



ANGLICAN & EPISCOPAL HISTORY

Volume 91

• June 2022 •

Number 2

SPECIAL ISSUE ON THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook, FRHistS, Editor-in-Chief

The John F. Woolverton Editor of Anglican and Episcopal History

AEHeditor@gmail.com

Benjamin Guyer, Contributing Editor

“You Share Our History”: Historiography of the
Lambeth Conference

By Benjamin Guyer 133

Archbishop Michael Ramsey and the Lambeth Conference

By Peter Webster 152

Anglicanism, the Lambeth Conferences, and International
Relations in the Twentieth Century

By Andrew Chandler 176

Anglican and Episcopal History is a quarterly, peer reviewed journal published by
the **Historical Society of the Episcopal Church**.

Learn more and become a member at hsec.us.

These articles are provided for the public good to provide some historical
background on the Lambeth Conference. Please share this document with others.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
ShareAlike 4.0 International License.



Archbishop Michael Ramsey and the Lambeth Conference¹

PETER WEBSTER

The Anglican Communion is perhaps unique in world Christianity in that its sources of authority are both centralized and (at the same time) diffused. In recent years, four institutions, known as the Instruments of Communion, have come to be regarded as the means by which the communion is held together. One is as old as the Anglican church itself – the office of the archbishop of Canterbury; one, the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC), is very new in comparison; the other two – the Primates’ Meeting, and the Lambeth Conference – have appeared and evolved as the Anglican Communion itself has evolved. As a recent collection of essays showed, the relationship between the Instruments, and the extent of their influence in individual provinces, are varied, fluid, and at times uncertain.² This article examines the relationship between two of the Instruments at a particular point in time: the Lambeth Conference of 1968, and the tenure of Michael Ramsey as archbishop of Canterbury (1961–1974).³

¹ My thanks are due to Andrew Chandler, Alana Harris, and Bill Jacob for their reflections on this paper at various stages. I also gratefully acknowledge the help of Ben Guyer as editor of the special issue, the peer reviewers, and Sheryl Kujawa-Holbrook and all at the journal.

² Paul Avis and Benjamin M. Guyer (eds), *The Lambeth Conference: theology, history, polity and purpose* (London, Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2017): see in particular the essay by Stephen Pickard.

³ On this relationship in general, see Paul Avis, “The archbishop of Canterbury and the Lambeth Conference,” in Avis and Guyer, *Lambeth Conference*, pp. 23–52. In part, this article develops ideas first given in outline in Peter Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey: the shape of the Church* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2015), pp. 21–5.

Peter Webster is an independent scholar of contemporary British religious history, based in the UK. His study of Michael Ramsey, archbishop of Canterbury, is published by Routledge. More information about his work is available at <https://peterwebster.me/>

Despite its present-day use, the language of the Instruments was not common in 1968. Stephen Pickard has shown that its currency in Anglican thought dates from the 1980s, part of a general cultural trend towards the transactional and away from “more organic and relational forms of ecclesial life.”⁴ From the first Lambeth Conference in 1867, through the subsequent gatherings at intervals of a decade (or as near to it as could be achieved), just such a pattern of relationships was set. The bishops that attended did so at the invitation of the archbishop and met under his presidency in the building that was both his place of work and his home. Unsurprisingly, then, some found the conference hard to separate from the office of the archbishop, even though its resolutions were formally its own. I shall show that the 1968 Lambeth Conference represented an important stage in the evolution of the conference into something more independent. I will also show that, in Michael Ramsey (1904–1988), the Anglican Communion had at its head the right person at the right time to plan and oversee the 1968 conference. I explore Ramsey’s role in giving the 1968 conference the shape that it took, tracing his influence on its agenda, its working methods, and (in particular) its openness to the gaze and to the voices of people other than the bishops themselves. His impact was also visible during the event, as preacher, leader of intercession and worship, chairman, and (in private) as host and mediator. I shall show that, at a time of acute unsettlement, Ramsey’s rare combination of theological acumen, ecumenical commitment, and political sensitivity allowed him to shape the conference such that it could face the questions that most needed to be faced.

MICHAEL RAMSEY AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Michael Ramsey became archbishop of Canterbury in 1961, after having first been archbishop of York (from 1956) and before

A summary account of the 1968 Conference is Alan M.G. Stephenson, *Anglicanism and the Lambeth Conferences* (London, SPCK, 1978), pp. 214–57.

⁴ “The Lambeth Conference among the Instruments of Communion,” in Avis and Guyer, *Lambeth Conference*, pp. 3–22, at p. 5.

that, bishop of Durham, from 1952. He was not, however, formed by proximity to power, as chaplain to a bishop, or in the administration of a diocese as an archdeacon or suffragan bishop. Rather, apart from two brief periods in parishes (neither of them as incumbent), his whole career to 1952 had been in teaching and research, first in the theological college at Lincoln, then Durham University, and (briefly) as regius professor of divinity in the University of Cambridge. Neither had he spent significant time anywhere in the communion but England. In 1961 Ramsey found himself in a very different relationship with the churches of the Anglican Communion to that in which his predecessor Geoffrey Fisher (1887–1972) had begun his term in 1945. Fisher had driven, almost to completion, the process by which churches were organized into provinces and given their independence from Canterbury. The Lambeth Conference of 1958 was attended by bishops of two new provinces in Africa that were Fisher’s creation, and two more were inaugurated before he handed over his position to Ramsey in 1961.⁵ In 1968 only a handful were still listed as “overseas bishops in the Canterbury jurisdiction.”⁶ Stephen Bayne (1908–1974), the bishop of Olympia in the state of Washington, became the first executive officer of the Anglican Communion in 1959. Freed then, both from the routine governance of overseas churches, and of much of the administrative work of the communion itself, Ramsey was able to take on a quite different role. The role now depended even more on the person of the archbishop, and I shall show that it was one that suited Ramsey’s particular talents.⁷

John Howe (1920–2001) was a bishop in the Scottish church when, in November 1968 to his great surprise, Ramsey chose him

⁵ Andrew Chandler and David Hein, *Archbishop Fisher, 1945: Church, state and world* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2012), pp. 87–90. On the development of the Communion in general under Fisher’s direction, see: W.M. Jacob, *The making of the Anglican church worldwide* (London, SPCK, 1997), pp. 263–83; William L. Sachs, *The Transformation of Anglicanism: from State Church to Global Communion* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 303–21.

