Historical Society of the Episcopal Church

President
Robyn M. Neville, St. Mark's School, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

1st Vice President
J. Michael Utzinger, Hampden-Sydney College

2nd Vice President
Robert W. Prichard, Virginia Theological Seminary

Secretary
Pamela Cochran, Loyola University Maryland

Treasurer
Bob Panfil, Diocese of Virginia

Director of Operations
Matthew P. Payne, Diocese of Fond du Lac

administration@hsec.us

Anglican and Episcopal History

Editor-in-Chief
Edward L. Bond, Natchez, Mississippi

The John F. Woolverton Editor of Anglican and Episcopal History

acheditor@earthlink.net

Church Review Editor
J. Barrington Bates,
Diocese of Newark

churchrevieweditor@gmail.com

Book Review Editor
Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook, Claremont School of Theology

aehbookreviews@gmail.com

Anglican and Episcopal History (ISSN 0896-8039) is published quarterly (March, June, September, and December) by the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church, PO Box 1301, Appleton, WI 54912-1301 (formerly the Church Historical Society). Information at hsec.us/aeh. Periodicals postage paid at Appleton, Wisconsin, and additional entry offices. A member of the Conference of Historical Journals. Single print copies $10 including postage. Annual membership includes digital edition: $15 student, $30 retiree, $45 regular, $60 institution, $100 sustaining, $250 patron and $500 benefactor. Print edition $30 additional for student, retiree, regular and institutional members. Information at hsec.us/membership. Become a member at hsec.us/membership. Subscription without membership is available for institutions ($70 digital only, $100 print only, $130 digital & print, add $30 non-US print) or individuals ($30 digital only, $45 print only, $70 digital and print, add $30 non-US print). Subscription requests, orders for current and back issues, and information about advertising opportunities should be sent to Matthew P. Payne, Director of Operations, HSEC, PO Box 1301, Appleton, WI 54912-1301, (920) 383-1910, administration@hsec.us. Checks payable to HSEC. Online payment available.

Submissions: submissions for consideration should be typed, double-spaced, 12-point serif font, and conform to the Chicago Manual of Style (15th ed.). Electronic submission as Microsoft Word preferred to acheditor@earthlink.net or to Edward Bond, 902 State Street, Natchez, MS 39120. A physical manuscript not accepted for publication will only be returned if a self-addressed, stamped envelope is included with the submission. Books for review should be sent to Professor Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook, Claremont School of Theology, 1325 North College Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711, aehbookreviews@gmail.com.

Submissions for Church Reviews should follow direction found at hsec.us/church-reviews. Permission to photocopy articles and reviews for classroom use may be obtained from the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., Academic Permissions Service, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. To request permission for other types of copying, such as general distribution, advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, or resale, contact the Editorial Office, 902 State Street, Natchez, MS 39120, acheditor@earthlink.net. Editors are not responsible for the accuracy of the statements of contributors. The opinions expressed are solely those of contributors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church. Articles abstracted and indexed in HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS; AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE; and INDEX TO RELIGIOUS PERIODICAL LITERATURE. POSTMASTER: Please send address changes to Business Office, Historical Society of the Episcopal Church, PO Box 1301, Appleton, WI 54912-1301, administration@hsec.us, (920) 383-1910.

The editors are not responsible for the accuracy of the statements of contributors. The opinions expressed are solely those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors or of the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church. Articles in this journal are abstracted and indexed in HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS; AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE; and INDEX TO RELIGIOUS PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

POSTMASTER: Please send address changes to Business Office, Historical Society of the Episcopal Church, PO Box 1301, Appleton, WI 54912-1301 (920) 383-1910.

Copyright 2020. The Historical Society of the Episcopal Church

Printed by Sheridan PA, Hanover, PA
Contents

Historical Revision in Church: Re-examining the “Saint” Edward Colston

By Samuel J. Richards 225


By Alan L. Hayes 255

The Contentious Conferences of 1924: A Study of the Proceedings of the Anglo-Catholic Priests’ Convention and the 38th Episcopal Church Congress

By Jesse J. Lee 281

Church Reviews

Pandemical Context, Second Report

By J. Barrington Bates 302

Online Worship in Waco During a Season of Pandemic

By Joel W. West 305
Contents
(continued)

Book Reviews


GERBNER, KATHERINE, Christian Slavery: Conversion and Race in the Protestant Atlantic World, by Jennifer Snow 313

BYRD, BRANDON, The Black Republic: African Americans and the Fate of Haiti, by Kevin M. Lowe 315

HORN, HUSTON, Leonidas Polk: Warrior Bishop of the Confederacy, by Gardiner H. Shattuck Jr. 317


KIDD, THOMAS S., America's Religious History: Faith, Politics, and the Shaping of a Nation, by Kevin M. Lowe 321

BELLOWS, BARBARA L., Two Charlestonians at War: The Civil War Odysseys of a Low Country Aristocrat and a Black Abolitionist, by Glem Bowman 323

DOWNS, MATTHEW L. and M. RYAN FLOYD, eds., The American South and the Great War 1914-1924, by Christopher Webber 325

BUGGELN, GRETCHE N and BARBARA FRANCO, Interpreting Religion at Museums and Historic Sites, by Geoffrey Brown 326

MITCHELL, KERRY, Spirituality and the State: Managing Nature and Experience in America’s National Parks, by Harvey Hill 328


GREM, DARREN E., TED OWNB Y, JAMES THOMAS, JR., eds., Southern Religion, Southern Culture: Essays Honoring Charles Reagan Wilson, by Nicholas M. Beasley 333

DANIELSON, LEILAH, MARIAN MOLLIN, DOUG ROSSINOW, The Religious Left in Modern America: Doorkeepers of a Radical Faith, by Justus D. Doenecke 335
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHAN, PETER C.</td>
<td>Asian Christianities: History, Theology, Practice</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Angela M. Tankersley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNE, RANDY M.</td>
<td>Surviving Slavery in the British Caribbean</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Kyle Welty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAÑIZARES-ESGUERRA, JORGE, ed.</td>
<td>Entangled Empires: The Anglo-Iberian Atlantic, 1500-1830</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Carla E. Roland Guzmán</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK, SHARON</td>
<td>Colonial Complexions: Race and Bodies in Eighteenth Century America</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Joan A. Gundersen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUDNUT-BEUMLER, JAMES</td>
<td>Strangers and Friends at the Welcome Table: Contemporary Christianity in the American South, by Justus D. Doencke</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODS, ERIC TAYLOR</td>
<td>A Cultural Sociology of Anglican Mission and the Indian Residential Schools: The Long Road to Apology</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Jesse Link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS, DUNCAN RYUKEN</td>
<td>American Sutra: A Story of Faith and Freedom in the Second World War</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Kathryn Nishibayashi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBBER, CHRISTOPHER L.</td>
<td>Christian Psalms for Worship and Prayer</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATRON, JOHN W.</td>
<td>Embracing Protestantism: Black Identities in the Atlantic World</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Stefan WheeLOCK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESENDEZ, ANDRES</td>
<td>The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Matthew P. Payne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Editorial Board

Nicholas Beasley
Greenwood, South Carolina
Mary S. Donovan
Hunter College, City University of New York
Joan R. Gundersen
University of Pittsburgh
Kevin R. Hardwick
James Madison University
Robert G. Ingram
Ohio University
Benjamin J. King
University of the South

Robert Bruce Mullin
General Theological Seminary
Robert W. Prichard
Virginia Theological Seminary
Jane Shaw
Grace Cathedral, San Francisco
Peter Sherlock
Melbourne College of Divinity
Victor Stater
Louisiana State University
John N. Wall
North Carolina State University

Advisory Editors

Phyllis D. Airhart, Emmanuel College, University of Toronto
C. FitzSimons Allison, Diocese of South Carolina
S. Charles Bolton, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Henry W. Bowden, Rutgers University
Robert G. Carroon, Diocese of Connecticut
Craig D’Alton, University Church of St. Mary the Virgin
Justus D. Doenecke, New College of Florida
R. William Franklin, Bishop of Western New York
Allen C. Guelzo, Gettysburg College
Miranda K. Hasset, Episcopal Divinity School
Alan L. Hayes, Wycliffe College, University of Toronto
Charles R. Henery, Diocese of Milwaukee
David Hilliard, Flinders University
Daniel Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, Seminary of the Southwest
Samuel I. Koshiishi, Anglican Peace and Justice Network

Stanford E. Lehmberg
Mei-Mei Lin, National Dong Hwa University
Paul Victor Marshall
Frederick V. Mills, LaGrange College
Alfred A. Moss, University of Maryland
John K. Nelson, University of North Carolina
Lesley A. Northup, Florida International University
William L. Sachs, Diocese of Virginia
Gardiner H. Shattuck, Diocese of Rhode Island
William S. Stafford, Church Divinity School of the Pacific
Fredrica Harris Thompsett, Episcopal Divinity School
Dewey P. Wallace, George Washington University
Peter W. Williams
J. Robert Wright, General Theological Seminary
Historical Revision in Church: Re-examining the “Saint” Edward Colston

BY SAMUEL J. RICHARDS

In April 2015, the governing body of the University of Cape Town voted to remove a bronze statue that had stood at the center of its campus since 1934. Prior to the decision, the monument honoring British imperialist and mining magnate Cecil John Rhodes (1853-1902) was the subject of protest led by a group called Rhodes Must Fall.1 After achieving victory in Cape Town, Rhodes Must Fall campaigners launched an appeal at Oxford University demanding the removal of a statue from the façade of Oriel College.2 The university’s chancellor, Lord Patten of Barnes, defended keeping the statue. In an essay, Patten characterized campaigners as arguing, “history should be rewritten to expunge the names (though not the endowments) of those who fail to pass today’s tests of political correctness.”3 Across the Atlantic Ocean at Yale University, a similar debate regarding Calhoun

---


Samuel J. Richards teaches history and politics at Shanghai American School in China.
College named for former U.S. Vice President John C. Calhoun (1782-1850) was resolved differently. Yale dropped the name of the fiery defender of slavery and Yale President Peter Salovey publicly stated, “The decision to change a college’s name is not one we take lightly, but John C. Calhoun’s legacy as a white supremacist and a national leader who passionately promoted slavery as a ‘positive good’ fundamentally conflicts with Yale’s mission and values.”

Universities are not alone in re-evaluating the ways historical monuments and names fit with missions and values of today.

Historical re-appraisals have led to campaigns advocating the removal of historic tributes in many places. These campaigns require thoughtful people to take an honest look at past horrors connected to racist thinking. This is not limited to Rhodes in Cape Town and Oxford or Calhoun in New Haven. In Brussels, Adam Hochschild’s 1998 study shocked many when he argued Belgium profited while an estimated ten million Congolese died under the reign of King Leopold II. Nevertheless, Belgium’s Royal Museum for Central Africa glorified Leopold II and colonialism for another two decades. Updated exhibits finally swept away much of the imperial propaganda in December 2018 by introducing a candid narrative of Belgium’s colonial past questioning abuses in the Congo. Even so, work remains. In February 2019, United


Nations observers determined racial discrimination against Africans remains “endemic” in modern Belgium.\(^7\) Similarly, racist legacies inform ongoing debates in Bristol, England, and in U.S. cities, such as Baltimore, New Orleans, and Richmond, regarding Confederate monuments. Conversations spurred by de-colonization and Black Lives Matter movements raise questions about memorialization. Most debates reported in the news focus on universities and government properties. Nevertheless, similar debates are happening in churches.

Discussions regarding contested history and racial reconciliation in the Anglican Communion are evident in recent decisions made in the Episcopal Dioceses of Alabama, Maryland, and Southwestern Virginia.\(^8\) Journalists often report these events locally without considering them as part of a larger global pattern of historical revision and penance occurring in predominately white Christian communities coming to terms with complicity in the horrors of racism and slavery. Similar discussions have preceded decisions to alter or remove monuments in Grahamstown Cathedral in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa and in Washington National Cathedral in the United States.


In the west of England, the work of historians, especially Madge Dresser, Roger Ball, and David Olusoga, require thoughtful people—particularly Bristolian Christians—to re-evaluate commemorations of Edward Colston (1636-1721) in light of evidence that his connections to the slave trade were for too long obscured. It is now common knowledge that much of Colston’s wealth derived from the trade and labor of slaves. A coalition called Countering Colston is among those working to revise ways Colston is remembered. Writers now mostly describe Colston as a slave trader and philanthropist, instead of merely as a philanthropist. In April 2017, Bristol’s prime music venue, Colston Hall, announced it would reopen under a new name following renovations in order to drop its “toxic” associations with the slave trader. Countering Colston’s efforts have also influenced the Diocese of Bristol, especially its cathedral.

Guidebooks and signage in Bristol Cathedral and the nearby St. Mary, Redcliffe, now acknowledge that their fabric and ministries benefitted financially from slave traders including Colston. Both churches are now included in educational pamphlets entitled

---


“Transatlantic Slavery and Abolition in Bristol.”12 This was not always so nor is this uncomfortable reality limited to Colston. Similar to imperial era improvements in Brussels, Bristolians are now discussing how best to deal with the fact that their city’s Georgian era renaissance was produced largely from the exploitation and dislocation of African men, women, and children.13 During the eighteenth century, London, Bristol, and Liverpool were Great Britain’s leading ports. Bristol’s economy depended heavily on triangular trade of goods, such as sugar, tobacco, cotton, and slaves. Bristol ships transported an estimated five hundred thousand plus enslaved people. This will likely lead to further questions about how the city remembers its past. For now, discussions largely center on the legacy of Edward Colston whose leading role in the London-based Royal African Company’s slave trade was the primary source of his philanthropic wealth.

HISTORY TO LEGEND

On 6 November 1931, The Church Times published a story extolling “the many good deeds of Edward Colston.”14 The article, signed only with the initials A.T.F., chronicled the virtues of this “Bristol Saint” including his desire to live simply, give greatly, and attend church regularly. It is indisputably true that Edward Colston did good works during his lifetime and left a legacy that continues to benefit Bristolians. His benevolence helped found alms houses, clothe the needy, educate poor Bristolian boys and

---

12 Church leaders at Bristol Cathedral and St. Mary, Redcliffe, have created placards and booklets that describe connections to Bristol’s slave trading merchants, but volunteer docents lack adequate training. During my visit to St. Mary, Redcliffe, the docent was surprised to learn the church had a window dedicated in memory of Colston. However, he had no problem drawing a false equivalency between white indentured servitude, white transported prisoners, and black slavery while criticizing the "Johnny come latelys" who were trying to change Bristol history. Observation, October 2018.


girls, and repair many churches. Both during his lifetime and in
the centuries since, civic and religious leaders have pointed to
Colston’s exceptional giving as a role model of Christian charity
worthy of emulation. Even now, the Dolphin Society, established
in 1749, with its emblem and namesake inspired by Colston’s coat
of arms, annually provides £250,000 for needy causes in Bristol.15
The Dolphin Society marks the end of its annual fundraising
appeal in early November on Colston Day.16

In recent years, members of Countering Colston have criticized
and protested Colston-related events.17 This discussion would be
easier if it were a simple binary issue between Colston and his
contemporaries being good or evil. However, humanity is infi-
nitely more complex. University of Bristol philosophy lecturer
Joanna Burch-Brown, a member of Countering Colston, has pons-
dered the ethics of renaming, altering, and removing contested
objects.18 As part of this discussion, the Church of England’s
Diocese of Bristol is examining its connections to slavery. Bristol
Cathedral’s website now features a section entitled, “The legacy
of slavery in Bristol” that specifically mentions “the debate about
how the slave owner Edward Colston is memorialised.”19 Intro-
ducing Colston as a slave trader, rather than as a philanthropist,
is a significant departure from two centuries of diocesan practice.
However, thus far historians evaluating Colston’s legacy have pri-
marily considered the role once played by the Society of Mer-
chant Venturers (akin to a modern chamber of commerce) in
promoting the trading interests of Bristolian businessmen and

uk/history (accessed 16 October 2018).

16 Tories dominated the Dolphin Society. The exclusive nature of the Dol-
phin Society led Liberals to establish the Grateful Society (1759) and the Whigs
to establish the Anchor Society (1769). Together with the Parent Society, these
form the four Colston Societies that continue in contemporary Bristol.

17 Tristan Cork, “Buns, sermons, and slave songs - how slave trader Edward
Colston was awkwardly commemorated on Anti-Slavery Day,” The Bristol Post, 23
October 2017, www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/buns-sermons-slave-songs-
how-652628 (accessed 16 October 2018).

18 Joanna Burch-Brown, “Is it Wrong to Topple Statues and Rename

the philanthropic Colston Societies while paying less attention to ways clerics and the church historically contributed to Bristol’s cult of Colston.  

In November 2014, Michael Arthur “Mike” Hill, then Lord Bishop of Bristol, came under intense scrutiny for comments made while addressing hundreds of Bristolians during an annual Society of Merchant Venturers’ Charter Day service. Hill reportedly said there was “speculation” regarding Colston’s business roots. Tony Gosling, the radio host of A Bristol Angle on World Politics on BCfm, was in attendance at the service that day and recounted that “the bishop said he thought Edward Colston had ‘lived a life of significance’ and there ‘may be still some speculation on some of the circumstances around his business roots right here [in Bristol].’” Gosling interpreted Hill’s comments on “speculation” as obscuring Colston’s role in slave trading leading to what BBC Radio Bristol host Steve Le Fevre later described as a “social media storm.” As a result of criticism, Hill issued a clarifying statement to his diocese:

Some of my words about Bristol Merchant Edward Colston have been seized upon, particularly regarding the morality of Colston’s business dealings. I stand by what I actually said at the Merchant Venturers [sic.] Charter Day service yesterday, but not by what some have inferred from what I said. I am equally clear that I am against all forms of slavery, both at the time Edward Colston made his money and today. To suggest otherwise is both untrue and unkind.

A day after his public statement, BBC News published a story noting the bishop’s defensive posture. He was quoted as saying, “Colston, despite his ill-gotten gains, did some things that were significant and the children and elderly in our city have

---

20 “Cult of Colston” is a phrase first used by the Rev. Dr. H. J. Wilkins in 1920.
21 Steve and Laura at Breakfast, Radio Bristol, 13 November 2014, www.radio4all.net/files/tony@cultureshop.org.uk/2149-1-BishopMikeColstonMV7am-Wednesday.mp3 (accessed 30 July 2020).
benefitted from his benefaction but at the same time it does not in any way justify his attachment to the Royal African Company.” 23 The bishop’s nuanced view included a radical departure from the diocese’s traditional portrayal of Edward Colston.

