newbigin had foreshadowed MRI in various works, even hinted at its title in an address at Kuala Lumpur some years before during which he mentioned "mutual responsibility" and "interdependence."[32] Allen's works had also intrigued men such as Boone Porter, then a professor at General Theological Seminary (later editor of The Living Church), and Theodore Eastman, editor of the Overseas Missionary Review (afterwards Bishop of Maryland). At the conference, near Niagara Falls, Britain's authority on Allen analyzed his vision of new forms of ministry. Many, though, were completely unfamiliar with Allen's works, and "couldn't adequately handle or absorb the radical unorthodox presented in the...lecture."[33] Porter suspected a deeper problem. "This all reflects the standard Anglican assumption that our Church should confine its ministrations to a dwindling number of hereditary Anglicans or to a dwindling number of far-away savages in whose midst we erect missionary compounds."[34] Ironically contrasting with the enthusiasm for MRI of delegates from developing lands, Latin Americans were among the staunchest traditionalists. Although the Cuernavaca conference on Latin America planted some seeds which blossomed into MRI, Latin Americans had little to do at the Congress itself[35]; with all the focus on Africa and Asia, the "neglected continent" was even mentioned in only the last few days,[36] and the delegates to the St. Catherine's conference showed "a hard, inflexible resistence to anything that questioned or challenged traditional patterns."[37] Ideas moved slowly from Toronto to Niagara.

Broader reactions ranged from resistence to rejoicing. The criticisms were predictable; they had been broached at the outset at the ACMS and the Congress itself.[38] Some suspected an appeal for capital funds that "most" had expected, disguised but still overly emphasized.[39] One picked up on MRI's

phrase of "that which ought to die" and nominated for extinction the "stifling clericalism" and especially the monopoly of bishops (from whom the document itself had come), the "cultural imperialism of an English Christianity which by the grace of God has already been transmuted within the Anglican Communion into a multitude of indigenous forms," and "the fear of theological encounter."[40] Another decided MRI initially erred by not asking receiving Churches to get the erstwhile senders to list what they need first, to underscore the reciprocity inherent in MRI. Nonetheless, he perceived both a new role for the missionary who has "a special function" to know what one church has to offer the other, and for the various churches" such as Japan or Nigeria to discover what they can give to the United States."[41]

Church publications generally welcomed MRI as the sweetest bloom of a lush Congress. The Living Church praised the evolution of the concept of mission from "a condescension of the good, wise, and powerful to the benighted and weak" to what D.T. Niles's termed "one beggar showing another beggar where to find bread." Its editor perceived a shift in attitude both between younger and older churches, and also among the Anglican powerhouses as Americans, Canadians, English and Australians become "participants in each other's life and thought, and sharing each other's burdens." He dismissed fears of over-organization. Quite the opposite; "there is far too little organization in this organism." PBCUSA, he agreed, should implement MRI.[42]

The Living Church notwithstanding, these fears could find substance in how the secular press reported the Congress. The New York Times said MRI would "unify the Anglican Communion by establishing a central authority." One comment could raise eyebrows on several points. "The executive office, held by Bishop Rayne, would be greatly strengthened. It appears destined to become, in effect, the mainspring of church leadership, thus reducing the historically predominant role of the Church of England."[43] Two days later, the Times' editorialists lauded "the Anglican manifesto [as] one more evidence of the

effort being made" toward Christian unity.[44] Wrote Time, "The 18 branches of the Anglican Communion are proud of their independence—and last week the Anglican Congress...asked them to surrender some of it."[45] Newsweek made no mention of fund-raising, though it quoted Bayne's opinion that the American churches "are so fat we don't know what to do with our money." It added dryly, "Appeals for modernization of the world's churches are hardly new."[46]

Though Britain's press more eagerly followed the Great Train Robbers' $5 million heist, The Times of London daily reported on the Congress. It described MRI as "likely to be of historical significance."[47] Its editors noted the paradox of the rise of ecumenism at the same time as increased denominational interest in worldwide organization as exemplified by the Congress. The character of Anglican relationships is now being changed," and MRI "points to a far more dynamic role for Anglican relationships.... The implementing of the bold vision depicted in the Toronto document will face formidable dangers in reducing the "beggary" while respecting the autonomy of indigenous churches. Furthermore, "great sensitiveness" will be needed to distinguish between tasks for world Anglicanism and tasks for ecumenical action. But the Communion's "ecumenical role demands that it be recognizable not as a highly organized pan-confessional body but as still a 'family of churches'" in communion with Canterbury and true to its heritage.[49]

The Toronto Daily Star found the Congress "rather a shocker to people who have thought of th Anglican Church as a stuffy hangover from Colonial...times, or, as is sometimes said of it in the U.K., 'The Tory party on its knees.'" Instead, the Congress manifested a "universal, radical and revolutionary" force facing the frontiers of faith.[33]

Archer Torrey, principal of a Korean theological college, had predicted delegates would return from Toronto "angry because the Anglican Congress was neither radical enough nor conservative enough," unwilling to take steps to meet the world's needs lest those steps risk disrupting the Communion, nor so

conservative as to attend adequately to what the Communion needed.[50] He wrote before MRI. Far from upset, they returned to dioceses and parishes with glowing reports of the Congress and its "manifesto." A Massachusetts priest likened it to a family gathering which bred new respect for others in the clan: the English for insisting on excellent education, the Canadians so often neglected by their southern neighbors, the bishops for the vilification they endure, the sensitivities of those from developing nations--and how MRI is one means of drawing the family even closer.[51] The Bishop of Montana shared his joy

> to see the Church awakening from out [of] her sleep of death and once more gathering Her strength and forces to stride across the world on Her Lord's ministry rather than sitting at the side of the road asking for a pledge to the budget.[52]

A young Californian found the opening service "beyond comprehension": It was the largest Anglican congregation ever. "I was surprised and almost shocked not only at their number but their variety of nationalities" which resembled "a Warner Brothers spectacular." More profound were "memories and ideas...which will, I think, shake the church to its ancient foundations."[53] For Suffragan Bishop of Connecticut Warren Hutchens, the Communion "came alive" as a "microcosm of the Kingdom, of what the whole world might become in the presence and in the Spirit of Christ."[54]

Personal experiences were shared not only by delegates, but by many who attended. A Canadian layperson who now works as a professional for the national church's staff cites the Congress as "when I decided I wanted to be an Anglican." She vividly recalls the "spine-tingling" services, full of color and vestments and an atmosphere of many traditions coming together. Though held in the Maple Leaf Stadium like the Billy Graham rally she attended about the same time, "this was different"--and for her, decisive.[55]

The word spread from those who were there, whether delegates or visitors, in print but even more in the personal tales shared with friends, congregations and groups. It too made lasting impressions. ECUSA's Presiding Bishop recalls

and a young priest new to mission work sitting in the basement of St. Michael's Cathedral in Kobe, hearing Japan's Primate, Michael Yashiro, report on Toronto.

> It was one of the most moving things that I have ever heard. The line that I shall never forget was the line that he said, 'We are no longer a receiving Church. We have something to contribute to the whole Communion.' I thought that was magnificent.

For a tiny Church which was sorely persecuted and still felt insignificant, "to have that told to you and to grab hold of that is just fantastic."[56]

In countless conversations, interviews and articles, delegates spread the initial word of MRI. Soon it was being explained in more formal ways as it received official ratification by the churches, ushering in a new phase to its life. MRI would change from a vision to a program.

C. The Evolution of a Program

1. In the Provinces

In such a decentralized polity, no Congress or Conference could enact a program. It was left to each province or national church to authorize it for itself, and pursue its objectives each in its own way.

After the Congress it had hosted, the Canadian Church led in approving MRI. Its Executive Council in October adopted a program, timetable and structure to oversee it, in which a nation-wide central committee would develop sub-committees on "intercession and prayer partnership," "study plans for the parishes," "recruitment" for overseas work (exploring as one option a parallel to the Peace Corps), "theological training and exchange of students, teachers and priests," "finances" which would look at raising $500,000 by the next Whitsunday as Canada's initial commitment, and "self-examination" to apply MRI principles on every level of the Church's life. Each diocese would develop parallel committees for all but on theological education, and every parish was urged to organize a World-Mission Committee with comparable concerns. Beginning with a pastoral letter from the primate in Advent, the entire church would pray, study, reflect and contribute toward world missions, while exploring MRI's ramifications for its own life.[57]

Almost immediately it made one change: The Anglican Church Women integrated with the General Synod. As a result, mission study, heretofore the purview of the women, became a concern for the entire Church.[58]

The Church of England was not far behind. Progressive churchmen embraced it immediately. David Paton, returning from the Missionary Executives' Conference and the Congress, informed Parish and People leaders that this was a major issue before the Church and they had to decide whether "to stand aside from reform or help to give it theological and liturgical integration."[59] Official sanction came at 1963's autumn Church Assembly session, which delegated the Missionary and Ecumenical Council ("MECCA," which Paton soon headed) to "take such action as in their judgment will assist the Church to respond rightly to the challenge of MRI." By July 1964, MECCA began coordinating with the missionary societies--itself a step forward--for a "campaign" to begin in November 1964 and reach

> a spiritual climax in Lent 1965. This campaign calls for self-examination and renewal in every parish. It is entitled 'No Small Change' not simply because in terms of stewardship and sacrifice MRI calls for more than small change, but even more because if our Church is to find its life renewed in going out to the world in Abrahamic faith, this will call at every level for no small change.[60]

The Episcopal Church had to wait a year until its General Convention could fully approve it. In the meantime, the Presiding Bishop commended it to all Episcopalians.[61] His House of Bishops lauded MRI "as a step toward unification of the Anglican Communion," and in its spirit approved in principle the independence of the Brazilian Episcopal Church. Seeking unity while granting separation is a paradox inherent in the document which sought above all to replace dependence with interdependence, which is what the Brazilians sought.[62] During the year, a "Special Committee on Mutual Responsibility" made its preparations so that in October, 1964, Convention could quickly adopt MRI as a statement of purpose, create a Mutual Responsibility Commission to implement its purposes and commit the Church to raising for cooperative

projects a million dollars in 1965, two million in 1966, and three million in 1967.[63] MRI in the United States was born.

Throughout the world, the Churches of the Anglican Communion adopted MRI one by one. Each, especially the more developed countries, devised programs which sought to bring MRI to the local level. Typically, that meant a study program as much to spur reflection as to impart information to parishioners.

Particular approaches varied; Canada not surprisingly took as its starting-point the Congress which had met in its heartland. From "What Happened at the Congress," the sessions then looked at themes entitled, "Called to be a Serving Church," "Called to a New Understanding of Mission," "Called to be a Listening Church," "Called to be One Church" (the theme of ecumenism was rarely neglected), "Called to Affirm the Unity of the Human Race," and the "hook," "God Has Called Us All."[64]

England took a more parochial approach. Its "No Small Change" program for Lent, 1964 were "designed to help people to see what MRI can mean to them":

1. The Parish Looks at its Purpose
   Why does the local Church exist?
   What has God called it to do?
2. The Parish Looks at its Neighbours
   Who are our neighbors--in the parish, in the diocese, in the community, in the world?
3. The Parish Looks at the World
   How is the world changing?
   How are people affected?
   What does this mean for us?
4. The Parish Looks at God's People
   What is it like to be a Christian in Iran
   What is it like to be a Christian at Home?
   How can we help each other?
5. The Parish Plans for Action
   What does our study mean to us in terms of change? What new things do we have to do? How different do we have to become? Our plans are useless unless they meet our needs and the needs of others.[65]

The effort in itself reflected an exercise in mutual responsibility, for it was issued jointly by MRCCA, the missionary societies, and the Church's Board of Education. England's various bureaucracies had begun to collaborate.

Australia's program was different still. In 1964-5 it sponsored a program titled "Parish Action" to promote a self-examination of parish life "in terms of our obedience to mission." It sought a response in terms of support for particular projects.[66] Between 50-60% of parishes held some kind of study, with groups ranging from six to over 100, over half of which were led by laity but which often did not include lay leadership.[67] Through these sessions, "parishes discovered that the basic force lies in the Christian commitment, or the degree of faith, of the individual Church members, both lay and clergy." So, its 1966 follow-up became more personal. Topics included "Jesus is the Way," "Jesus is the Truth," "Jesus is the Life," "Mission," and a final session, "Witness," which coordinated with the ecumenical program proposed by the Australian Council of Churches. Its developers took pains to connect the program to MRI both in its concept and in its material: One session utilized vignettes drawn by Bishop Ralph Dean, by then Bayne's successor as Anglican Executive Officer.[68]

Programs as these often relied on varieties of resources and methods developed locally or elsewhere, reflecting a different form of inter-Anglican sharing. Both Canadian and Australian series made heavy use of group-dynamics lessons newly emerging from U.S. social scientists. Leaders could read up on techniques in books with titles as "Leading Adult Classes" and "How To Lead Discussions," published in the U.S. (and in the first case, by Seabury Press, the Episcopal publishing house). Newsprint and "flip charts" soon decorated parish halls in Australia and New Zealand. Anglican farmers in Saskatchewan, when not studying Matthew, Luke, or Leslie Newbigin, were forming "buzz groups" and role-playing third-world Christians.[69]

Technological advances made other resources available. Canadian group leaders found appended to each session plan a long list of films, filmstrips, records of Asian music (all made available by the Anglican Book Centre) along with plays, biographies, magazines, devotional works and, of course, monographs

exploring particular areas of the Church's mission. Leading authors of the day were represented: Roland Allen, Charles Forman, Hendrik Kraemer, Neill, Newbigin, Niles, Warren, Webster. If any parish wanted ideas for follow-up activities, they had plenty of suggestions, from collecting prayers of Christians elsewhere to sponsoring the visit of an African or Asian student or priest to sending a group abroad.[70]

Many of the books were already circulating. Some, such as Anglican Mosaic, The Church in the Sixties and Peter Whiteley's account of the 1963 Congress, Frontier Mission, prepared for or explained the Congress itself. Other authors set to work. Dewi Morgan explored Anglicanism's ecumenical role in Agenda for Anglicans.[71] Barry Till, who oversaw "No Small Change," put MRI into a British context from the 1910 Edinburgh conference to its present in Change and Exchange.[72] A group of British scholars and bishops headed by Archbishop Coggan, every one a veteran of foreign lands, compiled a book of essays, Mutual Responsibility: Questions and Answers jointly published by CMS and SPG to deepen English understandings of what MRI is (Biblical, for instance) and is not (e.g. a curia).[73]

2. In the American Church

Ironically, the Episcopal Church lagged behind, largely because of changes in New York and London. As early as March, 1963, Ramsey suggested to Bayne that he leave as AHM by the end of 1964, feeling that anyone's staying in the post beyond five years would create a "rootless person out of touch" with his own or any individual Anglican church, and because "the emphasis now must lie in the particular churches" rather than in the central office.[74] Michael Ramsey was not one to promote a curia either. Meanwhile, in New York, Bishop Jonathan Bentley planned to retire as head of PECUSA's Overseas Department. Lichtenberger was not well; he began delegating leadership as he could.[75] It became clear a new Presiding Bishop would be elected in 1964. That opened one,

possibly two jobs for a man of Bayne's calibre. "MC says the primacy is in God's hands: I mustn't set my own wishes first," Bayne noted to himself after a visit to Lambeth Palace. "But he agrees that Overseas would be an exciting and most important thing." He added "(But MC thinks I should be PB.)"[76] Personal reasons intervened too: It was a lonely, rootless, disruptive life which paid so poorly that Bayne's "financial worries...increase each year." So the day after the Congress opened, Bayne shared with Coggan (who wanted him to stay until 1970[77]) that he would leave. "It was very hard to sit in the service last night and look at that household and think of a time when I would not be their servant." Someone else, though, could glean the full participation of the Church of England, which he felt he was not able to do.[78] By October he was writing to presidents of American provinces to expect him home twelve months later to replace Bentley "precisely at the time when 'Mutual Responsibility' comes to the separate churches for response and action."[79] Heading the Overseas Department placed Bayne at the center of the American response.

After this was arranged, Lichenberger announced his retirement, and at October's General Convention the House of Bishops elected John Elbridge Hines of Texas over Bayne as Presiding Bishop.

In London, what Bayne termed the "After Bayne Whom sweepstakes" brought a dark-horse winner. Bayne predicted Leslie Brown of Uganda, John Sadiq of India or A. M. Zulu of South Africa.[80] But Ralph Dean of Canada took the prize. He also kept his see, the diocese of Cariboo--unwisely, as it divided his attentions.[81]

The United States entered the program phase of MRI, then, with no clear leadership. Yet MRI's influence would not wait. The House of Bishop's pastoral letter from the St. Louis Convention of October, 1964 meditated on MRI's meaning for the Church.[82] Meanwhile the women at their Triennial resolved "to make a critical analysis of the organizational structure of Episcopal Churchwomen at every level" and urged Convention to accept the document.[83]

Upon the urging of a special MRI commission gathered by Lichtenburger, the St. Louis Convention gave a Mutual Responsibility Commission "unprecedented scope." Charged "with the stimulating, supporting and coordinating responsibility for the implementation at all levels of the Church, of the program set forth in the MRI Document" and especially section III's proposals for action,[84] the Commission's purview and purpose was truly far-reaching. Putting the third section into practice meant, first, increasing support in money and manpower. To that end, Convention authorized the commitment of $1 million in 1965, to be doubled in 1966 and tripled in 1967. (Convention changed the interim committee's recommendations only in adding that these funds could be utilized for the Wider Episcopal Fellowship.) It was to study the Church's structure, theology of mission and priorities; the enabling resolution began that process by transferring the job of 815's Strategic Advisory Committee to the new Commission. It had oversight of the Document's points on receiving as well as giving, testing every activity in light of mission and service, and developing communications.[85] As someone noted, its tasks included "virtually everything comprehended in the Summary of the Law."[86]

The Commission drew together a cross-section of leadership. On it sat some of the prominent clergy and laity of the Church, such as Robert Young, the actor, and Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Bayne served as a consultant and on the Executive Committee.[87] A staff was gathered in New York, headed by Walker Taylor, Jr.[88]

Not until April, 1965 did the Mutual Responsibility Commission address the Church, and then to suggest preliminary steps toward fuller implementation. These began with personal prayer and renewal, correspondence with others abroad and involvement by travellers in lands they visit. It suggested a missionary aspect to baptismal and confirmation preparation programs, commended companion relationships with churches abroad and involvements in agencies at home--this last a new element to MRI. "In such endeavors we must lay ourselves open to a

deeper understanding that God is actively at work in the midst of today's world, and that mission means our entering in to that presence and work of God in the world."[89]

But the Commission had larger objectives in sight. They required at least a minimal structure. Its chairman, Bishop Thomas Wright of East Carolina, urged each diocese to set up a committee to communicate with his group and to oversee, under the bishop, the planning and activity of the diocese. Such a committee on the one hand should reflect "every major activity of the diocese, rather than one dealing with MRI as if it were one more activity to be put along side Christian Education or Missions or whatever." MRI's point, after all, was to affect every aspect of the Church's life. However, it should not on the other hand necessarily create channels discrete from established patterns. The Church already had an Overseas and a Home Department at 815, for instance, which "can only be involved in Mutual Responsibility as they are used to the full"--likewise its bureaus on social relations, Churchmens, laymen, finance.[90] These would only guide, not rule, MRI. Dioceses were to be its fundamental units. As each Province was responsible for the mission in its land, so the diocese would develop its own response to MRI--though with 815's resources readily available. They, not parishes, would receive the emerging Project Check Lists. From them, not parishes, official commitments would flow. Eager parishes anxious to take on a project were referred to their bishop. MRI in practice would need to reflect MRI's principles.[91]

To be sure, the national Commission would provide plenty of materials. It issued a sequence of pamphlets, illustrated with maps and photographs, to acquaint laity with the history, mission and challenge of particular corners of Anglicanism. Tellingly, North America was one, but not Europe. Sample projects indicated the nature of efforts which might be supported in that region, from development programs in rural Africa to urban efforts in the U.S. These were collected and summarized in "MRI in Episcopal Church Life."[92] In

1966, resource books appeared to explain the nature, theology and history of MRI. One collected essays on various of its aspects by a diversity of authors. A second reprinted a lecture series by Bayne on MRI's genesis.[93]

At about the same time, a course for laity was ready. In a sequence of "installments," it articulated "beliefs and goals" of the program based upon the conviction that "People inevitably depend upon each other--and are responsible for each other. And it all begins with God." Subsequent installments raised, in light of MRI, issues of parish self-evaluation in five areas of activity: Social action, ecumenical action, financial giving, "companion dioceses," and "Projects for Partnership." Like Canada's program, this provided a wealth of suggestions and aids for teaching. Some were decidedly offbeat: A leader, for example, could explore what "mutual responsibility" was conveyed in Humphrey Bogart's film "Key Largo." The American program went much further, showing how each of the five "activities" could be related to parishioners of various sorts: Leaders, adults, children, junior high and senior high school students. A church school teacher could explore "social action for children." It also clearly sought to apply MRI to every aspect of parish life, for example a youth program--as the American "baby boom" hit adolescence.[94] A four-session "Layman's MRI Course" was also developed.[95]

Efforts aimed at quickening spiritual life as well. The Anglican Cycle of Prayer was recommended. Massey Shepherd, the liturgical scholar, had edited a devotional booklet for the Diocese of California gaining national distribution under the name Far and Near. In 1966 it merged with a Canadian counterpart to become Response--Far and Near, a bimonthly "devotional guide in praying for mission throughout the Anglican Communion." The reader found, on a given day, a biblical meditation with an MRI twist on one page, and a brief description of one diocese's work, with suggested intercessions, on the other.[96]

a. MRI in the Dioceses: East Carolina

As the basic component of MRI in the U.S. was the diocese, each took responsibility for precisely how it would proceed. Predictably, they differed

on approach, outline and outcome. The Diocese of East Carolina produced a "parish guide to the study of Mutual Responsibility" which encompassed articles generated within the diocese and reprints from various sources. Committing $10,125 to improve hospital facilities in the Diocese of Melanesia as a "Project for Partnership" gave particular focus. But "MRI will have little meaning if it simply becomes another effort to raise funds for world relief." So one article explored the stewardship of "sacrificial giving." Another anticipated what East Carolina would receive. Another explored "how can we vitalise the Church in East Carolina," looking especially at Christian education, administration, worship and lay ministry. MRI was not the only influence; the liturgical movement peeked through in the query, "Why has the service of Morning Prayer become the predominant Sunday worship service in most of our Churches?" instead of Holy Communion. Roles of the bishop and of parish rectors were questioned. Thus even where there was specific focus, MRI received broad application. "If we cannot begin to be responsible where we are (Near), we dare not be responsible only where we are not (Far).[97]

b. MRI in the Dioceses: Connecticut

By contrast, the much larger Diocese of Connecticut developed a far more intricate program. No one doubted that it would participate; Bishop Gray had been the prime mover behind the 1954 Anglican Congress, the editor of the Pan-Anglican and sat on the ACMS when it voted on MRI. He was a keen backer. But the lawyer in him insisted on "due process," an intuition affirmed by both the national commission's and AEO Bishop Dean's insistence that "proper channels" be honored.[98] Although some enthusiastic parishes quickly granted funds for overseas projects, Gray deferred diocesan action and asked parishes to restrain themselves for the moment.[99]

For its program, Connecticut relied upon a sequence devised by the Province of New England (comprising the region's seven dioceses). First comes renewal, then financial outreach. That order is crucial.