⁶ *The Lambeth Conference 1968: Resolutions and reports* (London, SPCK, 1968), p. 20.

⁷ Chandler and Hein, *Fisher*, pp. 87–91; Stephen F. Bayne, *An Anglican Turning Point: Documents and Interpretations* (Austin, Texas, Church Historical Society, 1964), pp. 3–20, and *passim*.

as the next executive officer of the Anglican Communion.⁸ On his travels over the next few years, Howe often found himself in Ramsey's wake and thus in an unrivalled position to judge his impact. The need was for the archbishop to form relationships, to be *pri-mus inter pares* in a community of equal churches: a situation made for Ramsey, Howe thought.⁹ Ramsey travelled a great deal, even when an old man might have been forgiven for avoiding such strains. His press officer thought that Ramsey enjoyed it, in fact, and had a prodigious memory for the people and places he saw.¹⁰ Howe met bishops, isolated from the stream of theological development in the United Kingdom and North America, who found Ramsey, both in person and in writing, a fortifying figure. His achievement was not in the dispensing of "routine phrases of encouragement." While not pretending that all was well, he showed "amongst things new and old, what is sand and what is rock."¹¹ The theologian John Macquarrie (1919–2007), a Presbyterian who had become an Anglican, and with wide knowledge of both British and American scenes, thought it providential that someone of Ramsey's theological competence should have been at the head of the Anglican Communion in the 1960s. It was Ramsey's general stance that had been so important; he had been "open to the new ideas striving to find expression in the sixties, yet at the same time critical, and profoundly attached to and respectful towards the tradition."¹²

Churchmen close to Lambeth were sometimes guilty of failing to grasp the changing nature of the Anglican Communion: of continuing to view its affairs as it were from the center to the periphery. Ramsey's politics, always liberal, had had a wide

⁸ Howe to Ramsey, 18 November 1968, at Lambeth Palace Library (hereafter LPL) Ramsey Papers 136, f. 87.

⁹ Howe, "The Future of the Anglican Communion," in Christopher Martin (ed.), *The great Christian centuries to come* (London, Mowbrays, 1974) pp. 113–34, at p. 114.

¹⁰ Michael De-la-Noy, *A Day in the Life of God*, (Derby, Citadel, 1971). p. 41.

¹¹ Howe, "Future of the Anglican Communion."

¹² John Macquarrie, 'Whither theology?' in Martin (ed.), *Great Christian Centuries to Come*, pp. 152–68, at p. 157.

anti-imperialist streak even as a young man in the 1920s.¹³ Even before his travels began, Ramsey saw that the balance of world Christianity was already shifting from west to east, and north to south. At the meeting of the World Council of Churches (WCC) at Evanston, Illinois in 1954, he noted the “growing leadership of the Churches in Asia already, and perhaps of the Churches in Africa very soon.” Though they still needed western help, “neither the Churches nor the countries will suffer western domination: they are rising to adult stature, they are the teachers and we are the learners.”¹⁴ “Let African and Asian missionaries come to England,” Ramsey told the Anglican Congress at Toronto in 1963, in something more than a rhetorical flourish, “to help to convert the post-Christian heathenism in our country and to convert our English church to a closer following of Christ.”¹⁵ And Ramsey’s travels as archbishop continued to deepen his understanding of the situation; Howe detected a “quickness of his understanding at depths far below the outward appearance.”¹⁶ Writing to the theologian E.L. Mascall (1905–1993) in 1966 concerning the ecumenical situation in Nigeria, Ramsey stressed the importance of studying “the potentialities of the African mind in developing Christian forms and not to judge everything by Western concepts.” Ramsey had learned to look beyond written formularies, and to see unity in “these total sociological terms.”¹⁷

Lambeth 1968 was Ramsey’s second Lambeth Conference; he attended the 1958 conference as a relatively new archbishop of York.¹⁸ But he already knew something of such global ecclesiastical events, having attended the first meeting of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948. Having a keen sense of Anglican

¹³ Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 11–12; Owen Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey: a life* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 18–21.

¹⁴ Ramsey, ‘Evanston’, in Michael Ramsey, *Durham essays and addresses* (London, SPCK, 1956), pp. 81–4, at p. 83.

¹⁵ Ramsey, ‘Anglicans and the future’ in Michael Ramsey *Canterbury Essays and Addresses* (London, SPCK, 1974) pp. 74–79, at p. 78.

¹⁶ Howe, ‘The future of the Anglican Communion’, p. 114. On Ramsey’s travelling, see Chadwick, *Ramsey*, pp. 209–12.

¹⁷ Ramsey to Mascall, 18 March 1966, as reproduced at Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 184–7.

¹⁸ Chadwick, *Ramsey*, pp. 97–100.

history, he contributed a foreword to a history of the first Lambeth Conference in 1867. Some bishops had then come with a “desire for an Anglican Synod or Council which would speak with authority on the doctrinal turmoil of the time.” What had in fact emerged was not an authoritative synodical body or an “Anglican Patriarchate,” but a “family of Churches” that could advise each other: “through the series of Lambeth Conferences a growing, undefined, moral authority has been felt, always within the Anglican Churches and sometimes beyond them.”¹⁹ Though Ramsey’s view of the authority of the conference in relation to national churches did not change, he nonetheless saw that there were areas in which that authority was likely to be felt increasingly. The conferences had, he told the Convocation of Canterbury in May 1968, often expressed the common mind of the communion in matters of ethics (and the family in particular), and in relation to Christian unity. Now, with worldwide ecumenical negotiation under way with both Orthodox and Roman Catholics, “we need organs that serve [all the churches of the Communion] and take certain actions in the name of them all.” Just as the central organs of the Anglican Communion were changing shape and growing, so too was the role of the conference: it was “to make recommendations about our needs for common action as a Communion.”²⁰ Although Ramsey did not agree with some of the more excitable speculation that 1968 might see the last conference, he was prepared to entertain the possibility that its role might change. As I shall show, not only its role was to change, but its form too.

CONTEXTS

The context of unsettlement in which the 1968 Lambeth Conference took place had several facets. Perhaps the most prominent, and certainly the most publicized, was the unsettlement in theology identified with ideas of “religionless Christianity,” “demythologization,” and the “Death of God.” These ideas were

¹⁹ Alan M.G. Stephenson, *The first Lambeth Conference 1867* (London, SPCK, 1967), pp. xiii-xiv.