Hill’s statement, nonetheless, defended the well-known positive philanthropic elements of Colston’s legacy in accord with centuries-old custom while slightly tempering long-accepted views extolling Colston as an unblemished example of Christian virtue. The bishop’s words invited rebuke and became a rallying cry for Countering Colston, including protests in 2015 at various public events. For example, members of Countering Colston distributed pamphlets to Colston Day attendees in November 2015. The pamphlets focused on Bishop Hill’s usage of “speculation” and contended that he had made a “clumsy attempt to rewrite history.” In their zeal to change Colston memorialization, protesters also embarked on their own clumsy attempt to rewrite history. Their pamphlets claimed:

Colston is often portrayed as a Christ-like figure giving without prejudice to the ‘poor’ of Bristol. In fact he was a Christian fundamentalist who hated Catholics and non-conformists; in fact anyone who wasn’t part of the High Anglican church. 24

It is true that the cult of Colston invited comparisons between Colston and the biblical Good Samaritan, but incorrect to describe him as a fundamentalist. Critics also conveniently ignored ways the killing of over 200,000 people during the English Civil War (1642-1651) coincided with Colston’s childhood shaping his political and religious views favoring order and stability in the form of monarchy and High Anglicanism. Even so, as recently as 2017, Roger Ball, writing for the Bristol Radical History Group, likely alluded to the bishop’s remarks when he wrote:

The reluctance to face up to the dark history of Edward Colston has led some commentators in Bristol to denigrate or even ignore his involvement in the trans-Atlantic slave trade. It is notable that where there has been a focus on this history, Colston is often portrayed as merely an investor, a beneficent share-holder, distant from both the organisations that ran the trade and its horrors. Other major public figures in Bristol have mistakenly implied that the history of his involvement is mere speculation.\textsuperscript{25}

Countering Colston has continued to advocate changes to Colston memorialization. Their work represents a significant change to over two-hundred years of popularized history in Bristol.

Praise for Colston’s philanthropic endeavors came easily from Bristol pulpits for centuries, and the Bristol Archives hold numerous sermons extolling his virtues delivered before the Tory-affiliated Dolphin Society at their annual Colston Day services as early as 1755. During that year, the Rev. William Hawkins, a former poetry professor at Oxford University, declared, “in this Place the Name of COLSTON will be an everlasting Incitement to Christian Virtue!” for his diffusive charity.\textsuperscript{26} Another example dates to November 1783 when the Rev. John Hodges preached on the text of Psalm 112:6 (“The Righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance.”)\textsuperscript{27} One does not have to think deeply nor read the entire sermon to know whom Hodges used as an example of the righteous. He even implied that providence granted Colston greater riches because he showered them on the poor.

The preserved evidence shows that this pattern of annually praising Colston continued unabated and even escalated during nineteenth century and into the early twentieth as interpretations of Colston expanded from the exclusive domain of Anglican


\textsuperscript{27} John Hodges, “A Sermon Preached before the Dolphin Society at the Cathedral-Church, Bristol, on Thursday, November 13, 1783, being the anniversary commemoration of that great benefactor and liberal founder, the late Edward Colston, Esq.” (Bristol, 1784), Bristol Archives, SMV/8/1/3/3.
A sermon delivered at Bristol Cathedral on Colston Day in November 1840 by the Rev. James Caulfeild Brown used the text of Matthew 7:20, ("By their fruits ye shall know them.") and suggested that Colston was a hero because he viewed the Church of England as “the only certain method of merging the wild dogmas of fanaticism, and of destroying the foul deeds of anarchy" whether they be political, religious, or moral. Four years later, artist Richard Jeffreys Lewis reimagined “The Death of Colston” in a painting at the same time that Colston’s body was exhumed. It was a piece of artistic propaganda meant to show Colston’s deathbed coinciding with exhumation of his body that was said to be perfectly preserved a century after interment. Then, in 1852, Thomas Garrard (1787-1859) wrote his Edward Colston, the Philanthropist, His Life and Times. In keeping with biographical writing of the time, Garrard offered a mostly glowing account of his subject, including his description of Colston Day when “the respectable citizens of Bristol would assemble, as for years and years they have done, on the birth day of the infant whose enrolment as a servant of Christ was that day celebrated.”

Praise for Colston was continuous. In 1866, the Rev. Henry Goldney Randall used Colston’s memory to make a fundraising pitch for repairing the steeple or installing a memorial window in the ornate Gothic church of Bristol merchants,

---


30 For an excellent analysis of this painting see Madge Dresser, Slavery Obscured, 3. The painting by Richard Jeffreys Lewis formed a part of the 1999 exhibition “Bristol and the Transatlantic Slavery” at Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery. A copy of the painting is included in the exhibition catalogue. See, Madge Dresser and Sue Giles, eds., Bristol and Transatlantic Slavery: Catalogue of the Exhibition 'A Respectable Trade? Bristol and Transatlantic Slavery,' (Bristol, 2000).

31 Thomas Garrard, Edward Colston, The Philanthropist, His Life and Times: Including A Memoir of His Father, ed. Samuel Griffiths Tovey (Bristol, 1852), 27.
Randall was successful in quickly raising the money for an intricate, large-scale window. Just four years later, on Whitsunday 1870 subscribers witnessed the dedication of the window in the north transept. The window given in memory of Colston depicts Jesus’ Parable of the Good Samaritan. This illustrates the parable recorded in the Gospel of St. Luke, but it also reflects the Colston family motto, "Go and do thou likewise," from St. Luke 10:37, the concluding line of the Good Samaritan parable. In the nineteenth century, it also encouraged views that Colston was a Good Samaritan. This ignored Colston’s refusal to help “the other,” especially religious dissenters who did not conform to his Tory politics and High Anglicanism, rendering the Good Samaritan comparison applicable only if one views him as either the priest or Levite. He was not the Good Samaritan. Today, even beneficiaries of Colston endowments acknowledge his heavy-handed approach to promoting order via the Church of England. Nevertheless, Victorian Era donors interpreted Colston as the Good Samaritan and no space existed for criticism as the tributes continued. Twenty years after the Redcliffe parish installed its Good Samaritan window, Bristol Cathedral followed suit. The Dolphin Society paid for and later helped maintain the north transept window that once again reminded Bristolians of their very own Good Samaritan.

---

32 The window in St. Mary’s, Redcliffe, was installed in 1870. Its only connection to Colston is a small banner noting that it was given in memory of Colston along with his dolphin insignia. Peter G. Cobb, “The Stained Glass of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol,” Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society CXII (1994): 150; Observation, October 2018.

33 During a 17 October 2018 visit to St. Mary, Redcliffe, I inquired about the Good Samaritan window. The three docents on duty were perplexed to learn a window related to Colston existed. After consulting the verger, two of the docents guided me to the window while sharing their views regarding the Colston debate. See also, Cobb, "The Stained Glass of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol," 150.

34 John Wroughton, Mr. Colston’s Hospital: The History of Colston’s School, Bristol, 1710-2002 (Bristol, 2002), 4-5.

35 This window suffered damage from the German Luftwaffe during World War II. Most passers-by will easily overlook the Colston elements in the massive window. Surviving Colston elements include his initials and symbol, the dolphin, that also honors donors from the Dolphin Society. As late as November 1920, the cathedral chapter asked the Dolphin Society to help clean and repaint the ironwork for the “Colston windows.” “Bristol Cathedral Chapter Minutes, 1920-1930,” Bristol Archives, DC/A/8/10.
later civic officials paraded to dedicate a statue of Edward Colston near the newly designed Colston Avenue on 13 November 1895.

Records of the cathedral chapter between 1893 and 1895 make no mention of this event nor of any plans for fundraising or other involvement in developing the new City Center.\footnote{During this period, the cathedral chapter’s minutes reveal conversations about donations to the cathedral, ongoing discussion regarding the nearby development of the new road in Canon’s Marsh, and installing electric lighting in the cathedral. “Bristol Cathedral Chapter Minutes, 1879-1900,” Bristol Archives DC/A/8/8.} It is likely that Anglican clerics attended or even participated in the unveiling of the “hunched, brooding, figure” of Colston.\footnote{Douglass Merritt, Sculpture in Bristol (Bristol, 2002), 30-31.} Today, journalists tend to describe this Colston statue in isolation instead of as part of the larger Victorian civic space created after docks were infilled.\footnote{One retired journalist provided a hint of newsroom conversations when he offered his opinion in a letter originally published in the Bristol Post. Mike Gardner called for the eradication of Colston memorials from Bristol and described the center city statue as “worst of all.” Gardner wrote that Colston “is one of the most evil men in English history” comparable to Adolf Hitler, Pol Pot, Atila the Hun, and Joseph Stalin. See Mike Gardner, “Edward Colston: the father of Bristol’s slave shame,” Operation Black Vote, 17 June 2014, www.obv.org.uk/news-blogs/edward-colston-father-bristols-slave-shame (accessed 18 October 2018).} This leads to incomplete conclusions. It was no coincidence that Bristol publisher and Anchor Society member James William Arrowsmith (1839-1913) began fundraising for the Colston statue in 1893. The Colston statue exists in tandem with a nearby statue of another member of parliament for Bristol.\footnote{Ironically, both Colston and Burke were rarely resident in Bristol.} A statue of Edmund Burke (1730-1797) was unveiled in 1894 by Liberal Prime Minister Archibald Primrose, the Earl of Roseberry. Douglass Merritt easily explained the erection of Burke ninety-seven years after the political leader’s death by writing: “He was proudly considered a ‘liberal’ and the Liberal Party had many powerful supporters in Bristol at the end of the nineteenth century.”\footnote{Merritt, Sculpture in Bristol, 30-31 and 328-29.} As a result, icons of contemporary liberal and conservative party politics in Bristol were juxtaposed in the newly developed City Center, a clear sign that Bristol history was being memorialized in a way that conveniently omitted laborers in the
factories and dockyards. This tempers Spencer Jordan’s claim that from the 1860s Colston became a unitive symbol fitting the sensibilities of bourgeois Bristolians.\(^{41}\) In a politically divided city, the statues of Burke and Colston attempted to achieve this together. Statues in the new City Center attempted to elevate the bourgeois left and right by placing their respective icons on pedestals in the aftermath of labor unrest stoked by poor working conditions in Bristol.

Historical inaccuracy combined with political expediency informed Colston’s 1895 elevation on a plinth. Donors honored Colston as a Tory grandee and philanthropist while ignoring his role in the slave trade. Colston was no longer a historic man; he was a legend. Connections between Colston and slavery had vanished from narratives by the late 1700s as part of a larger trend among Bristol residents to distance themselves from slavery.\(^{42}\) By 1788, there was no obvious hypocrisy when the dean of Bristol, John Hallam, served as a member of Bristol’s Abolition Committee while Anglican clergies extolled the virtues of Colston.\(^{43}\) The hypocrisy went unnoticed because the only label attached to Colston even then was “philanthropist.” Bristol Anglicans were not unique in this approach. This distancing coincided with increasing calls for abolition and Bristol’s shift away from slave trading. However, if Colston had become the unifying symbol some claim, Victorian Bristolians would have been satisfied with a lone statue of Colston in the new City Center. Instead,


\(^{43}\) The committee also included the Bristol Cathedral prebendary, dean of Gloucester, and Anglican businessman Joseph Harford. There is also private correspondence between Bishop Thomas Newton of Bristol and abolitionist Granville Sharp. Outside of the hierarchy, Anglican cleric and leader of the Methodist movement John Wesley spoke out against slavery in 1774 from his New Room in Bristol’s Broadmead. See Dresser, Slavery Obscured, 137, 139. Brychan Carey, “John Wesley’s Thoughts upon slavery and the language of the heart”, The Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, 82 (2003): 269-284.
On 18 October 2018 an artistic protester drew attention to slavery of the past and present on the U.K.’s Anti-Slavery Day. The art installation placed the 1895 statue of Edward Colston at the helm of a slave ship. One-hundred human figurines were arranged behind the title "Here and Now." Labels contained titles like sex worker, car wash attendant, domestic servant, fruit picker, and farm worker. The statue was toppled on 7 June 2020. The empty plinth remains a focal point of community debate. Photo Credit: Samuel J. Richards, October 2018.
statuary installed near the newly developed Colston Avenue in the 1890s included both Burke and Colston. Additionally, J. W. Arrowsmith found difficulty in raising funds for the Colston monument, perhaps a foreshadowing of elections that ended Tory dominance in the Bristol council chamber. Bristol was and is a divided city. Divisions surrounding Colston’s legacy reflect this. Bristolians have conveniently acknowledged and disregarded aspects of Colston’s legacy since the very beginning and continue to do so. In January 2017, the Centre for Dynamics of Ethnicity based at the University of Manchester issued a report entitled “Bristol: a city divided?,” commonly referred to in Bristol as the Runnymede Report. It concluded that ethnic minorities in Bristol are at a greater educational and employment disadvantage than any other region of England and Wales. The racial and class divisions in the city inevitably influence the historiography surrounding Colston in regards to class and factionalism.

Local historians have more recently relied on the work of historians Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger to interpret these changes as “a Victorian re-invention” or “invented tradition” that was meant to reinforce the power of nineteenth century Bristol elites. These observations related to the growing cult of Colston in the late nineteenth century might be best applied to Liberal and Whig Bristolians. Among Tories, however, these changes were not so much a reinvention as much as an escalation of what had existed for over a century. Traditions of annually honoring Colston’s piety and benevolence among Tory Anglicans occurred even before Colston’s death. In Britain’s modern social welfare state, it is too easy to downplay the important role of charitable
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44 Merritt, Sculpture in Bristol, 30-31.
works encouraged by the church and the philanthropic example of Colston.

Honoring Colston was not about documenting history nor was it about social control. Adherence to a Marxist lens of history prevents activist-historians of the Bristol Radical History Group from acknowledging this.47 Martin Gorsky’s detailed analysis of nineteenth century charitable giving in Bristol found that charitable subscriptions fell with the declining economy. This led Gorsky to caution against “easy linkages” made by proponents of the Marxist social control thesis.48 Unfortunately, “easy linkages” are being made, thus introducing new Labor-inclined or leftist inaccuracies into Bristol historiography just as layers of Tory and Liberal narrative are finally being questioned. Regardless, the evidence is clear that praising Colston relied on inaccurate historical portrayals that encouraged good works among Bristolians. These localized efforts were crucial, albeit inadequate, to community well-being in Britain prior to 1948 and development of the modern social welfare state.

Far from being a Victorian era invention, Bristolian Anglican and Tory elites were inextricably linked to incomplete narratives that annually extolled Colston as legend, a tradition that began during his lifetime. Aspiring Whig and Liberal elites in Bristol later adopted Colston’s mantel as their own by establishing the Anchor and Grateful Societies, their very own Colston-inspired charities.49 The Victorian era Colston tradition was not new, but its audience during the nineteenth century expanded due in part

47 Local historians founded Bristol Radical History Group (BRHG) in 2006. They describe their mission as rediscovering “hidden history” with a focus on “history from ‘below,’” avoiding what they describe as “establishment histories.” In their words, they are “local people from Bristol and are NOT funded by universities, political parties, business or local government.” They are an affiliate of the International History from Below Network of “historian-activists, artists, and agitators” that works to study ‘the exploited classes in a social order.’ BRHG products are marketed for purchase at the local government’s Bristol Archives.


to the proliferation of newspapers.\textsuperscript{50} Jordan argued: “Through the development of this wider audience the Colston tradition remained a key aspect of élite culture within the city up to and beyond the First World War.”\textsuperscript{51} This was evident in 1918 when the cathedral invited the Liberal-affiliated Grateful and Whig-affiliated Anchor Societies to join the Tory-affiliated Dolphin Society for a joint Colston Day worship service. Divided Bristolians might be inclined to interpret this differently depending on their respective religious and political views. Those suspicious of Anglican leaders might narrate this as a ploy on behalf of the dean and chapter to promote Anglican pre-eminence. On the other hand, was it a genuine, well-intentioned way to promote unity during the Great War? Minutes of the cathedral chapter are silent on this issue. However, a related event provides a sense of the dean and chapter’s thinking around this time.

On 11 November 1918, the chapter met privately and made plans for a “Celebration of Signing of Armistice.” As a gesture of unity, the dean and chapter invited the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clifton and President of the Free Church Council of Bristol.\textsuperscript{52} While Roman Catholic bishop George Ambrose Burton declined the invitation, the Rev. Dr. Arnold Thomas of Highbury accepted. In 1918, this was breathtakingly inclusive, ecumenical thinking from the bishop, dean, and chapter. Soon after the bishop of Bristol led the service on 20 November, he received an objection from thirty-two clergymen who opposed inclusion of a Congregationalist minister. One newspaper gleaning carefully pasted into chapter minute book announces, “BRISTOL’S THANKSGIVING FOR PEACE: Nonconformist Participation. Clerical Protest and Bishop’s Trenchant Reply.” Diocesan officials responded that a cathedral is not just a center of religious life for the Church of England, “but a Cathedral is something more; it holds a peculiar position in civic life.”\textsuperscript{53} The defiant bishop also

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 311.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 312.
\textsuperscript{52} Meeting of 11 November 1918, Bristol Cathedral Chapter Minutes, 1901-1920, Bristol Archives, DC/A/8/9.
\textsuperscript{53} Meeting of 1 January 1919, Bristol Cathedral Chapter Minutes, 1901-1920, Bristol Archives, DC/A/8/9.
unnecessarily disclosed the even more provocative news that the Roman Catholic bishop was also invited. If the bishop, dean, and chapter willingly faced down objections to inviting non-establishment Anglican clergy to participate in thanksgiving worship at the cathedral, it is obvious that their work in bringing together the Colston Societies was a genuine act of community building encouraging philanthropy. Throughout history, Bristol Cathedral and Anglican clerics have maintained a prominent role in annual Colston celebrations. Their involvement in encouraging the remembrance of Colston is unsurprising.

Colston’s support for hierarchy and the established church were uncompromising. The childhood crucible of the English Civil War forged Colston’s beliefs. Instability during the English Civil War and the resulting protectorate influenced Colston’s views of religion and government. The beheading of a king will do that. Subsequently, proponents of Colston’s legacy simplified this complex historical event to promote stable government and hierarchy during the late eighteenth century—likely terrified by events in revolutionary America and France—and again when facing labor unrest during the 1800s. This is especially evident in Bristol city treasurer Thomas Garrard’s 1852 biography of Colston in which many pages disparage Oliver Cromwell and other Protestant dissenters. Garrard’s description of the Quakers’ remembrance of their Civil War actions drips with sarcasm and contempt. One example will suffice. Garrard summarizes Quaker actions thus:

But the now inoffensive Quakers, who had been subdued from their frantic enthusiasm and singularity, —to a patient and enduring tranquillity, had never possessed power, —had never declared themselves enemies to the King’s authority; they still suffered, nevertheless, from persecutions the most vile and atrocious.\(^{54}\)

Since the earliest days of Colston memorialization, keepers of the Colston legend have emphasized the dangers of anarchy that existed during the English Civil War. This emphasis allowed them

\(^{54}\) Thomas Garrard, *Edward Colston, The Philanthropist, His Life and Times: Including A Memoir of His Father*, ed. Samuel Griffiths Tovey (Bristol, 1852), 257.
to create a Colston that fit their growing needs to reinforce hierarchy, the established church, and order in an industrializing Bristol where labor unrest was increasing. In this sense, proponents of the Marxist lens are correct. Even so, overreliance on this aspect of Colston’s legacy leads to an incomplete, flawed analysis. Colston’s memorialization was predominately about philanthropy and love of an idealized Bristol that never was. Garrard clearly overemphasized the English Civil War to serve his own purpose. Even in correcting this error, modern historians must still acknowledge the traumatic civil war in order to understand the inextricably linked religio-political views held by Edward Colston as an adult. If the goal really is historical accuracy, Colston narratives must consider his own context including events that preceded him and shaped his childhood. These defining events led to his using money and power to promote stability in the form of High Anglicanism in the Church of England and vehemently oppose Anglican Latitudinarians, Roman Catholics, and dissenter Protestants. This exclusive sectarianism grates against modern values of diversity and inclusiveness but was entirely consistent with Bristol’s sectarian civic life before, during, and after Colston’s era. In 1991, historian Mary Fissell wrote: “Both church and party divided the city, but the fracture lines created by religion probably ran deepest.” She speculated that Bristolian sectarianism had Lollard roots. In this divided city, Colston’s support for the Church of England was unflinching and Anglican clerics in Bristol—with one notable exception—for centuries unquestioningly praised his charity as a result.