> New and deeper relationships within parishes between members, and similar relationships between parishes and their dioceses, between dioceses and our National Church and other sections of the Anglican Communion is the primary type of step to be taken. Once such relationships are established, there can be a more intelligent approach to the financial side of the program.[100]

"Belonging to one another," as Gray quoted Ramsey to the diocese, "starts in our own parishes and missions. Each member of a congregation should feel a special responsibility for the development of the Christian life of the whole congregation." This, in turn, causes the Christian to reach out into the community.[101] But renewal begins with relationships with each other--and with Christ: The Diocese had held a teaching mission in Lent, 1963 with the common theme "To know Christ and to make him known." It had reached all 196 congregations which in turn strived to visit the homes of every Episcopalian in the state, culminating with a six-night series in Holy Week.[102] Thus MRI had a foundation on which to continue building.

MRI, then, continued the momentum. The program had two phases: Renewal, and Outreach. First, "Mobilization for Christian Renewal" began with Advent, 1965 as a time of prayer, worship and service with special concern for the lapsed, inactive and unchurched. Each parish would examine its own life and effectiveness for mission. Church school staffs were to evaluate its curriculum and attendance "to make certain that all are being instructed in the Christian Faith." Phase II, "Mobilization for Christian Outreach," would take the following Lent to consider how to respond, especially through projects, but their response was not to be through funds alone but toward deepening personal relationships. In the meantime, parishes were to analyze what they were already doing, and report that to the Diocese.[103] Parishes were also asked to report what they gave to programs consistent with MRI. Between 1964 and 1966, the commission found, $54,967.60 was being given to projects outside the United States, and a total of $190,991.53 overall.[104] But, as Gray told his 1965 convention, "We must not only think of giving but also of receiving." He hoped

for "closer ties with other sections of our world Church" wherein Connecticut Episcopalians would visit and be visited by "overseas Churchmen," fostering mutual learning.[105]

In line with Gray's hopes, and following his preference toward the Pacific, the MRI Commission proposed Trinity College, Quezon City in the Philippines as a partner. It would connect Connecticut with the Episcopal diocese in the islands as well as the Philippine Independent Church, in which Gray had a special interest through the Wider Episcopal Fellowship.[106] The Diocesan chairman, the Reverend Grant Morrill, and a leading layman, Henry Noble, visited the College in early 1967.[107]

The keystone was another diocesan-wide "program of Renewal and Outreach" in Lent, 1967. Well beforehand, preparations began by clergy and lay leaders. Each parishioner received letters inviting participation. He heard sermons by clergy underscoring MRI's importance. If he belonged to a parochial organization, his group received a visit from an MRI Committee member--for the document called for mission awareness on every level of the Church's life. His home received mailings and invitatory telephone calls.[108] Finally, the program came. For five weeks he gathered with fellow parishioners in a home where he decorated walls with newsprint and collages and, thanks to leaders trained in group discussions,[109] he explored

1. What in the World is MRI? Why in the World should we bother?
2. Where in the World are the needs?
3. What in the World should we do about the needs?
4. How in the World can we become mutually responsible and interdependent?
5. Where in the World do we go from here?[110]

Over 5,000 people in 120 parishes--roughly two-thirds of the diocese's congregations--took part in the Lenten series. "A very high percentage" of those parishes initiated follow-up efforts in adult education, communications and youth work. Though reactions varied, chairman Grant Morrill summarized the basic insight of MRI being not so much a church program as "a speaking to and a responding to the truth about ourselves."[111]

Efforts continued through the year. A second study course entitled "The Church, The World and You" was developed to deepen an understanding of and participation in the Church's ministry. Five sessions explored the meaning of the Gospel, its communication and its relevance, with emphasis in one on interpersonal relationships; a sixth optional session concerned "where does the MRI program in our parish go from here?" Lacking the diocesan-wide emphasis of the Lenten sequence, only "a fair number" of parishes participated.[112]

The 1967 program received liturgical expression too, and with it the chance to promote recent innovations. An ad-hoc committee's "liturgical applications" suggested the then-rare action of administering baptism at a Sunday morning service, the supposedly "High Church" practice of preceding Communion with the Litany, and the still-liberal idea of replacing the King James Version with RSV or NEB. The committee commended daily, public Morning Prayer, greater use of intercessory prayer, homilies based upon weekday group meetings, homilies at early celebrations of Communion and "dialogue-type sermons." It raised issues of music and ceremonial.[113] MRI not only caused a re-thinking of customary practices, it also became a means to institute in parishes many of the ideas which had evolved in the postwar period. Many ideas became standard operating procedure and were incorporated into the 1979 Book of Common Prayer.[114]

The purpose of renewal was action. So, as Phase I progressed, the MRI Commission moved forward on fostering particular projects. First, it discovered what parishes were already doing. In rural Brooklyn, the Trinity Church Young People's Fellowship raised $15 toward a bus for leper patients in Okinawa. The huge Christ Church, Greenwich donated over $25,000 in 1965 alone to a variety of programs in the U.S. and abroad. Some supported the Church's expansion: Christ Church Cathedral in Hartford gave $19,000 to the new Saint David's Mission in Gales Ferry, the largest grant listed; but in the spirit of receivers being givers, Saint David's pledged $150 to its neighbor, Saint James' in Poquetanuck, for its building drive. Many aided urban work: St.

Luke's, New Haven received $5,300 from St. John's, Essex and became a partner parish to Trinity, Newtown. St. Paul's, Southington, with a yearly budget of $24,000, donated $35,000 over four years for projects. The Committee totalled up $190,991.53 between 1964-66, of which $54,967.60 went overseas, all above the annual diocesan budget of about $890,000.[115]

Second, the Commission decided to undertake a particular diocesan project. It would assist both the Episcopal Church in the Philippines and the Philippine Independent Church, part of the Wider Episcopal Fellowship, with specific focus on Trinity College, Quezon City. The Diocese looked toward a relationship which "will be based on a truly professional analysis of need, objectives both long and short range, policies, educational methods, etc." It presumed funds, ideas, and personal exchanges "as well as other imaginative activities which will enable all churches involved to receive and give of themselves." However, the Commission assured, "this interest will in no way supercede other MRI interests and concerns" of individual parishes.[116]

As Phase I led to Phase II, parishes geared up their outreach efforts. During Lent, 1968, church school offerings went for Trinity College, raising the total given by the Diocese to over $50,000. There were other forms of help; a member of the college's faculty studied in the state with diocesan support in 1967. Its president attended the 1968 convention, receiving a warm welcome from Gray.[117]

But even as applause for a Filipino academic filled Hartford's Cathedral, MRI's apparently bright future was clouded by uncertainty. Gray wondered to Morrill what direction the national MRI effort might head.

> It is not at all clear to me from what I have been able to read in materials coming from the Executive Council of the National Church just what is happening. I assume that nearly everything will depend upon what actions are taken at the General Convention in Seattle.[118]

The diocesan commission realized that MRI should not exist as a discrete entity, analagous to veins and arteries of a body rather than as a separate organ. That implied that the body should absorb MRI into its being, and that

the commission itself go out of business. Meanwhile, other challenges loomed. Gray gave MRI but a scant paragraph in 1968, but pages to "the crises in the nation."[119] At the next year's convention, MRI received nary a word.

c. Other Responses

What programs other dioceses adapted,[120] and what projects they adopted of course varied. While Connecticut then had no formal "Companion Diocese" partnership, Ohio did, with Southwest Brazil. For that diocese, MRI meant its relationship with Brazil. A hardworking young businessman spearheaded what became a closely-knit group of "high-powered people" from Ohio who ventured to Brazil and brought some to Ohio. Bishop Burroughs fondly recalls his and his wife's three trips there, his friendship with Brazil's three bishops, and the visit of one to Ohio for several months. "He made a tremendous impact."

> It began with the bishop involved, and the clergy. We swapped back and forth. Then the laity, chiefly due to the persistence of this layperson. We gave a lot of money, but it didn't cost the diocese much; everybody paid his own way down there. We sent some young people down, and they sent some to us.[121]

Some dioceses were not allowed to participate. MRI appealed for $15 million, but that was above and beyond ongoing commitments. Dioceses--and in Connecticut, parishes[122a]--which did not meet obligations to the larger Church were excluded from taking on projects. Colorado was one diocese that found itself left out, and it irked its bishop. The problem, he said, was local: Parishes were not pulling their weight, sometimes for "ridiculous" reasons as resentment that PECUSA supported the National Council of Churches. The MRI committee promoted informal educational programs and talks, but had to content itself with prayer, study and concern.[123a]

Those dioceses that met their basic quotas could choose from a wide variety of projects. Connecticut's emphasis on both renewal and outreach reflected the fundamental concept. But the MRI document, engendered in a discussion of capital needs, had called for $15 million as immediately crucial for urgent projects. So, although sharing resources might have been pushed to the end of

the agenda, it was never far out of mind. Primatial assurances to the contrary, some thought money-raising was the end of MRI in a double sense: Its purpose, however hidden; and eventually its destruction.

D. Responses Far and Near

From around the world, from 1963 on, proposals streamed into the Executive Officer's headquarters. These were compiled in "directories" which went to Provincial headquarters and thence to dioceses. For these, Canada immediately pledged $500,000. The United States accepted responsibility for 250 priorities. Brief descriptions were printed and distributed to dioceses under the title "Projects for Partnership."[122]

Not surprisingly, some projects betokened more haste than sound planning. Bayne confessed "a large number...seem not to reflect very much of the ideals of Mutual Responsibility."[123] Further, all came from abroad; an American listing was gathered, but at Bishop Dean's request not circulated until after the five-year "emergency period" had completed--by which time MRI was being pushed aside. "This exciting chapter" of American receiving, as the national Commission called it, was never opened.[124]

Dioceses freely selected projects each deemed appropriate. Initiative remained with bishop and diocese with no "hard sells" from New York. In the first year, 127 projects were chosen with pledges or receipts of $900,425.22. As part of that, companion-diocese relationships grew from twelve to 38.[125]

As the second directory was published, Bayne issued four cautionary words. He reiterated the need to respect local planning. In this was a tension, for although regional officers had been appointed, most did not work out well, and cooperative planning on regional levels was still more promise than reality[126]: Insufficiencies in planning were inevitable in the first steps toward a deeper maturity, he wrote. Mutuality demanded respecting indigenous

decision-making, however shaky. Furthermore, requests for help in planning poured in; and his office was hard-pressed to respond.[127]

Payne had received complaints that some were more "housekeeping" programs rather than front-line advances in the Church's mission. Some, he argued, are urgent and very necessary in what is, he reminded, a transitional phase. More telling, he agreed, was the lack of "any clear ecumenical dimension in the projects themselves"—a lack which is apparent in the life of the American Church itself, he observed. Finally, he noted that only two overseas dioceses of PECUSA, the Philippines and Taiwan, were represented in the directories. That too would change as others forwarded proposals.[128]

By 1967 the national Commission evaluated the first five years of MRI as

> what it was intended to be: a time of transition within the Anglican Communion when our widely separated paths would come closer together; a time when we would be developing new patterns of relationship; a time when we would see ourselves growing from a fellowship of Churches to a fellowship within the Church of God; a time of emergency when new assistance must be transmitted to the younger Churches.[129]

Its members looked back upon a pilgrimage which had its start in Toronto, but which was far from completed. They had been troubled years, yet clearly not without success. The Commission, indeed the Church had vastly overestimated what it could do: Upon its formation the committee found that simply organizing was more complex than it realized.[130] Six million dollars had not been sent; the figure was half that: $2.25 million for MRI projects, another half-million through Companion Dioceses, $300,000 more labeled as MRI. The Committee put a happier face on the figure by adding in another million dollars committed prior to 1963 or from United Thank Offering or other sources. It had not attained its monetary goal.

The finances, too, had brought consistent controversy. Despite the assurances from the dais of the Royal York Hotel to countless bishops, priests and lay members of MRI committees, many continued to view MRI as a slightly-disguised money-raising gimmick—an assertion still vehemently denied by many

involved with MRI at the time.[131] Archer Torry from the first had complained that MRI "got off on the wrong foot" by asking receiving churches to list their needs before the givers did,[132] virtually assuring an emphasis on money and a perpetuation of the needy supplicating the prosperous. Bruce Porter believes that "MRI turned out in fact to be largely a way of raising money to hire professionals" to do what other denominations were using clergy with secular skills in developing lands. Furthermore, efforts to raise the salaries of native clergy and lay workers to the levels of expatriates "only increased the financial dependence since the local church could not and had no idea even of meeting these costs. In that setting MRI appeared highly unrealistic."[133] Finally, some took advantage of MRI to feather their own particular nests, with or without official sanction. Visiting preachers raising money on "begging tours," Hayes told one of many complainants, "are entirely contrary to the spirit of MRI."[134] But perhaps they were inevitable.

The Committee faced another disappointment. It responded to the 1964 Convention mandate of studying Episcopal Church structure with a series of resolutions on the Presiding Bishop's office, executive council, and Convention. Little happened.[135]

On the other hand, the program advanced the Church's mission in ways which can be quantified and in some that cannot. Around the world, dioceses made new commitments to support the Church's mission. Auckland, for instance, raised £25,000 over five years as New Zealand became more of a giver.[136] Not far away, fund enabled a Polynesian diocese to purchase 550 acres on which, through MRI, a model village could be built, with each household having 13 acres to farm. That aided community development. For the Church, MRI funded the staff of the College of St. John the Baptist in Suva, "good and qualified" men mostly from overseas who prepared natives for ordination.[137] Stories such as this abounded. MRI raised money--no one knows precisely how much--and in distributing it, allowed much to grow.

More important, the Commission stressed, "in essence MRI was a matter of the spirit."[138] As such, the MRI program made deep and lasting impressions.

It was the first, and only, program of its type in the Anglican Communion. Never before or since has anything of this magnitude been attempted, which is worldwide in scope, which attempts to involve every Anglican in a manner which educates, renews, and seeks a response.

The program introduced new ideas and techniques. Primarily, it brought to reality the point that receivers can give. Be it a struggling mission congregation in Connecticut giving to another, or a struggling missionary diocese in the Solomon Islands sharing its people. Meanwhile, it put group dynamics and products of modern technology into active use among parishes of at least some of the Provinces of Anglicanism.

Attempting to fulfill the manifesto's call for a radical study of the Church's obedience to mission, countless parishes and dioceses analyzed their structures and ministries with a renewed view to fundamental obedience to the Gospel. They reevaluated their forms of Christian education, worship, and personnel as well as service and outreach.[139]

Perhaps most lastingly, relationships developed which proved to be enduring in their effects. The companionship of Brazil with Ohio placed Americans in a context which changed their lives, and faiths. "The thing that impressed us was the depth of their own faith as a tiny minority in a great big country which was primarily Roman Catholic," recalls Nelson Burroughs. Speaking of himself and his wife, he thinks that the experience "was a great developing factor in our own faith. We both 'got religion' down there."[140]

Notes; From Vision to Process to Partnership

1. New York Times, August 10, 1963.

2. Bayne, AC'63, 128.

3. AC'63, 46, 91.

4. Warren, first theme address and responses, AC'63, 19-44.

5. AC'63, 81f.; cf. Time, 23 August 1963, p. 49.

6. Explanation before reading the document. AC'63, 117.

A. First Reactions

7. Ramsey, AC'63, 122ff; cf. above, p. 108 re Casserly.

8. David Coco, AC'63, 125.

9. Time, 18 January 1963, 39.

10. Richard R. Rosecrans, AC'63, 126f.

11. John Sadiq, Ibid., 127f.

12. AC'63, 132-4.

13. Boyce, in Ibid., 183.

14. Ibid., 184.

15. Ibid., 184, 185f.

16. Ibid., 187f.

17. Ibid., 189; cf. Time, August 23, 1963, p. 49, quoting Coggan: "Heaven save us from a jamboree!"

18. AC'63, 189ff.

19. Ibid., 193ff.

20. Ibid., 198-202.

21. Howard Johnson, in Ibid., 227.

22. Whiteley, Frontier Mission, 77-79.

23. Ibid., 76f.

24. In AC'63, 262. Some delegates requested their inability to shape the document, the Congress, or by extension, the Communion; cf. Charles H. Long, "Ten Days in Church," CWR, IX, 2 (Epiphany 1964), 5f.

25. AC'63, 220f.

26. Chandler W. Sterling, "Riding the Circuit," The Episcopal Present [Diocese of Montana], VII, no. 1 (Michaelmas 1963), Grey Book.

27. Whiteley, Frontier Mission; the anthem, "Blessed City, Heavenly Salem," is a hymn-anthem in the grand manner by Edward Bairstow (1874-1946).

28. Jouet de Blank, in AC'63, 265-270.

29. Ibid., 264f.

30. Mark Gibbs, "Anglicans Look Outwards," Manchester Guardian Weekly, LXXIII, 9 (August 29, 1963), p. 9.

B. After the Congress

31. AC'63, 260.

32. Cf. Pill, Change and Exchange, 32. The phrase itself was, and is, controversial. "I know they went over it over and over again. It's certainly been a very difficult title, no question about that," recalls Margaret Chisholm, Boyce's assistant, about the evolution of the MRI name.

33. Theodore Eastman, "Thinking Together Regionally," OMR, I, no. 2 (Epiphany 1964), 10f.

34. E. Bruce Porter, "Not Much Awareness," OMR, I, no. 2 (Epiphany 1964), 12.

35. Charles H. Long, Jr., "Ten Days in Church," OMR, I, no. 2 (Epiphany 1963), 7. Because no province then existed on the continent, no South American could sit on the ACMS or LCB as defined.

36. Eastman, 11.

37. Robert L. Curry, "The Anglican Congress of 1963," The Pastoral Staff (Diocese of Western Massachusetts), LI, no. 7 (September 1963), 1 (in Grey MSS).

38. Cf. above, p. 129.

39. Bayne, Introduction to MRI, 12; John V. Taylor, "Missionary Responsibility in the Anglican Communion," IRM, LV (1966).

40. Long, "Ten Days," 7f.

41. Archer Torry, "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence: Off on the Wrong Foot?", OMR, I, no. 2 (Epiphany 1964), 24 [emphasis in original].

42. Peter Day, "A Coming of Age," TLC, September 1, 1963.

43. The New York Times, August 18, 1963, 1, 33.

44. Ibid., August 20, 1963, 32.

45. Time, August 30, 1963, 45.

46. Newsweek, August 26, 1963, 69. The author refers to a $190-million budget for PECUSA, with $6 million going overseas. This first figure most likely refers to the collective budgets of parishes and dioceses as well as the national church.

47. The Times, August 15, 1963, 1.

48. Ibid., August 24, 1963, p. 7.

49. Toronto Daily Star editorial, August 20, 1963, reprinted in The Episcopal Review [Diocese of Los Angeles], XIV, no. 8 (September 1963), p. 4.

50. Archer Torrey, "The Agony of the Anglican Congress," TLC, August 11, 1963, 21.

51. Curry art., Gray MSS.

52. Sterling, op. cit.

53. Bob Dollard, "Anglican Congress 1963," The Episcopal Review [Diocese of Los Angeles], XIV, no. 8 (September 1963), 13. White MSS.

54. J. Warren Hutchens, "The Anglican Congress - 1963," mss article in Hutchens MSS.

55. Janette Ledwith, Mission Education Consultant with Anglican Church of Canada, interview with the author, Washington, D. C., February 7, 1986.

56. Edmond L. Browning, interview with the author, September 3, 1986.

C. The Evolution of a Program

57. Anglican World Mission Committee [, Anglican Church of Canada], "A Resume of the Programme and Timetable" and "Notes for the Bishops From the Committee," October 15, 1963, Gray MSS. Cf. Howard H. Clark, "Post-Toronto: The Implications of Mutual Responsibility for the Anglican Church of Canada," EAWR XXX, 4 (October 1964, pp. 5-8.