²⁰ Ramsey’s presidential address to the Convocation is at *The Chronicle of Convocation* [14–16 May 1968], (London, SPCK, 1968), pp. 4–6.

not wholly new, but did attain a new prominence, largely due to the impact of popularizing works: (from England) the volume of essays entitled *Soundings* (ed. A.R Vidler, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962) and John A.T. Robinson's *Honest to God* (London: SCM, 1963); from the United States the work of Paul van Buren, in *The Secular Meaning of the Gospel* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), and, later, Harvey Cox, William Hamilton and Thomas Altizer.²¹ It fell to Ramsey to deal with the fallout from Robinson's *Honest to God*, and he later felt he had been slow to grasp the need which the book aimed to meet.²² But he was to return to the questions raised several times, in his Scott Holland Lectures for 1964 (published as *Sacred and Secular*) and in particular in his book *God, Christ and the World*, the preface to which is dated March 1968, weeks before the conference began.²³ This intellectual disturbance went hand in hand with (in the UK, at least) a rapid overturning of the historic Christian basis of the law as it touched matters of morality: abortion, divorce, homosexuality, and capital punishment, among others. This new differentiation of crime from sin Ramsey could hardly avoid, and indeed he and his staff were deeply involved in framing the Church of England's response.²⁴

Rather less sensational, but equally far-reaching, were the streams of ecumenical effort which were converging in the years immediately before the Lambeth Conference. The Second Vatican Council transformed Anglican expectations of ecumenical advance with Roman Catholics; Ramsey himself made a highly symbolic visit to Paul VI in March 1966. A joint preparatory commission of Anglicans and Roman Catholics convened as a result, delivering the so-called "Malta Report" in January 1968, which, though

²¹ On the English situation, see Keith W. Clements, *Lovers of discord: Twentieth century theological controversies in England* (London, SPCK, 1988), pp. 143–217.

²² Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 108–12.

²³ Ramsey, *Sacred and secular* (London, Longmans and Green, 1965), in particular pp. 47–58; Ramsey, *God, Christ and the world. A study in contemporary theology* (London, SCM, 1969), *passim*.

²⁴ For a general account, see Nigel Yates, *Love now, pay later? Sex and religion in the fifties and sixties* (London, SPCK, 2010). On Ramsey's response, see Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 65–90.

unpublished, was made available to the bishops at Lambeth.²⁵ At just the same time, the process of rapprochement with the Methodist church in England was on the cusp of fruition. The final details of a proposed scheme of reunion were published in April 1968, a reunion to be achieved by means that (to its opponents) seemed to nullify any prospect of progress with Rome.²⁶ More than one scheme of reunion elsewhere in the Anglican Communion was at, or approaching, a similar point of decision – in North India and Pakistan, and in Ceylon, and in Nigeria – and as such the decision in England was likely to be determinant of those futures too.²⁷

More widely, the mid-1960s saw Ramsey being drawn into wider controversies of politics and society which seemed to demand a Christian response. The war in Vietnam presented numerous opportunities for risky public comment and action, not least a joint statement with other British religious leaders in February 1968, and a World Council of Churches initiative for peace shortly afterwards.²⁸ At a time when the Church of England was pressing for greater independence from the state, Ramsey was prepared to criticize governments from a greater, more prophetic distance.²⁹ Ramsey criticized British government policy both before and after the unilateral declaration of independence by the white minority government of Southern Rhodesia. In Parliament, Ramsey advocated the use of military force if necessary on behalf of the black majority; as the colonial power, “nothing could damage us more in the eyes of African countries” than to fail to uphold the cause of justice

²⁵ Chadwick, *Ramsey*, pp. 318–23; Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 31–33. On the Malta Report, see Michael Manktelow, *John Moorman: Anglican, Franciscan, independent* (London, SCM, 1999), pp. 116–7.

²⁶ Peter Webster, “Theology, providence and Anglican-Methodist reunion: the case of Michael Ramsey and E. L. Mascall,” in Jane Platt and Martin Wellings (eds), *Anglican-Methodist Ecumenism: The Search for Church Unity, 1920–2020* (Abington: Routledge, 2022), pp. 101–17.

²⁷ *Lambeth Conference 1968*, pp. 129–34.

²⁸ Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 122–5.

²⁹ Peter Webster, “Parliament and the law of the Church of England, 1945–74,” in T. Rodger, P. Williamson and M. Grimley (eds), *The Church of England and British Politics since 1900* (Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 2020), pp. 181–98. On the shifting relationship of the Anglican churches with political power more widely, see Sachs, *Anglicanism*, pp. 314–23.

with the same constancy in every situation.³⁰ The resulting media storm was the largest of Ramsey's career.³¹ At home, Ramsey well knew that the treatment of racial and religious minorities in Britain affected the lives of Christian minorities elsewhere.³² He was publicly and controversially involved in issues of race relations, both on behalf of immigrants from the Commonwealth who were already resident in the UK and, in March 1968, on behalf of Kenyans of Asian descent forced out by the Kenyatta government.³³ Weeks later came the shock of the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. In July Ramsey flew home early from the WCC assembly in Uppsala to speak in Parliament in support of what became the Race Relations Act, just days before the Lambeth Conference opened.³⁴

Viewing these currents together, it is possible to characterize the mid-1960s as a moment of turbulence among the worldwide Anglican churches. Talk of crisis is itself not neutral and has the tendency to create or exacerbate that of which it speaks.³⁵ But there was clearly a distinct change in atmosphere in the councils of the Anglican Communion between the 1958 conference, and 1966, when the agenda for 1968 was being set. In 1958 the worldwide church, when viewed in aggregate, was growing in number; new provinces were being created; in the shape of the executive officer and the new working bodies mandated in 1958, the Anglican Communion seemed to be fitting itself for a greater role. One of the committees of the 1958 Lambeth Conference had spoken of the "truly inspiring structure" of a communion which was "destined for greater and perhaps more dangerous responsibility," to bring

³⁰ *House of Lords Debates*, 15 November 1965, vol. 270, cols 265–66.

³¹ Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 125–7.

³² Peter Webster, "Race, religion and national identity in Sixties Britain: Michael Ramsey, archbishop of Canterbury and his encounter with other faiths," *Studies in Church History* 51 (2015), pp. 385–98.