RELUCTANTLY REDISCOVERING THE HISTORICAL COLSTON SINCE 1920

The Rev. Henry J. Wilkins (1865-1941) was a scholarly vicar who served Westbury Parish in greater Bristol for forty-one years during

---

the early twentieth century. In 1920, he wrote *Edward Colston, a chronological account of his life and work*. The book presented a long Colston chronology including primary sources. It then concluded with Wilkins’ short, damning analysis. This challenged Colston’s cult-like status eleven years before *The Church Times* declared him “a Bristol saint.” In his study, Wilkins wrote:

> It is a thankless task to try to form a just estimate of the character of Edward Colston, when for so many years that has been distorted by fulsome adulation of his personality obscured by endless eulogies, which have little in them that has any relationship to historical accuracy. Yet this is more than necessary if we are “to see the man” as he really was.

Wilkins’ critical pen described a heavy-handed Colston whose benevolence used the power of the purse to command deference, promote Tory politics, and cultivate sectarian High Church Anglicanism. Wilkins concluded that “Edward Colston must have been an extremely difficult man to co-operate with, owing to his temper and the obstinacy with which he asserted his own will.” Even so, records of Bristol Cathedral show that fawning annual celebrations of Colston continued. Yet, the vicar’s book had some effect. Colston Day celebrations continued but the construction of new Colston monuments in common spaces slowed, then quietly stopped.

Despite Wilkins’ well-documented study, several organizations continued celebrating the Colston legend they inherited. This was especially true of the Society of Merchant Venturers, Colston’s Girls’ School (CGS), and the Diocese of Bristol. Sadly, the cathedral ignored the vicar’s study and continued to host annual services and dedicated a window on 12 January 1922 that includes the likeness of Colston alongside three other historically
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56 For more information on Wilkins see Richard Coates, *Wilkins of Westbury and Redland: The Life and Writings of the Rev. Dr. Henry John Wilkins (1865-1941)*, Avon Local History and Archaeology No. 24 (2017).


important Bristolians. The window offers a one-word commentary under Colston’s likeness, that of “philanthropist.” The cathedral chapter’s minutes refer to this interchangeably as the “King memorial” and “historical window.” Its four lights given in memory of Samuel J. King (1849-1919) were likely already under construction by the time Wilkins’ book began circulating in 1920.

Evidence of Colston Day celebrations during the interwar period are documented in Bristol Cathedral’s Register of Services. The 1930s volume often includes the scripture that visiting clergy expounded upon. For instance, the scripture used for Colston Day in 1935 was 1 Kings 21:3 and in 1936 it was 1 Corinthians 1:2. Unfortunately, one piece of valuable information that the 1930s register lacks is the number of congregants. Nevertheless, records do include collection totals for offerings that may give some indication of attendance, or at least financial wherewithal, of worshippers at Colston Day services. In most instances, Colston Day offerings were marked for the Tory-affiliated Dolphin Society Benevolence Funds and are of higher values than average Sunday cathedral services. However, they are by no means the largest offerings listed on the folios. For example, in 1936 the Colston Day service yielded £12.15s.4d., which was dwarfed by a “Civic Commemoration” on Remembrance Sunday that gathered £27.13s.4d. benefitting the Earl Haig Fund. Similarly, giving during the 1939 “Colston Commemoration Service” was £15.9s.6d., roughly half of the £30.5s.9d. given for the Earl Haig Fund on Remembrance Sunday. In the 1930s Colston Day was a
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59 This window was dedicated in memoriam of Samuel James King, a Port of Bristol ship owner who died in 1919. Design by G. J. Hunt, made by Arthur Saulsby. It includes standing figures of Colston, John Cabot, William Worcester, and Samuel Wesley. See, M. Q. Smith, The Stained Glass of Bristol Cathedral (Bristol, 1983), 86; Meetings of 8 June 1921 and 27 July 1921, Bristol Cathedral Chapter Minutes, 1901-1920, Bristol Archives, DC/A/8/9; Observation, October 2018.

60 Bristol Cathedral Register of Services (begins 22 May 1935, ends 8 January 1939), Bristol Archives, DC/A/15/1.

61 British Field Marshal Douglas Haig established the Earl Haig Fund in 1921 to assist veterans. It is better known in the United Kingdom today as the Poppy Appeal sponsored by the British Royal Legion.

62 Bristol Cathedral Register of Services (begins 22 May 1935, ends 8 January 1939), Bristol Archives, DC/A/15/1.
normal part of the November calendar at Bristol Cathedral second in significance only to Remembrance Day. World War II changed this.

No services related to Edward Colston occurred at Bristol Cathedral between 1940 and 1943. When the cathedral resumed Colston-related events the cathedral dean, Harry Blackburne, led the "Colston’s Girls’ School Commem. Service" on 17 November 1944. This service resumed without any recorded discussion in the cathedral chapter’s minutes. This is significant as the dean and chapter were especially fussy about approving frequent requests for special services in the nave that were disrupting the regular rhythm of worship. This suggests the cathedral chapter did not consider Colston services to be extraordinary, but rather a regular part of the liturgical life of Bristol Cathedral.

War changed Bristol significantly. The German Luftwaffe damaged sections of the city including cathedral precincts and the Good Samaritan window given in memory of Colston. It also changed pre-war patterns related to Colston Day. In this case, the dean himself led the 1944 service, but the offering benefitted the Cathedral Appeal Fund and prisoners of war instead of the Dolphin Society. Additionally, the offerings for Colston-related events in the post-war years tended to be noticeably higher than all other cathedral services in November save Remembrance Sunday. By 1948, the Dolphin Society resumed its place in the register as beneficiary of Colston Day offerings and the close relationship between the cathedral and Colston-related events is apparent in the 1950s register. The new dean, Francis Lunt (1900-1982), presided over the 1952 service for CGS while Bishop Frederic Arthur Cockin (1888-1969) officiated at the 1953 Colston Day service. Unfortunately, the sermon delivered by the bishop is not among cathedral papers in the Bristol Archives.

63 Bristol Cathedral Register of Services (begins 19 January 1939, ends 24 April 1948), Bristol Archives, DC/A/15/2.
64 Bristol Cathedral Register of Services (begins 19 January 1939, ends 24 April 1948), Bristol Archives, DC/A/15/2.
65 Bristol Cathedral Register of Services (begins 26 May 1952, ends 12 August 1956), Bristol Archives, DC/A/15/4.
The annual pattern of Colston-related commemorations in early November remained firmly in place for the remainder of the twentieth century. The cathedral register frequently includes the word “commemoration” near entries related to November services held by CGS, a nod to its purpose in honoring the philanthropic narrative of the school benefactor. During 1963, the CGS service in Bristol Cathedral coincided with All Saints’ Day.\textsuperscript{66} One noticeable change in patterns during this period is that offerings during the CGS commemorations were noticeably higher than giving during other November services. For example, the recorded offering from the CGS Matins on Friday, 3 November 1967 amounted to £64.8s. compared to the next highest collection £17.8s.6d recorded on that register page.\textsuperscript{67} Just over ten years later, the CGS service on 2 November 1979 coinciding with All Souls’ Day collected £229. The nearest Sunday collection (October 28) gathered £197.05 for all services combined while the Remembrance Sunday collection was £154.19.\textsuperscript{68} For over fifty years, CGS commemorations resulted in higher-than-average offerings as Bristol Cathedral and CGS annually preserved the flawed Colston narrative they inherited.

A former leader of Colston’s Girls’ School provides a glimpse of these occasions in her 1991 history of the school. Sarah Dunn, who served as headmistress between 1954 and 1980, begins her book with the school’s annual cathedral service. She described the commemoration as Matins during which “everyone” wore bronze chrysanthemums—reportedly Colston’s favorite flower—which were “laid at the foot of Colston’s statue on the Centre” after the service in Bristol Cathedral. In Dunn’s view, “A member of the school in 1954, returning to Bristol in 1991 would find the hymns, the anthems and the readings reassuringly familiar.”\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{66} Bristol Cathedral Service Book, (begins 20 September 1956, ends 13 February 1966), Bristol Archives, DC/A/15/5.
\textsuperscript{67} Bristol Cathedral Service Book, (begins 8 January 1966, ends 3 February 1973), Bristol Archives, DC/A/15/6.
\textsuperscript{68} Bristol Cathedral Service Register, 1979-1985, Bristol Archives DC/A/15/8. The ledger entry reflects the decimalized British pound sterling. Decimal Day in the United Kingdom occurred on 15 February 1971.
\textsuperscript{69} Sarah Dunn, Colston’s Girls’ School: The First Hundred Years (Bristol, 1991), 172.
This is hardly reassuring as it confirms Colston commemorations occurring in the context of Anglican worship continued unexamined for nearly a century after Wilkins provided ample evidence to question the propriety of the Colston cult. Dunn’s book made no mention of slavery, an omission now unthinkable.

The conversation surrounding slavery in Bristol changed significantly in the late 1990s. On 6 March 1999, Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery opened its exhibition “Bristol and Transatlantic Slavery.” CGS alumnae must have been among the 160,000 exhibit visitors who discovered a very different side of Edward Colston. Near John Michael Rysbrack’s 1726 Bust of Colston a placard read, “He was also actively involved in the transatlantic slave trade as an official of the London-based Royal African Company.”

This fact went entirely unmentioned in Headmistress Dunn’s school history just eight years prior. Similarly, publications about Bristol Cathedral began to acknowledge connections to the slave trade. John Rogan’s Bristol Cathedral: History and Architecture published in 2000 mentions cathedral memorials having “connections with the infamous slave trade.”

The Anglican Diocese of Bristol began explicitly acknowledging its connections to Bristol’s slave trading past in the early 2000s as shown in John Rogan’s history of the cathedral. Visitors to Bristol Cathedral today will find mention of slavery in the guidebook for sale in the bookshop. Additionally, both Bristol Cathedral and St. Mary, Redcliffe, have installed placards to contextualize monuments. In the cathedral, a maroon sign under the Good Samaritan window draws attention to the origins of Colston’s wealth and invites visitors to pray “for the victims of the transatlantic slave trade, to celebrate the courage and bravery of their descendants and to give thanks for the efforts of those who opposed it.” It also includes the words of Isaiah 61:1-2.

In the Diocese of Bristol, 2017 was a watershed moment in changing Colston historiography. Nearly a century after Wilkins’

---

70 Dresser and Giles, Bristol and Transatlantic Slavery, 16.
72 Observation, October 2018.
1920 publication, news reports in February 2017 disclosed then-cathedral dean David Hoyle’s openness to replacing the cathedral’s largest window.\(^{73}\) CGS also radically departed from its past practices and announced to alumnae that Colston would not be mentioned during the annual Matins.\(^{74}\) This was not entirely true. A few days later, Dean Hoyle preached at the Colston Day service held in St. Mary, Redcliffe. Tristan Cork, a skeptical local reporter, passed by the protestors and police guards to listen to the sermon. He observed choirs singing the same spirituals once sung by slaves seeking freedom. Cork quoted Hoyle as saying: “For 100 years or more, the trade saw 2,000 ships leave Bristol and 500,000 people from Africa went on those ships. Edward Colston was involved in that slave trade.” Cork wrote, “The phrase ‘went on those ships’ scraped across the deck of the church like rattling chains.”\(^{75}\) After two centuries, Colston is no longer simply a “philanthropist.” University of Bristol lecturer and Countering Colston member Joanna Burch-Brown has described actions taken by the cathedral and other Bristol organizations as being “unprecedented reparatory steps.”\(^{76}\) Yet, work remains.

**CONCLUSION**

The Colston debate in Bristol is not a discussion mired in the past. The sign placed under the cathedral’s Good Samaritan window in October 2017 is a reminder of this. We all want heroes. Colston is not that hero. He is a flawed human being who gave money, lots of money. But that does not make him the saint once described by *The Church Times*. In May 2018, U.K. House of Commons chaplain Rose Hudson-Wilkin, the highest-ranking black
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\(^{75}\) Tristan Cork, “Buns, sermons, and slave songs – how slave trader Edward Colston was awkwardly commemorated on Anti-Slavery Day,” *The Bristol Post*, 20 October 2017.

\(^{76}\) Burch-Brown, “Is it Wrong to Topple Statues,” 84.
clergywoman in the Church of England, now bishop of Dover and bishop in Canterbury, read the words of American abolitionist Frederick Douglass (1818-1895) to commemorate his 1846 visit to Bristol while he was virtually exiled from the United States. Standing in the cathedral pulpit gazing around the nave and at that large window given in memory of Colston, Hudson-Wilkin read:

In this great temple, at every turn I see honoured those who I cannot count as good Christians. Men who benefited from the trade in flesh, and yet thought themselves godly, as if just works outweighed the monumental evil in which they were invested.

These seem like perfect words to hang on the cathedral wall near the window given in memory of Colston. By the late 1700s, Bristolians simplified Colston’s biography to avoid these uncomfortable truths. Reducing Colston to an example of just works was in keeping with motives to downplay slavery. This promoted a narrative about a Bristol-born businessman who made his fortune in London and showered good works on his hometown. By the late 1800s, his likeness was placed on a plinth to have a philanthropic Tory hero next to the Liberal’s Burke. These actions simplified the complexities of Colston by telling conveniently incomplete narratives. This is also one potential ramification of removing his likeness from city locations. Through all of this, Bristol has remained a deeply divided city along lines of race, class, and creed. Through all of this, the Anglican Diocese of Bristol played a role.

In the twenty-first century, the church should not require protesters before it reckons with the sins of slavery and racism. Bristol Cathedral’s efforts to candidly address racism and historical links to slavery exist thanks to pressure from historians and local activists. This reluctance contrasts with its more progressive role regarding women clergy and even current inclusion of a Muslim
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77 For more information about Douglass’ tour of Britain and Ireland see, Laurence Fenton, “I was Transformed”: Frederick Douglass, An American Slave in Victorian Britain (Gloucestershire, 2018).
79 Judith Evans, “Bristol, the slave trade and a reckoning with the past,” Financial Times, 9 August 2018.
chorister in its cathedral choir.\footnote{The first ordination of women as priests in the Church of England occurred on 12 March 1994, when then bishop of Bristol, Barry Rogerson, ordained thirty-two women in Bristol Cathedral. The Rt. Rev. Vivienne Faull became the first woman installed as bishop of Bristol in 2018, four years after the Church of England began ordaining women as bishops. Faull has publicly stated she sees no theological problems with blessing gay relationships. Choir and leadership demographics based on observations made in October 2018.} Today the all-white leadership team of Bristol Cathedral is participating in a long overdue re-examination. Initiatives have included a publicly broadcast debate in February 2017 regarding possible removal of the window memorializing Colston and a month-long \textit{Journey to Justice} exhibition in October 2017. The October exhibition included an examination of human rights issues past and present, including the Bristol Bus Boycott of 1963 and contemporary social justice issues. The cathedral hosted an opening lecture by theologian Robert Beckford, professor of Religion and Culture in the African Diaspora at Canterbury Christ Church University. Beckford, a frequent critic of racism in the Church of England, spoke about “the politics of memory,” “dangerous memory,” “American apartheid,” “sanitization of history,” and how we can rightly remember the 1960s Civil Rights movement to inform present justice struggles related to refugees, Islamophobia, and the gay community.\footnote{Prof. Robert Beckford, “Journey to Justice Bristol Launch, October 2017, \url{https://soundcloud.com/user-623177219/prof-robert-beckford-at-jtojbristol-launch} (accessed 20 May 2020).} That same month leaders of Bristol Cathedral installed a sign inviting pilgrims to remember and pray for victims while standing below the large Good Samaritan window given in memory of Colston. Dean Hoyle also participated in city-wide conversations about educational and employment disadvantages faced by ethnic minorities in Bristol and the cathedral hosted a May 2018 commemoration of American abolitionist Frederick Douglass’ visit to Bristol.\footnote{The Very Rev. David Hoyle and Prof. Robert Beckford, “Should Bristol Cathedral remove a window dedicated to a seventeenth century MP, philanthropist, and slave trader?” \textit{BBC Radio 4}, 26 February 2017, \url{www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p04v2g2c}; “Journey to Justice exhibition,” \textit{Bristol Cathedral}, October 2017, \url{https://bristol-cathedral.co.uk/whats-on/journey-to-justice-exhibition}; Adam Becket, “African-American abolitionist Frederick Douglass celebrated in Bristol,” \textit{Church Times}, 1 June 2018; Tom Morris, “Bristol the most segregated...
ended. Annual cathedral services for Colston’s Girls’ School no longer include readings from Colston’s Last Will and Testament, promotions of a one-sided Colston legend, or wearing the slave trader’s favorite flower.  

Other churches might learn from steps taken at Bristol Cathedral. Similar dynamics exist in on-going re-appraisals regarding the ministries of former bishop of Chichester George Bell (1883-1958) and Residential Schools in Canada. Likewise, the church should not ignore decolonization and Black Lives Matter movements. These movements invite humble self-reflection among Christians and further study by church historians. More work is required to understand ways lay and clerical leaders throughout the Anglican Communion are prompting, reacting to, ignoring, and participating in discussions regarding once overlooked and even buried information.

AFTERWORD

This study was awaiting publication when the chilling video of George Floyd’s death in police custody sent shockwaves across the United States. The resulting protests reached across the Atlantic and re-energized the dormant debate in the west of England regarding the legacy of Colston. On 7 June 2020, Bristol became the subject of global news reports when the city’s Colston statue was pulled down in a display of revolutionary, street theatre during a ten-thousand-person Black Lives Matter march. The statue was then dragged across a plaza and dumped into the River Avon. Responses
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83 Historians will someday examine the dean and chapter’s role in this debate when minute books and internal correspondence are publicly archived. One wonders what documents will reveal about candid internal discussions. Was the cathedral staff ahead of leaders at CGS and the Society of Merchant Venturers in embracing change? Actions by the dean and chapter suggest a greater willingness to discuss the complex legacy of slavery than actions by leaders at CGS and the Society of Merchant Venturers.

from leaders were divided along predictable partisan lines. Global news reports described Colston only as a slave trader with little or no mention of his philanthropy, which left readers and viewers to wonder why Bristolians would have erected a statue honoring Colston in the first place. It is important to remember that those who built Colston memorials saw him only as a philanthropist while those removing tributes view him only as an enslaver.  