58. Edward Schmitt, interview with the author, Washington, D. C., February 7, 1986.

59. Jagger, Parish & People Movement, 95. Along with the MRI recommendation, Paton cited to the Central Committee of the newly-merged P&P/Keble Group on October 12, 1963 the forthcoming Anglican/Methodist report on a unity scheme, and the "Leslie Paul Report" on the deployment and payment of clergy. Cf. Welsby, 81f, 167ff, 131ff.

60. Missionary & Ecumenical Council of the Church Assembly, "MRI in the C of E" (London, June 1964), p. 2f.

61. The Living Church, October 13, 1963.

62. Press release, n.d. [October 1963], Sherrill Resources Center, Episcopal Church Center, New York, pp. 1-3.

63. Journal of General Convention 1964, pp. 324-330.

64. The Primate's Committee of the Church's World Mission, "The Parish...a Powerhouse for World Mission," n.p., n.d., passim.

65. Church Information Office, "No Small Change" (Rotherham, Henry Garnett & Co.), [p. _].

66. The Primate's Committee on Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence, The Church of England in Australia, "M.R.I. 1966: Leader's Book" (Melbourne, General Board of Religious Education), p. 16.

67. The Primate's Committee on Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence, The Church of England in Australia, "M.R.I. 1966: Clergy Book" (Melbourne, General Board of Religious Education), p. 5.

68. "M.R.I. 1966: Leader's Book," pp. 16, 43, 18f.

69. "The Parish...a Powerhouse for World Mission," 10f., 29f. Cf. Hikaru Yanagihara, "Can 'Group' Exist in Japan," East & West Review, XXVII, 2 (April 1961), 32f.; Eric A. Cowing, "Church and Group Life Laboratory," East & West Review, XXVII, 1 (January 1961), 24-31.

70. Ibid., 19, 27f, 46f, 52f, 61, 74, 85f.

71. Morgan, Agenda for Anglicans (New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1963).

72. Till, Change and Exchange (London: MRCCA, 1964).

73. John Wilkinson, ed., Mutual Responsibility: Questions and Answers (London: SPCK and CMS, 1964).

74. Bayne to Coggan, May 18, 1963, Bayne MSS.

75. New York Times, March 18, 1963, 1; Burroughs interview.

76. Bayne, "Notes on Interview with Michael Cantaur," 9 May 1963, Bayne MSS.

77. Coggan to Bayne, 14 March 1963, Bayne MSS.

78. Bayne to Coggan, August 14, 1963, Bayne MSS.

79. Bayne to Gray, October 2, 1963, Gray MSS.

80. Bayne to Ramsey, November 7, 1963, Bayne MSS.

81. Cf. Coggan interview.

82. Journal 1964, pp. v-viii.

83. Minutes of the Triennial..., St. Louis, Mo., 1964, Sherrill Resources Center, New York, pp. 87-89. The "Triennial" meets concurrently to General Convention, though they are two distinct entities.

84. "MRI Report: Report of the Mutual Responsibility Commission to the Sixty Second General Convention," n.p., [1967], p. 3.

85. Journal 1964, 324-330; cf. Appendix 2o, "Report of the Presiding Bishop's Committee on Mutual Responsibility," 722-730.

86. "MRI Report," 3.

87. Ibid., 55.

88. MRI Resource Book 1: Background for Action (New York: Seabury Press, [1966]), 14.

89. "A Statement from the Mutual Responsibility Commission to the Church," April 21, 1965, Esquirol Papers, Hartford.

90. Letter of Thomas H. Wright to "the Bishops of our Church," April 28, 1965, J. H. Esquirol MSS, Hartford.

91. Bayne to "My dear brothers" [PECUSA bishops], April 29, 1965, Hutchens MSS, Hartford.

92. [MRI Commission,] "Projects for Partnership," n.d. Eight- to twelve-page pamphlets described the Middle East, South Pacific, Latin America, Africa, North America and Asia, in addition to the overview.

93. MRI Resource Book 1: Background for Action and Stephen F. Bayne, MRI Resource Book 2: Mission in Response (New York: Seabury Press, 1966).

94. The MRI Packet, "Introductory Section: Beliefs and Goals," n.p., Seabury Press, 1967, pp. 6, 5, 10ff; "Aids for Parish Leaders and Units for Group Study," p. 1; "Self-Evaluation and Planning in the Parish," p. 3.

95. "Layman's Newsletter," Late Trinity, 1966, Hutchens MSS, Hartford.

96. MRI Resource Book 1, p. 17; Response--Far and Near, May-June, 1966, p. 1.

97. Diocese of East Carolina, "MRI Far and Near," [1966?], Sherrill Resources Center, pp. 24, 35, 37f, 47ff, 51ff, 56.

98. Diocese of Connecticut Bulletin, 10, #6 (May 6, 1965), WHC MSS.

99. Gray, Pastoral Letter, December 1, 1964, WHC MSS, p. 2.

100. Diocese of Connecticut Bulletin, 10, #3 (January 19, 1965).

101. Gray, Pastoral Letter, December 1, 1964, WHC MSS, p. 1.

102. The Living Church, April 21, 1963, 8, 14; John G. Pennypacker, St. Mark's and Its Forebears: The First 200 Years (Mt. Vernon, New York: Golden Eagle Press, 1964), 145.

103. Untitled, undated memo [1965?], WHC MSS; memo from Diocesan MRI Commission, Dec. 1, 1965, JMH MSS, 1.

104. Report of The M.R.I. Commission of the Diocese of Connecticut, [1965 or 1966], pp. 5-12.

105. Bishop's Address, Journal of the Annual Convention of the Diocese of Connecticut (afterwards Connecticut Journal), 1965, 112.

106. Cf. Connecticut Journal 1965, 112; MRI Commission Report, Connecticut Journal 1966, 76.

107. Helene M. Schnerbush & Grant A. Morrill, comps. & eds., The History of St. Mark's Parish 1964-1971 (n.p., October 1961), 19.

108. Diocese of Connecticut, "MRI In Action" (1966?), pp. C-1ff.

109. Ibid., pp. A/T-5-9.

110. Schnerbush, The History of St. Mark's Parish 1964-1971, 19.

111. Connecticut Journal 1968, 75.

112. Grant A. Morrill, letter to "Brother Clergy," September 21, 1967 with accompanying description of "The Church, The World, and You," JMH MSS; Connecticut Journal 1968, 83.

113. The Ad Hoc Committee [of diocesan clergy], untitled memorandum to the clergy of the Diocese of Connecticut, January 1, 1967, Hutchens MSS.

114. Cf. The Book of Common Prayer, 298: "Holy Baptism is appropriately administered within the Eucharist on the chief service on a Sunday or other feast."

115. Report of The M.R.I. Commission of the Diocese of Connecticut, [1965 or 1966], pp. 5-12; Connecticut Journal 1966, 191ff, 233..

116. Ibid., 3.

117. Connecticut Journal 1968, 83, 115.

118. WHC to G. A. Morrill, August 14, 1967, JMH MSS.

119. Connecticut Journal 1968, 83f, 115, 117-120.

120. MRI Resource Book 1, 15f.

121. Burroughs interview. MRI in Ohio was not exclusively tied to Brazil. Parishes were allowed and encouraged to assume "Projects for Partnership" in the wider program. However, the connection was a natural one, and the enthusiasm high. Cf. Journal of the Diocese of Ohio, 1966, pp. 100-102; 1967, pp. 82-84; 1968, pp. 108-112. As in Connecticut, MRI received little word in 1969.

122a. Gray, Pastoral Letter, March 19, 1965, WHC MSS, p. 3f.

123a. Address of the Bishop, Journal of the Diocese of Colorado, 1968.

D. Responses Far and Near

122. MRI Resource Book 1, 14.

123. Bayne to "my dear brothers" [PBCUSA bishops], April 29, 1965, p. 2.

124. MRI Report 1967, 15f.

125. MRI Resource Book 1, 14f.

126. Powley interview, Paton interview.

127. Bayne, Introduction to Projects for Partnership 1965-1966 (Executive Council, September 1965), 2f.

128. Ibid., pp. 3-6.

129. MRI Report 1967, 1.

130. MRI Resource Book 1, 12.

131. E.g. Samuel van Culin and Nelson Burroughs; Arthur Walmsley was surprised by the assertion. Cf. interviews with each by the author.

132. Torrey, "Off on the Wrong Foot?," 24.

133. M. Boone Porter, letter to the author, June 18, 1986.

134. Bayne to the Rev. E. Lawrence Carter, March 11, 1964, Bayne MSS.

135. Cf. Journal 1967, pp. 465.

136. Bayne, "Church & People," August 1964, Bayne MSS.

137. John Vockler, "Polynesia," in All One Body, 274f.

138. MRI Resource Book 1, 15.

139 Cf. East Carolina, 47ff.

140. Burroughs interview.

VII. Whatever Happened to MRI?

"The time is urgent. The woods are on fire. The trees are burning all around."[1]

So the MRI Committee reported to the 1967 General Convention. Soon not trees but cities were burning, cities and Vietnamese jungles; and in these flames MRI would disintegrate in the United States. It would not linger much longer elsewhere, before Anglican leaders transformed it to something else.

Inside the Royal York Hotel, the Toronto delegates could see traces of what was to come. Already that summer of 1963, British youth went wild over a long-haired foursome who called themselves the Beatles. British theologians, clergy and laity were debating Bishop John Robinson's latest book, Honest To God; another bishop soon to win comparable notoriety, James Pike of California, fired the first shot in another controversy by condemning glossolalia in his churches. Vatican II had recessed until fall, little realizing that another Pope would occupy Peter's chair when it resumed. President Kennedy, who also would not survive the year, increased the number of advisors in Vietnam. And, right after the Congress finished, a "March for Jobs and Freedom" would rally blacks and whites in a massive civil rights demonstration in Washington.

Whether on the cultural, religious, social, political or international scene, massive changes were in store. They would rearrange institutions and understandings. In the process they would disintegrate the synthesis which undergirded MRI; and in their swirling dynamics they would eventually force the MRI program well into the shadows.

Thus, even as it was proclaimed, MRI's demise was destined by forces which no Church, no institution could escape. Some of its faults lurked within the program, if not the concept. Even greater influences whirled around and even in the Congress, gently at first but gathering inexorable power which by the critical year of 1968 spelled the end of the MRI program.

A. Problems Within MRI

Neither mangoes nor new redeemed nor the Church can put on the new without the old reappearing. Former ways die hard.

As MRI turned from vision to program, criticism inevitably continued. In some cases, such as Douglas Webster's small book, Mutual Irresponsibility, the critiques were incorporated into the book-lists as a means of forestalling difficulties by pointing them out before they happened.[2] Others observed that MRI, like any human effort, had its defects. Unfortunately for MRI, some of their criticisms went uncorrected, so that the defects fed into the even greater forces which would spell MRI's doom.

One set of problems concerned the MRI program. Critics on this level accepted the paper's theses but questioned their execution. Douglas Webster voiced his concerns over the danger of "doing the right things in the wrong way."[3] He, and others, raised some salient questions.

First, what were priorities in giving and receiving? The fear had been expressed from the first that MRI was merely "a great exercise in fund-raising to keep the Anglican Communion afloat and where possible to help it to move a little faster." Webster saw dangers in sending money rather than personnel, and in building structures rather than staffs. "To provide this kind of help could be little short of mutual irresponsibility."[4] A missionary dreamed of his African bishop analyzing the needs of his diocese and proposing for the MRI Regional Directory an "octagonal addition to Cathedral, for such purposes as the Bishop shall designate, including Bible study and training in methods of Evangelism"—in short, a chapter house, just like in England or Canada.[5] Asked Webster of such proposals, "Can this in all honesty be regarded as a missionary priority, so urgent that outside help is justified?[6]

In addition to prioritism, he wondered if money was being given in lieu of more personal involvement.

> Money is a substitute for persons which it will not give or will not spare. Money is sacramental when a Church gives in such a way that it gives of itself, its prayers and its members, the money going with and because of the people whom it also gives.[7]

Furthermore, this was not a matter only for the Western Churches. If money is sacramental, then it behooves <u>each</u> Church to give to others without regard to the relative wealth of either giver or receiver, nor the size of the gift.[8] Indeed, the nature of giving and receiving forms a second major concern. For one Church exclusively to give or alternatively to receive defeats the purpose of MRI. But <u>how</u> a Church gives and receives may be equally as important. For example, younger Churches can infuse older Churches with new, vibrant ideas. On the other hand, Webster warns of the temptation to glean them by inviting persons from younger Churches to spend extended time in the West: Great are the dangers of culture shock, of dependence resulting from generous and kind-spirited parishes, of removing much-needed manpower from one area to minister in the West--manpower which might necessarily be the very best in order to cope with the Western situation, and who might be seen in Western eyes as typical of his Church. Training an African in Britain might appeal to both British and African, but preparing him for an English curacy might do grave injustice when he tries to minister in Africa. That, asserted Webster, made for a "shocking irresponsibility."[9]

MRI tried to promote inter-Anglican relationships. Sweet we these became bilateral instead of multilateral. This was a third concern, especially when the United States was involved. Webster was one of several who cautioned against the limitations which a companion diocese relationship inevitably imposes. In fact many dioceses equated the two; "to them MRI has come to mean 'companion diocese.'"[10] Some dioceses, such as Ohio, structured MRI efforts around their companionship.[11] While this gave impetus and personal meaning

to their efforts, it suffered from restricted horizons. "If Mutual Responsibility is to mean what it was meant to mean," wrote Webster, "it implies interdependence and multilateral links and relationships with the whole Church. Anything less than this falls short of the Toronto vision."[12]

Fourth, some questioned if MRI was truly mutual. A missionary in Asia complained that the program "got off on the wrong foot" by

> asking the erstwhile receiving churches to make us a long list (as being, of course, the erstwhile sending churches) what they needed.... This we should have done, but not to have left the other unsaid, namely, to ask the USA, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia to make a list of their needs to submit to the others first.[13]

The question of how and what Western churches could receive plagued the program from the start: Although many, such as the current Presiding Bishop, were fascinated by the novelty of Americans abdicating Yankee independence for once in order to rely on others,[14] at least in terms of resources the MRI program was necessarily lopsided. Ironically, when the United States for one found itself confronting its most significant crises of the postwar years, the Episcopal Church neither asked for nor received help from outside.

Critics of MRI's effectiveness essentially agreed with the concept, if not its execution. A second set of concerns scrutinized the very notion of MRI. From the outset, including at the Congress, worries were voiced that MRI was essentially contrary to ecumenism. To what did the phrase "Body of Christ" refer in its title? Despite explanations to the contrary, some perceived an implication of Anglicanism alone. From Pakistan to the London Times came the observation that, with but one exception, every reference to "the Church" implied Anglicans. "To follow this way is to put the clock back at least 20 years" and to contradict the essence of MRI itself.[15] For all its ecumenical efforts, wrote G. E. Duffield, a lay member of England's Church Assembly,

> official Anglicanism seems unable or unwilling to extricate itself from pan-denominational, pan-episcopalian Anglican Communion thinking. In fact its exponents do not seem to show the inclination for the dramatic rethinking which in MRI they are urging on others.[16]

Second, MRI produced a higher degree of centralization than many deemed acceptable. The *Times* correspondent, for one, objected especially to a Regional Officer for India appointed by Canterbury (albeit with Indian advice) and given $15 million "which will bedevil his relationship to Anglicans in India and our relationships with other Christians." For all the respect he commanded as an eminent Indian bishop, the Regional Officer had no official connection to other denominations or to interdenominational organs, with the result, the writer feared, of casting "doubt on our integrity as Christian citizens."[17]

Some, such as Duffield, saw this as part of an ongoing and deleterious trend. "We all know there has been an enormous growth in centralization in Anglicanism," he wrote, manifested in England by Church Assembly boards, the Paul Report on parish patronage, and now MRI in two ways. He feared, on one hand, a "coup": "Can anyone seriously doubt that at the present moment Lambeth controls policy behind the scenes?" On the other, he dreaded over-amalgamating the missionary societies lest either local commitment or evangelical enthusiasm be diluted.[18]

Finally, MRI called for "radical change" in Anglicanism; and some feared it meant exactly that. Duffield alleged that "MRI gives the impression that Anglicans have suddenly got to change everything." But the Church of England in his view

> has far too many revolutionary schemes on hand. It cannot think them all out at once. It is fatally easy to imagine that simply having a new Prayer Book, a new Bible translation, a shake up in clerical deployment, a merger with the Methodists, and a few other changes will solve our problems. These things will not solve them, for the real problems are elsewhere--intellectual and theological muddle in the churches,...--low standards of godliness in the church--a spiritual poverty of prayer and worship.[19]

On the other hand, for some, MRI was not going far enough in the directions which Duffield would find anathema. John Heuss, Rector of Trinity Church, New York, in his 1965 Hale Sermon at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, pleaded for a far greater degree of Anglican centralization. For archbishops to meet

Biennially was inefficient; rather, he argued, they should comprise a canonically-authorized International Council to oversee the entire Communion. It should coordinate not only missionary efforts through a Department of Anglican Mission sited in London, but also Christian education materials and ecumenical consultations. It could prompt an "Anglican people-to-people program" so that priests and especially laity could become better acquainted across Provincial lines. He would not want a Papal government any more than Duffield; yet he urged a more earnest searching toward Anglican--versus Episcopalian or C-of-E--attitudes. MRI moved in that direction, but "already I see signs that the phrase 'mutual responsibility and interdependence' is becoming a smooth slogan to cover up our sins of national pride and ecclesiastical slothfulness." Instead, he proposed,

> as the Church of Rome has discovered that too great centralization of power is no longer suitable for the modern world, so Anglicans around the earth deep in their hearts know that we no longer can go it alone without central planning, without frequent communication, without coordinated policies, and without real leadership.

Thus, point by point he refuted the critics: On ecumenism, he went further; on centralization, he urged even greater coordination than did the primates; against a resistance to too much change, he alleged the changes were not radical enough. "Let us retain that which is good. Let us also be daring for Christ's sake in a totally new world."[20]

House found a strange bedfellow in the Church Times editorialist. In a stinging autopsy of MRI's alleged inability to generate significant sums for its projects, he cited "the simple reason that for its success it required a strong central executive authority which in the Anglican Communion simply does not exist."[21]

Bayne fired back from New York that "irrelevant editorial jargon about central authority" obscured the fundamental point that, to him, "we do not care enough." The mutual caring is what MRI sought to attain, he argued, far above the "scheme of Christian charity" which the Church Times had consistently

conveyed. "From the start," Hayes charged, "...you have failed to understand 'NEI'. You still consider it a financial program."[12]

Critics by and large agreed with Hayes. That, at least, was not their question. Whether NEI went too far or not far enough, it would soon be subsumed in the face of farther-reaching dynamics which would test the Church's ability to accept--or contend with--radical changes. NEI had opened the Church to new ideas and new structures, even if not everyone in the Church agreed on whether or not even that was a good thing. But these new ideas, if not the structures, helped to fan the fires that were beginning to kindle.

B. Disintegration of the Synthesis

In his keynote address to the Toronto Congress, Max Warren raised problems twice in quick succession. First, he suggested God might work through such unlikely characters as Marx and Freud. Then, he commended a "deeply sincere and profoundly courageous book by the Bishop of Woolwich," Honest to God.[1] He provoked a minor crisis on that first day. Some groups wanted to approve the book formally. Others felt Robinson "had failed to communicate the Christian faith to outsiders and caused further confusion within the Church." They were unable to resolve their divisions.[2]

They typified what would happen over the years. Robinson's book sparked a far-reaching debate which at heart asked the same question as NEI: How do Christians address the modern world? Like the synthesis which grew out of the immediate postwar years, so now the argument touched every aspect of Christian life: Liturgy, theology, pastoral ministry, ethics both personal and social. In time the debate became nearly as tumultuous as the decade itself. But in the process, the synthesis began to unravel. By decade's end not only NEI but the coherentness of the Church had been tattered.

Like the synthesis before it, the debate emerged within the tension of the intellectual with the concrete. In 1962, a group of Cambridge scholars

published a volume of essays entitled Soundings: Essays Concerning Christian Understanding. Edited by Alec Vidler, they drew out some of the questions which had arisen from theological and biblical studies of the post-war period. When British readers awoke to a Sunday morning newspaper entitled "Our Image of God must Go," the dispute broke into the open. Robinson wrote the article the week before Honest to God was published. The publicity, the cheap cost of the paperback, and the fact that its author wore episcopal purple guaranteed worldwide sales exceeding a million copies.[25]

Robinson was not interested in royalties nearly so much as the Church's mission. As a biblical scholar, liturgical reformer and bishop of a declining urban diocese, he could pose the questions which scholarship, on the one hand, and the modern person, on the other, were themselves asking. Drawing on Barth and Bonhoeffer, Robinson maintained that man who has "come of age" needs new images to understand God, a God which can propel him into "the beyond in the midst," "to the Christ in the hungry, the needy, the homeless and the prisoners." Instead of moral codes, "compassion for persons overrides all law."[26]

He provoked a storm. "It is not every day that a bishop goes on public record as apparently denying almost every Christian doctrine of the Church in which he holds office," spluttered the Church Times. Archbishop Ramsey paid outward due to the questions being debated; he published booklets sympathetic to what Robinson was asking. Inwardly, he was irked.[27] He confided to Bayne that Robinson "is philosophically illiterate, that he strayed from theology into mysticism without recognizing the difficulty, and without being competent in mysticism."[28]

But the debate spread. Cambridge students heard lectures, subsequently published in a best-selling book whose title summarised its theme: Objections to Christian Belief (1963). The same year in the United States, Paul Van Buren put out The Secular Meaning of the Gospel which declared that statements about an unknowable God are meaningless but that Jesus Christ could hold meaning for

the world as the perfect expression of freedom. Harvey Cox lauded modern society in The Secular City (1965). It only remained for two more Americans to debate when God died, whether in the first century when Christ arrived (T. J. J. Altizer) or in the twentieth (William Hamilton).[29]

What radical theologians proposed was a variant of some MRI concerns. As one apologist explained, "The call for a new Christianity issues out of a confluence and collision of fideism and exclusivism with relativism and secularism." Fideism which places faith on the basis of authoritative revelation had been challenged by nineteenth-century Liberalism and twentieth-century Neo-orthodoxy, and indeed much of post-war theological thinking. Likewise, Christianity's claim to exclusive truth had been undermined through contact with other faiths or--as Warren implied by referring to Marx and Freud--with other intellectual forces. A Christian monopoly on truth further eroded under the waves of ecumenism. Instead, discovering diversity breeded a relativism which tended to abrogate a sense of the absolute. "The idea of timeless truths, unchanging values and permanent institutions appears hollow in a world increasingly committed to relativism"; and claims to divine knowledge came across as arrogant presumption. Finally, radical theologians concentrated on this world, this age. Where previous ages oriented themselves to think in terms "from above," modern man responds to science, technology and social revolution by explaining life and truth "from below." The theological phenomenon was a counterpart to youth not trusting anyone over thirty. "The day of accepting anything on authoritative testimony without empirical and experiential corroboration soon will or already has passed away."[30]

In its way, speakers at the 1965 Congress fostered themes of the then-emerging radical theologians. Exploring the frontiers of life meant confronting realities in the world and appreciating them for what they were worth, from Islam and Buddhism to social change and ecumenism. Those who sought encouragement in radical directions, indeed, the radical theologians

did not spring from nought. Sydney Ahlstrom maintains that they insisted that theology not segregate itself from its social environment (a point repeatedly made about the Anglican Communion). But radical theologians and biblical scholars were rejecting how their neo-orthodox fathers had met, or glossed over, the challenge of modern religious ideas.