³³ Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 127–30.

³⁴ Chadwick, *Ramsey*, p. 174. Ramsey's speech is given in full at Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 197–201.

³⁵ On this tendency at large, see Sam Brewitt-Taylor, "The Invention of a 'Secular Society'? Christianity and the Sudden Appearance of Secularization Discourses in the British National Media, 1961–4," *Twentieth Century British History*, 24:3 (2013), 327–350, <https://doi.org/10.1093/tcbh/hwt012>

to the world in all its crises “a tempered wisdom and a spiritual stability.”³⁶ The discussion that came under the heading of Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence (MRI) after the 1963 Anglican Congress in Toronto seemed to represent the same new maturity. Not for nothing did Stephen Bayne entitle his 1964 book *An Anglican Turning-Point* (Austin, TX: Church Historical Society).

In October 1965, Ralph Dean (1913–1987), Bayne’s successor as executive officer, was arranging the agenda for the 1966 meeting of the Lambeth Conference Consultative Body, the group of primates to whom it fell to plan the 1968 conference. The major items suggested for consideration in 1968 so far were the general question of education and the work of a bishop; other lesser topics included liturgy, baptism, and “Christian behaviour.”³⁷ By the following April, when the group met in Jerusalem, Dean’s sense of things had changed completely. His experiences in the previous eighteen months had led him to think “that the world situation is intensely critical and that necessarily the situation of the church within the world is not less so. The very foundations of the Christian Faith are being challenged and it is having a marked effect on the church’s sense of mission amounting almost to a failure of nerve, and certainly of conviction.” The Lambeth Conference would be accused of cowardice, he thought, if it did not address the “‘Death of God’ dialogue” and do something to set the boundaries of belief. The agenda in hand lacked the comprehensiveness the moment demanded. If all this seemed radical, he continued, then “I can only say that we live in radical times.”³⁸ It is not clear how much of Dean’s change of mood Ramsey knew before the meeting in Jerusalem, though they were in very regular contact being based in the same city. But Ramsey was aware of the feeling of crisis that was abroad, even if not from Dean. He took the chair

³⁶ *The Lambeth Conference 1958: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports* (London/Greenwich CT., SPCK/Seabury, 1958), part 2, p. 69. On the ambiguous optimism of the 1950s, see Sachs, *Anglicanism*, pp. 307–8.

³⁷ Dean to the members of the Lambeth Conference Consultative Body, 27 October 1965, at LPL Ramsey Papers 99, ff. 291–3.

³⁸ Typescript memorandum dated 24 April 1966: ‘Some reflections by the Executive Officer on the Agenda for the Lambeth Conference’, at LPL Ramsey Papers 100, ff. 25–6.

at St George's College as the twenty primates discussed the matter, and by the end of the meeting the priorities of the 1968 conference had largely been set.³⁹

THE PLANNING OF LAMBETH 1968

An event such as the Lambeth Conference, unfolding over a full month, is the work of many hands. To determine just how much of the conference's shape was due to Ramsey, and how much to its steering committee and to Dean, is beyond my scope. Ramsey certainly acted to alter things with which he was not content. But there were innovations which so closely accord with Ramsey's own priorities that, even if they were not first promoted by him, then they would surely have been heartily approved. Lambeth 1968 was by some distance the largest conference up to that point, due to the decision to invite not only diocesans but all bishops in active service; this added some forty-eight suffragans to the total from England alone. The greater availability of air travel was certainly a necessary condition, but there were more positive reasons for the growth in numbers. The change in policy reflected a subtle distinction, more characteristic of the catholic Ramsey than of Fisher, between the administrative and juridical function of the bishop, exercised only by diocesan and metropolitan, and the sacramental and teaching function that all bishops in active service shared. "We feel the important thing is to be a bishop in the Church of God, working," Ramsey told reporters, "and the distinction of bishops and suffragans and assistants isn't a distinction to be recognized."⁴⁰ And to invite suffragans and assistants, Ramsey argued, was to enable a greater representation of the African provinces. (Of the nineteen bishops from the province of West Africa, eight were assistant bishops.) This was more than merely fairness; it was an acceptance, indeed an anticipation, of what the African and Asian churches had to offer. "We shall find culture challenged by culture as well as doctrinal emphasis challenged by doctrinal emphasis,"

³⁹ The minutes are at LPL Ramsey Papers 100, ff. 29–48.

⁴⁰ James B. Simpson and Edward M. Story, *The long shadows of Lambeth X: a critical eye-witness account of the tenth decennial conference of the 462 bishops of the Anglican Communion* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 5.

Ramsey told the Convocation of Canterbury in May: "We may all learn rather painfully that the cultural clothing of our own Christianity may not be of the *esse* of Christianity at all and may in some ways be a hindrance to it."⁴¹ One Australian bishop, veteran of more than one Lambeth Conference, felt that there had been a new and distinctive freedom in fellowship in 1968: "The power of the English bishops to create awe in the spirits of their overseas brethren has gone."⁴²

Ramsey had disliked the size of the WCC assembly at Evanston in 1954, and the consequent difficulty of achieving a genuine exchange of thought.⁴³ The committee Ramsey had chaired in 1958 had been forty-two strong; to bring out the fullest deliberation of a group of such a size would have been beyond even the best of chairmen.⁴⁴ With the increased size of the 1968 Lambeth Conference, the problem could have been greater still, but for the adoption of a different working arrangement. The sub-committees of Lambeth 1968 had only ten to twenty members, and fed their reports into one of three sections, for each of which there was a small team of three charged with drawing the threads together. Was this not somewhat cumbersome, a reporter asked Ramsey? It was perhaps a "tricky exercise," he admitted, but the point was to "ensure that every bishop who is present is engaged in real discussions with others, and so you get a real meeting of minds between bishops from totally different places and backgrounds."⁴⁵ The bishops were asked to nominate the committee on which they wished to serve, and nearly all their choices were accommodated.⁴⁶ Such an arrangement must surely have tended to a better quality of deliberation.

⁴¹ Ramsey's presidential address to the Convocation is at *The Chronicle of Convocation* [14–16 May 1968], (London, SPCK, 1968), pp. 4–6.

⁴² Kenneth Clements, bishop of Canberra and Goulburn, to Dean, 14 October 1968, at LPL LC247, f. 13.