Soon after the Colston statue was toppled, I shared a pre-print of this study with leaders of the diocese and cathedral in Bristol. On 16 June Bishop Vivienne Faull announced that “prominent references” to Colston were being removed from Bristol Cathedral and St. Mary, Redcliffe. In her statement, the Lord Bishop wrote:

A cathedral or a church should be a place of sanctuary, justice and peace: a place where God’s glory is worshipped and God’s love is felt. The dedications to Colston, in two significant places of worship, has prevented many people from finding peace in these beautiful buildings. These dedications have either been removed or covered.

Faull also publicly committed to addressing institutional racism and to recruit and support more Black, Asian, and other minority ethnic people (BAME) to enter ordained ministry in the Diocese of Bristol. This announcement came just before her predecessor, Mike Hill, withdrew from public ministry in relation to accusations of racism under investigation by a Church of England tribunal. In a statement published by the U.K. Church Times, Hill wrote that he had used “racial stereotypes which were unacceptable and offensive” in making staffing decisions.
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same bishop who was once criticized for suggesting Colston’s ties to slavery were merely speculative. Looking ahead, the Colston legacy and lessons learned while he was dean of Bristol are now influencing David Hoyle’s next steps as leader of London’s Westminster Abbey. In a June 2020 reflection in which he suggested some memorials in the abbey may need to go, he wrote:

The idea that history is static, that events happen and then more events follow and we just keep a record does not work. Historians are forever reassessing the significance of a moment or an individual, things come in and out of focus. Put another way, statues tend to have a life cycle, they come and go. We remembered Colston one way, we will remember him another, and in time perhaps differently again.89

These views may resonate with historians but likely have less traction in much of the United Kingdom where Whig historiography continues to shape popular understanding.90 Church historians must play a role in better bridging the gap between academic history and popular history to help Christians develop a more nuanced, accurate view of history in order to make informed decisions about their church fabrics and what they communicate to worshippers and visitors alike.91


The Elusive Goal: The Commitment to Indigenous Self-Determination in the Anglican Church of Canada, 1967–2020

ALAN L. HAYES

In 1967 the Anglican Church of Canada (ACC) committed itself to support Indigenous peoples who were calling on the Canadian government to recognize their right to self-determination, and in 1995 it resolved to move to recognize Indigenous self-determination within the church itself. Nevertheless, in the ACC, as in the country at large, Indigenous self-determination has remained an elusive goal. To say so is not to deny the progress that the ACC has made in developing Indigenous leadership, governance, ministry, and advocacy. But with a few partial exceptions, Indigenous Anglicans remain under the oversight of a settler-dominated church with its Eurocentric constitution, canons, policies, budgets, liturgical norms, assumptions, and administrative procedures.¹ Why has the goal of Indigenous self-determination proven so elusive? I intend to argue here that colonial assumptions and structures have proven tenacious, and that, although Indigenous self-determination is consistent with historical patterns of Christian mission and organization, the

¹ The terms “settler” and “Indigenous” are both problematic, but the nature of this discussion requires, at least provisionally, a binary terminology, and these terms are currently widely used.

The Rev. Canon Dr. Alan L. Hayes is Bishops Frederick and Heber Wilkinson Professor of the history of Christianity at Wycliffe College and the Toronto School of Theology at the University of Toronto.
theological, constitutional, and financial obstacles to decolonization have defied solution.2

INDIGENOUS ROLES IN THE ACC, 1967–2019

In the centennial year of Canadian Confederation, 1967, Indigenous claims for justice finally gained traction in the country at large and in the ACC. In that year the reformist Hawthorn Report was completed; this was a study by social scientists, commissioned by the federal government, of the economic disadvantages and oppressive conditions experienced by Indigenous peoples. The report particularly noted some of the damaging results of the Indian residential schools that were administered (until 1969) by various Christian denominations and entities, including the ACC.3 An international exposition in Montreal, called Expo 67, which attracted fifty million visitors, featured a controversial “Indians of Canada” pavilion, which vividly presented a history of violations of treaties and Indigenous human rights.4 Chief Dan George, a well known actor who would later be nominated for an Academy Award, protested the subjugation of his people in a momentous speech entitled “Lament for Confederation,” delivered to over thirty thousand people in Vancouver’s Empire Stadium, and widely reprinted.5 A Nisga’a elder named Frank Calder, who was among other things a graduate of the

2 A common definition of colonialism is that it is a continuing situation of domination, originally economic, created when a foreign nation has entered a territory, taken authority over the land, and subjected the original peoples to their control. In Canada a principal vehicle of colonialism is the Indian Act, with its many controls and repressions.


Anglican Theological College in Vancouver, launched a lawsuit that would result in the epoch-making declaration by the Supreme Court of Canada that Aboriginal land title predated colonization.\(^6\) The National Indian Council dissolved amid criticisms of its ineffectiveness, leading to the founding of two more militant organizations, the predecessors of today’s Assembly of First Nations and the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples.\(^7\)

Before this watershed the ACC had seen itself as a settler organization and treated Indigenous Anglicans not as members but as wards. In 1967 its “Joint Interdepartmental Committee on Indian / Eskimo Affairs” (which had no “Indian” or “Eskimo” members) expressed repentance for its paternalism and patterns of control. In a report to General Synod, the chief governing body of the ACC, it wrote, “We, as Christians,” meaning settler Christians, “must plead forgiveness for our participation in the perpetuation of injustices to Indians.”\(^8\) On its recommendation General Synod resolved to “give its full support to and become actively involved in projects enabling Indians to discuss their own proposals for self-determination” within Canada.\(^9\)

Before the end of that year, the ACC commissioned Charles Hendry, a professor of social work, to research First Nations issues and “the church’s attitudes towards Native Peoples.” When his report was released two years later for discussion by Anglican groups across the country, many were shocked and ashamed to discover the destructiveness of “our past ‘apartheid’ policies.”\(^10\) In 1969 General Synod gave its “general approval” to the recommendations which Hendry’s report presented, including that “the Church must listen to the Native peoples” and “the role of the Church must be redefined.” It also gave direction for concrete action.\(^11\)

---


True to its resolution, the ACC began making considerable progress towards respect, healing, and inclusion. It supported Indigenous land claims and other issues of justice, participated energetically in an ecumenical Aboriginal Rights Coalition, increased the numbers of ordained Indigenous clergy and (in 1989) began consecrating Indigenous bishops, established the Council of Native Ministries (the forerunner of today’s Anglican Council of Indigenous Peoples, or ACIP), held regular national Indigenous consultations (which in 1988 were formalized as meetings of an entity called “Sacred Circle”), and publicized Indigenous issues through educational and advocacy programs and materials, presentations at church synods and parish meetings, and coverage in the Anglican Journal (until 1989 called the Canadian Churchman), the monthly denominational newspaper.12

These were important achievements and changes. But the church had not yet named and confronted its continuing colonial character, or the full extent of the intergenerational damage it had inflicted on Indigenous peoples, particularly in its Indian residential schools. Nor had it yet formulated the goal of Indigenous self-determination within the church.

As in the 1960s, so in the 1990s, these next steps were prepared by external developments. In 1988 there appeared the first draft of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which affirmed Indigenous self-determination as a right. (UNDRIP would finally be ratified in 2007 with only four dissenting votes: Canada, United States, Australia, and New Zealand.)13 Indigenous self-determination was the main theme of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1991–1996) [RCAP], the country’s most comprehensive investigation ever of the issues of Indigenous peoples and the negative consequences of colonialism. RCAP quickly publicized its view that the many problems of Indigenous communities could be solved only by the communities

---


13 In 2016 Canada declared its support for UNDRIP and its intention to implement it by law.
themselves, and only if they were empowered to be self-determining.\footnote{For example, RCAP, \textit{Sharing the Harvest: The Road to Self-Reliance} (1993), online at \url{http://data2.archives.ca/rcap/pdf/rcap-453.pdf}. A huge database of RCAP publications, reports, submissions, and transcripts of hearings is online from \url{https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/aboriginal-heritage/royal-commission-aboriginal-peoples/Pages/introduction.aspx}.} RCAP’s most telling exposé of the damage done by the colonial denial of Indigenous self-determination was its report of the physical, sexual, and psychological abuse inflicted on First Nations children (as well as Inuit and Métis children) at the churches’ Indian residential schools. The full extent of this historical outrage was just coming to light as RCAP was beginning its work.\footnote{On the residential schools, see James R. Miller, \textit{Shingwauk’s Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools} (Toronto, 1996). On the televised interview in October 1990 where a prominent school survivor disclosed his sexual victimization, see 328; thousands of other victims came forward subsequently.} The ACC had administered about thirty-five of the schools,\footnote{Numbers are vague because residential schools can be variously defined, and Anglican sponsorship is not always clear: The IRSSA covered 141 residential schools, of which 29 were administered by the ACC.} which were designed to assimilate pupils into British cultural norms of behavior, values, and outlook. Some Anglicans even yet defended the intent of the schools, but many others were ashamed. In August 1993 Michael Peers, the primate of the ACC, came to Sacred Circle to apologize on behalf of the church: “I am sorry, more than I can say, that we tried to remake you in our image, taking from you your language and the signs of your identity.”\footnote{Available on the ACC website at \url{https://www.anglican.ca/tr/apology/}.}

The affirmations of UNDRIP, RCAP’s promotion of Indigenous self-determination, the growing settler recognition of Indigenous rights, and the revelations of the churches’ involvement in the criminal abuse of Indigenous children set the stage for a meeting of Indigenous Anglicans in 1994 which made a solemn covenant “to call our people into unity in a new, self-determining community within the ACC.”\footnote{Bomberry, E12; the Covenant can be read at \url{https://www.anglican.ca/im/foundational-documents/covenant/}.} In 1995 General Synod voted to “receive, accept, and affirm the Covenant,” as “a promise and hope for liberation and self-determination for indigenous people,” and for “transformation for the whole Anglican Church.”\footnote{ACC, GSJ (1995): 97.}
Unfortunately, progress towards self-determination was stalled for a decade as the ACC wrestled with legal actions involving well over a thousand plaintiffs on account of its Indian residential schools, as well as several criminal proceedings. In this context an embittering episode of 2003, largely unnoticed by settler Anglicans, again demonstrated to Indigenous Anglicans their colonized condition within the church. Settler ACC officials, wanting to protect the church from bankruptcy in the face of residential school litigation, had been negotiating a deal with the federal government that would minimize and cap the church’s liability. They co-opted one conflicted Cree archdeacon to the negotiating team, but otherwise they did not consult with ACIP or with other Indigenous Anglicans, although they represented themselves both publicly and to their Indigenous brothers and sisters as profoundly sympathetic to Indigenous justice issues. In February 2003 they revealed the terms of their agreement in principle. The government would cap the church’s liability, but survivors of the Anglican Indian residential schools would be required to renounce all further claims, “whether or not now known or existing at law,” explicitly including any claims relating to violations of treaties or loss of culture; and, should any such claims be made, the church would join with the federal government in “vigorously” opposing them. For settler Anglican leaders, the government was evidently the ally, Indigenous Anglicans the adversary. Interestingly, the United Church of Canada, offered the same opportunity by the government, declined. Indigenous Anglican leaders felt betrayed. They registered strong

---

20 [Melanie Delva,] ACC, “One Step on a Journey: The Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement and the ACC – Lessons Learned” (ACC, 2019), https://www.anglican.ca/wp-content/uploads/All-Parties-Lessons-Learned-ACoC-FINAL.pdf. The agreement signed by the ACC with the government in March 2003, which is the one discussed in this paragraph, was superseded by the IRSSA. See also Alan L. Hayes, Anglicans in Canada: Controversies and Identity in Historical Perspective (Urbana, 2004): 42–45.

21 Personal communications from Brian Thorpe and James Scott, who participated in these decisions for the United Church. They note, not wanting to claim morally superiority for the United Church, that since their denomination had managed fewer residential schools than the ACC it faced a lower level of liability; moreover, it had just received a substantial bequest. Note that the agreement discussed here, although signed, was superseded by the IRSSA.
protests with the primate, the chancellor, and the general secretary, but to no avail. The ACC signed the agreement at a ceremony that ACIP boycotted. Nor was this betrayal an isolated episode in a singularly desperate situation. It was part of a multi-year legal strategy by which the ACC and other defendants, as a law professor observed, “used adversarial tactics that often revictimized the survivors.”

The lesson for Indigenous Anglicans was clear: they needed to stop imagining that they could depend on settler leaders for their protection. They needed to become masters in their own household.

The ACC returned to its agenda for Indigenous self-determination after it signed the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement (IRSSA) of 2006 among the federal government, the church “entities” that had managed the schools, and representative Aboriginal organizations. Its first notable step was creating the position of National Indigenous Anglican Bishop (NIAB) in 2007.

The first (and so far only) NIAB, Mark MacDonald, has effectively strengthened the common ecclesial life of Indigenous Anglicans, ensured that their voice has been heard in the wider church, given wise pastoral direction, and raised morale. A second step was the enactment by General Synod of in 2010 of Canon XXII on “The National Indigenous Ministry;” its text incorporated in full, by direct quotation, the Covenant of 1994 with its aspiration to Indigenous self-determination. (The same session of General Synod embraced UNDRIP as a standard of practice in the church.)

Still another concrete change in the direction of Indigenous self-determination was the creation in 2014 of an Indigenous diocese, called the Spiritual Ministry of Mishamikoweesh, for about

---


23 The ACC website has a page about the NIAB at https://www.anglican.ca/im/niab/. As of 2019, the incumbent has the title of archbishop (and is thus the “NIAA”).

twenty-five Cree and Oji-Cree parishes in northwestern Ontario and northern Manitoba. It is led by an Indigenous bishop and an Indigenous suffragan bishop.\textsuperscript{25} Episcopal areas with Indigenous suffragan bishops were later carved out within the dioceses of Calgary, Brandon, and Saskatchewan. At this writing, the ACC has twelve active Indigenous bishops, most but not all of them appointed to oversee Indigenous clergy and ministries.

These measures were welcome progress, but the specific goal of Indigenous self-determination has remained distant. Of the two governance bodies established in Canon XXII, Sacred Circle is allowed only “to worship, to discuss, and to communicate with the broader Church,” while ACIP is authorized simply to “maintain relations with” settler-dominated units of church governance, and to organize the Sacred Circle. Revisions to the canon in 2019 were trumpeted as monumental steps in the triumphal march towards a self-determining Indigenous church, but they were excruciatingly modest in substance: ACIP now could determine its own voting membership and that of Sacred Circle, and could “regulate the affairs” of the NIAB’s tiny department at the denominational head office. The NIAB himself has no jurisdiction; the mandate of that office in Canon XXII is simply, and vaguely, to have “a pastoral episcopal relationship” with Indigenous ministries. Since 2017 a small council called the Vision Keepers, appointed by the settler primate not the NIAB, monitors “the work of the Church in implementing the spirit of UNDRIP through transformed church structures, governance systems, processes and practices,” but the group has no power to make changes and has had little to say.\textsuperscript{26} No further constitutional reforms are on the horizon.

Despite the formal pronouncements of their General Synod in favor of Indigenous self-determination, many settler Anglicans remain resistant or at least uncommitted. There are no doubt many

\textsuperscript{25} The ACC website gives an overview of Mishamikoweesh at https://www.anglican.ca/im/ mishamikoweesh/; the diocesan website is at https://mishamikoweesh.ca.

who remain scarcely aware of the issues. Of those who are, not all accept that Indigenous Anglicans should be treated differently from other Anglicans, or from other minority Anglicans; not all are persuaded that talk of Indigenous self-determination is more than the hobby-horse of a few activists; and not all accept that the words “colonial” and “racist” are accurate descriptors of any part of the ACC. Many are inclined to think that “we” have already done enough for “them.” As a reasonably typical example of settler Anglican sentiment, consider this outburst by a prominent settler priest (now deceased) in a diocesan monthly newspaper. Addressing a hypothetical Indigenous Anglican after many Indigenous delegates to the General Synod of 2007 voted against the blessing of same-sex marriages, he wrote: “If you believe I need to repent of my culture’s racist past in order to enter God’s new creation of love and justice, I think it only fair that you repent of your culturally-entrenched homophobia.”

Note how he made no distinctions among Indigenous cultures, how he pictured Native societies as backward and error-bound, how he used settler vocabulary (“homophobia”) to caricature the culturally complex “Other” and shut down dialogue, how he treated Indigenous peoples as one special interest group among many, how he wished that Indigenous peoples could think more Eurocentrically in order that the ACC could be a better place, how he regarded his own culture’s racism as “past,” how he spoke from an assurance of his own “wokeness.”

With partial exceptions, such as Mishamikoweesh, Indigenous Anglicans remain under settler-dominated governance and under the authority of settler bishops. Even the NIAB himself cannot exercise his ministry, even on treaty or unceded lands, without the prior permission of the settler bishop within whose settler-defined territory he proposes to function. Similarly, the budgets for Indigenous ministries, the salaries (if any) of Indigenous clergy, and denominational policies in general remain, for the most part, under settler control. In short, the scope for Indigenous Anglican self-determination remains slight.

27 Niagara Anglican (September 2007): 16.
28 Many Indigenous groups are accepting of same-sex relationships, but have a different cultural understanding of marriage from western Christians.
The language of “self-determination” is not, of course, Biblical. Probably few theologians would claim that God has given nations or individuals the power actually to determine themselves or their circumstances or their destiny. It is the language of international affairs. It took root after World War I, to promote and justify the ethnic fragmentation of central Europe and the Russian and Ottoman Empires. The “self-determination of peoples” was affirmed in Article I of the United Nations Charter of 1948. The principle was invoked in the subsequent rounds of African and Asian decolonization. UNDRIP applied self-determination to peoples and communities that were to remain joined to a larger nation-state, in effect relativizing it by recognizing the necessity of “balancing . . . rights and duties between states and Indigenous institutions, especially regarding the scope of Indigenous self-government.”

Nevertheless, in church affairs the principle of national self-determination pre-dates modern commitments to human rights. Indeed, we see it in the historic nation-by-nation organization of most of the world’s church families. The Anglican Communion is an association of forty national provinces, all but a few of them representing single nation-states. The Eastern and Oriental Orthodox churches are associations of autocephalous national churches. The Roman Catholic Church historically negotiated concordats with European nations, and today has devolved authority in some measure to national conferences of bishops. The Lutheran World Federation, the Methodist World Council, and the World Reformed Council all connect national churches.