> In this light we may more clearly see that the proposals of the so-called 'death of God theologians' and Rudolph Bultmann's program for demythologizing biblical language, were essentially continuous with a tendency that Max Weber had ascribed to Calvinistic theology in general and Puritanism in particular: 'The elimination of magic from the world.'[31]

Reactions to Warren's reference to Honest To God show by no means everyone at Toronto either perceived this continuity or approved the trend. As much as "a very considerable minority...was no doubt deeply relieved to find more meaningful ways to express their faith and order their lives," Ahlstrom agrees that the radical ideas profoundly disquieted a great many.[32] So they did. Radical theology provoked a hubbub in Britain and the United States. Robinson, of course, was a bishop. Paul van Buren had left the Episcopal priesthood; Altizer remained an Episcopal layman.[33]

In the United States, the theological quandaries led to an Episcopal crisis when the Bishop of California, James Pike, was charged with heresy. Pike had attained Church-wide fame for his contribution with Norman Pittinger to the Seabury Series, The Faith of the Church (1951). Edited by the future Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger, nearly 150,000 copies circulated throughout the Church. Pike could claim that "it is the only over-all doctrinal formulation which our Church with any degree of official sanction has ever issued" other than the Articles of Religion in 1801.[34] Though not numbered among the radical theologians Pike had close ties to them--Robinson mailed him an advance copy of Honest to God--and shared convictions in a "post-Copernican theology" which addresses laity as well as professionals.[35] Two sermons on the day before the 1964 St. Louis General Convention, the one which would give final approval

to MRI, prompted the Bishop of South Florida to demand from the floor of the House of Bishops an apology for his 9:30 sermon on racial justice and for his 11:00 sermon on doctrine. By 1966 he was charged with heresy. Bishop Bayne chaired the committee to explore the charges and arrange a settlement.[36]

In 1965, Time bannered from its cover: "Is God dead?" Just three years later, it queried, "Is 'God is dead' dead?"[37] Radical theology was just not tenable. For missions, it provided no sustenance: An evangelist could hardly preach a gospel of an obsolete God. For Anglicanism, any success it had in addressing a new world in modern terms must be balanced by the confusion it sowed and the impression it gave of theological disarray even among the episcopate. No longer could the bishops pretend--if indeed they ever could--of speaking with one theological voice.

C. Episcopalians In Crisis

Meanwhile, President Kennedy was sending troops to Vietnam, and Lyndon Johnson sent even more. The draft provoked resistance on college campuses. But as much as Episcopalians argued about these, nothing so indicated the disintegration of Anglican unity in the United States as the combination of urban and racial crises.

The night before the Toronto Congress convened, Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger convoked his bishops for a special meeting. One topic alone comprised the agenda: "Race Relations," or so a special committee called its report. Just over two weeks hence, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. would lead a "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom." A Church Assembly would gather in conjunction with the demonstration.[38]

The bishops felt compelled to speak, not only because of imminent events. The racial situation in the United States had become increasingly urgent, and Episcopalians had been progressively more vocal, on each side of the issue of civil rights. In 1960 an office of the National Church produced a paper on

civil disobedience. Recalls Arthur Walmsley, one of its authors, "Some of the Southern bishops were indignant because it seemed to be supporting Dr. King--which it was! The whole tradition of civil disobedience and public demonstration just wasn't there."[39] That tradition would quickly grow, and include members of the House themselves: Bishop Daniel Corrigan was arrested and jailed at a protest. Sixteen priests were imprisoned in Jackson, Mississippi. Meanwhile, in the South, certain Episcopal schools remained staunchly segregated.[40] Amid the growing controversy, Lichtenberger issued a pastoral letter on Whitsunday, 1963 appealing for personal commitment, action and money from Episcopalians to support the protest. He lodged his Church squarely against segregation.[41]

The House of Bishops agreed. First, it commended the Presiding Bishop's letter as "appropriate and helpful," "wise and timely." Second, with an eye toward Washington, it recognized not only the right of citizens to assemble to express grievances but also that participating "in such an assemblage is a proper expression of Christian witness and obedience"; it welcomed the discipleship which impels such obedience, and prayed that the march would peacefully succeed. Finally, it urged the U. S. Congress to pass civil rights legislation.[42] Nelson Burroughs, vice-president of the House, remembers general agreement (votes were not recorded). But one of his colleagues, George Gunn of Southern Virginia, groused to a Time reporter that "the resolution was not the way to accomplish anything. Mass meetings don't help anybody."[43]

Within days, the issue reached the floor of the Toronto Congress. A South African priest working in the United States reported how his tour of Southern states exposed segregated Episcopal schools and even churches. "This is a scandal, and the truth must be spoken in love and charity."[44] Minutes later, a delegate from Southwestern Virginia attacked the "fuzziness of some clerics' minds," as when "the hierarchy of the Protestant Episcopal Church become[s] mere handmaidens of the pseudo-liberals, whose chief interest is either

political gain or factional dominance." He saw nothing necessarily discriminatory in segregation, and

> nothing Christian about a mob of 100, of 200, of 1,000 or of 250,000 people parading throughout the streets (in Washington or elsewhere), disrupting traffic, pushing people from sidewalks, blocking business establishments and causing others not of a like mind to become overly excited.[45]

When he finished a chorus of applause and hisses competed through the hall.[46] Two days later, delegates cheered Michigan's Bishop Emrich who stridently called segregation a sin. The editorial committee reported a "comprehensive and uncompromising 'finding'" that discussion groups "affirmed their conviction that all Christians must associate themselves with the unequivocal condemnation" of discrimination. This was all echoed in the Congress' message, though only after a vigorous exhortation by a Nigerian delegation.[47]

Days later, Dr. King led thousands of demonstrators to the Lincoln Memorial, Episcopalians among them: Bishop Creighton of Washington led a contingent of 1,000 who had gathered at St. John's Church, Lafayette Square.[48] Clergy and laity would continue to participate visibly in the Civil Rights movement.[49]

They could claim support (if any were needed) not just from repeated resolutions of General Convention, but from MRI: Bishop Bayne drew a direct connection between the centrality of mission for the Church with the struggle for racial justice--a connection which he said Episcopalians had too much overlooked. "The fact was," he told the Congress,

> that we were simply not engaged in the racial conflict--this was a special mission, which was out on the periphery of the Church somewhere; and therefore we were able to avoid facing this cancerous thing which was at the very heart of American life, and is now.

The answer, he continued, lies both in personal renewal and in organizing for mission, keeping the issue ever in the forefront of Christian consciousness.[50] MRI's point of view, then, upheld the social action of the 'sixties.

Concerns for civil rights soon could not be separated from concerns for cities. Attention increased as a perceived "urban crisis" deepened. The Episcopal Church was no exception, forced not only by national preoccupations but its own circumstances as well. In New York, said its bishop, Horace W. B. Donegan, the diocese had expanded greatly between 1940 and 1960. But by the late 'fifties growth had tapered off, most acutely affecting "the more vulnerable metropolitan areas." Responding to MRI, the diocese undertook a self-study "to determine how the Church can respond in this period of tension and uncertainty, to the sophisticated questions that men are asking about life and its meaning." MRI forced the diocese to confront the reality of its own changing life, both physically and intellectually.[51]

MRI brought out a different quality to whatever response Episcopalians could make. It did not lie in money so much as in relationships. At the height of the urban crisis, Presiding Bishop John Hines reflected on what constituted effective ministry, echoing if not citing Toronto's perspective.

> People have said about the church that it is very easy for it to give money, but it is less easy for it to identify itself with the poverty areas. It soon became apparent that the major problem was not really money, ...but it lay in the realm of <u>human relationships</u> and <u>human dignity</u>; and unless this could be ministered to by people who were at least properly motivated so to minister, then all the money that was poured in would never solve the problems which lay at the base of the difficulty.[52]

Money, though, was posing a problem as an instrument of the American Church. At the 1967 General Convention, Bishop Hines proposed a "Special Program" which would broadly reallocate budgetary priorities, allocate substantial funds--$3 million per year for three years--to bring "the people of the ghettos into areas of decision-making," to give this "empowerment money" to community organizations controlled by residents themselves, and to join with other American religious groups in a "mobilization" to heal the nation's wounds." The Church Women's Triennial Meeting voted by 447 to 20 to give the $2 million left over from its 1967 United Thank Offering for GCSP.[53]

All too quickly it aired in controversy. Barely months into the program, GCSP made a grant to defray expenses incurred by Julius Hobson, a controversial black civil rights leader in Washington, D. C. in suing the District's school system. Five prominent parishes of the diocese complained. One feared "a new course of division within the Church"; another alleged it harmed "the missionary challenge of our changing world." A third warned of "massive withholding of funds not simply by conservatives but by racial moderates" opposed to "his highly objectionable actions" outside of the suit itself. From New York, 815 cited GCSP guidelines permitting grants for "long-range attacks on causes of violence, to provide hope for people in ghettos." Hines' assurances that Hobson served on a committee which studied the social issues and which led to GCSP did little to allay the furor.[54] By 1970, when $5 million had gone for GCSP grants, critics had plenty to cite: $40,000, for example, to a New Mexico-based Hispanic organization whose leader languished in jail for killing two in a courthouse standoff. Some would applaud and others would mourn the Episcopal Church's leadership among mainline denominations in supporting projects for minority groups.[55]

Meanwhile, the war in Vietnam intensified, and with it, radicalism on college campuses and demonstrations opposing the war and the draft. Late in 1967, the Bishop of Pennsylvania was urged to resign by the "Committee for the Preservation of Anglican Principles" who alleged that his Urban Missioner had abetted the burning of draft cards when he attended an anti-war rally in October. Bishop DeWitt denied the charge and declined to quit.[56]

On May 1, 1969, James Forman, a half-dozen associates, a television crew and a gaggle of reporters walked into 815 demanding to see Bishop Hines. As the PB was in Wyoming consecrating a bishop, they were ushered in to see the second-in-command, Stephen Bayne, along with Brooke Mosley, the two ranking prelates. They presented him with what came to be known as the "Black Manifesto." As "reparations" for injustices toward black peoples, Forman

demanded $60 million for black economic development, 60% of yearly profits of all PECUSA's assets from stock holdings and real estate to pension funds, and a listing of all assets of the Church and its dioceses.[57] It was his first stop of a tour that led to the National Council of Churches and other denominational headquarters, leaving demands which totalled $500 million from American churches. "There were no threats or abusive or violent gestures," Bayne reported to fellow bishops, but with typical understatement added "we were caught off guard." The event generated considerable publicity, "yet...I can't see how we could fairly have refused to receive him." Fairness, too, led Bayne to place the Manifesto into a broader context.

> It is skillfully drawn by a man who has done his homework well. The ten specific demands include objectives which, with two or three exceptions, are sensible and important in the eyes of most people. ...The "reparation" concept is (I think) inappropriate and unjust to all concerned. But there is an echo in it, surely, of profound Christian significance--and to the Jewish community, too. Whether one wants to quote John Donne or Lincon's second inaugural or whatever, the fact is that injustice and cruelty entail a cost on all who come afterward.[58]

In comparably conciliatory tones, he calmly instructed the 815 staff on how to respond if demonstrators took over their building. "The work of the Church is going to go on even if our building is closed for a couple of days."[59]

As incursions into church headquarters gave way to interruptions of church services, as Forman raised his demands to $3 billion, tensions shot sky-high. Unlike Bayne's attempt at evenhandedness and the NCC's "great appreciation" for Forman's "presentation" which warranted serious study by denominations, "the American public responded to the Black Manifesto as though it were a sick joke."[60] For some, it was the last straw. Whether on civil rights, the Manifesto or Vietnam, from bishops, priests and laity, an avalanche of letters poured into 815, asking for clarification, challenging the official point of view, threatening to withhold pledges. "We are shocked at the Church handing out money to the black people and we want not one cent of our money to be used

in this way," wrote one couple to Bayne.[61] They were relatively mild. Bayne responded with lengthy and often-appreciated replies which soothed at least some and perhaps helped somewhat to reconcile, recalls Peggy Chisholm.[62] But the days were tense. John Hines entered the 1970 Convention with a bodyguard after receiving threats on his life two months before. The security budget increased from $3,000 in 1967 to $50,000 in 1970.[63]

There was more. New forms of spirituality challenged mainline churches. Yale University students were speaking in tongues as early as 1963, a phenomenon which James Pike, of all bishops, admonished as "dangerous to peace and unity of the Church and a threat to sound doctrine and polity."[64] And the "new morality" emerged, with an Episcopal priest, Joseph Fletcher, bestowing upon it the name "situation ethics." Walter Gray, who praised MRI at one moment, chastized this "liberal" tendency a few breaths later[65]--not realizing that some of the same forces were responsible for both.

Every mainline denomination faced these tensions. Within the Episcopal Church, there were others. Not only did the 1967 Convention vote in GCSP, it allowed laity to administer the chalice at the Eucharist. It authorized women to sit, for the first time, on the floor of General Convention beginning in 1970; in England, women had been allowed to lead worship since 1963.[66] Most directly concerning every parish in the Church, it authorized revision of the Prayer Book, first resulting in "The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper (1967), the "Green Book" (Services for Trial Use, 1970) and the "Zebra Book" (Authorized Services, 1973). Though the process did not end with a new book until 1979, it was the beginning of the end of the 1928 Prayer Book.

Meanwhile, throughout the Communion, Provinces reexamined their liturgies. Lambeth 1958 had encouraged it. But Episcopalians felt it acutely: With all that was going on, 1967 marked a decline in baptized membership--first in its history--that would would continue until 1981.[67]

The slippage was not peculiar to Episcopalians. Nor were other results. Clergy and laity increasingly diverged in attitudes on civil rights and the war. One scholar found that, on a five item "hawk-dove scale," the general public was two and a half times more hawkish than the clergy.[68] The survey might have traced comparable attitudes on theology and liturgy as well. One observer noted that seminarians had little trouble adapting to higher biblical criticism, but graduates preached a "practical fundamentalism" as though the developments had never occurred.[69]

The feeling grew, too, that an ecclesiastical "establishment" was divorced from those in the pew or even the pulpit: Complaints abounded from both right and left, from those who perceived their Church moving way too fast and from those who lost confidence in it moving at all.[70] So resistence developed to national structures generally. "There was that sense that powerful, big forces were controlling our lives so we had to have this grassroots business," recalls a bishop, then at 815. Diocese after diocese abolished departments and programs in favor of local initiative.[71]

Further, as the Washington parish warned, donations decreased. In 1969 the national programs of major Protestant denominations suffered their first cutback in funds since the depression. A New York layman upset over clergy involvement in civil rights withdrew a $600,000 pledge to the Diocese of New York.[72] Largely because of GCSP, pledges in the Diocese of North Carolina decreased by $160,000, and the Bishop of New Mexico and Southwest Texas, irked by the courthouse seige by GCSP-funded militants, withheld his $82,000 quota.[73] For the national Church, collective consequences were severe. Over the previous two decades, the national staff had grown with the Church and its program; over 20 oversaw the "Seabury Series" in the Christian education department. Diminished funds and decreasing confidence could no longer support such a structure, but its demise was quick and by all reports insensitive.

First a third of the staff and then a half of the survivors received pink slips "as Christmas presents."[74] What was left of the 1971 budget ran $1 million short, balanced by legacies.[75]

The confluence of crises drew many a program into its maw. Spiritual life suffered: "Parishfield," a retreat house on a Michigan farm, moved to downtown Detroit transmogrified into a center for remedial education. The Boston Industrial Mission, designed to explore the Christian faith in an electronic age with people in high-tech industries in the Route 128 complex, shifted to urban work in Boston's center. The Joint Urban Program, created in 1961 as a pilot program to relate the gospel to urban culture, gave way to UCSP.[76] Ministries to higher education eventually fell for lack of funding and lowering of priority.[77] One by one, programs crafted in the 'fifties and early 'sixties were swept aside by the forces and tensions of a new era.

So two were leaders. Stephen Bayne left 815 for General Theological Seminary in 1970. Before the next Convention, John Hines had announced his early retirement, criticized, depressed, and surrounded by controversy.[78]

In the face of such a maelstrom, MRI had no chance to survive. By 1968 it was shoved to the back of Episcopal consciousness; by 1969, virtually nothing remained of its once-vast program.

D. MRI's Role in the Crisis of the 'Sixties

Although the state of scholarship allows little more than hypotheses to be ventured, yet some lines seem evident as to why the Church was rent asunder in the 'sixties--and MRI's influence within that.

In 1963, delegates rejoiced at a pronouncement which, as officially as any such statement could do, brought the Anglican Communion to reflect, affirm, and minister both in and to the post-war world. Within a fortnight, Bob Dylan would sing from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, "The times, they are a'changing." At the moment when the post-war synthesis attained its most

significant Anglican promulgation, the world in which that synthesis grew suddenly changed, and, at the same time, the synthesis disintegrated.

By 1968, the optimism of newly-independent countries had ebbed. The President who tried to open the United States to wider horizons lay buried in Arlington Cemetery, and his brother nearby. Riots broke out when another visionary, Martin Luther King Jr., was assassinated, deepening an already profound urban and racial crisis. Vietnam attracted increasing attention, concern and furor as death tolls mounted and television reports depicted the mayhem to the world. Campus radicalism spawned by outward events and inward cultural shifts broke out in open revolts. To be sure, the seeds for many of these were sown long before; John Kennedy was the one who ordered more "advisors" to Saigon. The year 1968 marks a bitter harvest of turmoil, not only in the United States but in France, Czechoslovakia and around the world.

Likewise in the Church, that doleful year saw the harvest of fruits that had been long ago planted. It was bitter fruit, not necessarily because of the individual products but because, taken collectively, they left the Church deeply divided just at the point when unity in the face of the cultural, social, and political onslaught was crucial.

New theologies had undermined older presumptions. No longer could one speak of an overall orthodoxy within Anglicanism. While the Anglican approach breeds diversity, the decade saw diversity run rampant. Writers such as Robinson pressed the biblical probings of the previous decade to their limits. Although an able theologian of the postwar tradition presided at Canterbury, Michael Ramsey could mediate but not eradicate the furor within the Church and the wider society. Further, the hubbub over radical theology, Welsby alleges,

> revealed something of the intellectual poverty of many of the clergy. Those who had maintained their theological studies took the spate of radical publications in their stride for they were aware that these were bringing to the surface questions which had been asked over a long period. The response also showed the complacency with which Christians had accepted uncritically the theological statements of the faith.

If it strengthened the faith of some, it threatened the presumptions of many who perceived the ferment as undermining the very dogma of the Church.[79] What he wrote of Britain could undoubtedly be said of America and elsewhere.

Its ramifications were even wider. "Situation ethics" eventually ranked with "secular humanism" in the vocabulary of dangerous doctrines which decay the general morality. As unmarried couples chose to live together without benefit of Holy Wedlock, or as those who had received that blessing opted for divorce, "situation ethics" was blamed. Yet it, too, could be seen as a product of the post-war world.

During this same period, two more forces came to fruition. "Ministry of the laity" had become a theme of the previous decade; and many laypersons took that seriously. About fifty percent of them--arguably the more active half--were women. In the United States, women won the right to serve on vestries, stand as wardens, sit at diocesan conventions, and finally in 1970 to represent their dioceses to General Convention. Some discerned a call to ordained ministry, and the course of that movement proved even more divisive than arguments over the Prayer Book: The 1976 General Convention barely approved the resolution opening priesthood to women; it passed the new Prayer Book with near unanimity.[80]

Unanimity at General Convention did not mean unanimity throughout the Church. For over eight years, the Episcopal Church had not worshipped in common. Various trial services, designed to test new liturgies, brought an inevitable dose of disagreement as well as of study and experimentation. Of course, the proposals themselves reflected results of scholarship and of realities which built up in the Church, such as the concern for lay inclusion, Christian communal development and missionary conviction. Prayer Book revision by no means originated with "Services for Trial Use"; it began at least as far back as the Parish Communion Movement, Dix's Shape of the Liturgy, a 1946 General Convention authorization of studying the Prayer Book and the attentions

of the 1958 Lambeth Conference. The post-war period made clear, at least to one revisionist, that "the world view of the 1928 BCP is one which takes no account of the fact that Christendom in its Constantinian forms had been finally and irrevocably shattered."[81] Not everyone in the pew saw it that way.