⁴³ Ramsey, 'Evanston', p. 81.

⁴⁴ The members of the committee on 'The Holy Bible: its authority and message' are listed at *Lambeth Conference 1958*, section 2, p. 1.

⁴⁵ Transcript of an interview broadcast on Associated Television in the UK on July 28, 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 126, ff. 39–45, at f. 42.

⁴⁶ Draft annual report of the Executive Officer for 1967, at LPL Ramsey Papers 136, f. 11.

Writing to Ramsey after the Lambeth Conference, Eugene Carson Blake, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, thought it had had a significant effect on the ecumenical scene.⁴⁷ One prominent English insider thought the Anglican Communion had regained “the ecumenical initiative because of Lambeth’s openness to the other Christians; because we envisaged the transformation or disappearance of Anglicanism as a ‘separate encampment’ not merely as a vague possibility, but as a programme for the next ten years.”⁴⁸ That openness was both signalled and made manifest by the list of those who, like Blake, were invited to observe. In 1958 the Lambeth Conference had received delegates from several other churches, who had been ceremonially welcomed, and had attended the opening services, but were not admitted to the main business of the conference.⁴⁹ It was very much in line with Ramsey’s approach to other churches that the delegates in 1968 were far greater in number, and their involvement much closer. The range had been extended beyond Europe and North America, and beyond the more familiar denominations, to include such bodies as the Mar Thoma Church, the Society of Friends, and the Assemblies of God. The established Free Churches in England were represented not individually, but by their worldwide bodies. The Church of South India, formed in part of churches that had previously been Anglican, had not been invited to the conferences in 1948 and 1958; this time, it sent three delegates. Unlike 1958, the observers were able both to attend and to speak in the plenary sessions of the conference, and (if invited) to attend meetings of the subcommittees.⁵⁰ “They have not come just to watch” said Ramsey in a televised interview; “they have come to take part in the discussions in giving and taking, and I think

⁴⁷ Blake to Ramsey, 11 December 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 136, ff. 105–6.

⁴⁸ This was David Paton, of the Missionary and Ecumenical Council of the Church Assembly (MECCA), in a letter to Ramsey, 14 October 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 136, ff. 78–9.

⁴⁹ *Lambeth Conference 1958*, section 1, pp. 65–66.

⁵⁰ A detailed briefing note distributed to the observers is at LPL LC 209, ff. 97–8.

their presence will make us just a bit more of an ecumenical conference.”⁵¹ To the observers themselves he said: “you are here so generously because we need you.”⁵²

The Second Vatican Council too had admitted observers; merely one startling aspect of a startling event. Two of the Anglican observers in Rome were also at Lambeth 1968. One of them, the American (but British-based) theologian Howard E. Root had found the experience in Rome life-changing: “[t]he isolation of centuries has been broken down for ever. In its place has come a new sense of responsibility, founded upon the solid ground of personal friendships, theological discussion, and the conviction that we all belong to one Christian family with common problems and aims.”⁵³ The change of mood was indicated by the presence of several Roman Catholic observers in 1968, which would have been hard to imagine a decade earlier. Among them were men with whom Ramsey was in regular contact, most notably Jan Willebrands (1909–2006), the secretary of the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Unity among Christians, who had been a regular visitor to Lambeth Palace.⁵⁴ Willebrands read aloud a message from Pope Paul VI in the opening session.⁵⁵

A further, and unexpected, indication of a new openness was the relationship with the media. Ramsey himself gave two press conferences, one at each end of the Lambeth Conference, as well as a sherry party; Ralph Dean made himself available in a similar way. Additionally, reporters (but not broadcasters) were allowed into the plenary sessions of the conference itself. (It was to this change in policy that the historian owes the detailed account of the 1968 conference by two American clergy journalists, James B. Simpson, and Edward M. Story.)⁵⁶ Ramsey’s relationship with the

⁵¹ Transcript of an interview broadcast on Associated Television in the UK on July 28, 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 126, ff. 39-45, at f. 39.

⁵² Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, p. 41.

⁵³ As quoted in Christopher Brewer (ed.), *Theological radicalism and tradition: “The limits of radicalism” with appendices* (Abingdon, Routledge, 2018), p. 12

⁵⁴ Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 30, 32.

⁵⁵ Reproduced at Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 287–8.

⁵⁶ Their assessment of this new openness was given at Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 64–71.

media was complex – and so far is under-explored by historians – and the public relations operation of the Church of England was in a state of some flux. He had not relished the crowd of hangers-on that he encountered at Evanston in 1954, nor the kind of media boosterism that accompanied it.⁵⁷ But though Ramsey did not quite delight in the presence of the media, the kind of secrecy of earlier Lambeth Conferences could not be maintained. “This privacy of ecclesiastical gatherings has rather become a thing of the past,” Ramsey told a television interviewer as the conference began. The precedent had been set by the Vatican Council in its invitation to observers; in this way “the privacy goes [and] if it goes, it had better go altogether.”⁵⁸

There was another group at the 1968 Lambeth Conference that was wholly new. The Vatican Council had been supported by a large group of *periti*: consultant theologians who were available to advise the bishops as the conference progressed. A suggestion of something similar had been made to Geoffrey Fisher for the Lambeth Conference of 1948, but he had resisted. The bishops did not need the kind of help that professional theologians had to give, Fisher thought: instead, their task was to “bring a decisive point all their experience through the years in administering their own Dioceses” and to come to a common mind on that basis.⁵⁹ Fisher did not change his view in 1958, but a certain cultural change was already under way within the central bodies of the Church, at least in England: a greater recognition of the complexity of the problems to be faced, and of the usefulness of expert advice.⁶⁰ Even without this, however, Ramsey’s own background made the idea a natural one to adopt. His role at the 1948 WCC meeting in Amsterdam had been similar, when he (at the time still professor at Durham) was part of a commission with Richard Niebuhr, Karl Barth

⁵⁷ Ramsey, ‘Evanston’, p. 81.

⁵⁸ Transcript of an interview broadcast on Associated Television in the UK on July 28th 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 126, ff. 39-45, at f. 42.