This pattern of nation-by-nation ecclesiastical authority no doubt has practical, political, and legal advantages, but it is theologically grounded. In the Bible the main unit of narrative interest is not the individual, not the family, not the clan or tribe, not the

human race, but the nation. (The Biblical languages do not know the English distinction between “nations” and “cultures,” both being represented by goyim in Biblical Hebrew and ethnē in Biblical Greek.)

The Old Testament is concerned with Israel among the nations. God made Abraham “a great nation” (Gen. 21:18) and “the father of many nations” (Gen. 17:5); Israel’s role, as it emerges in the prophecies of Isaiah, is to bring the knowledge of God to the other nations (Is. 40–55). With the New Testament, the focus moves to the person Jesus, but Jesus himself represents his nation as its king, messiah, and prophet. When Jesus, surprisingly to some of his disciples, deals with non-Jews, they are identified by nationality, such as Samaritans, Syrophoenicians, and Romans, representing the extension of salvation to the nations beyond Israel. In Luke, Jesus tells his followers to proclaim the forgiveness of sins “to all nations” (24:47). In Matthew, he commissions them to “make disciples of all nations” (28:14). Christ redeemed us, says Paul, “in order that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come to the nations” (Gal. 3:14). Luke records Simeon’s prophecy that Jesus will be “a light to lighten the Gentiles”: the Greek word is just ethnē, the invented word “Gentiles” being used in English translations for “nations other than Israel.” The theme of bringing the gospel to the nations is illustrated in the fine dramatic narrative of Pentecost in Acts 2, where the testimony of the apostles reaches Jews and proselytes who are explicitly representatives “from every nation;” their home nations are listed. These examples show that “all the nations” does not function in the Bible as a synonym for “everyone in the world.” All people are culturally located. From this missiological point of view, the early church proclaimed the gospel nation-by-nation, not individual-by-individual.

The key strategy for the spread of early Christianity was honoring cultural pluralism. Christian missions relativized the culture of the message-bearer and made “the recipient culture the true and

---

30 Terence L. Donaldson, “Gentile Christianity as a Category in the Study of Christian Origins,” Harvard Theological Review 106 (2013): 433–58. I am indebted to this article, and to my conversations with its author, for several points in this discussion.
final locus of the proclamation,” as Lamin Sanneh, the late professor of mission at Yale University, argued memorably. Sanneh contrasted the church’s “mission by translation” with the alternative “mission by diffusion,” exemplified by Islam, the religion in which Sanneh himself grew up: Islam makes “the missionary culture the inseparable carrier of the message.”

By “translation” Sanneh partly meant linguistic translation. In the narrative of Pentecost just considered, the author makes a point of saying that people heard the message in their own respective languages. Accordingly, missionaries translated the Bible into many languages. But linguistic translation requires cultural translation, since language is embedded in culture. If converts were to truly meet Christ in their life and not simply assent to foreign formulas, Sanneh said, the gospel proclamation had to make sense to them within their culture. Translation was thus a theological process, forcing the church in every culture to consider the meaning of the gospel for its people.

Students in my Christian history courses are often surprised by how many European conversions occurred not individual-by-individual but nation-by-nation: Armenia in (perhaps) 301, Gaul in 496, the kingdoms of Anglo-Saxon England in the 600s as narrated by Bede, Saxony in 785, Bulgaria in 865, Poland in 966, Russia in 988, Iceland in 1000, Lithuania in 1387. Often a ruler declared the nation Christian and arranged for mass baptisms, and the new national church thus established developed practices of Christian piety, discipleship, worship, and decision-making that made sense in its cultural context.

Similarly, “Indigenization” was the goal of church missions recommended by Henry Venn, the chief missiological theorist for the Church Missionary Society (CMS), the English evangelical organization which took on the lion’s share of early Anglican outreach to Indigenous peoples in the Canadian North West and in British Columbia. The missionaries appointed by the

---


CMS typically learned Indigenous languages, lived in Indigenous communities, translated the scriptures, preached in Native tongues, and relied on Indigenous assistants. But in the end CMS missionaries were frankly too Eurocentric and racist to bring themselves to acknowledge the spiritual wisdom of Indigenous Christians. They finally rejected “mission by translation” and Venn’s goal of “Indigenization” and operated on the premise that Indigenous peoples could not be real Christians unless they were assimilated into English culture.33

As recent postcolonial interpretations have shown, however, Indigenous Anglicans did indeed “translate” the gospel, in ways to which white missionaries were largely oblivious. Indigenous Christian catechists, evangelists, lay preachers, prophets, parents, and other leaders not only proclaimed the gospel within their cultural contexts of meaning, but often infused their traditional practices and ceremonies (some of which had become illegal under settler law) with gospel significance.34 On the west coast, for example, Indigenous Anglicans sometimes celebrated saints’ festivals, funerals, and birthdays in ways that could look strangely like potlatches.35 On Baffin Island the Inuit held Christmas parties that looked strangely like their traditional winter festival.36 Around the Great Lakes, when Ojibway Christians sang hymns and prayed away from the mission chapel, the occasions could look strangely like traditional Ojibway celebrations with singing societies and


34 Over the past twenty years a number of historians and anthropologists have demonstrated the agency of Indigenous peoples under colonialism, in various regions and contexts, in constructing their religious beliefs and commitments within their own cultural frames of meaning. One fine example is Susan Neylan, The Heavens are Changing: Nineteenth-Century Protestant Missions and Tsimshian Christianity (Montreal and Kingston, 2003).

35 Among many sources for this observation, Cara Krmpotich, The Force of Family: Repatriation, Kinship, and Family on Haida Gwaii (Toronto, 2014): 34.

drums and feasting. On the Canadian Prairies, Archdeacon Edward Ahenakew (1865–1961), as settler Anglicans discovered after his death, kept alive the stories of his own Cree nation, “pagan” though they would have appeared to his British imperialist bishop. In other words, Indigenous Anglicanism has long been self-determining, but in an undocumented, even subversive way that typically escaped the notice of settler missionaries, church leaders, and Indian agents. Today the great majority of Indigenous peoples self-identify as Christians to census-takers, without any devaluation of their cultural and social identity.

If this line of thought seems to be leading to an affirmation that the Indigenous members of the ACC should be recognized as a self-determining nation, it meets two obvious problems. First, indigeneity is not a culture or nation. It is a colonial catch-all category for an extremely diverse group of cultures, representing, in Canada, an estimated seventy languages, diverse environmental adaptations, complicated sets of historical rivalries and hostilities and alliances, and innumerably different stories and histories and identities. Would a single Indigenous Anglican church fall into a kind of Anglican pan-Indianism, in which, to borrow a phrase from a skeptical Nak’azdli academic, all members would “smudge themselves ... and consider tobacco, eagles, drums, etc. as sacred”? Strategically, given their small numbers, Indigenous


40 Nicholette Prince appears to be the main author of *Nak’azdli and Tl’azt’en: We Are Telling You* (Northern Health, Nak’azdli Whuten and Tl’azt’en First Nation, 2015), at https://www.indigenoushealthnh.ca/sites/default/files/Nakazdli%20and%20T%27azten-We%20are%20telling%20youF.pdf, 11–12.
peoples do need to cooperate in their confrontation of colonialism, but they also take pride in their differences. In 2019 Inuit musicians boycotted the annual Indigenous Music Awards when the administrators of the competition refused to disqualify a Cree artist who performed throat-singing, an Inuit art form. For the Inuit musicians, cultural appropriation by an Indigenous person was no more permissible than by a non-Indigenous one. From this perspective, should Indigenous Anglicans oppose a transcultural, syncretized Indigenous identity as colonial, or should they embrace it as a strategic counterweight to colonialism? The question is even more fraught if we acknowledge that a significant minority of Indigenous Anglicans actually oppose attempts to integrate traditional spiritualities into their expressions of Christianity, especially ceremonially, because, as one put it, having “put these pagan traditions aside,” they would be “wrong to take them up again.”

A second complexity in affirming the theological appropriateness of a self-determining Indigenous Anglican church is that, as an effect of colonialism, it is not easy to determine who is Indigenous. The 2016 census reported about 820,000 status Indians under the convoluted rules of the Indian Act, but another 232,000 who self-identified as First Nations (“Indians”) without having the legal status. Does only the smaller number qualify as Indigenous, or the larger number, or another number? The Métis National Council has established a process for identifying Métis “citizens,” but its criteria of Métis identity are contested, especially in eastern Canada. The construction of Inuit identity has been complicated by the creation of the mostly Inuit territory of Nunavut, which raises the possibility that Inuit identity can be determined on a civic and not just a cultural basis. Moreover,

41 Bomberry, E10.
many people in Canada are bicultural or have hybrid parentages. Would the self-determining Indigenous Anglican church restrict itself to those who met certain requirements of its own definition? In a town or city, where Indigenous and settler peoples lived in the same neighbourhoods and worked together and went to the same schools, would they have to choose between an Indigenous and a non-Indigenous church? Would bicultural Anglicans need to select their preferred identity? Would mixed congregations need to split themselves into two? What about families with Indigenous and settler members?

In summary, a self-determining Indigenous Anglican church would not in itself represent an inculturation of the gospel. Its value at first might be as an anti-colonial counterweight, offering Indigenous Anglicans freedom in the gospel protected from the repressions and incomprehensions of settler oversight. And it would face some complicated issues. But in time it could develop into an umbrella structure for a diversity of self-determining Indigenous communities, some Cree, some Mohawk, some Inuit, some Nisga’a, and so on, in the great line of national churches that originated in New Testament times.

MODELS OF SELF-DETERMINATION

There are several alternative approaches to Indigenous self-determination in the ACC, each with its advantages and disadvantages. Each approach looks to past analogies, since where else other than history can one search for proven workable models? Each model offers a slightly different answer to the question: how is the good of social and cultural distinctiveness to be balanced against the good of church unity? When Indigenous Anglicans in 1994 penned the phrase “a self-determining community within the Church” they identified two principles in tension, the authority of a culturally diverse unit versus the authority of the whole. How can both principles be appropriately honored? Indeed, that question has continually vexed the wider Anglican communion, and it cannot be answered a priori; circumstances change. In 1863, for example, Canadian bishops wanted to
remain within the Church of England, but were forced to separate from it by English judges.\textsuperscript{44} Today the ACC regards its independence from the Church of England as entirely natural and desirable. The tension between diversity and unity cannot be engineered perennially for Indigenous Anglicans within the ACC now any more than it could have been for settler Canadian Anglicans within the Anglican Communion in 1863. In 2020 the balance is to be found if and as the ACC lives into a new reality of Indigenous autonomy.

A first model of Indigenous Anglican self-determination is the diocese of Mishamikoweesh, mentioned earlier, where Indigenous bishops oversee Indigenous parishes. It is self-determining insofar as it can honour Indigenous wisdom, values, languages, and life-ways, but it remains formally subordinate to the governances of the ecclesiastical province and national church, and it relies financially on settler-dominated judicatories, corporate bodies, and benefactors. Moreover, virtually all its clergy are non-stipendiary.\textsuperscript{45}

A second model was suggested by Sacred Circle at its meeting in 2011 in Mississauga, Ontario, in a statement that it called the Mississauga Declaration. Working through questions of “structures of authority” and “jurisdiction,” the vocabulary of settler constitutional law, Sacred Circle arrived at the solution of an Indigenous “fifth province.” The ACC now has four internal geographical ecclesiastical provinces; under this proposal, a fifth non-geographical province would be created, drawing parishes from the other four: A drawback is, again, that internal ecclesiastical provinces are subordinate to General Synod and its settler structures, priorities, attitudes, and conventions of decision-making.\textsuperscript{46}

A third model is a kind of para-church entity, as suggested in 2017 by the chancellor of General Synod. The CMS, previously mentioned, is an example of an independent but distinctly Anglican agency. Under this proposal, the National Indigenous

\textsuperscript{44} Hayes, 92–96.
\textsuperscript{46} The Mississauga Declaration is available at https://www.anglican.ca/im/foundational-documents/mississauga .
Ministry might become an independent Anglican corporation a little like the CMS. The catch, however, is that in any given area this entity could only “operate with the permission of the appropriate diocesan bishop.” In other words, Indigenous Anglicans would have self-determination only so far as allowed by settler bishops. This is obviously not self-determination at all.

A much more radical approach was intimated in 2001 in an Indigenous ACC resource called “A New Agape.” It proposed “a truly Anglican Indigenous Church in Canada” as inspired by the Two-Row Wampum Belt treaty of 1613 between the Haudenosaunee and the Netherlands (and later the English), where the two peoples agreed to travel their journey independently but side by side. Since the Haudenosaunee have never accepted that they are anything less than a sovereign people, this model implies actual independence from the ACC. Similarly, in their Mississauga Declaration Indigenous Anglicans affirmed “our sovereign identity as the people of the Land.” This reference to sovereignty appears to evoke an aspiration to decolonization, a much more robust goal from that envisioned by UNDRIP, which balances Indigenous rights to language and identity, and Indigenous authority in education, health, social services, and other areas, against settler sovereignty. The rejection of settler oversight in this model invites comparison with recent Indigenous critiques of “the politics of recognition” in Canada. For writers like Glen Coulthard, Indigenous peoples gain little of substance when they persuade a settler government to recognize their rights, lands, and authority, since state recognition leaves the state’s role intact, protects its ultimate authority of dispossession, and reproduces the colonial power relationship.

---


49 As just one example, see Susan M. Hill, The Clay We Are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River (Winnipeg, 2017), 239 (and passim).

50 Article 46 of UNDRIP determines this interpretation.

51 Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition (Minneapolis, 2014).
General Synod passes a Canon XXII to recognize some modest measure of Indigenous authority, it is *ipso facto* reinscribing its own colonial authority. The two-row wampum model proposed in “A New Agape,” by contrast, envisions two independent, non-interfering Anglican provinces in the same country. An Anglican parallel might be the Church of North India and the Church of South India.

A fifth model on which some Indigenous Anglicans have looked with interest is the “tikanga” system, established in 1992 by the Anglican Church in New Zealand, Aotearoa, and Polynesia. Its three tikangas, or cultural streams, are the Maori of Aotearoa, the Pakeha (settlers) of New Zealand, and Polynesia. Each has its own primate, episcopal hierarchy, and legislative body. On this model, one can imagine two episcopal hierarchies and legislative bodies in the ACC, one for Indigenous peoples and one for non-Indigenous peoples. A disadvantage is that separating tikangas can—some New Zealand Anglicans say it actually does—minimize mutual interchange and dialogue, cooperation in common mission, and possibilities for reconciliation. And they can force mixed Maori/Pakeha families either to choose one tikanga over the other, or to worship separately.52

Also, a significant difference between New Zealand and Canada is that New Zealand has only one dominant Indigenous grouping, while the latter has several dozen Indigenous nations.

A sixth historical solution that might be adapted to the ACC is the reasonably common practice in the Roman Catholic Church of overlapping episcopal jurisdictions under Canon 372 of the Code of Canon Law. In Canada, for example, Ukrainian Catholics in a given area have one bishop and Latin rite Catholics have another. Pope Francis in 2017 instituted a similar provision for India; the Syro-Malabar Church has its own episcopal hierarchy. Latin bishops have not generally been pleased with these arrangements, but Pope Francis has wanted to accommodate the “variety of ecclesial life, which shines with great splendour throughout lands and nations,” and has affirmed that “the presence of several bishops of the various *sui iuris* Churches in the same territory will surely offer an eloquent witness

---

52 A helpful history, with no author given, is currently accessible on the website of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia, at http://www.anglican.org.nz/About/History.
to a vibrant and marvellous communion.”

But this model works partly because all Roman Catholic bishops are answerable to a Vatican in a far-away country, unlike the situation in the ACC.

A seventh historical model, this one from outside the ecclesial world, is the example of Quebec, a “distinct society” within the Canadian confederation, a “nation within Canada” according to the federal House of Commons. It is distinct in recognizing an adaptation of Napoleonic civil law; it enjoys greater authority than other provinces in such areas as employment, immigration, pensions, and taxation; and it takes pride in its distinct artistic culture, as well as an understanding of Canadian history unlike what is taught in the “ROC” (“rest of Canada”). In 1987, identifying Indigenous nations as distinct societies was unsuccessfully recommended to a Canadian constitutional conference at Meech Lake, Quebec. On this model, Indigenous Anglicans might negotiate a special status within the ACC with heightened authority in certain areas.

A difficulty with applying any of these seven models to Indigenous Anglican self-determination is that they are all “one size fits all,” even though in fact Indigeneity in Canada is culturally very diverse. In this respect these solutions are like Canada’s Indian Act, which ignores distinct nationalities. A more flexible arrangement is the self-government agreements (SGA’s) between Canada and specific First Nations and Inuit populations. “Because communities have different goals,” the government of Canada says of

---

53 Accessed on line from the Vatican press office at https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2017/10/10/171010b.html. I am grateful to Bishop Wayne Kirkpatrick of the diocese of Antigonish, and to Father Francis Morrisey, OMI, professor of canon law at St. Paul University, Ottawa, for this reference. For different reasons, Anglicans are also accustomed to overlapping episcopal jurisdictions: in Europe there are both “the Diocese of Gibraltar in Europe” of the Church of England and the Convocation of Episcopal Churches in Europe of the Episcopal Church in the United States. For this point I am grateful to members of a session at the 2019 Episcopal/Anglican Tri-History Conference in Toronto where I gave an earlier and shorter version of this paper.

54 Andrew McDougall, Canadian Federalism, Abeyances, and Quebec Sovereignty (Ph.D. diss, University of Toronto, 2016).

its approach to SGA’s, “negotiations will not result in a single model of self-government.” Canada has concluded twenty-two SGA’s with Indigenous groups across the country, and about fifty negotiations are in process. They pre-empt the Indian Act. As an example, an SGA might recognize a band’s legal authority for itself and for settlers on its territory in such areas as health, education, environmental management, taxation, and land use, establish funding arrangements with Canada comparable to transfer payments between the federal and provincial governments, and identify programs and services which the community will provide. On this analogy, the ACC might negotiate diverse SGA’s covering specific congregations, organizations, and ministries, identifying areas of autonomy and laying out financial relationships. Indeed, the chancellor of General Synod has mused about an arrangement similar to this. Some critics, however, object that Canada’s SGA’s “municipalize” First Nations, which remain generally subject to provincial and federal law except in matters otherwise specified, leaving them well short of sovereignty.

For mixed situations of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Anglicans, a ninth model that might be considered is the collaborative Gwaii Haanas agreement of 1993 between the Council of the Haida Nation and the government of Canada. The two parties jointly established an Archipelago Management Board for a national park reserve. The representatives from both parties reach

57 Jones to Macdonald, 4.
decisions by consensus, with a special provision for rare cases of disagreement. Questions of actual land ownership are held in abeyance.