Finally, MRI and GCSP grew from the same urgency to attend realistically to the needs of the world. Henry Knox Sherrill had insisted that the Church assist refugees coping with a demolished post-war Europe. MRI pressed Anglicans to learn of their world and help each other to cope with its realities. But it was one thing to support an irrigation project halfway around the world. It was quite another to read of local activists demonstrating in ways that tested--or overreached--the limits of legality in one's home city, only to find that the Church to which one contributed was providing it with funds. Furthermore, the massive educational effort of MRI had no counterpart in GCSP; nor did GCSP match MRI's emphasis upon personal renewal as a basis for action.

Thus, by 1968, the year which would mark the end of MRI's first, transitional phase, the basis upon which it stood had been demolished by the very forces which had built it up; and the world in which it was first placed had changed almost beyond recognition.

Meanwhile, many in the Church were still living in an atmosphere of the 1950's, or even before. MRI was one of countless efforts to assimilate new understandings into the life of the Church in ways that the Church could act. If, though, a leading bishop such as Burroughs was surprised by what he learned in 1963, how many more remained in their unenlightened state well into the decade. MRI sought to reach them; but by 1966 its fundamental theses were quavering under a twofold influence: On the one hand, new, even radical ideas were severely questioning older orthodoxies, making division inevitable. On the other, powerful groups were continuing to move along lines very different from masses of the people. Troops and generals found themselves marching to different ends, theologically and socially, while using different maps.

At the same time, MRI's contributions toward a church in turmoil must not be lost--even if it helped in ways to contribute to the turmoil.

If MRI was doomed by events swirling around it, the effort also helped to prepare the way for Episcopal participation in those events. First, it articulated a point of view which maintained that Christians must take world realities seriously. Second, it proclaimed that Christians must share in the life of the world, in the struggles of their own epoch, as servants of God. Finally, it conveyed this to the local level as no program ever had done.

Yet the demise of MRI was propelled by elements which led to MRI in the first place. What MRI sought to implement had the effect of undoing the MRI program. Indeed aspects of the synthesis which produced a manifesto such as MRI, when drawn to their conclusions, contributed toward the very tensions against which MRI had no chance. Biblical theology which trotted out old texts into new light inevitably raised questions which, once asked, could not so easily be dismissed. Liturgical scholarship likewise breached questions of how the Church celebrated its mysteries. The same urge that brought Africans to include local customs into their ritual brought "The Mind Garage" to perform the "Electric Mass" at Saint Mark's-in-the-Bowerie in Greenwich Village.[82] That laity were increasingly involved in an active ministry, no longer conceived of as the exclusive possession of the collared few, cried out for liturgical expression. It also raised the issue of whether one-half of the Church's population should be excluded from making decisions on vestries and conventions, and from ministering as deacons, priests and ultimately bishops.

Meanwhile MRI, itself an exercise in confronting realities of the world, encouraged dioceses, parishes and individuals not only to look around them but to respond. It was the first truly Church-wide missionary effort which combined biblical study, renewal, self-study and education as preparation for service. It got the Church into the habit of giving its resources to projects. In preaching mutual responsibility, it made grants for particular

programs, both outside the United States and within. CCSP did the same for the cities. It wanted to send personnel into the missionary fray: They went, if not to Africa or Asia, then to Selma, Washington, or Chicago; if not singing tunes of Wesley or Barnby, then chanting protest songs of Bob Dylan. Furthermore, MRI helped to open people to recognize what was happening. Out of MRI came the self-study which helped to knock off some of the complacency of the Diocese of New York and redirect efforts into urban parishes in crisis.

In light of MRI, it is not surprising that the Episcopal Church should stand out in its involvements or its grants. While MRI cannot be credited for the direction the Church took, its influence should not be discounted.

MRI provided, further, a theology and a methodology for tackling domestic as well as foreign issues. It had always been intended to serve Anglicanism at every level of the Church's life. Although usually associated with overseas mission, "MRI was a perfect design to apply to domestic issues," maintains Samuel van Culin.[83] Leon Modeste, who headed the CCSP, agrees that one component was missing from his program. "We could have spent more time trying to articulate and explain what the objectives and principles of the program were. And that was a mistake"--an omission which MRI did not make.[84]

On one key issue, though, MRI failed to rally the American Church. Despite all proclamations affirming mutual responsibility, at its moment of crisis the Episcopal Church stood alone, neither asking nor receiving assistance from its Anglican partners. Absorbed with its own problems, not only did it offer little to other Provinces, it was not in a condition to receive. Whatever experience others might have had in race relations, in urban problems, in confronting the ethical issues posed by Vietnam bore no importance, nor could others truly render moral support to a Church in the thick of a national internal paroxysm. Not only does this question how deeply the point of MRI had rooted in American soil, it marks a tragedy that, for all its good words, it could have such little effect at a moment when it was most needed.

VII. Notes: Whatever Happened to MRI?:

1. MRI Report, 19.

A. Problems Within MRI

2. Douglas Webster, Mutual Irresponsibility (London: SPCK, 1965), 2.

3. Ibid., 4.

4. Ibid., 4f.

5. Gavin White, "The Chapter House," OMR, XI, 3 (Whitsunday 1966), 43f. The account is fictional, but illustrates what some feared was happening.

6. Webster, 5.

7. Ibid., 6, emphasis in original.

8. Ibid., 7.

9. Ibid., 9-14.

10. Milton R. LeRoy, "Directional Inertia," OMR, XI, 2 (Epiphany 1966), 43.

11. Burroughs interview.

12. Webster, 17.

13. Torrey, "MRI: Off on the Wrong Foot?," 24, emphasis in original.

14. Cf. Browning interview.

15. C. Murray Rogers in a letter headlined "Christian Integrity" to the Times of London, clipping dated "April ?/64" in WMC papers, Hartford. Cf. also C. Fitzsimmons Allison, "Now, About this 'Manifesto'...," OMR, IX, 2 (Epiphany 1964), 1f.

16. G. E. Duffield, "Mutual Responsibility," The Churchman, LXXIX (1965), 29. The author undercuts his own argument by denigrating Roman Catholic eucharistic theology: "Teaching the mass is heresy just as much as denying the deity of Christ, for both undermine the Gospel of justification by faith alone." For him, ecumenism must arise out of loyalty to "biblical essentials" (31). Apparently in his eyes Roman Catholics need not apply.

17. Rogers, letter to the Times.

18. Duffield, 32f.

19. Ibid., 33f.

20. Heuss, Implications, 12-15.

21. "MRI In Trouble," Church Times, May 22, 1966, clipping in ACC Archives.

22. Bayne to The Editor, Church Times, June 1, 1966, ACC Archives.

B. Disintegration of the Synthesis:

23. AC'63, 21f, 26.

24. Ibid., 44a.

25. Welsby, 110.

26. Ibid., 111f.

27. Quoted in Welsby, 113; Welsby, 114.

28. Bayne, notes on Interview with Michael Centaur, 9 May 1963, Bayne MSS.

29. Welsby, 115f.

30. Lonnie D. Kliever and John H. Hayes, ed., Radical Christianity: The New Theologies in Perspective (Anderson, S.C.: Drake House, 1968), 21-35.

31. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, "National Trauma and Changing Religious Values," Daedalus, 107 (1978), 24f.

32. Ibid. Ahlstrom charges that those who were perhaps most disquieted were often the "nominally or merely habitual members who see the churches as a vicarious guarantor of traditional beliefs and values" who "may, indeed, be a very important conservative force in American life." While not arguing with the latter point, evidence of disquietude among delegates to the Anglican Congress--who are among those least likely to be considered merely nominal or habitual in their membership--suggests that some at the center of the Church's life were uneasy with the new trends in theology.

33. Ibid., 42f.

34. James A. Pike, If This Be Heresy (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 5. For another view on the same side of the controversy see William Stringfellow and Anthony Towne, The Bishop Pike Affair (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).

35. Pike, 7.

36. Ibid., 8; cf. Chisholm interview.

37. Time, April 8, 1966, 82-85; May 2, 1969, 44.

C. Episcopalians in Crisis

38. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the House of Bishops, August 12, 1963, 3.

39. Walmsley interview.

40. AC'63, 81.

41. New York Times, May 26, 1963, 59.

42. Minutes of the Special Meeting, 3.

43. Burroughs interview; Time, August 23, 1963, 49.

44. AC'63, 81.

45. Ibid., 82f.

46. Ibid.; Time, August 23, 1963, 49.

47. AC'63, 83f, 265; The New York Times, August 24, 1963, 24. Bishop S. O. Odutula of Ibadan and his Chancellor strenuously protested the omission of such a statement from the draft; it was quickly added, to much applause.

48. The Living Church, September 8, 1963, 9. Reporters spotted at least 10 bishops and 300 other clergy. The Diocese of New York sent 15 busloads of people.

49. Cf. Madden, Gathering Storm, 14: "The clerical collar has become as much a part of the imagery of the civil rights protest as the bearded students in sandals and Bull Connor with his dogs and firehoses."

50. AC'63, 199.

51. Donegan, in All One Body, 230.

52. Hines, in Ibid., 282.

53. Statistics and Hines quotations from David L. Holmes, "The Travail of the Episcopal Church, 1965-1973" (unpublished paper presented to the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church in June, 1986), 4f.

54. The Living Church, January 28, 1968, 6.

55. Jerome P. Politzer and Russell Chandler in Christianity Today, November 11, 1970, 43; cf. Holmes, 7ff.

56. The Living Church, January 21, 1968, 6 [cf. TLC, Feb. 18, 1968, 5 for correction].

57. Bayne, Memorandum to Staff Program Group, May 12, 1969, Bayne MSS.

58. Bayne, letter to diocesan bishops, May 7, 1969, Bayne MSS, 1.

59. Bayne, address to staff, May 9, 1969, Bayne MSS.

60. Jeffrey K. Hadden, "Clergy Involvement in Civil Rights," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CLXXXVII (January 1970), 126.

61. Letter, Bayne MSS.

62. Chisholm interview. I remember an undoubtedly apocryphal story making the rounds of one letter sent to John Hines: "If our Lord knew what you were doing with His Prayer Book, He would roll over in His grave."

63. Politzer, Christianity Today, November 11, 1970, 43.

64. The Living Church, March 3, 1963, 10f, 19; and May 19, 1963, 11f.

65. Connecticut Journal, 1964, 100, 107f.

66. Cecil Northcott, "Women in Anglican Pulpits?," Christian Century, November 6, 1963, 1360.

67. David E. Sumner, "Episcopal Church History from 1940-1980: A Brief Chronology," Historical Magazine, LIV, 1 (March 1985), 87.

68. Hadden, "Clergy Involvement," 121. Cf. Dean R. Hoge, Division in the Protestant House (Philadelphia: Westminster Press), esp. 30-46.

69. Petersen, "Anglican Identity," 450.

70. Cf. George Peabody, "On Supervising Change, Witness, LVI, 8 (11 April 1971), 7f.: "I have little evidence that the mainstream of today's institutional church has much to do with anything.... I've found that action in God's world can be taken more freely outside the institutional church."

71. Walmsley interview.

72. Hadden, "Clergy Involvement," 126f; Gathering Storm, 35.

73. Holmes, 12.

74. Walmsley, interview; cf. Gillespie, interview; cf. also McRae Werth, "Moratorium I:--Buckets of Warm Spit," Witness, LVI, 4 (11 Feb. 1971).

75. Witness, LVI, 5 (1 March 1971).

76. Walmsley interview.

77. cf. Rehkopf, Historical Magazine, 401: An ecumenically-based interdisciplinary approach "with the intention of helping students and faculty make sense of their own identity" was begun in 1964; ten years later the Episcopal Diocese withdrew its financial support.

78. Walmsley interview; Holmes, 12ff.

E. What happened?

79. Welsby, 11ff.

80. T. J. Talley, in Howe, ed., Today's Church and Today's World (London: CIO Publishing Co., 1977), 25.

81. Petersen, "Anglican Identity," 439 n. 22; cf. 445.

82. The Living Church, December 15, 1968, 5f.

83. Samuel van Culin, interview with the author, London, July 8, 1986.

84. Quoted in Holmes, appendix, 2.

VIII: The Lingering Influence of MRI

By 1970, MRI as a program had been tucked off into a American closet of forgotten fads with hoola-hoops and the "Twist" and other memontos of a previous decade. But what MRI signified was too important to lay aside. The vision, if not the program, lingered long in the imaginations of people. The idea which that wordy mouthful expressed somehow symbolized a dream which, as was both proclaimed and charged, was as old as the New Testament itself. Long after the program folded, the initials circulated around the church, as they still do today. Program or no, the vision was too central to lose.

A. Conferences and Councils: Anglican Structures

MRI's authors anticipated a degree of centralization. As the ACMS they were already the collective boss to the Anglican Executive Officer; they tried to extend his scope through regional officers. They promised to meet more frequently, either wearing their ACMS hat or their LCB mitres.

Their hopes were realized only in part. The LCB did meet relatively on schedule. Regional officers were appointed, at least for some areas; they proved either ineffective or ignored. David M. Paton recalls being invited to Ireland exactly once in his brief tenure as Regional Officer for the British Isles; only in Southeast Asia was the position at all effective.[1] At the top, Michael Ramsey travelled widely with great publicity, but Bayne's successor as Executive Officer, Ralph Dean, remained a diocesan bishop in addition to his Anglican responsibilities. Even with a five-year leave of absence from Cariboo, it was not an effective solution in the eyes of many, including the then Archbishop of York.[2] To be sure, he travelled over half a million miles, circling the globe sixteen times in visiting fifty-two countries as "Anglicanism's Ambassador Extraordinary." Dean complained, though, that he was the Communion's strategist with no opportunity to strategize. Furthermore,

he had but a tiny staff and budget: Though Bayne in leaving recommended two assistants, he had but one, plus three secretaries. On a budget of £24,300 ($75,000), it was all he could afford. Critics such as Neuss still argued that only in greater centralization could Anglicans to work and even communicate with each other.

Bishops came to Lambeth in 1968 amid dreary English weather and a torrid American climate: Columbia University had been occupied, King and Kennedy assassinated that spring, and the Democratic Convention would see what Norman Mailer called the "seige of Chicago." While the bishops in London talked of peace, Soviet tanks rolled into Prague. The Conference reflected the distractions of the world scene.[3] Internal concerns, too, brought an element of divisiveness, especially for example over the ordination of women and, although rumors had quieted over the "death of God," over theological differences.[4] A preparatory paper welcomed the doctrinal controversies that had raged so furiously since Toronto. "By the grace of God, Western atheism has at last penetrated the Church," it began. "The liveliness of the world, the emergence of the independence of man, and the change in the nature of authority [have combined] in such a way that the deadliness of the Church is exposed and challenged to the point where there is an immense renewal in the knowledge of God."[5] The bishops found in the debate "inspiration for renewed faith."[6] As for women in the priesthood, amid high feelings on both sides, the bishops opined that theological arguments were inconclusive and that it warranted careful study. Individual provinces should not decide to ordain women withouth consulting the Anglican Consultative Council, but they should proceed to provide for the liturgical participation of women.[7] As two observers noted, "If Lambeth I did not open the door for women to be admitted to the priesthood, it surely unfastened the latch."[8]

Not surprisingly, the prominence of missions in general and MRI in particular took a lesser role. It was far from absent, though. As in the two

preceding conferences, attention focused primarily upon structural concerns. The bishops could analyze the effectiveness of their decisions of 1958 and of their leaders in 1963: The cycles of prayer warranted continuation; regional officers did not. MRI "proved to be a great inspiration" and deserved to continue both in concept and in program. A subcommittee evaluating it emphasized that "each Church must be free to decide to what extent it is appropriate to its own needs." Projects "should be realistic in scale"--as some were not--"flexible in operation, and in harmony with accepted criteria" toward meeting the objectives of the local Church. Projects must take account of the operating expenses as well as capital expenditures. Supporting local clergy should remain the "first charge of the local Church and not normally included in a Directory of Projects." While explicitly not discouraging the exchange of people, this would provide a corrective to the approach taken by the Diocese of Connecticut in paying salaries of Filipino professors. Finally, the bishops urged regional leadership in determining priorities and objectives, with advice as needed from London.[9]

The full council received and essentially adopted the report of its subcommittee. They were basically satisfied: Third-world bishops lauded its beneficial effects on their dioceses; some welcomed the increased American involvement in "the world situation with more than words"; conviviality in cloakrooms and lounges testified to friendships deepened by MRI.[10] With little discussion and full agreement, the bishops collectively recorded "gratitude for the concept of Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ, and for the renewed sense of responsibility for each other which it has created within our communion." Its concept was good. It warranted continued nurture, toward "a deeper commitment to Christ's mission through a wide partnership of prayer, by sharing sacrificially and effectively [our Churches'] manpower and money, and by a readiness to learn from each other." Cooperative planning, implementation and review, on ecumenical no less

these Anglican levels, remained important and needing "serious attention." However, the Conference concluded, "the time has come for a reappraisal of the policies, methods, and areas of responsibility" for the Anglican share in Christ's mission, and "for a renewed sense of urgency."[11]

That urgency took one major structural form: The Anglican Consultative Council. The Anglican Executive Officer's job and his corporate boss, the ACMS, were redefined. No more would Anglican Congresses meet; they were too expensive, said Coggan, and smacked too much of denominational jamborees. The need to meet remained, but not necessarily on a plane as exalted as the Primates nor as wide as the Congresses. (Meanwhile Walter Gray grumbled about people losing contact with each other.)[12]

Lambeth 1968 transformed the ACMS into the Anglican Consultative Council. John Hines of Trinity Church, Wall Street had pleaded for greater centralization. His theme was brought to London by a host of the Huron Conference, George Luxton. Sitting on the subcommittee on Anglican structure he was well-placed to sing his litany where it could be heard; he proposed a council of 500, far larger than the primates, though smaller and cheaper than a full-fledged Congress. His countryman Ralph Dean countered by suggesting 50; the minimum turned out to be 52.[13] Major Churches would send a bishop, priest or deacon, and lay person; smaller provinces would delegate a bishop and either a priest, deacon or lay person. The Archbishop of Canterbury would preside. The idea of meeting in proximity to the WCC Assembly gave way to biennial meetings in a variety of locales, with a standing committee of nine meeting annually.[14] A Secretary General would replace the Anglican Executive Officer, though this was not accomplished until 1971; he would lead a small secretariat, funded by the member Provinces.[15] In function, the ACC represented a corporate version of Bayne's and Dean's office and the ACMS, assigned as it was to share information and serve as an agency of common action, to advise on the evolution of new provinces and regional councils, to

develop Anglican policies in world mission and encourage mutual cooperation, to foster and guide Anglican ecumenical involvements, to improve inter-Anglican communication, and to promote review and research of matters of Anglican note.[16] It had no legislative powers, and in fact would need to be approved by two-thirds of the provinces before it would formally exist[17]: Not even the Lambeth Conference had authority to create such a structure.

The ACC of course was approved, an example of the continuing influence of the MRI attitude. Though not a "hot topic," its influence was "clearly reflected" in the Conference. John Maury Allin, who attended as Bishop of Mississippi and would five years later become Presiding Bishop, perceives it as the force behind the ACC and also the Primates' Committee,[18] which evolved under Donald Coggan's Primacy and first met in 1979. Like the by-then-long-defunct ACCS, it aims to foster communication and coordination at the highest level of the Communion.[19] What was needed in the late 1950's remained a need in the late 1970's, and beyond. The MRI philosophy necessitated a continuing imperative for structures to reflect the realities and needs of the Communion.

B. Programs, New and Continued

Though MRI declined, around the world it reappeared, in various guises. The new ACC promoted Partners in Mission to facilitate planning and sharing in collegiality. The British promoted cooperation through Partnership for World Mission. PECUSA raised substantial funds for projects in the U.S. and around the world through Venture in Mission, sent Volunteers in Mission to serve abroad, and continued MRI--even with that name--in a continuing variety of local manifestations.