⁵⁹ Edward Carpenter, *Archbishop Fisher. His life and times* (Norwich, Canterbury Press, 1991), p. 454–5

⁶⁰ An indication of this was the formation of the Church of England’s Board of Social Responsibility in 1958: Tom Rodger, ‘Spiritual authority in a “secular age”: the Lords Spiritual, c. 1950-80’ in Rodger, Williamson and Grimley (eds), *The Church of England and British politics*, pp. 222–39, at p. 229.

and others.⁶¹ So it was that a group of twenty-six consultants was assembled for the Lambeth Conference, with a brief to circulate freely around the many sessions, at the service and invitation of whichever group of bishops needed them.⁶² Among the names are many from the UK and North America, as was to be expected given the concentration of resources within the Anglican Communion. Several were professional academics based within universities or theological colleges (including Howard Root); there were also several names from the various central bodies within the Church of England that still helped to resource the Anglican Communion and others from comparable bodies in other provinces.⁶³ As with most such appointments, special care was taken visibly to balance evangelical and Anglo-Catholic opinion from England.⁶⁴ There were also voices from elsewhere in the communion: from Japan, the Church of South India, and two from the African churches, including Janani Luwum (1922–1977) – then a theological college principal in Uganda, but soon to become a bishop, and a martyr.⁶⁵

The group of consultants made their presence felt. The conservative evangelical Michael Green (1930–2019) found the experience a fascinating one, moving from committee to committee as required; his interventions helped to shape the report on the

⁶¹ Chadwick, *Ramsey*, pp. 66–7.

⁶² The names are given at *Lambeth Conference 1968*, p. 155; a second list (which does not quite agree) is at Stephenson, *Anglicanism*, p. 236; see also Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, p. 26. The letter of invitation is at LPL LC 208, f. 5, dated 24 April 1967.

⁶³ Among the academics were Henry Chadwick, David E. Jenkins, Dennis Nineham and Howard E. Root (all based in the UK) and Eugene Fairweather (St John's College Toronto); from the theological colleges, Michael Green, Martin Jarrett-Kerr, Douglas Webster and (from the USA) John Macquarrie. From among Ramsey's diplomats and experts in London, there was John Findlow, representative to the Holy See, and John Satterthwaite of the Council on Foreign Relations, along with David Paton of MECCA, Basil Moss of ACCM (the Anglican Consultative Council on the Ministry) and Mollie Batten of the Church of England Board of Social Responsibility. These were matched by officials in comparable roles in the Episcopal Church, Paul Anderson and Peter Day.

⁶⁴ David Paton to Dean, 18 November 1966, at LPL LC 208, ff. 1–3.

⁶⁵ From the Church of South India there was H.L.J. Daniel; from Japan, C. Powles; the African church was also represented by John Mbiti, also from Uganda.

ministry. Though he was disappointed with the theological acumen of some of the bishops, he spoke of the “sheer Christian graciousness of all concerned, the friendliness, the give and take.”⁶⁶ John Macquarrie too found many of the bishops unimpressive, and was surprised how prone some were to being swept along by theological fashion; he too influenced the drafting.⁶⁷ From the chair Ramsey singled out the contribution of the only woman in the group – and indeed at the whole conference – Mollie Batten (1905–1985), recently retired principal of William Temple College and now one of the experts from the Church of England’s Board of Social Responsibility.⁶⁸ Noting the absence of female voices, Ramsey had intervened to add Batten to the list, to the great surprise of Dean and of Ramsey’s staff, and wrote later especially to thank her.⁶⁹ Dean thought the presence of both observers and consultants a success, with the consultants in particular in great demand.⁷⁰ A number of bishops reportedly felt that the observers and consultants had been too prominent and too vocal, causing two of the consultants to seek clarification of their role, perhaps in self-defence.⁷¹ But Ramsey later thought that he had been happiest when there had been such participation from the gallery, in which observers and consultants were seated.⁷²

Of the group of consultants, eight also contributed to a substantial volume of preparatory essays, circulated confidentially to the

⁶⁶ Michael Green, *Adventure of faith: Reflections on Fifty Years of Christian Service* (Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan, 2001, p. 128; Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 159, 168; Green to Ramsey, 20 September 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 246, ff. 24–5.

⁶⁷ Macquarrie, ‘Whither theology?’, p. 157; Macquarrie, *On being a theologian: Reflections at eighty* (London, SCM, 1999), p. 39.

⁶⁸ Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, p. 159.

⁶⁹ Ralph Dean to John Andrew, 30 May 1967, at LPL LC 208, f. 11; Ramsey to Batten, 26 August 1968, at LPL LC 246, f. 5.

⁷⁰ Stephenson, *Anglicanism*, p. 237.

⁷¹ Paton to Dean, 13 August 1968, at LPL LC 208, f. 39. The two consultants were Dennis Nineham and Henry Chadwick.

⁷² Ramsey to Edward Carpenter, one of the consultants, 26 August 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 246, f. 2.

bishops in advance of the Lambeth Conference.⁷³ The majority of these were subsequently published in three volumes, under Ramsey's editorship.⁷⁴ In both the selection of authors, and in the essays themselves, Ramsey's priorities may be seen reflected. Several of the essays emanated from the English academic world which he knew well; contributions from the American academy came from Charles C. West, of Princeton, and John Macquarrie. But there were lay people too, notably the Oxford economist Denys Munby (1919–1976), and Mollie Batten. Ramsey also drew on expertise outside the Anglican Communion: Daisuke Kitagawa (1910–1970), an Anglican of Japanese American heritage, was on the staff of the World Council of Churches, as was Nikos Nissiotis (1924–1986), the Greek Orthodox theologian. The essay on relations with the Roman Catholic Church came from the Canadian Catholic scholar Gregory Baum (1923–2017), who had been a *peritus* at Vatican II. D.T. Niles (1908–1970) of Ceylon was general secretary of the East Asia Christian Conference, and a Methodist.

Though Ramsey could invite writers to write, he could not be responsible for the result. But he would very likely have appreciated the unflinching way in which many of the writers took to their task. The contributions from Macquarrie and from David Jenkins, later bishop of Durham, stand out for their frank discussion of, respectively, the problem of religious language and the challenge of atheism.⁷⁵ An indication of what Ramsey felt the task of the Lambeth Conference to be was reflected in his own essay entitled "Principles of Christian Unity" that opened *Lambeth Essays on Unity* (London: SPCK, 1969). Ramsey had often referred to the ecumenical task as one that went beyond the piecing together of existing structures, as if mending a broken toy.⁷⁶ As the churches grew in holiness and truth, so would they grow closer together, but the

⁷³ *Lambeth Conference 1968: preparatory essays* (London, SPCK, 1968).