Most models implicitly assume that it is the Indigenous grouping that is anomalous and requires special provisions, exemptions, or agreements, while settler governances continue as always. A tenth model takes a different approach: to reform settler governance. A settler government that has gained authority through land dispossession and genocide cannot be presumed to stand above correction. John Borrows, an eminent professor of law and a member of the Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation, has recommended strengthening the place of Indigenous laws in the Canadian judicial system. 60 Indigenous legal traditions, which are sophisticated and robust, are already recognized by Canada in limited ways, as in the “reserved rights” of Indigenous peoples in matters not subject to treaty. It may seem complex for courts to have to work with different legal traditions, but, as Borrows points out, Canada has been doing exactly that since the Quebec Act of 1774, which recognized both English common law and French civil law. These two legal traditions sometimes function separately and sometimes are harmonized. Borrows argues that it will be virtually impossible to address many issues of Indigenous justice, such as land tenure, within European law systems alone. On this analogy, the ACC should thoroughly re-think and reform its constitution and canons, taking into account the jurisprudential and legal wisdom of its Indigenous members.

An eleventh model for Indigenous Anglican self-determination is to interpret it spiritually, shifting attention from governance to discipleship. This substantial “change in direction,” as Macdonald has called it, was broached at General Synod in 2016. Indigenous Anglicans would no longer struggle to change colonial institutional structures; they would focus instead on cultural matters, Christian community formation, leadership training, and ministry. According to a later elaboration, Indigenous Anglicans would maintain their “citizenship” in the settler-dominated

60 John Borrows, Canada’s Indigenous Constitution (Toronto, 2010).
church, but add a second citizenship under Canon XXII, roughly analogous to Anglicans in the military who come under two jurisdictions, the military ordinariate and a geographical diocese.\(^{61}\) This spiritualizing approach was further developed for Sacred Circle in 2018, where it was summarized in the phrase “our spirituality is our governance.” The spirituality envisioned was a “gospel-based discipleship” such as had recently been promoted by the World Council of Churches Conference on World Mission and Evangelism in Arusha. Self-determination would be a Christian life lived out in very close-knit local Indigenous communities focused on Scripture and prayer. The vocabulary of authority and jurisdiction, which formerly had seemed to many Indigenous Anglicans to be essential to forestall future betrayals by settler leaders, was now largely rejected as Eurocentric and institutional.\(^{62}\)

Whatever model of self-determination might be chosen, its prospects will be strengthened if financial self-sufficiency can be developed, as UNDRIP recognized. Colonialism has made self-sufficiency elusive for Indigenous peoples by displacing them from their lands, restraining their rights, seriously damaging their cultures, and until the 1960s formally excluding them from many economic relationships. In the ACC in particular, Indigenous ministries depend primarily on annual operating budgets decided by settler-dominated govenances, and allocations to Indigenous ministries are so minimal that relatively few Indigenous clergy receive stipends or salaries.

Are there possible systemic solutions? In 2018 the ACC appointed a small group called the Jubilee Commission to find a funding base

---


for Indigenous ministries. Its direction is unclear at this writing. It may exercise a certain forensic function, since there is a suspicion that in the past some funding (perhaps much funding) intended for Indigenous missions and ministries has been diverted to other uses. It may also consider ways to give Indigenous Anglicans restitution for their loss of land, such as a tithe on sales of church property to support Indigenous ministries. There are some parallels and precedents. In May 2019 the synod of the Anglican diocese of New Westminster (the lower mainland of British Columbia centred on Vancouver) approved a resolution to direct five percent of the proceeds of the sale of land and buildings to “the Indigenous Nations and communities who are the ancestral caretakers of that land for use as they see fit,” plus another five percent to the Native ministries of the dioceses and the national church. (Canadian bishops are not required to accept the resolutions of synod; the bishop of New Westminster has rejected this one.) Still another option is the repatriation of land that the ACC has acquired from Indigenous peoples, not always in the most transparent and consultative way. In May 2019 the United Church of Canada transferred to the Lenape people of the Eleunaapeewi Lahkeewiit (Delaware) nation about ten acres of their ancestral land in Bothwell, Ontario, which it had received as a gift decades earlier. Since all of Canada is the traditional territory of Indigenous peoples, settler acts of restitution might seem reasonable and just. But settlers typically regard violations of Indigenous land rights as events in past history that have been normalized by the passage of time.

---


CONCLUSION

Before 1967 Indigenous Anglicans in Canada were virtually outsiders in a settler Church. Today they are an influential, impassioned, faithful, and creative constituency, served by wise and well respected leaders, ministering to one another in local communities, carrying on effective programming in Indigenous education, discipleship, ministries, communications, and healing, and inviting many non-Indigenous Anglicans into their histories, cultures, and spiritualities.

This progressive historical trajectory has not, however, reached the elusive goal that generated so much apparent enthusiasm at General Synod in 2010: a self-determining Indigenous community within the ACC, an ecclesiastical adaptation of UNDRIP. The dominant theological, constitutional, canonical, and administrative ethos of the ACC remains Eurocentric, obstructing the stated desire of Indigenous Anglicans to govern themselves as “the church in our own homelands and among our own peoples, . . . structured by our own understanding of what it means to be nations and peoples.”

Why has the goal of Indigenous self-determination remained elusive? Obviously it has not been fully embraced by settler Anglicans, who dominate denominational governance; but why not? It may simply be that many settler Anglicans have not engaged with the issues. For that purpose, the ACC has appointed a reconciliation animator to promote conversation and mutual understanding among Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. But many settler Anglicans are actually resistant to change or worry about creating problematic precedents. Many no doubt are attached to colonial assumptions and privileges. Some may be reacting negatively to “compassion fatigue” and “guilt-tripping” with issues of Indigenous justice. Some worry about possible financial costs to the church. Some resent Indigenous Anglicans for allegedly

---

braking progress in other justice issues, such as reforming the heteronormativity of the ACC’s marriage canon.

Moreover, it is not at all clear how the goal of Indigenous self-determination is to be attained. There are many alternative, sometimes dramatically conflicting models. Is there one solution that can win broad support because it succeeds in balancing church unity with Indigenous self-determination, establishing financial sustainability for the Indigenous church, finding space for bicultural individuals and mixed communities, recognizing Indigenous nationhood as a theologically crucial category while also affirming the strategic value of Indigenous alliances, and promoting interchange and mutual understanding among Indigenous and non-Indigenous Anglicans? If there is, it has not yet been found.
The Contentious Conferences of 1924: A Study of the Proceedings of the Anglo-Catholic Priests’ Convention and the Thirty-Eighth Episcopal Church Congress

JESSE J. LEE

When the thirty-eighth Episcopal Church Congress opened on 29 April 1924, to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Church Congress movement in the United States, there was a notable degree of consternation in the air. Instead of unbridled praise and celebration for all that the Church Congress had done and accomplished for the church in the past half-century, Bishop William Lawrence’s opening address, entitled “The Present Situation in the Church,” dwelt upon the difficult situation that the Church Congress found itself in. At least from the perspective of the church leaders, while the Episcopal Church faced many issues in the early-twentieth century, perhaps the most prominent problem facing the church was the contentious nature of the church parties, especially between the Broad Churchmen and the Anglo-Catholics. Indeed, while the Church Congress met in Boston on 29 April-2 May 1924, the Anglo-Catholic Priests’ Convention met at the same time (29-30 April 1924) in Philadelphia. For Bishop Lawrence and others at the Church Congress, such scheduling represented a threat to the unity of the Episcopal Church. No longer would the Church Congress house the theological diversity within the church, nor would it facilitate the free discussion of differing ideas, as it was initially
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founded to do. Instead, church members and leaders found themselves in the position of choosing sides, deciding which conference to attend and with which church party they associated. In this way, the conferences of 1924 raised a familiar question that the Episcopal Church has consistently encountered throughout its history: How ought the church maintain a sense of social unity amid great theological diversity and difference?

In order to further explore the past struggles with this question, it is necessary to investigate the historical context and recorded proceedings of these two conferences to examine the ways in which they perceived themselves and each other. While many at the Church Congress perceived and presumed an antagonistic and competitive nature of the Priests’ Convention against the Church Congress, the historical record is less definite. To be sure, many Anglo-Catholics at the Priests’ Convention sought to distinguish themselves from the ethos of the Church Congress and resist the influences of an overly-modernist Broad Church party. Still, many others at the Priests’ Convention framed their gathering as not only consistent with, but also representative of true toleration of difference within the church. As such, the central contention of these conferences rested on the questions of individual liberty and the proper expression thereof. While Bishop Lawrence intimated in his address that the Priests’ Convention disrupted the unity of the church by meeting according to their Anglo-Catholic uniformity, those at the Priests’ Convention claimed they were actually representing and embracing their difference as a means of preserving the diversity of identity within the Episcopal Church. Some Anglo-Catholics even insinuated that it was instead the Church Congress and the Broad Church party that sought to diminish real diversity within the church by aligning themselves predominantly with other Protestant denominations and secular American institutions, thereby dismissing and denigrating Catholics and Anglo-Catholics. This rhetorical contention over definitions and expressions of diversity, liberty, and unity formed the center of such debates and framed the
ways in which Episcopalians of all kinds imagined themselves and envisioned their church in the early-twentieth century.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH PARTIES AND THEIR CONFERENCES

The Priests’ Convention and the thirty-eighth Episcopal Church Congress were not the beginning of partisan debates and controversies over the theological identity and social ethos of the Episcopal Church. Rather, they represent a dramatic moment of institutional competition over the preservation and propagation of such partisan ideologies and identities. The Anglo-Catholic movement in America can be traced back to the early 1840s, when the increasing interest in Catholic thought and liturgical expression inspired by the Oxford or Tractarian Movement in England crossed the Atlantic.¹ Concurrently, cultural influences pervading American society, such as the Romantic era of art and literature, the Gothic revival of architecture, and the arts and crafts movement, compounded this interest in Catholic aesthetic and liturgical expression, arguably aiding in the demand for and prominence of Anglo-Catholic incarnational sacramentality and liturgical expression.² This division on the acceptance or rejection of Catholic influences would polarize and militarize Episcopal Church parties, causing at least twenty-nine priests and deacons, and, notably, Bishop Levi Silliman Ives of North Carolina to convert to Roman Catholicism between 1840-1870.³ This ritualist controversy escalated further in the 1860s and 1870s, eventually causing George David Cummins, the assistant bishop of Kentucky, and Charles E.

² Notably, these cultural movements and influences cultivated a greater appeal throughout all American society for a grander, more colorful, and organic aesthetic in contrast to the more bleak and austere aesthetic of Reformed Protestantism. This appeal would especially manifest itself in the construction of secular buildings, such as libraries, museums, and even department stores, and religious buildings, such as churches and cathedrals of all denominations. Peter W. Williams, Religion, Art, and Money: Episcopalians and American Culture from the Civil War to the Great Depression (Chapel Hill, 2016), 53-63, 212-14.
³ Prichard, History of the Episcopal Church, 182-83.
Cheney to lead an evangelical group of eight clergy and nineteen laypersons to secede from the Episcopal Church and form the Reformed Episcopal Church in 1873.\(^4\) This schism was the climactic event that demonstrated the greater need for unity amidst theological and liturgical differences in the late-nineteenth century. The Episcopal Church Congress would meet for the first time in 1874 as one of the church’s responses to this need.

In this way, the Church Congress was founded as a direct response to the ritualist controversy and the deep theological antagonisms between Anglo-Catholics and lower-church Episcopalians.\(^5\) The prevailing hope of the Church Congress was to foster within the church a broader tolerance for diversity of thought by means of open discussion and debate. With this objective in mind, the leaders, presenters, and participants of the Church Congress were intended to include

---

\(^4\) David Hein and Gardiner H. Shattuck Jr., *The Episcopalians* (New York, 2004), 93.

Although ritualism and the fear of Roman Catholicism were central to the succession and formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church, there were, indeed, many contributing factors and motivations. Prichard noted that more than theological differences, evangelical Episcopalians decided to leave and form their own denomination in the wake of the Civil War, wherein they lost “prestige, financial resources, educational structures, and, to some degree, the very conviction that their own process of reasoning led to truth.” In other words, evangelical Episcopalians left because they had neither the institutional nor individual authority or influence to assert their own views and expel the opposing Oxford theology and movement from the American church. Prichard, *History of the Episcopal Church*, 190-91.

\(^5\) Anglo-Catholicism has often been unilaterally associated with the ritualists and the ritualist controversy in the 1840s-1870s; while this perspective is understandable, it is at best incomplete. Although Anglo-Catholics were large proponents of ritualism, this was more consequent of their ultimate goal. This is perhaps best described by William McGarvey, Anglo-Catholic leader who eventually defected to Roman Catholicism in 1908 after the open pulpit controversy: “It is totally false to suppose that the aim of the leading men identified with the [Catholic] Movement in England and this country was simply to introduce Ritualism into Anglicanism. Ceremonial occupied but a secondary place in their thoughts, and some of them gave no attention to it whatever and even deprecated its introduction. They had before them a purely spiritual object . . . to restore [the Anglican Church] to the full exercise of her spiritual functions; to bring out in her all the features of a Catholic Church, so that she might be recognized by the East and West as a true part of historic Christendom.” Edward Hawks, *William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit: An Intimate History of a Celibate Movement in the Episcopal Church and of its Collapse, 1870-1908* (Philadelphia, 1935), 20.
persons from all parties within the church. However, in spite of the aspirations of the Church Congress, partisan resentment and competition persisted. Indeed, this contention between Catholic-minded and Protestant-minded Episcopalians expressed itself on several fronts. For instance, the General Convention of 1874 passed a resolution that gave bishops and their Standing Committees authority to stop rituals and practices considered divergent from Episcopal liturgy and doctrine. In turn, Anglo-Catholics proposed at nearly every General Convention from 1877 well into the twentieth century a name change to omit the word “Protestant” from the Episcopal Church’s official name; every such attempt had failed. Furthermore, Edward Hawks, an Episcopal defector to Roman Catholicism after the open pulpit controversy, reported that what he called the “Broad or Modernist party” and the Anglo-Catholics were often set “at daggers’ points,” especially concerning the trial of the Rev. Algernon Crapsey. Even still in 1928, the House of Bishops felt the need


7 William Wilson Manross, A History of the American Episcopal Church, Revised 3rd ed. (New York, 1959), 299-301. Admittedly, this resolution proved to be difficult to enforce and ended up resolving little. The resolution was eventually and silently dropped in 1904. See also Thomas C. Reeves, “Professor Guelzo on Anglo-Catholicism: A Rejoinder,” Anglican and Episcopal History 63 (September 1994): 371.

8 The official name of the church is the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, which is still the official name of the church today. Manross, History of the American Episcopal Church, 315.

9 The open pulpit controversy consisted of a debate at the General Convention of 1907 in Richmond over a resolution that would enable ministers from other denominations to preach in Episcopal churches under certain conditions. Anglo-Catholics contested this desecrated the importance of Episcopal ordination, while Protestant-minded Episcopalians saw this as a move towards greater unity with the rest of Protestantism. See Hawks, William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit, 143-152.

10 The Crapsey trial was a heresy trial in 1906 that eventually deposed the Rev. Crapsey, who was supported by the Broad Church party, because he “claimed the right to interpret the Apostles’ Creed in such a way that the reality of the Virgin Birth and the bodily Resurrection of our Lord might be practically denied.” Hawks, William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit, 97-98.

The Broad Church party can be described as the American descendants of English Latitudinarianism, which sought Christian unity through moderation and rationality. As such, the Broad Churchmen advocated great individual liberty of reason and the integration of science into their theological worldviews.
to issue a pastoral letter specifically addressing the hostilities between Anglo-Catholics and lower-church Episcopalians, admitting openly that the “tension is at times severe.”

Such partisan antagonisms were clearly felt by Anglo-Catholics themselves, who often believed that the institutions of the Episcopal Church, including the Church Congress, were prejudiced against them. In response, Anglo-Catholics formed the Clerical Union for the Maintenance and Defense of Catholic Principles, or more commonly known as “The Catholic Club,” in order to connect and establish a common sense of identity among Anglo-Catholics in 1886. Moreover, Anglo-Catholics were also connected by magazines, such as *The Pulpit of the Cross* and *The Lamp*, both founded by Father Paul Wattson, which sought to give “voice to the Pro-Roman High Church party in the United States and even abroad . . . [and] gave them a feeling of solidarity in special times of stress.” Such efforts, in conjunction with

---

and polity. In this way, Broad Churchmen were generally Modernists and inclined to ecumenical relationships with other American Protestant denominations. Consequently, they were often the antagonists, perceived or real, to Anglo-Catholic, High Church, and traditionalist Episcopalians.

In fuller context, it reads: “We must begin with our own Church . . . Catholic in our unbroken continuity with the Christian ages and in the fullness of our Christian heritage, Protestant in our participation in the great 16th century movement of reformation and freedom . . . the extremes are far apart and often seem impossible to reconcile. The tension is at times severe.” *Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: Held in the City of Washington, D.C. From October Tenth to October Twenty-fifth, inclusive, in the Year of Our Lord 1928* (New York, 1929), 148, [https://www.episcopalarchives.org/sites/default/files/publications/1928_GC_Journal.pdf](https://www.episcopalarchives.org/sites/default/files/publications/1928_GC_Journal.pdf) (accessed 20 May 2018).


Importantly, Anglo-Catholicism must be understood as a diverse movement encompassing many different ideologies, theologies, and intentions. While there were some Anglo-Catholics, called Anglo-Papalists or Pro-Romanists, who sought reunion with the Roman See, many Anglo-Catholic leaders were “unsympathetic if not hostile to the Roman Catholic Church, believing that they offered a purer Christianity.” So, while Father Wattson and his magazines emphasized the merits of the Roman Catholic Church through his Anglo-Catholicism, not all Anglo-Catholics agreed with him. Thomas C. Reeves,
international Anglo-Catholic and Free-Catholic influences, eventually found resolution in the development of the Churchmen’s Alliance for the Defence of the Church in 1919 and the Central Conference of Associated Catholic Priests in 1923, which would open the Priests’ Convention the following year. To be sure, although Anglo-Catholics were in the numerical minority of the Episcopal Church, their presence, influence, and international connections were clearly felt and feared. Indeed, so great was this perceived threat of Catholic and Anglo-Catholic influence in the Episcopal Church, there were even “rumors . . . about a gigantic conspiracy to lead the whole High Church party into the arms of Rome.” These rumors ended up amounting to nothing, but they did not help to quell anti-Catholic suspicions and anxiety.

FRAMING THE CONTENTION: OPENING STATEMENTS

As such, the history of partisan antagonism between Catholic-minded and Protestant-minded Episcopalians escalated and manifested in the development of separate ecclesiastical associations and independent conferences. Consequently, when the Priests’ Convention opened on the precise same day as the Church Congress in a different city, it was difficult to interpret such planning as coincidental or benign. On the opening evening of the Church Congress, William Lawrence, Bishop of Massachusetts, presented a paper entitled “The Present Situation in the Anglican and Episcopal History 68 (June 1999): 217.