1. Partners in Mission

Though project directories continued into the early 1970's, clearly their heyday had passed. By 1973, responses to the MRI Project Lists totalled barely 4% of the financial support of one part of the Communion to others.[20]

American churchmen were arguing among themselves; the English had few enough coins to send abroad. In Africa, calls had begun for a "moratorium" on missions in order to promote independence.[21]

But according to the MRI point of view, programs and money were far less important than relationships between Anglicans (not to mention Christians in general). Reported the first ACC meeting, at Limuru, Kenya in 1971,

> It is important to distinguish now between the greater realization of the principle of MRI, which should set the pattern of our life and activities as a family of Churches, and the operation of the directory project, which must be seen as one among several forms in which our interrelationship is expressed. ...We must try to grasp and articulate the ways in which this great principle becomes a reality in our common life.[22]

While criticizing the "'shopping list' mentality of which we have all been guilty," the Limuru Council hoped for "responsible relationships" characterized by a commitment to the fundamental mission of the Church in evangelism, conversion and baptism and through corporate dialogue which encourages the Church in each place in "going beyond" merely maintaining its life toward "those who are not, or cannot be, touched by the Church as it is." In such relationships, responsibility for the mission in each place rests with the Church in each place; but donors share in the task--only as requested. "It has been increasingly clear that each Church has to plan its total mission for itself and decide what other partners it wants to involve in that mission." Joint planning, though, becomes all the more important.[23]

ACC-1 assumed the Directory of Projects and reaffirmed the desirability of exchanging personnel, maintaining companion relationships and surveying needs. By underscoring concerns for consultations[24] it opened the way for the next stage of Anglican development, what the next ACC meeting called "Partners In Mission." Once again MRI was the starting point. It promoted a now-accepted "conviction that there is but one mission in all the world, and that this one mission is shared by the world-wide Christian community." Having reiterated that point, ACC-2 expressed with greater forthrightness what its predecessor

conference had moved toward saying, that "the responsibility for mission in any place belongs primarily to the church in that place." But, it added,

> the universality of the gospel and the oneness of God's mission mean also that this mission must be shared in each and every place with fellow-Christians from each and every part of the world with their distinctive insights and contributions. If we once acted as though there were only givers who had nothing to receive and receivers who had nothing to give, the oneness of the missionary task must now make us all both givers and receivers.[25]

Ten years after Toronto, MRI remained invaluable for its ideals. The Directory of Projects, said ACC-2, had promoted planning and sharing of information. It had, though, become ineffective. It also bred an identification of MRI as a whole with the Directory it put out, and so in turn with a "shopping list mentality." A different format--with distinct initials--was needed. The Council found that format emerging from the same sort of gathering that engendered MRI, a meeting of missionary executives. The year before in Greenwich, Connecticut, representatives of agencies composed an aide-memoire in which, with MRI clearly in mind, they committed themselves to closer collaboration of their agencies and consultation with each other, towards a "growing partnership" of Anglican dioceses and Provinces and of ecumenical counterparts as well. They further determined to work through Provincial and Regional Councils, insisting for example that requests for personnel, funds or projects be coordinated, set and made by the inter-diocesan boards.[26]

After testing these ideas through regional consultations in the West Indies and Japan, and with leaders in major "donor" Churches, the ACC promulgated Partners in Mission. It attempted to straddle several philosophical and pragmatic tensions: On the one hand, to uphold the unity of global mission while on the other, the individual responsibility of each Province over its work; to urge collaboration while promoting local oversight; to encourage financial independence while fostering interdependence; to provide collaboration at Provincial levels while nurturing a "people-to-people approach." Not only did it acknowledge a debt to MRI, it restated some of its

objectives, especially the equalizing nature of partnerships and the diversity of resources and needs which each Church has[27]--and it confronted some of MRI's inherent tensions.

A new format appeared. A PIM Consultation involves an intensive study by a particular national Church or Province of its mission and objectives, feedback by invited partner representatives, and only then commitments by others to assist with particular aspects of the local Church's mission. Proposed at ACC-2 in Dublin, approved by Lambeth 1978 and revised by a Mission Issues and Strategy Advisory Group set up by ACC-5 (1981, Newcastle), the process aims at:

(a) The strengthening of the Communion by building up a sense of interdependence between its members.
(b) Aiding the clarification of goals and priorities in the planning of diocesan and Provincial programmes arising from the perceived mission of the Church in each place.
(c) Reflecting on mission strategy together with local ecumenical partners.
(d) The establishing of a new pattern of relationships between Provinces in their strengths and weaknesses, so that resources can be shared and used more creatively in the mission of the Church.
(e) Helping Provinces under a variety of constraints to build up a sense of confidence in the knowledge that there are Partners able and ready to lend support.
(f) The developing of the identity of each local church, and its own potential for carrying out its mission in the context of its own community.
(g) Promoting greater co-operation between member dioceses of Provinces and the application of the partnership principle at all levels of the Church's life.
(h) Encouraging an openness on the part of all so that full disclosure of information and the possession of resources can be made to one another in Christian fellowship.[28]

A Consultation involves nine stages. First, in extensive preparation a local Province studies its own life and ministry in detail, often extending the study process to deaneries and parishes as well as dioceses. The examination includes a review of the overall context in which the Church works, its evangelism, ministry, stewardship, communications, provincial unity, and its prospects and objectives with the forthcoming five years especially in view. Though the first stage can take months, the next occurs in a matter of days: This is the consultation itself, in which representatives of the host Church

through Provincial and diocesan presentations explain their life and work to delegates invited from partner Provinces. After discussion, an agreed statement would result, summarizing the presentations and categorising priorities. Stage three works out the programs and resources needed to fulfill the strategies and implement the ascertained priorities. To these, the host Church then identifies what it can commit on its own. Fifth, the host Church shares its needs and cites ways in which external partners can assist. They then respond to the invitation as they believe appropriate. The Consultation agrees on methods for the seventh stage, which is for regular reports on how the priorities are implemented. It also sets guidelines for the eighth, evaluative, stage. Finally, about five years after it starts one process, the Church prepares for another Consultation.[29]

Uganda, for one, held a consultation in 1985. Between its first one in 1975 and this second gathering, the nation endured tyranny, war and revolution in which the Church endured "suffering which has affected every fibre of her life and witness." Delegates were invited from England, Ireland, Wales, Canada, the United States, Germany, Kenya, Tanzania, and Provinces of Southern Africa, West Africa and Burundi, Rwanda and Zaire. It involved ecumenical representatives of local denominations, the All Africa Conference of Churches and the World Council of Churches. Each of the twenty dioceses was visited, and each diocese sent four representatives. Staff included, over 140 participated.

For nearly two weeks, the partners heard presentations and discussed the mission of the Ugandan Church, vivified by the continuing strife. External and internal partners agreed on priorities: Training and education; evangelism; transport and communication; development and self-reliance; stewardship and accountability; increased participation of women in Church and society; strengthening companion dioceses, welfare programs, and ecumenical relations. Broad categories were defined by more specific categories which received particular attention: Liturgical renewal, for example, was a component of

"evangelism." To a Church still using the English 1662 Book of Common Prayer, external partners urged "a more dynamic move toward liturgical revision" which would "give special attention to the indigenization of worship, expressed in symbols, gestures and music," take note of insights gleaned in Anglican revisions elsewhere, be "sensitive to the needs of young people," and "specially recognise[s] the important place of music in worship" incorporating traditional [African] musical instruments. Amid continuing national strife, the partners urged the Ugandans to continue its "voice of prophecy" and pledged the "prayerful support among the Partner Churches." They noted, though, the absence of pastoral care for members of the armed forces, prisons and police.[10]

PIM Consultations, then, do not always bless the status quo. For one thing, they evoke specific responses from Provinces, in ways that are corporately considered. When the Tanzanian consultation determined a need for a provincial center to facilitate deeper unity as well as administration for the province, the Episcopal Church offered funds, but only in response to the specific, carefully articulated need.[11] For another, they could challenge the host Churches, sometimes bluntly: At the sole U.S. consultation, in 1977, Bishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa spoke critically of American insularity. "As we look around the Episcopal Church in the United States we see that you have built such walls around your parishes and congregations and dioceses, yes even around the Episcopal Church itself, we don't see how you can possibly even think about becoming involved in world missions."[12]

David Birney, a veteran of several consultations as DFS staff member, describes the "complete openness" indicative of "what joint planning, mission partnership, mutual sharing and commitment can mean in our global family." But, he continues, "my perception is that this has occurred in more healthy ways in the overseas churches than in our own."[13] Revealingly, the United States has not held another consultation. Simon Barrington-Ward of the CMS expressed his fears to the ACC that PIM--rather like MRI before it--could raise

expectations higher than reality could provide; that it could become "a new Western-imposed game by which the players who want to get what they want have had to learn new rules"; that the process may hinder truly mutual sharing in the eternal task of communicating the Gospel to those who have not heard it and in the struggles for a "just ordering of...society according to the principles implicit in the Gospel."[34] ACC-6 endorsed PIM once again, as helpful in planning priorities and promoting evangelism, while further coordinated responses remain needful. Bishop Birney asks, "Is the PIM process bringing about renewal for the mission of the Church?"[35]

Partners in Mission, then, replaces MRI as the ongoing policy of the Anglican Communion as the means to identify and address needs of the Body. It shares not only the vision of Toronto, but also the continuing questions and chronic difficulties which Anglicanism has encountered.

2. Partnership for World Mission

A unified mission requires coordination. This was an underlying principle of MRI and PIM. It had also brought closer collaboration since 1958 among the distinct missionary societies in the Church of England, though not without controversy over whether centralized efforts discouraged individual initative, support, and general vision and enthusiasm. The Church of England in 1978 established Partnership for World Mission to coordinate the General Synod and various voluntary societies. Joining representatives of eight "recognized" societies were those of the Church Army and Mothers' Union; sixteen other agencies became associate members. It sought to become a forum for coordination and planning, a source of advice for the Church and a means of promoting prayer and concern for world mission.[36]

3. Venture in Mission

After the turmoil of the 1960's, the furor over GCSP and the resignation of Presiding Bishop John Hines, the 1973 General Convention took several actions.

It elected John Maury Allin of Mississippi to succeed Hines; it merged OCSP into other programs for minorities; and it approved a design for Venture in Mission, an effort which became a centerpiece of the Allin years. Many saw it as a means of turning the American Church's eyes outward after years of tumultuous introversion.

As promulgated at the 1976 Convention, Allin called the Church to raise $100 million for mission, at home and abroad. Its genesis, he maintains, was MRI. More immediately, it arose when ECUSA bishops in dioceses outside the United States appealed for $5 million to start the means of attaining financial independance.[37] By 1978, 86 of the 93 U.S. dioceses had agreed to participate.[38]

"Venture-in-Mission was born of the MRI spirit," writes Bishop Allin. Samuel van Culin agrees. Hines had wanted a major extra-budgetary fund, but the times were not right. Allin felt, too, that his Church was simply not responding adequately to mission within its ongoing budget. Although not directly associated with MRI, VIM built upon the principles of Toronto.[39]

Indeed, it filled a gap created when funding out of the MRI program ceased and the financial needs in mission development remained. Without the mechanism to advertise their needs, in the period between MRI and VIM, bishops would circulate by mail and in person to appeal for aid. VIM provided a means for needs to be known and for Americans to contribute toward programs and projects in global missions.[40]

VIM was not designed as an overseas support system. Nor was MRI. VIM directories continue to list "opportunities" as varied as diocesan centers in Argentina and Paraguay, facilities for Bishop Tucker Theological College in Uganda (nearly $1 million), Christian education for the Navajoland Area Mission in the American Southwest, $13.5 million in endowment for three black colleges, and $140,000 for evangelism spot commercials for television.[41] Overseas projects now generally arise out of a PIM process.[42]

At the same time, VIM duplicated some of the failings of MRI without taking all of its advantages. As happened ten years before, some programs were thoroughly considered by their sponsors; others were not,[43] more like the "chapter house" of the MRI nightmare. As the PIM process had not hit its stride, and because VIM was to some extent donor-controlled, projects might correspond to personal acquaintances with letter-writing bishops than to provincial priorities. The same was alleged of MRI, especially as American dioceses favored their overseas companions with whom they had relationships. More severely, the image Bishop Allin uses to describe CCSP[44] could be applied to VIM as well: a "one-way street" allowing little opportunity for Americans to receive anything, necessarily, from the recipients of American largesse. Furthermore, the Church Center still reeling from staff cuts lacked the ability to lead a nationwide educational effort comparable to MRI. It did produce a yearlong series for "The Journey in Mission" which, like MRI, began with renewing personal commitment to Jesus Christ and his mission.[45] Though many a tree fell to provide VIM materials, not nearly so many parishes shared in educational enterprises. MRI stressed both renewal and mission, VIM emphasized mission. Its stated purpose was what MRI was accused of being: A means primarily of raising money, albeit for a vitally important cause.

To be sure, many parishes and individuals found renewal as well, and increased their commitment to the Church's mission. they took seriously the call to a single mission, at home and abroad. But VIM took from MRI a truncated heritage, shorn of the spiritual and educational nurturing out of which missionary giving was to arise.

4. Volunteers for Mission

Amid more publicized votes on the ordination of women and ratification of the new Prayer Book, the 1976 Convention authorized a program, Volunteers for Mission, which fell very much in line with MRI hopes for "exchanges of

manpower." Its purpose is to send volunteers to various places around the world where their particular abilities could be well used by the local Church.

From 1978, when a New York nurse brought his talents to Honduras, and 1984 some 115 Volunteers for Mission completed terms of service in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and among Indians of the American West. The Episcopal Church Center screens and matches volunteers and requests, provides orientation, training and general oversight; local congregations usually provide travel expenses and ongoing support for their parishioner volunteers. Serving for limited times ranging from summer vacations or sabbaticals to one- or two-year periods, they supplement what longer-term missionaries can offer.[46]

For a doctor and his wife to immunize 30,000 in Uganda, or a retired priest to train new clergy in Korea, or young Episcopalians to teach music, English and earth science to Honduras, accords with what the Huron missionary executives envisioned in their recommendations on the ministry of the laity, and the sharing of resources of personnel, even though they hardly dared hope for such volunteers. The MRI paper cited the need for manpower. "Men and women in every nation and every church are searching in an unprecedented way to find out how to serve as Christians and to fulfil Christ's ministry to the world in their own lives." But the executives and the ACMS presumed that any laypeople engaged directly in mission away from their homes would be there anyway: The student in a foreign university, or a soldier, diplomat or businessman assigned abroad. These people denoted an untapped resource, the Huron Conference maintained, and they could be trained and tapped. What they had suggested for preparation perhaps better suited those with greater missionary intentionality than those with corporate or governmental orders. Nonetheless, what the Huron paper advocated in training and orientation was picked up thirteen years later.[47] Late though it was, Volunteers in Mission serves to indicate the continuing influence of the MRI dream.

C. MRI, Continued

Though fading away in the early '70's--no death certificate was ever signed; MCC-2 and formulating PEP was the closest to a formal declaration--MRI continues to receive mention from place to place.

Olive Mae Molica retired from 815 in 1976, having served primarily in the General Division of Women's Work. In her Colorado parish, she found an item in the Episcopal Churchwoman's budget labeled "MRI." Later, when elected ECW president, she asked what that meant. "That's our MRI, our 'Mutual Responsibility' or something like that," said the treasurer, "I never did understand what it was all about." Every year, she says, "Father Kitagawa in Japan got $25 for his school."

The Diocese of Colorado was not able to promote MRI. However, "the priest of the parish met Father Kitagawa and liked him, and came back and said, 'Here's our MRI program.' They had no idea what they were doing. Yet in a way, that was in the spirit of MRI."[48]

So, to a point, it was: The priest contradicted policy by doing something independent of diocesan, national or Anglican structures; no background education occurred; he paid no attention to carefully-outlined priorities; parishes in Colorado were not supposed to participate because their diocese was not meeting its proportionate share to the national Church. For all that was wrong, though, this small gesture endured where others did not. It grew out of a personal relationship; it broadened the horizons of a parish who wanted to share as it could in the wider mission of the Church; it helped, they felt, to fill a need.

Somehow MRI captured the imagination of clergy and people in ways that would last. When Judy Gillespie travels from 815's World Mission desk, she still encounters talk of "mutual responsibility" as "something that is still very widely known and referred to by the Church at the grassroots level" even though national and provincial levels speak now of "partnership."

> You get out to the Diocese of South Dakota and you find that they have in their program planning an MRI offering. They still are using the terminology of Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence, and you find that in local churches overseas as well.... The words somehow or another struck a chord with people in the Church.

She admits they are not easy words. Bishop Boyce and colleagues wrestled long over their choice, recognizing they posed a mouthful which was criticized by some, then and now.[50] But, she continues, "they may be easier for people to grasp what is meant by that than the words 'Partnership in Mission.'" which is "exceedingly difficult to articulate and to explain."[51]

And occasionally, the words continue in use, as do the concept they express. Finding that blind college students had difficulty obtaining tape-recorded materials, St. Barnabas' Parish in Portland, Oregon began recording textbooks. From 1965 to 1986, the St. Barnabas' Tapers recorded 2,763 books or selections. Their service grew from local universities to include community colleges, high schools and junior high schools and for graduate and technical students too. "Time and people change," writes the rector, "but the spirit and the intent of M.R.I. live on."[52]

MRI made an impression not only because it was so widely promoted but also because it was widespread enough to include the world and personal enough for a parish or individual to participate. It promoted the global mission of the Church, while encouraging a ministry next door. Its initials, concept, and even individual efforts far outlasted the official program. Along the way, it influenced a generation of Anglicans in their own lives.

D. Reactions of Persons

MRI as it evolved had a profound effect on those whose hands helped its birth, who led the Anglican Communion in new directions as a result. As it developed into a program, it made a deep impact on those who heard of it, studied it, or who gave or received in response to it, and who now have become leaders. Thus, its influence continues through the persons it affected.

Stephen Bayne was at once MRI's midwife and the first upon whom it exerted an influence. "Bishop Bayne had a very intense personal experience of the Anglican Communion and the ways in which we might relate," recalls Peggy Chisholm.[53] Through his travels he gained a comprehension of the Church's purpose which began to imbue his writings, and an understanding which because of his personality he was able to convey and which because of his ability and position he could articulate. His role was pivotal, in gathering the concepts which eventually comprised MRI, in fostering their articulation by the people who could express and then enact those concepts, and through his constant writing and travel in explaining them broadly. This role and understanding, however, could not develop ex nihilo: They depended upon what he learned through endless peregrinations in the first three years as ABO.

As part of the preparations for Toronto, in 1963, Archbishop Donald Coggan chaired a conference at Cuernavaca exploring Anglicanism in Latin America. A dispute emerged over whether Anglicanism had much future on the continent. Ralph Dean, once Coggan's associate, argued strenuously that it did not. The Archbishop just as vehemently perceived an opportunity for a non-Roman form of Catholicism. He emerged as a continuing proponent of Latin Anglicanism throughout his tenure at Canterbury, and since. He continues to promote what MRI sought, of interrelationships among an Anglican family, of personal participation in mission, of mission as "the very esse of euangelion."[54]

At Huron with the Primates, Nelson Burroughs of Ohio was amazed to discover the breadth, diversity and enormity of Anglicanism and its problems. He rejoiced to find on his trips to Brazil under MRI aegis a deep spirituality which fostered his own.[55]

It may be too much to suggest that MRI was responsible for such growth on the part of Anglicanism's leadership. As biographies of Bayne, Coggan and others appear, its influence may become more--or less--apparent. However, its effect should not be discounted either. Principles of MRI coincided with the

principles which guided at least some of the major figures of Anglicanism, including two if not three of its Archbishops of Canterbury since 1960.

Some of today's leaders attest its influence, not least of which is the current Presiding Bishop. When Edmond Browning first heard of MRI in the basement of St. Michael's Cathedral in Kobe, Japan, "it was one of the most moving things that I have ever heard." MRI addressing his experience as missionary in a Japanese society "had a profound effect on how I see the Church, that is, that every person, every Church has something to contribute to the well-being of the whole." Today, he sees MRI's influence not only in overseas relationships of the Episcopal Church (PIM, companion dioceses) but in a wide variety of domestic efforts: Coalition 14, a network of erstwhile missionary dioceses collaborating on sharing resources; the ministry among the Navajos, or among Hispanics in the Northeast corridor; various "networks" on topics like peace, hunger or evangelism. "It seems to me that all of that is related to what has come out of MRI," he concludes.[56]

In London, Samuel van Culin now occupies the office Stephen Bayne initiated. As a staffer at the 815 Overseas Department, he wrote to encourage MRI. As Secretary General of the ACC, he remembers it as a formative expression of Anglicanism. "It's more than an agreed statement. It was a changed way of life." He believes it broached an awareness of the world among Episcopalians, and of younger Churches that they "were not just at the end of a missionary society but they were actually beginning to be churches in a worldwide community." For him personally, it provided the context of his work: At 815, it, and the PIM process which succeeded it, "became the strategic focal point for the Overseas Department and provided the context within which to plan budgets, appointments, and companion diocese relationships." At the ACC, it undergirds the entire rationale for the secretariat he now heads, and gives the "framework for expanding our unity."[57]

His assistant, Martin Stevens, quite simply calls MRI "a gift of the Spirit."[58]

Some, it impressed only in time: Arthur Walmsley, now Bishop of Connecticut and senior prelate of Province I, "saluted the idea of MRI" but at the time was preoccupied with domestic matters so that "it was not important in my priorities"--as indeed it was not so influential nationally as it might have been had domestic upheavals not intervened. He confesses a dislike for its awkward turn of phrase--and for appreciating its concept only later, as earlier controversies quelled and as he had the chance to travel extensively. So, he believes, the nation: "I think we couldn't hear the meaning of MRI until we had grasped a deeper and more nuanced, maybe a more shadow-side of what America and the Church was all about in relation to the rest of the world; and that'we've come into our own in the '80's is I think an outgrowth of that spiritual struggle."[59]

Some, it still has not impressed. "As a verbal formula or slogan, it did not greatly grab me," writes Boone Porter, then a teacher at General Theological Seminary and now editor of The Living Church. "I know Bishop Bayne didn't mean it that way, but it seemed to me at the time largely a money raising gimmick." The context of mission work, he states, was one of hiring professionals to do what other denominations were sending laity to do. That needed money, and that in his opinion guided MRI.[60]

Charles Long is more balanced. A former overseas missionary who now heads Forward Movement Publications, he perceives both internal changes and evolutions in attitudes. On the other hand, "MRI shifted the focus of Mission from Evangelism to inter-church aid." This has produced a generation of Episcopalians who "have grown up without any sense of World Mission, Vocation or the challenge of cross-cultural evangelism" unless they received it from one of the few American counterparts to the English missionary societies.[61]

Both these criticisms, if well-founded, mark lapses not in MRI principles but in MRI practices. It aimed at broadening missionary work to include all Christians, lay as well as professional. It strived to educate about the world, and to involve in evangelism. As the program years progressed after the educational foundations, and as MRI evolved into VIM and PIM, memory may have grown dim of what MRI first sought to do.