⁷⁴ *Lambeth essays on faith*, *Lambeth essays on unity* and *Lambeth essays on ministry* were all published by SPCK in 1969.

⁷⁵ Macquarrie, 'The nature of theological language', in *Lambeth Essays on Faith*, pp. 1–10; Jenkins, "The debate about God," *ibid.*, pp. 11–21.

⁷⁶ Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, p. 26. On Ramsey's understanding of ecclesiology in general, and its expression in his 1936 book *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, see *ibid.* pp. 14–17.

resulting churches would no longer look as they now did. The Anglican Communion had a role to play in “synthesis and understanding.” But it now faced some difficult decisions: “It need not as a Communion be set upon its own self-preservation so long as it sees the principles it has stood for shared with others in the re-integration of Christendom in its mission to the world. It may exert a greater influence in a process of dying to live than it could ever have in a self-preserving isolationism.”⁷⁷ Such a vision of the future could scarcely have occurred to Fisher a decade before.

RAMSEY AS PRESIDENT AND HOST

It naturally fell to Ramsey to preach at the opening service of the Lambeth Conference, in Canterbury Cathedral on July 25, 1968. The note of urgency returned, and more starkly. “Today the earth is being shaken,” and the shaking was of society as well as the churches. Ramsey spoke of “the terrible contrast between the world of affluence and the world of hunger, the explosions of racial conflict, the amassing of destructive weapons, the persistence of war and killing. And Man, they say, has come of age.” But while “many things are cracking, melting, disappearing,” it was nonetheless possible “to distinguish the things which are shaken and to receive gratefully a kingdom which is not shaken, the kingdom of our crucified Lord.” The faith would “always be folly and scandal to the world,” never truly popular, and “cannot adapt itself to every passing fashion of human thought. But it will be a faith alert to distinguish what is shaken and is meant to go, and what is not shaken and is meant to remain.” And in the radically changed relations between the churches, “[w]e shall love our own Anglican family not as something ultimate but because in it and through it we and others have our place in the one Church of Christ . . . there will come into existence United Churches not descriptably Anglican but in communion with us and sharing with us what we hold to be the unshaken essence of Catholicity.” But the question, then, of the nature of the Anglican Communion itself could be faced “without fear, without anxiety, because of our

⁷⁷ ‘Principles of Christian unity’, in *Lambeth Essays on Unity*, pp. 1–5, at p. 5.

faith in the things which are not shaken. Perhaps the Anglican role in Christendom may come to be less like a separate encampment and more like a colour in the spectrum of a rainbow, a colour bright and unselfconscious."⁷⁸

Once the conference was under way, its course was only under the president's control to a limited extent. The thirty-three subcommittees deliberated, and their findings were filtered up through the sections into plenary sessions, after which different groups of bishops wrote their reports, which in turn came back to plenary discussion. It is difficult to assess exactly how far Ramsey shaped the resulting set of reports and resolutions from the chair, although in general he intervened relatively little, and less so than Fisher in 1958, which at least one bishop was known to have regretted.⁷⁹ Some level of dissent was surely inevitable, whatever he might have said; John Macquarrie recalled some disagreement with Ramsey's intervention in relation to intercommunion.⁸⁰ One American bishop felt he had been brusquely dealt with from the chair, but such moments were only as frequent as to be expected in any large and lengthy meeting.⁸¹ The two observers, Simpson and Story, thought Ramsey had retained the respect of all the factions within the conference, and had "entered the Conference and left it as a great leader of Anglicanism and Christendom." A writer in the *Church Illustrated* spoke of "an infinite capacity to grasp the heart of opposites"; seemingly contradictory opinions "reached his Chair and somehow bounded back transmuted."⁸²

In the "whirl of oratory, discussions and committees, and typed documents" that Ramsey saw at Evanston in 1954, there had been no room left in which the real work could be done: "[g]reat matters of religion need thought, and thought requires spaces of quiet

⁷⁸ The sermon is reproduced in full at Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 204–8.

⁷⁹ The bishop was Robert Stopford, bishop of London: Chadwick, *Ramsey*, p. 276; Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 212, 232.

⁸⁰ Michael De-la-Noy, *Michael Ramsey: a portrait* (London, Collins, 1990), pp. 159–60.

⁸¹ This was the Bishop of Erie: Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 56–8.

⁸² As quoted at Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, p. 277.

and leisure.”⁸³ The 1968 Lambeth Conference had its share of large events, but in comparison to 1958, the number of engagements was small, and deliberately so. Ramsey had hoped that the social program would be minimal, and “the bishops will have – if they wish – some quietness for their concentrated task.”⁸⁴ More generally, the recollections that survive tend to stress Ramsey’s role in the setting of just such an atmosphere. His first biographer had the impression that what most impressed the bishops was “the religiousness of the man.”⁸⁵ Eric Treacy, bishop of Wakefield, was struck by just this during a day of recollection that Ramsey led before the formal business began.⁸⁶ Simon Phipps, newly consecrated as suffragan bishop of Horsham, had been impressed by the sight of Ramsey leading the bishops in the *Veni Creator Spiritus* each morning.⁸⁷ Russell Chandran, one of the observers from the Church of South India, similarly felt that the tone Ramsey had set in prayer, and his evident humility, had been crucial.⁸⁸ And to set and maintain such a tone under the circumstances was a significant achievement. Just as the Lambeth Conference began, the Vatican issued the seismic declaration on contraception, *Humanae Vitae*, prompting a press conference given by Dean to the eager media; the conference had thus begun, in Ramsey’s later words to the press, “in an atmosphere of sky a bit darkened.”⁸⁹ In mid-conference, the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia; the fighting continued in Vietnam and Biafra. In such circumstances, a kind of feverishness might have ensued. Oliver Tomkins, bishop of Bristol, had detected a febrile atmosphere at the assembly of the World Council of Churches, which took place in Uppsala immediately before the bishops congregated in London. But the Lambeth Conference was different, Tomkins thought: not “so urgent as

⁸³ Ramsey, ‘Evanston’, p. 81.

⁸⁴ As quoted (but without attribution of a source) by Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, p. 101.

⁸⁵ Chadwick, *Ramsey*, p. 275.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ De-la-Noy, *Ramsey*, p. 159.