The Churchmen’s Alliance was initially founded in direct response to the open pulpit controversy, seeking to preserve the integrity and importance of Episcopal ordination. See, “What People and Papers Say,” The Christian Union Quarterly 9 (1919): 45-46.

Reeves, “The Light That Failed,” 216.

Church,” in which he addressed “the real issue” the church and the Church Congress faced: “whether the Christian Church is to be a Church wherein there is large liberty of thought, opinion, and interpretation; or whether the Church is to be even more than ever broken up into sects wherein each contains only those people who think and believe just alike.”

This address was seemingly an indirect remark against those gathering in Philadelphia at that time, especially considering the Priests’ Convention was meeting on the basis of their Anglo-Catholic uniformity in contrast to the supposed diversity and inclusivity of the Church Congress. Bishop Lawrence also contended that the unity of the church is not based upon strict laws and limitations on doctrine or interpretation. Rather, it is based upon a common faith in Jesus Christ and a common spirit of brotherhood, and whoever “is not in sympathy with the spirit, finds himself spiritually outside though he be formally within.”

In this way, he censured those who, though part of the Episcopal Church, did not act in a sincere spirit of collegiality. However, in proper Broad Church fashion, Bishop Lawrence revealed a more reserved disposition in the remainder of his address. This is especially evident when he acknowledged the Priests’ Convention directly:

The Church is larger than the point of view of any group, party or age. Our historic Church is not a sect. All Churchmen may learn much from this Congress, and those of us who happen to be here may well heed the discussions and services of the Priests’ Congress in Philadelphia.

Notably, at this particular point in his address, he was expounding the second of four elements that he believed were essential to church unity at that time, namely a need for greater sympathy. Significantly, in this same section of the address, he pointedly condemned militancy and extremism, observing that “a man’s loyalty

---

18 Ibid., 404.
19 Ibid., 407.
to his creed is often measured by the violence of his defence."20

Aware of the sometimes sharp relationship between Anglo-Catholics and lower-church Episcopalians, Bishop Lawrence advised against strong, "often painful and violent," reactions.21 This is evidently a plea for Anglo-Catholics to refrain from making the Priests’ Convention a method of militant retaliation against the more-Protestant ethos of the church and Church Congress. Meanwhile, Lawrence also encouraged those at the Church Congress to refrain from quick judgments and assumptions about the Priests’ Convention. Indeed, the third element Bishop Lawrence declared as essential for peace and unity within the church was necessarily patience. Since Bishop Lawrence’s address was given on the first day of both conferences, it was too soon to tell what would become of the Priests’ Convention and, thus, could only be viewed with expectation and, understandably, some degree of suspicion.

The fear that the Priests’ Convention would be the schismatic means of leading the Anglo-Catholics out of the Episcopal Church was not necessarily unfounded, especially considering rumors circulating of a militant Anglo-Catholic movement in the making. Moreover, concern over the nature of the Priests’ Convention appears to have also emerged from the suspicion of any independent conference movement at all. In fact, those within the church also initially viewed the Church Congress with reservation and resistance in 1874. This fear seems to have stemmed from a meeting of about thirty-five radical, evangelical clergy at a conference in December 1870, which would eventually lead some of these clergy out of the Episcopal Church only three years later.22 With this evangelical conference and the formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church fresh in the minds of the church, many believed that the Church Congresses would equally disturb the peace and unity of the Episcopal Church.23

---

20 Ibid., 406.
21 Ibid.
22 Chorley, Men and Movements, 408.
23 Ibid., 512. Notably, Horatio Potter, Bishop of New York, refused the invitation to preside over the first Church Congress of 1874, contending that holding such a Congress right before the General Convention would upset the already tense and delicate state of the church.
Therefore, it seems the Priests’ Convention was also viewed with a similar suspicion of independent conferences. This is especially true considering the single-party nature of the Priests’ Convention resembled the evangelical conference in 1870 even more so than the Church Congresses. Furthermore, this gathering of Anglo-Catholics further resembled the formation of the Companions of the Holy Saviour (C.S.S.S.), a clerical order of Anglo-Catholics, in 1891.\textsuperscript{24} Notably, when the general chapter of C.S.S.S. met for a retreat at Nashotah House three weeks before the General Convention at Richmond in 1907, nine of the twenty-two persons there would later convert to Roman Catholicism after that General Convention passed the open pulpit amendment.\textsuperscript{25} Additionally, most of the twenty priests and five seminarians who converted to Roman Catholicism in the months after the open pulpit controversy were members of the C.S.S.S.\textsuperscript{26}

To further the relationship between these two groups and meetings, Bishop William Walter Webb of Milwaukee, who gave one of the opening sermon at the Priests’ Convention, was also a founding member of the C.S.S.S. and was present at that fateful retreat at Nashotah House.\textsuperscript{27} Indeed, the same day that Bishop Lawrence gave his address in Boston, Bishop Webb preached on the burden of the Cross. Suggestively, Bishop Webb mentioned the burden of the Cross borne by Christ included “the loss of friends and disciples, [and] the misunderstanding and misjudgments” from others.\textsuperscript{28} When extrapolating the burdens of the Cross for Christ to his listeners, he said: “We are despised—so was He. We are poor—so was He. Our friends, our followers,

\begin{footnotes}
\item[24] Hawks, \textit{William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit}, 35.
\item[25] Ibid., 131.
\item[26] Ibid., 153-80. For a complete list of the priests who converted to Roman Catholicism in 1907-1908 and their affiliation with the C.S.S.S., see DeMille, \textit{Catholic Movement}, 170, fn18.
\item[27] This particular retreat at Nashotah House was significant for several reasons, especially the dynamic of conversation and relationships reported there; for more information, see Hawks, \textit{William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit}, 130-35.
\end{footnotes}
desert us—so did His. We are misunderstood—so was He.”

In this way, Bishop Webb spoke directly to the experience of Catholic-minded Episcopalians who felt as though the Church Congress and modernist Broad Church party were actively opposing and excluding them. It might even reflect on the exodus of his fellow Anglo-Catholics from the Episcopal Church, lamenting those who abandoned them for Rome. However, he contended that this burden was not something to be avoided or corrected, but rather something they must rightly bear with discipline and self-sacrifice, much like the early Tractarians did, as a witness to the truth. In fact, he went so far as to say that Anglo-Catholics ought to be filled with a missionary zeal not only for those who have never known Christ, but also “to those who have forgotten Him... in our homes and parishes, in our dioceses, in this country, [and] throughout the world.”

The tenor of his sermon does not make it too difficult to imagine whom exactly he is referencing as the targets of Anglo-Catholic evangelism.

If this were the only statement made from the Priests’ Convention, the Church Congress, and perhaps the rest of the Episcopal Church, might have found vindication for their suspicions and concerns. However, the other opening sermon given by Bernard Iddings Bell, the president of St. Stephen’s College in Annandale, New York, was much more conciliatory. Near the very outset of his sermon, he remarked on the “fundamental spiritual note” of the Priests’ Convention:

We know that this is our attitude of mind; it is well that others should realize it, too. We do not come together to controvert other people’s beliefs or lack of beliefs. We feel the largest love for those who are seeking God in other ways than ours. We are not seeking to demonstrate against anybody, or indeed to argue with anybody. We come together not to deny anything, but rather to affirm that we have found a burning, vitalizing faith.

---

30 Ibid., 250.
Much like Bishop Webb, he recognized that the Priests’ Convention was under scrutiny and contended that this Anglo-Catholic movement was deeply misunderstood. However, much like Bishop Lawrence at the Church Congress, and much unlike Bishop Webb, Bell clearly and explicitly argued against sectarianism within the church. While these two opening sermons at the Priests’ Convention might appear inconsistent in their understandings of the nature and purpose of their gathering, they were both seeking to affirm the merits of Anglo-Catholicism and argue for their inclusion in the ethos and identity of the Episcopal Church. As such, they were contesting the notion that the Church Congress and the Broad Church party were the sole determiners and definers of ecclesial unity. While Bishop Lawrence contended that Anglo-Catholics in forming their own associations and meeting at their own conferences apart from the Church Congress were undermining the spirit of unity and out of sympathy with a sense of Christian brotherhood, those at the Priests’ Convention asserted that their existence in the church and the expression of their Anglo-Catholic identity were not, or rather should not be, outside of or against such spirit and sympathy. Indeed, in affirming their communal Anglo-Catholic identity together at the Priests’ Convention, they asserted that what was most essentially Episcopalian was also harmoniously Anglo-Catholic.

EPISCOPAL ETHOS AND ANGLO-CATHOLIC IDENTITY: CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

In response to the overwhelming Protestant ethos of the Church Congress, the formation of a separate conference was necessary in affirming Anglo-Catholicism, especially since there was some Anglo-Catholic distrust in the Church Congress’ claim to represent all church parties impartially. Indeed, Edward Hawks believed that the Broad Church movement intentionally tried to oust Anglo-Catholics from the Episcopal Church, or at least make their stay intolerable. He contended, “The whole movement had
really been anti-clerical and anti-Catholic. . . . There seemed to be no doubt about this." As such, it was necessary for Anglo-Catholics to reaffirm their identity, but not necessarily in direct rejection of Broad Church ideology and presence, especially at the Church Congress. Notably, the Church Congress was never explicitly mentioned in any of the addresses given at the Priests’ Convention, demonstrating that the general objective of the Convention was not to controvert the ethos of the Episcopal Church, but rather to claim inclusion in the limits of Episcopal identity. In order to do this, Anglo-Catholics articulated an alternative definition of Episcopal identity and ecclesiastical alignment from that offered at the Church Congress, which Anglo-Catholics saw as overly modernist and perilously Protestant. Indeed, perhaps the greatest effort in articulating an Episcopal Anglo-Catholic identity was differentiating themselves from the general ethos of the Church Congress to emphasize their own Catholic credentials and Anglo-Catholic advantages.

Overall, the most noticeable difference in the character of these conferences was their different uses of language. The language of every paper presented at the Priests’ Convention is steeped in Catholic vernacular, referring to the Blessed Sacraments, altars, the Mass, and the Virgin Mother. Unsurprisingly, this type of language is largely absent from the Church Congress. Additionally, there is an apparent discrepancy in the understanding of the word “Catholic.” At the Priests’ Convention, it always referred to an apostolic and historic faith and tradition; whereas, at the Church Congress, it seemingly always referred to the Roman Catholic Church, which Anglo-Catholics would instead call the Roman or Latin Church. Such differences in language are perhaps most indicative of Anglo-Catholic freedom of language in their own conference that would not be understood the same in the context of the Church Congress. In this way, the very vernacular of the Church Congress imposed a distinctly Protestant worldview, which Anglo-Catholics needed to navigate. However, by using their own terms and definitions, they could reaffirm their common vision of Anglo-Catholic identity and

32 Hawks, William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit, 134, 139.
worldview without fear of misunderstanding or necessity of translation.

A more pointed subject of disagreement and distinction is in the Church Congress’ rejection of Catholic theology and the Priests’ Convention’s challenge of Protestant theology. In the opening statements, both William Walter Webb and Bernard Iddings Bell stoutly rejected the validity of Protestant theology. The former went so far to discuss the failures of the “false doctrine of justification by faith only”\(^\text{33}\) and the latter went even further declaring that “Protestantism has outlived its day.”\(^\text{34}\) Not only did many reject the theology and benefits of Protestantism, but some also threw into question the authority of Protestant documents, namely the “quasi-Official authority of the Articles of Religion.”\(^\text{35}\)

Divergence in theology between the conferences was most notable in their approaches to and understanding of sacramental theology. Marshall Bowyer Stewart, the professor of moral and dogmatic theology at Nashotah House, contended for the importance and relevance of the sacraments: “Again, under the Christian law should be included the obligations connected with the sacraments. Here again the protestant soul protests that this does not belong to morals. But surely it is a moral matter to administer and receive the sacraments rightly.”\(^\text{36}\) Stewart’s claim of the Protestant depreciation of the sacraments’ role in Christian life and morality might seem unfair, but considering the ways in which the Church Congress approached the sacraments, it was certainly not unfounded. For example, some of the speakers on the value of auricular confession at the Church Congress perceived penance not necessarily as a sacrament, but rather as a psychological


\(^{34}\) Bell, “Sermon Preached,” 254.


tool for the benefit of mental and emotional well-being. Some others even took auricular confession deeper into Protestant thought by connecting it to other forms of confession, such as group confession practiced in Methodist class meetings. Furthermore, in the responses to the papers presented at the Church Congress on divorce and remarriage, Percy Gamble Kammerer brazenly declared, “there is nothing sacrosanct about the family.” Also in that same section, Samuel D. McConnell went so far to say that the rise in divorce rates at the time did not signify a decline in morality, but rather might indicate a rise in morality. On the other hand, nearly every paper presented at the Priests’ Convention conserved and affirmed the traditional understandings and significance of the seven sacraments in Christian life and theology, especially the Eucharist, to which an entire section of the convention was devoted.

Another point of divergence between these conferences was their approaches to the issues of fundamentalism and modernism. To be sure, most Episcopalians were tired of this particular controversy by the 1920s. In fact, at the Church Congress, George Ashton Oldham, bishop coadjutor of Albany, in his paper on how the church ought to deal with fundamentalism explained that there was an objection within the Executive Committee of the Church Congress about whether it ought to address the topic.

37 See Percy Gamble Kammerer’s paper in Church Congress, Honest Liberty, 245.
38 See John Wallace Suter’s speech and remarks by Rosewell Page in Church Congress, Honest Liberty, 265, 268.
40 He contended that the rise in divorce rates might be related to the rise in women’s moral self-consciousness and self-respect. See Samuel D. McConnell’s speech in Church Congress, Honest Liberty, 165-66.
at all. Some on the committee contended that because “the type hardly existed within the Episcopal Church . . . the topic, therefore, was inappropriate.”

Furthermore, when George Emerson Brewer, emeritus professor of surgery at the College of Physicians and Surgeons in New York, attacked religious persons for holding too closely to the inerrancy of the Bible and on the insistence of doctrinal conformity in the creeds, he and his perceptions of the Episcopal Church were strongly lamented and rebuffed by no less than three bishops in response.

Nevertheless, those at the Priests’ Convention seemingly sought to distance themselves from the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, considering it a particularly Protestant problem. The simple fact that there existed a portion of the Church Congress solely devoted to addressing fundamentalism demonstrated their commitment in speaking to a problem wrecking the Protestant world.

Notably in Francis J. Hall’s paper at the Priests’ Convention on the divinity of Christ, he rejected modernist understandings of the historical Jesus by the name of “Protestant Liberalism.” In doing so, he contended “the adoption by professing Christians of these alien Christologies is plainly not due to scholarship . . . [but] is due to the blinding influence of the naturalistic and rationalistic standpoint, misleadingly called scientific.” This rejection of the modernist-fundamentalist debate as a Protestant issue might be best seen in Bell’s sermon, where he clearly and explicitly claimed:

This God we do adore. In adoring Him we find nothing which imprisons or enslaves our minds. Freely and gladly we accept the concluded and proven facts discovered by physical investigation and by

---

42 Oldham, “How Shall the Church Deal with Fundamentalism,” in Church Congress, Honest Liberty, 367.

43 These included: George Ashton Oldham, bishop coadjutor of Albany; Hiram Richard Hulse, bishop of Cuba; and, Arthur C. A. Hall, bishop of Vermont. See Church Congress, Honest Liberty, 312-18.

scientific Biblical and historical criticism. We are not obscurantists; we are not fundamentalists; we are Catholics.\textsuperscript{45}

In this way, those at the Priests’ Convention did not associate with theological modernism, with those who obscured the “divine simplicity”\textsuperscript{46} of the Catholic faith with “the formal coldness which made Wesley impatient and Newman despairing.”\textsuperscript{47} But neither did they associate with fundamentalism. Indeed, to associate with either side of the controversy would be to self-identify with a distinctly Protestant attitude, which the Anglo-Catholics simply could not do.\textsuperscript{48}

The last three papers presented at the Priests’ Convention are probably the most indicative of this rejection of Protestant identity since they deal with the essence of the church and ecumenical relations. For example, when Irving P. Johnson, bishop of Colorado, addressed the essentials of the church and the possibility of Christian reunion, he did so exclusively in the realm of “Catholic Faith,” including only Anglicans, Roman Catholics, and Eastern Orthodox.\textsuperscript{49} Even in the paper entitled “Reunion and Protestantism” presented by George Craig Stewart, there is a clear presentation of the Catholic Faith as superior and preferable. He contended that the path to reunion with Protestants is not found in compromise, but rather in the forthright and

\textsuperscript{45} Bell, “Opening Sermon,” 252.
\textsuperscript{46} Bell, Ibid., 255.
\textsuperscript{47} Bell, Ibid., 252.
\textsuperscript{48} This is appropriate to say, at least, for its time. It has been contended that the founders of the Anglo-Catholic movement in England and in the United States were all Biblical fundamentalists and that “Tractarianism was definitely in reaction against the growing influence of German biblical scholarship. . . . Liberalism was the great enemy.” However, later developments in the movement established its own distinct stance on the matter by the early twentieth century. See DeMille, Catholic Movement, 171-80.

For a more thorough explanation and discussion of the Anglo-Catholic position in the modernist and fundamentalist debate in the 1920s, see William Henry Smith, Modernism, Fundamentalism, and Catholicism (Milwaukee, 1926).

sincere clarification of their “Catholic credentials.” This particular attitude against Protestant ecumenical relations is best understood in response to the overwhelming Protestant nature of American culture. Especially in this time period, the divisions of many Protestant denominations began giving way to a common Protestant tradition utilizing many shared resources, such as hymnody, Sunday school aids, and devotional literature. The creation of this shared “Protestant Establishment” in American culture oriented the Episcopal Church and the Church Congress largely towards other Protestant denominations and nonreligious organizations, instead of towards the other historic traditions with whom the Anglo-Catholics better related. Indeed, at the Church Congress, there were no speakers who identified as either Roman Catholic or Orthodox. However, there were some speakers invited to the Church Congress who were members of other Protestant denominations, such as Katharine Bement Davis, who self-identified as a Congregationalist. Additionally, there were a fair number of speakers who were not even explicitly religious at all, including scientists, doctors, an industrial manager, and a district judge, demonstrating the Church Congress’ closer affiliation with American Protestant culture and secular institutions than with the apostolic and historic traditions.