But to a remarkable degree, memory survives--if not of specific programs, then of three letters which signified a remarkable change in what the Anglican Communion tried to be. The educational materials survive only in archives or cluttered parish closets. The projects may have flourished or folded or both. Although many people could not remember what the initials stand for, as Judy Gillespie observes from her travels, they resurrect some vivid recollections. So massive an educational program was bound to have an effect; one of those was to open the eyes of clergy and laity onto the world, as if for the first time. Betty Clarke was active in the Diocese of Kentucky in her mid-twenties. Invited to serve on the diocesan MRI commission, she then attended a national Church conference in Puerto Rico, followed by a visit to Haiti. Her first time outside the U.S., "this was the start of continued awareness." The MRI experience exposed her "early to an awareness of what goes on in other places and how those people feel about it."[62] She continues to hold positions of leadership. So too, to a remarkable degree, do the laity who participated in the Diocese of Connecticut's MRI venture of 1967-68.[63] Although they were invited to lead because they had already begun to lead, can MRI have influenced them to continue their work in the Church? Craig Casey, a priest who shared in the Connecticut program, concludes that "the concept of ourselves has changed. The use of the term Anglican has nothing to do with churchmanship, but to speak of ourselves as a worldwide unit."[64] MRI, then, guided Anglicans to understand themselves differently--as one Communion of a particular

distinctiveness far broader than they had realized; and more profoundly, as a Christian koinonia, the Body of Christ.

In new structures, in continuing challenges, perhaps in some projects, in revised programs, and above all in the consciousness of a generation of a widened Anglican Communion, MRI lingers on, even today.

VIII. Notes: The Continuing Influence of MRI

1. Paton interview.

2. Coggan interview.

3. James B. Simpson & Edward M. Story, The Long Shadows of Lambeth X (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), 137; cf. 121-133, 137-143.

4. Ibid., cf. 114-116.

5. David Jenkins, "The Debate About God," in Lambeth Essays on Faith, ed. The Archbishop of Canterbury [A. Michael Ramsey] (London: SPCK, 1969), pp. 11, 19. The author himself became the subject of controversy upon his appointment as Bishop of Durham in 1984?, both over his theological opinions and over the fact that York Minster, where he was consecrated, was struck by lightening and extensively damaged just days thereafter.

6. The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports (N.p.: SPCK & Seabury Press, 1968), 70; cf. Res. 3, p. 29.

7. Ibid., res. 35-38, pp. 39f.

8. Simpson & Story, 187.

9. Lambeth 1968, 145-147.

10. Simpson & Story, 250.

11. Lambeth 1968, Res. 67, p. 46.

12. Quoted in Simpson & Story, 251f.

13. Simpson & Story, 245f.

14. Cp. Lambeth 1968, p. 145 with p. 48, para. 7.

15. Howe, Highways, 37.

16. Lambeth 1968, pp. 46-47.

17. Ibid., 46 (Res. 69).

18. John Maury Allin, letter to the author, June 26, 1986.

19. Coggan interview; cf. Howes, Highways, 92ff. It is ironic that an idea, proposed by the American Church before 1958 and dismissed as too expensive, was essentially adopted twenty years later, though it should also be noted not to the exclusion of the more broadly-representative Council.

20. Howe, Highways, 181; ACC, Partners in Mission [Report of the Second Meeting, Dublin, Ireland, 17-27 July 1973] (New York: Seabury Press, 1973), 54 [afterwards ACC-2].

21. Kendall, End of an Era, chapter 6.

22. ACC, The Time Is Now [Report of First Meeting, Limuru, Kenya, 23 February-5 March 1971] (London: SPCK, 1971), 41 [afterwards ACC-1].

23. ACC-1, 43-45.

24. Ibid., 44-52.

25. ACC-2, 53

26. Ibid., 54.

27. Ibid., 55.

28. [ACC], Giving Mission its Proper Place: Report of the Mission Issues and Strategy Advisory Group (London: ACC, 1985), 31.

29. Ibid., 31-36.

30. [ACC,] "Church in Uganda: Second Partners in Mission Consultation, 5-18 February, 1985," passim.

31. ACC, Partners in Mission Consultation, 1977.

32. Quoted in David Birney, Address to "The Ingredients of Partnership," A Conference for U.S. Dioceses with Companion Dioceses in Africa, Washington, D. C., February 6, 1986.

33. Ibid.

34. Quoted in ibid.

35. [ACC,] Bonds of Affection: Proceedings of ACC-6, Badagry, Nigeria, 1984 (Anglican Consultative Council: London, 2nd ed., 1985), 50, 57, 61; Birney address.

36. Welsby, 275f.

37. John M. Allin, letter to the author, June 26, 1986.

38. David E. Sumner, "Episcopal Church History from 1960-1980: A Brief Chronology," Historical Magazine, LIV, 1 (March 1985), 88.

39. Allin letter; van Culin interview.

40. Gillespie interview.

41. [PBCUSA,] "Catalogue of Mission Opportunities: Venture in Mission" (n.p., n.d. [1983?]), 9, 17, 26, 31, 34.

42. Van Culin interview.

43. Ibid. She cites the Diocese of Western Mexico as exemplary, in taking a year to evaluate, involving every congregation in wrestling with its mission and strategy, coordinating with regional needs, and combining educational efforts with fund-raising. "Ten years later, now that the money is available, much of that program still stands"--some projects accomplished by the diocese on its own, some funded from the U.S. but equally valid.

44. Allis letter.

45. "Resources for the Journey in Mission," eight segments produced at the Episcopal Church Center for use from Advent 1977 to Advent 1978.

46. The Mission Information and Education Office, World Mission in Church and Society [ECUSA], "World Mission Handbook," The Episcopal Church Center, 1984, 125f.

47. Examples from ibid.; MRI, 20; "The Christian Vocation of the Anglican Layman Abroad," in MRI, 66-70.

48. Olive Mae Mallca, interview with the author, New York, May 21, 1986.

49. Gillespie interview.

50. Chisholm interview; cf. Walmsley, interview, and Porter, letter.

51. Gillespie interview.

52. Robert Crafe, "MRI prospers in Portland," The Episcopalian, October 1986, 7.

53. Chisholm interview.

54. Coggan interview; cf. his Chavasse lectures, published as Mission to the World (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1981).

55. Burroughs interview.

56. Browning interview.

57. Van Culin interview.

58. Mbwana interview.

59. Walmsley interview.

60. H. Boone Porter, letter to the author, June 18, 1986.

61. Charles H. Long, letter to the author, June 16, 1986.

62. Betty Clarke, letter to the author, [February 8, 1986].

63. Diocese of Connecticut MRI Commission, "MRI Training Bulletin #2," October 24, 1986, WMC MSS, 2ff.

64. Craig W. Casey, interview with the author, May 22, 1986.

IX. A Vision to Fulfill

Stephen Neill observed that St. Augustine in his age, and Dante in his, both sublimely expressed a synthesis of faith and culture just at the moment when that synthesis was about to disintegrate.[1] One hardly dares to compare "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence" with The City of God. Still, MRI expressed a synthesis of a faith with a culture at almost the very point--the year, even the month--when that synthesis began to unravel.

In many regards, MRI never achieved what it set out to do. In financial terms, it raised considerable amounts of money; no records seem to exist as to precisely how much. By 1967, scarcely half the submitted and approved projects had met with any response, despite carefully planned priorities by the proposing dioceses.[2] Even then, it had taken long to emphasize two points: That MRI was not designed to fund a shopping spree for poorer Provinces; and that MRI involved more than money. Many of the original "wish lists" were viewed in London as nothing short of "reckless." MRI, further, was often equated with projects and directories, with the sharing of personnel and of non-financial resources scarcely acknowledged. "We have to remember," the ABD's advisory committee cautioned itself, "that in the fulness of MRI, caring and sharing will involve the whole Church"[3]--so that all may give, and all may receive, out of the bounty which each may have.

The Primates had hoped MRI would influence every level of the Church's life. Education was to be a heavily emphasized component. However, it seemed to have little, if any, effect on the Church's educational systems, at least in the United States. Seminaries added few, if any, courses on missions or comparative religion. In the 1950's, Yale had a major on "foreign missionary service." By 1961, that had disappeared. To be sure, it consistently provided courses on missions and comparative religion, more by far than the specifically

Episcopal seminaries who provided one, at best. Today, General Theological Seminary has three, Virginia Theological Seminary, two; Seabury-Western and the Seminary of the Southwest, none (though global-mission issues are worked into other courses, and the latter has one on ministry in Chicano communities.)[4] Additionally, the Episcopal Church's El Seminario del Caribe, serving Caribbean provinces especially, closed down in 1977 for financial reasons.[5] The study of mission, generally, still does not rank high in the preparation of clergy.

More profoundly, MRI could not accomplish what it set out to do because the world changed once more. It was a culminating expression of a world-view which almost immediately ceased to be as appropriate. For newly-independent nations who were as eager to share in the life of the world as they were anxious to glean assistance which would enable them to do that, MRI was a fitting expression of a hope held by both erstwhile receivers and (at long last) erstwhile givers. Asian and African euphoria, though, soon turned to at least a degree of disillusionment as political and economic realities descended upon them. Max Warren observed in retrospect that "true freedom is a spiritual, and not a political reality," but conveying that truth tested the statesmanship of rulers, leaders, and missionary societies.[6] Meanwhile, whatever sense of dogma that had emerged in the postwar period eroded through the series of theological writings which challenged the prevailing orthodoxy and bred a mood of uncertainty.[7] This, too, occurred at almost the precise time that MRI was appearing. That mood, of course, turned once again, from uncertainty to crisis. In the face of that, MRI had no chance; and the fervor for missionary outreach was channelled into efforts closer to home.

In short, after 1963, the world no longer fit into a neat, Western-oriented package. It was, as C. E. Duffield maintained,[8] a time of enormous change.

In his opinion the times made it inopportune for MRI. Ironically, MRI had everything to do with the changes going on.

For all its shortcomings, MRI did exert a considerable influence on the Anglican Communion--and still does. First, it served as an integrative force in expressing and thereby helping to construct the post-war synthesis. The very concept of "mutual responsibility and interdependence" meant that no person, no Church, and by extension no idea existed in a vacuum. Therefore liturgical renewal, biblical scholarship, spiritual growth, theology, Christian education, ecumenism, social justice, ethics and missionary effort all had a bearing on one another. Insights from one endeavor could lead themselves to another. So too Americans, English, Liberians, Filipinos, Melanesians and Japanese were individually members of the Body of Christ who therefore had very much to do with each other. Each could give, each could receive, and thereby all could grow. That was the paramount insight which MRI expressed, and contributed to the Anglican understanding.

MRI was integrative in a second significant way. It tried to integrate the Anglican Communion into a community. Two points were central to its thesis: That the Communion is diverse; and that it is essentially one. People were constantly amazed at the ever-increasing heterogeneity. They had to take seriously the unity of the Body of Christ. So they faced a paradox: To affirm on the one hand the strength of local variation with all that those variation could offer, while on the other hand striving to modify centrifugal forces with at least some degree of cooperation, collegiality, and centralization. Because of that emphasis on unity, Anglicans on the local level discovered an never before their international multiformity. It helped to pull them together.

Furthermore, the entire MRI effort served as a theologizing force, by emphasizing first principles. Margaret Chisholm overheard many clergy dismiss MRI as merely a restatement of the New Testament.[9] If so, they praise by their damnation: The New Testament could hardly provide a better platform upon

which to develop a Church-wide endeavor. Moreover, MRI offered a means of clarifying and comprehending the relationships among Anglican units, from parishes to provinces, which maintained that all are equal, that all have a voice, that all have needs and all have gifts. The Anglican Consultative Council and the meetings of Primates operate on that presupposition.

MRI served, as well, as a propagative force. There was much that was propagated in its name. It spread newsprint across continents that had never known what a "flip chart" was. It acquainted provinces with group dynamics and file strips and the latest books on missions. More importantly, because it led to such a massive educational enterprise, it was able to acquaint innumerable Anglicans with theological concepts and liturgical innovations. It promoted radical notions that laity could serve where only clergy had served before. It expanded horizons of those who had never considered the concerns of Polynesians—or that Tanzanians might have something to give to Malaysians...or Americans. Because the endeavor reached down to every parish it could, MRI carried an impact to a generation of Anglicans. Say "MRI," and a goodly number will still know whereof one speaks. Significantly, its impact reached that generation of Anglicans which is now assuming the leadership of the Communion.

Its impact drew intense strength because MRI was a profoundly theological endeavor. Conceived during a period of theological ferment, it was rooted in the dynamic of scripture and liturgy on one pole, and the experience of Christians in the world, on the other. It was conveyed to the grassroots level as nothing else had ever been, other than the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. Two thousand ambassadors conscientiously took its message to every corner of the Communion; and that was but the beginning. Thus as an endeavor it remains unique in Anglicanism. Because its program phase depended upon thoughtful preparation, because it placed study ahead of action, and because it sought to have action evolve on innumerable fronts as a result of reflection, it had a profound impact upon the Communion in ways that CCSP or Venture In

Mission did not. Those built upon MRI, but lacked its depth of theology, nurture, or renewal. Though VIM had an educational component, it lacked strength in numbers; it was an American effort, while MRI was truly international. Finally, OCSP and VIM were received as either a money-giving or a money-raising venture. MRI faced that accusation, and for the most part managed to convince that its aim was in fact what Archbishop Ramsey said it was, a process to renew the Anglican Communion in every way, especially its spirit.[10] It hoped, and people generally seemed to hope, that their Church would truly be the Church (to adjust a phrase common to the 'fifties), which as Archbishop William Temple reminded is the only society in this world whose chief purpose is to serve those who for the most part are not her members.[11]

Therefore, MRI became a kind of preparation for the turmoils of the 'sixties, even as its program was one of its victims. Expanding horizons opened the possibility of concern for one's neighbors in Samoa, and if in Samoa then in Selma. The integrative principle had its effect.

Was MRI "either the biggest lead balloon or the most dramatic document in our history"?[12] Undoubtedly somewhere in between.

Did MRI transform Anglican relationships? Yes and no. At present there is a higher degree of partnership among Provinces than twenty-five years ago. Structures facilitate it. The PIM process embodies it. But Martin Mbwana notices a tendency for the consultations to take place in <u>receiving</u> Churches, as if they believe "unless we have a PIM consultation we won't be able to present our needs to our partners." He continues, "For 'partners' substitute 'funding agencies.'" At the same time, he finds a consensus that "it is a good concept for planning for mission." On that can future efforts be built.[13]

MRI posited a vision of a Church in which all were givers and all were receivers. That it has not been realized, Mbwana points out. Perhaps that is inevitable in a world which, as John Howe observed, economics vary so widely

that true partnership can be reached only when all Churches are on the same standard. Dependency has not ended.[14] However, that too phrases partnership in financial terms. Because Churches exist in the context of their times, this cannot be avoided. Because of the needs, "Projects for Partnership" evolved, with the aim of placing Churches on more equal footing; this, for Samuel van Culin, was when MRI took on real life.[15] But MRI also proclaimed that giving and receiving involved far more than money.

Furthermore, through the evolution of the Toronto manifesto and into the practicalities of its implementation which van Culin mentions, the leadership of erstwhile "funding Churches" became more sensitive to their colleagues in younger Provinces.[16] They had to. For although MRI grew out of a context which was dominated by the likes of Hayes, Warren, Ramsey and Gray--oriented to Western civilisation and Northern hemisphere--it was collegially developed; and Hayes had spent three years listening to concerns from throughout the world. The projects themselves were developed by local Churches.

So MRI cannot be considered a Western phenomenon, or a system developed by the Northern hemisphere and imposed on the South. A case could be made that it was a heavily Americanized document: born in Canada, written primarily by a Yankee, influenced by concerns of planning and structure. Mbwana again concurs. "Having agreed with that, we have now to make it not Western but universal. And this is where we have to go from the paper to the concept." And on that score, "I would not say it is Western. It is Christian."[17]

MRI, then, spoke out of some universal concerns. Those concerns remain. If it tempered giver-receiver dichotomies, it could not end them. Nor could it resolve other abiding needs. One is to deepen personal relationships. "For many Anglicans mission-partnership has become a distant centralized financial transfer which takes place through Toronto," wrote a staff member of the Anglican Church of Canada. "Many express the wish for direct experience and

participation in the mission-partnership."[18] Structures, planning and collaboration cannot replace the personal contact that widens horizons and gives flesh and blood to names seen on maps or mentioned in prayers. In response, the Canadians publish extensive materials. American dioceses relish their companion relationships. A U.S. branch of SAMS is thriving. From MRI's point of view, so they should: To centralize has never meant to cut off ties, but to strengthen them.

Although MRI was primarily associated with global mission (as has this study), it clearly perceived a link with mission in every place, of every kind. However, it was far less clear what political ramifications that held. MRI placed its focus more on Church than on fundamental changes within society. Indeed, it was a "churchy" effort altogether. If a distinction can be drawn between "building up the Body of Christ" and "proclaiming the Kingdom of God"--as it was in the early 1950's[19]-- MRI clearly sided with the former. Concentrating on one Church's mission evoked criticism that MRI was not sufficiently ecumenical. What could have been added is that it failed to account for God working among others (despite the revelation from Max Warren and others that God does not depend upon the Church, that he in fact may be in a place well before the missionary): Suggesting help for the Mar Thoma work among Indian youths was one thing; supporting Buddhist efforts quite another.[20]

The MRI program faded. The MRI statement remains "the one shared statement on contemporary mission that we Anglicans have."[21] Though the newsprint has long ago been thrown away, the ideas that were magic-markered onto it remain very much in force.

That is, in theory.

Whether MRI's principles remain in practice, these next years should do much to indicate.

The Anglican Communion now faces a variety of issues, some of them as touchy as any it has encountered, and some of them potentially coming before the 1998 Lambeth Conference. One of these is the role of women in the Church's life and ministry--and its episcopate. That is a Western controversy, which an African said African bishops will face only when a daughter of theirs presents herself for ordination.[22] They are concerned by an equally difficult issue: Whether polygamy is an acceptable lifestyle for Christians. That is to its way as inconceivable in the West (though as Howard Johnson heard, divorce allows Westerners to practice successive if not simultaneous polygamy) as an ordained woman has been so far in most of the East. These are in part culturally-bound issues, but they also affect deep concepts of ministry and of sacrament.

That women have been ordained in some Provinces but not in others presents another quandry: The Church of England has heretofore denied permission to allow female priests to function as such within its jurisdiction. In effect, England denies an ordination that ECUSA, New Zealand or Hong Kong recognizes. Is that "mutually responsible?"

By the same token, is it "mutually responsible" for the Episcopal Presiding Bishop to consecrate a woman to be a bishop for the whole Church--which he can legally do--when at least a substantial segment of that interdependent Church will not recognize her as such? All things are lawful, but not necessarily helpful. Or, to turn the question around, can another Province, on the basis of mutual responsibility, prevent an independent entity from following what it is convinced is God's will for it?

In short, what the Communion faces strains the boundaries of mutual responsibility and interdependence, and thereby they strain the existence of the Anglican Communion. "My hope is that we will find a way to live with those tensions and remain as a Communion," states Bishop Browning. "One of the greatest gifts that [Anglicans] can offer to the rest of Christendom is the

ability to live in great diversity and still remain a unified communion. There's no question in my mind that we can."[23]

This arises at a time which is the opposite, in some ways, of what produced MRI. The 'eighties is a moment of decentralization. Ecumenism has suffered as denominations push their own preservation. (It is ironic that MRI was accused of being anti-ecumenical; but the primary advances between Anglicans and others, such as Ramsey's and Coggan's visits to the Pope or the various dialogues) emanated in that era. More than that, individualism runs riot. But that is a force diametrically contrary to MRI, which sought to build up community while recognizing the creative role of the individual.

If that is the dynamic of our era, then the point of MRI remains a vital one, essential not only for the Anglican Communion but for this more jaded, more nuanced but equally needy age to hear.

MRI, it was said, simply restated the New Testament. If so, then, like the Scriptures, it was in part a creature of its time. It was written in the context of specific circumstances. Like the epistles, it responded to particular needs of its day. But because it addressed issues which had pressed themselves upon Anglicanism, and still do, it had--and has--a quality which is timeless. Like the New Testament, it proclaimed some truths about what it means to live within a Christian community as a member of the Body of Christ with gifts granted by the Spirit to offer as well as growing to be abetted by the gifts which God has bestowed on others.

Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence refers, then, not only to a wordy catch-phrase of a decade long past, nor to a worthy program swallowed up in controversy, nor to a valiant if only partially-successful effort to revitalize one denomination. It abides as a principle, drawn from the Scriptures, celebrated in Eucharist, practiced to varying degrees throughout Christian history. It remains a worthy goal, and a viable precept, a vision to fulfill.

IX. Notes: A Vision to Fulfill

1. Neill, Unfinished Task, 95ff.

2. Minutes of the Advisory Committee to the Executive Officer, Kandy, Ceylon, 12-16 June 1967 (ACC Archives).

3. Minutes of the Advisory Committee to the Executive Officer, Nairobi, Kenya, 4-7 July 1966 (ACC Archives).

4. Yale University, The Divinity School, Bulletin, 1956-57, 42f; 1961-62, 49f; 1967-68, 46-64; 1972-73, 74-96; 1977-79, 79-91. Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Ct., Bulletin 1957-58 (Catalogue, September 1957), 26f; Bulletin 1961-62 (Catalogue, April 1961); Bulletin 1964-65 (Catalogue), 34-36 & passim. General Theological Seminary, New York, N.Y., Academic Programs 1983-84, n.p. Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., Catalogue 1966-78, 48. Seabury Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill., Catalog 1979-81, passim. Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas, Catalogue, 34, 47. A "Seminaries Consultation on Mission" aims to provide cross-cultural experiences in Asia, and Seabury-Western welcomes students from Nigeria and elsewhere; cf. O.C. Edwards, letter to the author, (March 31, 1986).