⁸⁸ Russell Chandran was principal of the United Theological College at Serampore: Chandran to Ramsey, 13 November 1968, at LPL LC 246, f. 43.

⁸⁹ Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 44, 233.

Uppsala, but neither has it been so frenetic.” This was, he thought, largely due to Ramsey: his “personality . . . his dislike of frenzy, his quiet daily guidance of the meditations and his love of depth rather than width.”⁹⁰

But it seems likely that much of Ramsey’s business at the conference was transacted rather more quietly. The removal of restrictions on the media meant that, as the conference unfolded, Ramsey had to field letters expressing concern as to the drift of the debate; one such came from Eric Kemp, member of the commission on Anglican-Methodist unity in England, concerned about the apparent drift of the debate on intercommunion.⁹¹ It is also likely that much important work was done as Ramsey and his wife entertained small groups of the bishops at Lambeth Palace for evensong followed by a quiet dinner.⁹² One such guest was the archbishop of Sydney, Marcus Loane, a leading figure among conservative evangelicals who had been the constituency in the church most wary of the catholic Ramsey. When some weeks later he publicly criticized aspects of the report, Loane wrote to reassure Ramsey that the criticism was not personal, and to thank him warmly for his hospitality.⁹³ Though the traces of private conversations are naturally few, Ramsey’s mediation is evident in the aftermath of the most turbulent moment of the Lambeth Conference, in relation to Anglican-Methodist reunion. An intervention by the metropolitan of India, Lakdasa de Mel (1902–1976), had caused such ill-feeling among bishops of the catholic part of the church that several excused themselves from the final service at St Paul’s at which de

⁹⁰ Adrian Hastings, *Oliver Tomkins. The ecumenical enterprise* (London, SPCK, 2001), p. 145.

⁹¹ Ramsey reassured Kemp about the resolution that the conference would most likely reach and was correct in his prediction: Kemp to Ramsey, 13 August 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 134, ff. 329–30.

⁹² Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, p. 101.

⁹³ Loane to Ramsey, 16 October 1968, at LPL LC 246, f.36. On Ramsey’s relationship with conservative Anglican evangelicals in general, see Peter Webster, ‘Archbishop Michael Ramsey and evangelicals in the Church of England’ in Andrew Atherstone and John Maiden (eds), *Evangelicalism and the Church of England in the Twentieth Century. Reform, resistance and renewal* (Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 2014), pp. 172–92

Mel was to preach.⁹⁴ One of these was John Moorman, the other of the two Anglican representatives at Vatican II to attend the conference. Writing to Moorman, Ramsey regretted de Mel's speech, but while disagreement was a given, it was "only that breach of fellowship that wounds."⁹⁵ But in the case of Graham Leonard, suffragan bishop of Willesden and, if anything, a more conservative figure than Moorman, Ramsey was able to intervene to avert such a breach. A handwritten note was enough to convince Leonard that he both could be, and ought to be present at the service.⁹⁶

CONCLUSION

All Lambeth Conferences are consequential to some degree, given the range of subjects on which they have pronounced, and the diversity of local situations in which those resolutions land. The Lambeth Conference 1968 had its share of consequences, not least the creation of the Anglican Consultative Council; on other matters it was unable decisively to settle an issue, such as the ordination of women to the priesthood. In any case, to assess its effect at length is beyond my scope. It was, however, consequential in the sense that something of the character of the Lambeth Conference as an intimate private gathering of friends, at the invitation and in the home of the archbishop, was lost and was not to return. Fisher reportedly felt just this, and even that it imperilled the Anglican Communion.⁹⁷ Ramsey's relationship with his predecessor, who was also his former teacher and who opposed his appointment, was never straightforward, and by 1968 it had been damaged almost beyond repair by their disagreement over Anglican-Methodist unity.⁹⁸ But Robert Stopford, bishop of London, who had been the episcopal secretary to the 1958 Lambeth Conference and served on the steering committee in 1968, felt too a regret at

⁹⁴ Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 227–9; Stephenson, *Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 250–1.

⁹⁵ Manktelow, *Moorman*, pp. 125–6.

⁹⁶ John Peart-Binns, *Graham Leonard. Bishop of London* (London, Darton Longman and Todd, 1988), pp. 68–9.

⁹⁷ Chadwick, *Ramsey*, p. 276.

⁹⁸ Chadwick, *Ramsey*, p. 115; Webster, *Archbishop Ramsey*, pp. 42–43.

the change.⁹⁹ The increased scale of the conference unavoidably militated against a sense of intimacy; the openness to observers surely added to the effect, as did the decision to admit the media. But did this amount to anything more than the loss of a certain quality of interaction? Although it is hard to demonstrate the effect, the moving of the main sessions from the quasi-domestic surroundings of Lambeth Palace to the more functional setting of Church House may have served as a symbol of a distancing of the Lambeth Conference from the person of the archbishop. And though the conference resolved nothing new as regarded its precise relationship with the archbishop, its resolution to create the Anglican Consultative Council, of which Cantuar would be president but which would be under the chairmanship of another, seemed to be a straw in the same wind.¹⁰⁰ For some, the Anglican Communion had been held together by the relationship to Canterbury, and the Book of Common Prayer; at a time when the latter was being widely revised, there was danger in weakening the former.¹⁰¹

The full effect of 1968 on future Lambeth Conferences, I leave aside. But the mid-1960s saw an acute perception of crisis, within the Church and outside it. In Michael Ramsey, the Anglican Communion had at its head one who was both sensitive to the issues at hand and had the intellectual range to begin to address them. His achievement was to have provided the bishops with an agenda, a procedure, a set of resources (in person and in print), and – perhaps most importantly – an atmosphere in which they could at least begin to address the questions they faced. The degree to which they were successful is the subject for another study.

⁹⁹ Robert T. Holtby, *Robert Wright Stopford, 1901–1976* (London, The National Society, 1988), p. 53.

¹⁰⁰ Resolution 69, given at *The Lambeth Conference 1968*, pp. 46–9.

¹⁰¹ The view of Frank Woods, archbishop of Melbourne, in a letter to Ramsey, 19 April 1968, at LPL Ramsey Papers 136, f. 42. A similar protectiveness of Cantuar's status was voiced from the floor during the Conference: Simpson and Story, *Lambeth X*, pp. 247–8.