5. Peterson, "Anglican Identity," 460.

6. Warren, Crowded Canvas, 227.

7. Webster, You to Mission, 14f.

8. Duffield, "Mutual Responsibility," 29 (cf. p. 199, above).

9. Chisholm interview.

10. Cf. AC'63, 123f.

11. Cited by John Lawrence in AC'63, 86.

12. Bayne, quoted in Time, August 30, 1963, 45.

13. Mbuvane, interview.

14. Quoted in ibid.; cf. John S. Pobee, who refers to the "Peter Pan Syndrome" of younger churches who refuse to grow up (in Turner & Sugeno, eds., Crossroads Are for Meeting, 92).

15. Van Culin, interview.

16. Ibid.

17. Mbuvane, interview. Pobee presumably concludes differently; cf. his discussion of the "North Atlantic Captivity of Anglicanism," Crossroads, 96ff.

18. Cf. J. C. Hoekendijk, "The Church in Missionary Thinking," IRM, XLI (1952), 325f. For a more recent discussion, cf. Kortright Davis, "Can Mission and Church Be Integrated?," in Turner & Sugeno.

19. John Barton, memorandum to the House of Bishops, Anglican Church of Canada, re Companion Dioceses Handbook, February 3, 1986.

20. ACC-I Report, 47.

21. Gillespie, interview.

22. Browning, interview.

Bibliography

A. Archives and Manuscript Collections

Anglican Consultative Council, Archives, London.

Bayne, Stephen F., Jr., MSS, General Theological Seminary Library, New York.

Episcopal Church, The, Henry Knox Sherrill Resource Center, New York.

Esquirol, John Henry, MSS, Archives of the Diocese of Connecticut, Hartford.

Gray, Walter Henry, MSS, Archives of the Diocese of Connecticut, Hartford.

Hutchens, Joseph Warren, MSS, Archives of the Diocese of Connecticut, Hartford.

Sherrill, Henry Knox, MSS, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

B. Official Documents and Reports

Anglican Consultative Council, "Giving Mission its Proper Place: Report of the Mission Issues and Strategy Advisory Group." N.p.: Standing Commission on World Mission [ECUSA], 1985.

Anglicans [The Episcopal Church World's Fair Exhibit]. New York: [1964].

Bayne, Stephen F., Jr., ed. Minutes of the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy, Huron College, London, Ontario, August 5-8, 1963. ACC Archives and Gray MSS.

———, ed. Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence in the Body of Christ. New York: Seabury Press, [1963].

———, Brian Campion and A. E. L. Caulfield, Our Response to God and Far and Near. Forward Movement, May-June 1966.

Dawley, Powel Mills, ed. Report of the Anglican Congress, 1954. Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury Press, 1954.

Fairweather, E. R., ed. Anglican Congress 1963: Report of Proceedings. N.p.: Editorial Committee Anglican Congress, 1963.

[Lambeth Consultative Council]. "Forward Together: The Report of a Conference on MRI Projects and Directories held in Jerusalem, 14-18 April 1966." London: SPCK, 1966. 8 pp.

The Lambeth Conference 1948. London: SPCK, 1948.

The Lambeth Conference 1958. N.p.: SPCK & Seabury Press, 1958.

The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and Reports. N.p.: SPCK & Seabury Press, 1968.

[Mbwana, Martin, ed.] "An Account of the Partners of Mission Consultation, 20-22 August 1966, Dodoma, Tanzania," Anglican Consultative Council report, 19 pp.

Missionary & Ecumenical Council of the Church Assembly [Church of England], "The Church of England's Response to MRI." N.p., [ca. 1965]. 16 pp.

-----, "MRI in the C of E." London: Church Information Office, June 1964. 12 pp.

-----, "No Small Change" [introductory leaflet]. [London]: Church Information Office, [1964]. pp. 6.

[Mutual Responsibility Commission, PBCUSA], "A Statement from the Mutual Responsibility Commission to the Church. Issued at a Meeting of the Mutual Responsibility Commission, April 21, 1965.

-----, "Projects for Partnership" [pamphlets on regions of the Anglican Communion]. c. 1965.

-----, "Our Immediate Responsibility: Projects for Partnership. New York: Mutual Responsibility Commission, 1966.

-----, "Report to the Church on MRI." New York: Mutual Responsibility Commission, 1966.

Partners: The Seventh Unified Statement, 1939-1940: The Lambeth Number. London: Press & Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 1939.

The Primate's Committee on Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence, the Church of England in Australia, "M.R.I. 1966." Melbourne: General Board of Religious Education, [1966]. Clergy Book, 32 pp; Leader's Book, 48 pp; Member's Book, 32 pp.

The Primate's Committee on the Church's World Mission, The Anglican Church of Canada. The Parish...a Powerhouse for World Mission: A Parish Study Guide. N.p., n.d. [1964?].

Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Journal of General Convention, 1964-1970. N.p.

-----, Minutes of the Triennial Meeting of the Women of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, St. Louis, Mo., 1964 and Seattle, Washington, 1967. Sherrill Resources Center, New York.

-----, Dioceses of, Journals of Annual Conventions:
Diocese of Colorado, May 3-4, 1966.
Diocese of Connecticut, Hartford, 1964-1969.
Diocese of Ohio, 1966-1968.

[-----,] "Resources for the Journey in Mission," eight pamphlets for study groups for use in 1977-1978.

C. Books

Addison, James Thayer. The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931. N.p.: Archon Books, 1969.

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. A Religious History of the American People. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1972.

Anderson, Wilhelm. Towards a Theology of Mission. London: SCM Press, 1955.

Bakal, Carl. Charity USA. Np: Times Books, c.1979.

Bayne, Stephen F., Jr. An Anglican Turning Point: Documents and Interpretations. Austin, Texas: The Church Historical Society, 1964.

_____. Christian Living [The Church's Teaching Series, vol. 5]. New York: Seabury Press, 1957.

Beaty, John. The Church in History. New York: Seabury Press, 1979.

Bruce, F. F. History of the Bible in English. New York: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed., 1978.

Coburn, John B., and W. Norman Pittenger, eds. Viewpoints: Some Aspects of Anglican Thinking. Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury Press, 1960.

Coggan, F. Donald. Mission to the World. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1981.

Cross, F. L. The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. N.p.: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1977.

Davis, Gerald Charles ed. Setting Free the Ministry of the People of God. Cincinnati, Ohio: Forward Movement, 1984. [Report on the Roland Allen Conference, Melbourne, 1984.]

Denton, Robert C. The Holy Scriptures [The Church's Teaching Series, v.1, 1]. New York: National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church, 1949.

Dillistone, F. W. Into All the World: A Biography of Max Warren. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1980.

Dix, Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. London: Dacre Press, 2nd ed., 1945.

Erikson, Erik H. Insight and Responsibility: Lectures on the Ethical Implications of Psychoanalytic Insight. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1964.

Gaines, David P. The World Council of Churches: A Study of Its Background and History. Peterborough, N.H.: Richard R. Smith, 1966.

Goodall, Norman, et al. A Decisive Hour for the Christian Mission: The East Asia Christian Conference 1959.... London: SCM Press, 1960.

_____, ed. Missions Under the Cross: Addresses delivered at the Enlarged Meeting of the Committee of the International Missionary Council at Willingen, In Germany, 1952.... London: Edinburgh House Press, 1953.

Hall, Ronald Owen. The New Church Order [27th Annual Hale Memorial Sermon, Nov. 14, 1961]. Evanston, Ill.: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1961.

Hedden, Jeffrey K. The Communion Storm in the Churches. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969.

Hatchett, Marion J. Commentary on the American Prayer Book. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.

Herklots, H. G. G. Frontiers of the Church: The Mission of the Anglican Communion. London: Arnold Hodder Ltd., 1961.

Hewson, John. The Implications of the Toronto Manifesto. Evanston, Ill.: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1963.

Higgins, John S. The Anglican Communion Today. Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1950[?].

_____. One Faith and Fellowship: The Missionary Theory of the Anglican Communion. Greenwich, Ct.: Seabury Press, 1958.

Hoge, Dean R., & David A. Hoosen, eds. Understanding Church Growth and Decline: 1950-1978. New York & Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1979.

Hoge, Dean R. Division in the Protestant House: The Basic Reasons Behind Intra-Church Conflicts. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

Howe, John. Highways and Hedges. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1985.

Jagger, Peter J. A History of the Parish and People Movement. Leighton Buzzard, Beds.: Faith Press, 1978.

Jefferson, P. C., ed. The Church in the 60's. N.p.: The Anglican Congress, [1962].

Johnson, Howard. Global Odyssey. New York & Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963.

Kendall, Elliott. The End of an Era: Africa and the Missionary. London: SPCK, 1978.

Kliever, Lonnie D., and John N. Hayes. Radical Christianity: The New Theologies in Perspective. Anderson, S.C.: Drake House, 1968.

Leidt, William, ed. Anglican Mosaic. N.p.: Anglican Congress, 1963.

Lewis, Peter. The Fifties. New York: J.B. Lippencott Co., 1978.

May, Herbert G., and Bruce M. Metzger, eds., Foreword to The Oxford Annotated Bible with Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Morgan, Dewi. Agenda for Anglicans. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1963.

_____. The Bishops Come to Lambeth. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., Ltd., 1958.

———. Lambeth Answers. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1958.

Morgan, Edmund, and Roger Lloyd, eds., The Mission of the Anglican Communion. London: SPCK & SPG, 1948.

Moyes, John Steward. Australia Revisited: Minneapolis and Evanston, 1954. Sydney, Australia: Church Publishing Co., 1955.

Neill, Stephen. Creative Tension. London: Edinburgh House Press, 1959.

———. A History of Christian Missions. N.p.: Penguin Books, 1964.

———. The Unfinished Task. London: Edinburgh House & Lutterworth Press, 1957.

Newbigin, Lesslie. A Faith for This One World? London: SCM Press, 1961.

———. One Body, One Gospel, One World: The Christian Mission Today. London: 1958.

Pago, Robert J. New Directions in Anglican Theology: A Survey from Temple to Robinson. New York: Seabury Press, 1965.

Paton, David M., ed. Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism. London: SCM Press, 1958.

———, ed. The Parish Communion To-day: The Report of the 1962 Conference of Parish and People. London: SPCK, 1962.

Pennypacker, John G. St. Mark's and Its Forebears, The First 200 Years 1764-1964: The Story of St. Mark's Parish, New Canaan, Connecticut. Mount Vernon, N.Y.: Golden Eagle Press, 1964.

Pike, James A. If This Be Heresy. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

[Ramsey, A. Michael, ed.]. Lambeth Essays on Faith. London: SPCK, 1969.

Report of the Sixth Anglo-Catholic Congress, Subject: The Church. July 1948. Westminster: Sacre Press, [1948].

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. A Thousand Days. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.

Schnurbush, Helene M., and Grant A. Morrill, eds. The History of St. Mark's Parish, 1964-1971. N.p.: 1971.

Shepherd, Massey H., Jr., The Worship of the Church. New York: Seabury Press, 1952.

Sherrill, Henry Knox. Among Friends. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1962.

Simpson, James B., and Edward M. Story. The Long Shadows of Lambeth X. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Stephen Burrell: A Bibliography. N.p.: n.d. [1978].

Till, Barry. Change and Exchange: Mutual Responsibility and the Church of England. London: Missionary and Ecumenical Council of the Church Assembly, 1964.

Turner, Philip, & Frank Sugeno, eds. Crossroads Are For Meeting: Essays on the Mission and Common Life of the Church in a Global Society. Sewanee, Tenn.: SPCK/USA, 1986.

Wand, J. W. C. The Anglican Communion: A Survey. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Warren, Max A. C. Crowded Canvas: Some Experiences of a Life-Time. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1974.

———. Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion. London: SPCK, 1957.

———. Partnership: The Study of an Idea. London: SCM Press, [1955].

Webster, Douglas. Yes to Mission. London: Bloomsbury Press Ltd., 1966.

Welsby, Paul A. A History of the Church of England, 1945-1980. N.p.: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Whiteley, Peter. Frontier Mission: An Account of the Toronto Congress, 1963. London, Toronto, New York: SPCK, Anglican Book Centre & Seabury Press, 1963.

Wilkinson, John, ed. Mutual Responsibility: Questions and Answers. London: SPCK & CMS, 1964.

Wilson, Timothy, ed. All One Body. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1969.

D. Articles

1. Newspapers, Magazines as cited in footnotes:

The Living Church

The New York Times.

Newsweek.

Time.

The Times [London].

The Witness

2. Periodicals

Abbreviations:

ATR — Anglican Theological Review

E&WR — East and West Review

IRM — International Review of Missions

OMR — Overseas Mission Review

Ahlstrom, Sydney E., "National Trauma and Changing Religious Values," Daedalus, 107 (1978), 13-29.

Allison, C. FitzSimons, "Now, About This 'Manifesto'...." OMR, X, 2 (Epiphany 1964), pp. 1-2.

Bayne, Stephen F., Jr., "The Anglican Communion and the World Mission of the Church," ATR, III, 3 (Whitsunday 1950), 1-8.

Baker, J.G.H., "The Anglican Communion and its Missionary Task: Lambeth 1958," IRM, XLVII, 4 (1958), 445-453.

———, "Anglican Orbit," East and West Review, XXIX, No. 4 (October, 1963), 3-8.

Barnstead, Alex. L., "Church and Mission," International Review of Missions, XXXIX (1950), 263-269.

Carruthers, Thomas H., "Anglican Congress 1954," ATR, XXXV (1953), 249-251.

Clark, H.H., "Post-Toronto: The Implications of Mutual Responsibility for the Anglican Church of Canada," ECUR, XIX, 4 (October 1964), 5-8.

Crean, David E., "A Ministry of Hope," Anchor 64 [Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief], No. 1, 2-5.

Dunn, Ralph S., "Toronto 1963," East and West Review, XXIX, 3 (July 1963), 3-7.

Duffield, Gervase E., "Mutual Responsibility," The Churchman, LXXIX (1965), pp. 28-34.

Freytag, Walter, "The Meaning and Purpose of the Christian Mission," International Review of Missions, XXXIX (1950), 153-161.

Gibbs, Mark, "Anglicans Look Outwards," Manchester Guardian Weekly, LXXXIX, 9 (August 29, 1963), p. 5.

Goodall, Norman, "First Principles," International Review of Missions, XXXIX (1950), 257-262.

Gowing, Eric A., "Church and Group Life Laboratory," ECUR, XXVII, No. 1 (January 1961), 24-31.

Grey, Walter Henry, "The Future Course of the Anglican Communion: An Outline for Discussion" [Church Congress Syllabus No. 41], mimeographed paper, n.d. [ca. 1963], 12 pp., and in Anglican Theological Review, XXVIII (January 1946), 37-43.

———, "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.," East and West Review, XXVII, 4 (October 1962), 110-122.

Hebert, A. G., "The Mission of the Church," International Review of Missions, XL (1951), 385-392.

———. "The Missionary Obligation," International Review of Missions, XXXIX (1950), 385-391.

Hoekendijk, J. C., "The Church in Missionary Thinking," IRM, XLI, 324-336.

Hollis, Michael, "A Doctrine of the Church" [Review of Roland Allen, The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church...], International Review of Missions, XLIII (1954), 461-462.

Bubble, Gwenyth, "The Ghana Assembly, A Report on Group Discussion," IRM, XLVII, 2 (April 1958), 163-152.

Jeffrey, R. M., "The Bantu Education Act and its Effects," RAWR, XXV, No. 4 (October 1959), 101-109

Lobher, Neil, & Martyn Minns, "Why Did the Yankees Go Home? A Study of Episcopal Missions: 1953-1977," Historical Magazine, XLVII (1979), 27-43.

LeRoy, Milton Reese, "MRI--Of Anglicans, Christians or Men," CMR, XI, 1 (Michaelmas 1965), pp. 5-10.

Long, Charles, Jr., "Christian Vocation and the Missionary Call," IRM, XXXIX (1950), 409-417.

———, "Ten Days in Church," CMR, IX, 2 (Epiphany 1964), 4-8.

Luxton, G. N., "Why an Anglican Congress?" East and West Review, XXVIII, 4 (October 1962), 104-109.

Messinger, Carl W., "A Layman's Comment," CMR, X, 2 (Epiphany 1964), pp. 11-12.

Newbigin, Lesslie, "The Church and the Peace Corps," CMR, VII, 1 (Michaelmas 1961), 24.

Northcott, Cecil, "Rebirth of a Church?," Christian Century, September 4, 1963, 1071.

———, "Women in Anglican Pulpits?," Christian Century, November 6, 1963, 1360.

Painter, Borden W., "Bishop Walter H. Gray and the Anglican Congress of 1954," Historical Magazine, XLIX, 2 (June 1980), 157-184.

Peabody, George, "On Supervising Change," Witness, LVI, 8 (11 April 1971), 7-8.

Petersen, William H., "Anglican Identity," Historical Magazine, XLVII, 4 (December 1978), 427-452.

Ranson, Charles, "The Church Is the Mission," Christianity and Crisis XI, no. 22 (1951), 172-174.

Rehkopf, Charles F., "Reactions to Events of the '60's and '70's," Historical Magazine, XLVII, 4 (December 1978), pp. 453-462.

Shepherd, Massey H., Jr., "Honolulu and the Missionary Task," Anglican Theological Review, XXXVII (1955), 165-166.

Sumner, David E., Episcopal Church History from 1940-1980: A Brief Chronology," Historical Magazine, LIV, 1 (March 1985), 83-89.

Taylor, John V., "Missionary Responsibility in the Anglican Communion," IRM, LV (1966), 145-156.

"Toronto Congress Programme," East and West Review, XXVIII, 4 (October 1962), 99-103.

Torrey, Archer, "The Agony of the Anglican Congress," TLC (August 11, 1963), 21-22.

_____, "Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence: Off on the Wrong Foot," CHR, X, 2 (Epiphany 1965), 24-27.

Warren, M. A. C., "The Missionary Obligation of the Church in the Present Historical Situation," International Review of Missions, XXXIX (1950), 393-408.

Werth, McRae, "Moratorium I:--Rockets of Mars Spit," Witness, LVI, 6 (11 February 1971), 4.

White, Gavin, "The Chapter House," CHR, V' 3 (Whitsunday, 1966), pp. 43-45.

Yanagihara, Nikaru, "Can 'Group' Exist in Japan?" ERMR, XXVII, No. 2 (April 1961), 52-60.

3. Essays

Niles, D. T., "The Role of the Anglican Communion in the Families of Christendom," Lambeth Essays on Ministry, ed. the Archbishop of Canterbury [A. Michael Ramsey]. London: SPCK, 1968, pp. 73-84.

Visser 't Hooft, Willem Adolph, "The Genesis of the World Council of Churches," ch. 16 in A History of the Ecumenical Movement, eds. Ruth Rouse & Stephen Charles Neill. London: SPCK, 1954, 697-724.

E. Interviews with the Author

Brief titles or positions are given for purposes of identification. Copies of those which are starred (*) will be placed on file in the Archives of the Diocese of Connecticut, 1335 Asylum Avenue, Hartford, Ct. 06105.

The author wishes to record his particular gratitude to these individuals.

Browning, Edmond L., Presiding Bishop, ECUSA, New York, September 3, 1966.*

Burroughs, Nelson M., Bishop of Ohio (retired), Chatham, Massachusetts, July 21, 1966.*

Casey, Craig W., Vice-President, Church Pension Fund, New York, May 22, 1966.

Chisholm, Margaret, former assistant to Bishop Bayne, London, June 13, 1966.*

Coggan, F. Donald, 101st Archbishop of Canterbury, Washington, D.C., March 19, 1966.*

Gillespie, Judith M., Assistant for World Mission, ECUSA, New York, May 22, 1966.*

Ledwith, Jeanette M., Anglican Church of Canada, Washington, D.C., February 7, 1966.

Mawson, Martin, Assistant Executive Officer, Anglican Consultative Council, London, July 7, 1986.*

Molina, Olive Mae, former staff member, PECUSA, New York, May 21, 1986.

Paton, David, sometime Regional Officer for the British Isles, Gloucester, England, July 2, 1986.

Pawley, Margaret, biographer of Archbishop Coggan, Wye, Kent, June 19, 1986.

Reed, David B., Bishop of Kentucky, Washington, D. C., February 8, 1986.

Rose, David, Bishop of Southern Virginia (retired), Washington, D. C., February 5, 1986.

Schmidt, Edward, Anglican Church of Canada, Washington, D.C., February 7, 1986.

Taylor, John V., General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society and Bishop of Winchester (retired), telephone interview, July 1, 1986.

Van Culin, Samuel, General Secretary, Anglican Consultative Council, London, July 7, 1986.*

Walmsley, Arthur E., Bishop of Connecticut, Hartford, Connecticut, June 2, 1986.*

G. Correspondence, Addresses, Miscellaneous Items

1. Letters to the Author

Allin, John Maury, 23rd Presiding Bishop, June 26, 1986.

Eastman, A. Theodore, Bishop of Maryland, February 4, 1987.

Edwards, O. C., Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, March 31, 1986.

Long, Charles H., director and editor, Forward Movement Publications, June 16, 1986.

Porter, H. Boone, editor, The Living Church, June 18, 1986.

Sheppard, David, Bishop of Liverpool, 2 June 1986.

Taylor, John V., former head of the Church Missionary Society and Bishop of Winchester, 2 July 1986.

2. Address

Birney, David, "From Mission Work to Partnership," address to conference on "Ingredients of Partnership," Washington, D. C., February 6, 1986.

3. Miscellaneous items: As cited in notes.