Relatedly, the inclusion of such extra-ecclesial figures into the program of the Church Congress demonstrated that the commitments of the congress and the Broad Church party were pointed towards American society and social issues of the day. Since the foundation of the Episcopal Church Congress, it sought to progressively open participation, both as attendees and presenters, to the laity, women, and persons of color. In fact, one of the

---

52 Church Congress, Honest Liberty, 152.
53 Women were invited as participants and presenters in the Church Congresses as early as 1911, and black Episcopalians participated near the outset of the Church Congress movement. However, despite the inclusion of laity,
foundational purposes of the Church Congress was to address and discuss a variety of social issues, including the women’s suffrage movement, feminism, and segregation. However, the topics discussed and the tenor of discussions at the Priests’ Convention remained primarily ecclesial, theological, and/or devotional in nature, rather than social or political. This, however, did not mean Anglo-Catholics were apolitical. Indeed, George Nash identified Bernard Iddings Bell as a significant character in the development of the intellectual conservative movement in the United States. Nevertheless, this demonstrates a foundational dissimilarity in the demographic makeup of these conferences and their ultimate objectives. Indeed, more than establishing an ethos associated with Catholic theology, liturgical expression, and sacramental faith, the Priests’ Convention cultivated a distinctive character in Anglo-Catholicism that privileged clerical opinion. As the name suggests, the Priests’ Convention and the Central Conference of Associated Catholic Priests were composed primarily of ordained clergy. As such, it set the tone for subsequent Anglo-Catholic Congresses, which highly privileged the opinions and perspectives of the clergy, emphasizing the spiritual hierarchy embodied in the sacrament of Holy Orders. Consequently, and suggestively, this meant that all members of the CCACP and all participants and presenters at the Priests’ Convention were men. Even with the inclusion of laypersons in subsequent Anglo-Catholic Congresses, women were often tangential to such meetings and organizations.

women, and racial minorities, the congresses remained predominantly male, white, and clerical. Spielmann, “A Neglected Source,” 59, 67-68.


55 Notably, while the accounts of women are largely excluded from the reports of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses, evidence does suggest that women aided in supporting the congresses through hospitality. Additionally, and enigmatically, the second Anglo-Catholic Congress in 1926 lists “Miss Frances F. Bussey” as a member of the “Local Committee,” although it does not describe what her role may have been. The Second Catholic Congress: Addresses and Papers, transcribed by Wayne Kempton (Project Canterbury, 2011) (New York City, 1926), 5-8, http://anglicanhistory.org/usa/congress/2/ (accessed 20 May 2018).
In this way, the Priests’ Convention asserted the importance and relevance of Anglo-Catholic identity to the ethos of the Episcopal Church, which Anglo-Catholics felt they could not do freely in the context of the Church Congress dominated by Broad Church ideologies, objectives, and commitments. In so doing, it also provided a space for likeminded persons to associate, commiserate, support, and encourage one another. Still, it is important to note that the popular perception of antagonism or competition between these two conferences appear more the consequence of historical imagination and reaction than historical reality. Indeed, there were at least some Anglo-Catholics who decided to go to the Church Congress over the Priests’ Convention, most notably Arthur C. A. Hall, bishop of Vermont, and remarkably one person, Marshall Bowyer Stewart, professor of dogmatic and moral theology at Nashotah House, who somehow managed to present papers at both conferences. While the Anglo-Catholic perspectives and opinions were often and openly challenged at the Church Congress, such opposition was certainly not unilateral and must be qualified. For instance, Frank Gavin, professor of ecclesiastical history at General Theological Seminary, began his paper at the Church Congress by quoting P. N. Waggett, who presented a paper at the Priests’ Convention. Consequently, at least from the record of the Priests’ Convention, the beginnings of the Anglo-Catholic Congress movement were not unilaterally antagonistic to either the dominant Protestant-minded ethos of the Episcopal Church or the Broad Church-dominated Church Congress. Rather, the foundation of the Priests’ Convention and the development of the subsequent Anglo-Catholic Congresses initially sought to claim that their Episcopal identity was authentically consistent with their Anglo-Catholic identity. In so doing, they asserted that the emphasis and expression of their Anglo-Catholicism was a worthy and

---

worthwhile endeavor not just for themselves, but for all Episcopalians invested in ecclesiastical liberty, diversity, and unity.

Nevertheless, the problem of unity and diversity posed by Bishop Lawrence’s opening address has lingered and remained relevant to the development of Anglo-Catholicism in the Episcopal Church. Indeed, the very claim of an Episcopal Anglo-Catholic identity and the benefits of a strong Anglo-Catholic presence and influence in the Episcopal Church can easily be interpreted as antagonistic because it inherently positions one interpretation of identity over another. Consequently, any attempt to establish a viable alternative definition of Episcopal identity will necessarily sow division. In fact, Richard Spielmann has noted that the development of the Anglo-Catholic Congresses in conjunction with the development of the liberal evangelical Whitsuntide conferences in 1933 were the death knell of the Episcopal Church Congress movement. He contends that the deepening divisions of “partyism, or really the desire to meet only with those of one’s own view, and the failure of leadership, were chiefly to blame” for the eventual dissolution of the Church Congress. As such, while the beginnings of the Anglo-Catholic Congress movement sought to distinguish unity from conformity and diversity from division, the original suspicions and anxieties of the Broad Church party and the Church Congress eventually came to pass. In this way, while the rhetorical positioning of the Priests’ Convention and the thirty-eighth Church Congress discussed the questions of individual liberty, diversity, and unity, the historical developments of these conference movements and partisan dynamics chartered a different story.

57 Italics original. Spielmann, “A Neglected Source,” 79.
Now more than five months since the first diagnosis of coronavirus in the United States, there have been more deaths from COVID-19 than there were American soldiers killed in the First World War. (More than half of those casualties from World War I were victims of the influenza pandemic of 1918.) Worldwide, authorities have reported more than thirteen million cases of COVID-19, as well as over half a million deaths.

Although New York State seems to have come through its difficult stage as the epicenter of the pandemic, the view in some other states is not so optimistic. Our three most populous states—California, Texas, and Florida—report numbers that chill the soul. Those three states recorded more than thirty thousand new cases—or eighteen per cent of the global total—on one day in July.¹ The director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases has opined, “As a country, when you compare us to other countries, I don’t think you can say we’re doing great. I mean, we’re just not.”²

The primate of the Episcopal Church released this statement via an internet video: “We’ve been trying, making mistakes, learning, regrouping, trying anew. I’ve seen it. Holy Week and Easter happened in ways that none of us dreamed possible. I’ve quietly read Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, and Compline online with you. I’ve seen soup kitchens, pantries, and other feeding ministries carefully doing their work in safe and healthy ways. Zoom coffee hours, bible studies, and small discipleship groups. I’ve seen this church stand for the moral primacy of love. I’ve seen it, even when public health concerns supersede all other considerations, including in-person worship. That is moral courage. Who knows, but that love may demand more of us. But fear not, just remember what the old slaves use to say, walk together, children, and don’t you

¹ “California, Florida, and Texas, home to nearly 100 million, are getting swamped by the virus,” The New York Times, 14 July 2020.
get weary, because there is a great camp meeting in the Promised Land. Oh, I’ve seen us do what we never thought we would or could do, because we dared to do what Jesus tells us all to do.”

During the pandemic, there have been various attempts to address the situation liturgically. In the parish in which this reviewer resides, the congregation has alternated between live-streamed Morning Prayer and pre-recorded Holy Eucharist with spiritual communion. One particularly clever priest reworked her “Family Mass” into an online crafts activity with a spiritual message. She appeared with a divided tongue as of fire on her head, with construction paper taped to the backdrop to resemble a tree, and, on Easter Day, wearing bunny ears. Some have ramped up their effort, creating elaborate, crisply edited broadcasts—including virtual choirs, numerous social-distancing participants, and sermons from remote locations. Others continued with a single “talking head” and no music.

While churches are reopening for in-person worship in some places, it hardly resembles the old norm. Worshippers wear face masks, remain six or more feet from each other, and no longer shake hands or hug to exchange the peace. Where communion is offered, it is likely only in one kind, bread. And choirs have gone missing, out of concern that singing makes one a “super spreader” of the disease.

Our sister publication, The Historiographer, reports that the National Episcopal Historians and Archivists organization is collecting data to document how the pandemic is affecting worship, pastoral concerns, as well as administration and finances in churches. “What should historians of the future know about our churches’ response to this crisis?” they ask—anticipating publication of “an accurate and detailed picture of daily life in the Episcopal Church during the . . . pandemic” in a year’s time.

In the midst of the economic devastation and medical crisis, civil unrest over systemic racism and police brutality broke out recently across the country and around the world. St. John’s Church, on Lafayette Square in Washington, has been the site of Black Lives Matter protests, presidential photo-ops, and vandalism. Clearly, this is not the end of the saga, the last of many unexpected surprises we can anticipate, nor

---

the final report in these pages. The story continues to unfold, the death toll continues to rise, and the church continues to adapt to new, ever-changing, and uncertain circumstances.

J. Barrington Bates

Harbor Springs, Michigan
Online Worship in Waco During a Season of Pandemic

It is the first Sunday after Ascension, the seventh Sunday after Easter in the liturgical year, and the Sunday of Memorial Day weekend. In a normal year, this late May date would normally be a moderately busy one for Episcopal churches before the summer hiatus. This year, the narthex of St. Alban’s Episcopal Church in Waco is empty. The choir is not gathering for procession, nor are greeters passing out bulletins. Parishioners are not parking their cars on Thirtieth Street or Columbus Avenue, or chatting as they file in. For the hundreds who are looking over the shoulder of the music director/organist, it is clear that no one is in the pews.

Instead, in a scene that would have been surreal six months earlier—and, one prays, a decade or century hence—St. Alban’s is beginning its thirteenth week without in-person services. As elsewhere in America, the residents of Waco are in their fifth month of a surreal year, with schools, offices, factories, and churches emptied of people—while food, water, shelter, and the internet continue without interruption, in defiance of the laws of economics.

As with previous weeks, today’s nine-o’clock service is being broadcast using Facebook Live, and made available on the church’s Facebook page for tape delay. The live shots come from three cameras. The first is in the chancel, looking past the organ towards the nave; the second, in the chancel, tightly focused on the stone altar; the third, below the lectern.

Not counting the (off-camera) production crew, those inside the church are limited to the organist, a solo singer, and two priests. As it has been most Sundays since early April, the service goes off largely without a hitch.

As the organist plays the prelude, the broadcast cuts into a montage of still photographs: the distinctive neo-gothic bell tower, vaulted wood ceiling, and then the distinctive stained-glass window, incorporating Texas bluebonnets. When the prelude ends, the assistant rector carries a binder up to a (hidden) music stand in front of the altar. Looking directly at the camera, he directs viewers to the second page of the online service booklet, and then announces the opening hymn.

Waco is a medium-sized town equidistant between Dallas and Austin on Interstate Highway 35. In the twentieth century, it was best known as the home of Baylor University, the state’s oldest college, which was established in Independence in 1845. From 1870 to the end of World War II, Texas depended heavily on the railroad to move people, agricultural products,
and manufactured goods. Because Waco had a train line and Independence did not, the Baylor men’s college moved to Waco, merged with rival Baptist Waco University and started local classes in the Fall 1886—less than a year after the first Dr. Pepper was sold at Morrison’s Old Corner Drug Store.

In 1953, the deadliest Texas tornado of the twentieth century tore through downtown Waco, killing 114 and injuring 597. The city took decades to recover, as its population plateaued around 100,000 from 1960 to 1990. Sustained population and economic growth were delayed until the twenty-first century, when Baylor grew from a regional Baptist college to a nationally recognized Christian university.

St. Alban’s is the second of three Diocese of Texas churches in Waco. St. Paul’s Episcopal Church opened in 1870, and moved to its current site (four blocks west of then Waco University) in 1878. Two miles away, members of St. Paul’s founded St. Alban’s in 1946, bringing with it a strong choral tradition. St. Alban’s dedicated its church in 1950. Most of the woodwork was carved by founding member Camille Ward (1891-1978); prominently carved into the back wall on both sides of the altar is her quotation of Isaiah 40:31: “Those who wait upon the Lord will renew their strength.”

Decades later, the Church of the Holy Spirit was founded three miles west of St. Alban’s. As Baylor became more ecumenical, all three churches have developed strong ties to the university, through faculty, staff, students, and alumni.

While COVID-19 had already affected other parts of the country, it took several months to reach Texas: as late as 12 March, it still had less than a hundred documented cases, and its first fatality was recorded on 17 March. State and diocesan policies were often couched as guidelines rather than orders as in other states. On 5 March, the bishop issued his first guidelines for the diocese, culminating in the 13 March announcement that all parishes should worship online for the next two weeks. On 26 March, those guidelines were extended to 10 May. Since 10 May, the St. Alban’s bulletin has noted that “We will not be returning to in-person worship in the near future” and “We cannot provide a concrete return date.”

St. Alban’s was among the first in the diocese to go online—learning from services broadcast 2016–2018. For years, the parish posted service
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6 It was designed by local architect Walter Cocke Jr., who also designed Roman Catholic churches in Austin, Houston, and Chicago. Earlier, he oversaw construction of Waco’s eight-story Masonic Grand Lodge of Texas, the hub of Freemasonry in the state.

7 A Source of Strength & Grace: St. Alban’s Episcopal Church, 1946-2016 (Waco, 2016), 4.
books on its website; after the lockdown, that document was linked to each week’s video link within Facebook. On 15 March, it hosted its first live stream on Facebook for the Third Sunday of Lent. Since that Sunday, many aspects of the webcast remained unchanged. The staff usually included the rector and his assistant, the music director, and a soloist from the choir.

In 2020, the first three weeks of live streaming employed a single cellphone camera in a pew, pointing at the pulpit. On Palm Sunday, the live stream was upgraded to use three cameras. On Easter, the weekly prelude on the thirty-six-bell carillon in the bell tower was reinstated on a separate Facebook live stream. In later weeks, production values were upgraded with subtitles listing music, lessons, and the names of key participants. By 24 May, many other Waco churches were in their fourth week of restricted in-person worship. None of the Episcopal churches had done so, despite a diocesan process announced earlier in the month.

On a normal Sunday, St. Alban’s would have three Holy Communion services: a said Rite I at 7:30, and two sung services with choir at 9 and 11:15, both Rite II, except during penitential seasons. Since live streaming, these have been replaced by a single 9 a.m. Morning Prayer service. As it has since Palm Sunday, today’s bulletin carried the following explanation:

From the Rector: On Not Celebrating Holy Communion

For the time being, Morning Prayer will continue to be the liturgy for our Sunday worship services, including this Sunday. In doing so, we are following the guidance of the Bishop of Texas, who wrote recently to the clergy of the Diocese that Morning Prayer is “the most appropriate act of worship given physical distancing.” Thus, St. Alban’s will not conduct services of Holy Eucharist via live stream.

The Anglican understanding of Holy Communion, following our understanding of the real fleshly incarnation of our Lord, is that it is an

---

8 As with other churches in 2020, St. Alban’s referred to its service as a “live stream” rather than a “broadcast” associated with twentieth-century televangelists. As of mid-2020, the word “livestream” and the related phrase “livestream” were not officially recognized by the Oxford English Dictionary, although one or both could be found in Merriam-Webster and the Cambridge English Dictionary.

9 Starting in June, the weekly service was also broadcast on a new YouTube channel.

10 In late June, a second spike of infections in Texas forced many businesses and churches to re-close, including one large Dallas Episcopal church that had created outdoor services.
in-person meal shared by real people who eat and drink the elements. This requires three things: the gathered congregation, an ordained person to lead the prayers, and the elements of bread and wine. Since it is not possible to have these things during this time, we will wait. When we can come together again with all these things, we will assuredly “Celebrate the Feast”—and what a celebration it will be!\(^{11}\)

The service begins with the Invitatory—using the “Christ Our Passover” canticle—followed by Psalm 68 (1-10, 33-36). After a lay reader reads Acts 1:6-14 (the Ascension), a sung Gloria is followed by the Children’s Sermon, a reading from the gospel — John 17:1-11 (Jesus’ high priestly prayer) — and the main sermon.

The service is led by the assistant rector, with help from the rector. Both men are wearing a cassock, surplice, academic hood, and tippet. The lessons are recorded video clips: the gospel is read by a third priest—the church’s pastoral associate—wearing her clerical collar.

With his customary white preaching tabs, the rector explains the Ascension in his children’s sermon. The twelve-minute main sermon first touches on public anxiety of the past few months, using that to highlight the call to obedience given by Jesus to his Apostles in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and our need to (as they did) overcome our incomplete trust in God’s power. After the sermon come the Apostles’ Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and Suffrages A from Morning Prayer II. After the Collect of the Day comes the “Thanksgiving for Heroic Service” in observance of Memorial Day, and one of the concluding prayers for mission. As since 29 March, the collects conclude with the unique “In Time of Great Sickness and Mortality” from the 1928 prayer book. After the rector reads the announcements and the soloist sings an anthem, the assistant rector reads the General Thanksgiving, Dismissal, and the Grace (from II Corinthians 13:14).

Beyond the missing congregation and Eucharist, perhaps the most noticeable change is to the music. Gone is the choir—with its volunteers and paid soloists—and with it the harmonies and occasional descants. Gone is the hearty singing of dozens of parishioners, who (in a previous visit) sat in the front half of the nave. Gone also is half the music. In a normal Eucharistic service, the congregation would sing three hymns, the psalm, and three pieces from the mass setting; the choir would sing anthems for

---

both offertory and communion. Instead, this week there are two hymns, the *Gloria* by Robert Powell, and one anthem.

Singing the anthem and leading the other pieces from the lectern is the choir’s most frequent Covid-era soloist. A local community-college instructor with a Juilliard doctorate, this is her sixth of thirteen online services this year, including Palm Sunday and Easter. As in every week’s live stream — and for most Sundays over the past forty-one months — the music was selected and performed by the church’s music director.

Perhaps the greatest continuity is on the organ prelude and postlude. For the liturgical year, the music director opens and closes with movements of the *L’ascension* by Olivier Messiaen. In honor of the Ascension, the service opens with “Hail the day that seems him rise.” It concludes with the more familiar “Alleluia! sing to Jesus!” In between, the soloist sings “God is ascended” by Kenneth Leighton (1929-1988).

During the postlude, nine slides include an announcement of next week’s organ concert by the music director, his second since the lockdown began. At the very end, three subtitles promote Monday’s carillon concert for Memorial Day, the Sunday School lesson on the StAlbans-Kids page on Facebook, and a link for online donations. In total, the service lasts just over three-quarters of an hour from the beginning of the opening hymn to the end of the closing hymn, or fifty-six minutes including the prelude and postlude.

During lockdown, Sunday attendance is based on online views rather than parishioners in pews. Through Lent and Holy Week, St. Alban’s led the three local parishes in the former category. On both its first Sunday and Easter Day, its Facebook stream recorded 1800 views, far beyond its 299 average Sunday attendance in 2019—and more than the 918 views for the other two Easter services in Waco.

St. Alban’s quickly stood out for its quick response to the crisis. When comparing five churches on Palm Sunday and eight on Easter, St. Alban’s was one of the best—and clearly the best with an average Sunday attendance under five hundred. To some, the switch from Eucharistic worship feels unnatural, despite the rector’s well-considered theological arguments. After watching years of English church music, performing for the camera also seems unnatural; but to be fair, little about worship this season feels natural.

Joel W. West St. Matthew’s, Newport Beach, California

---


In this authoritative and exhaustive study, Breaking White Supremacy: Martin Luther King Jr. and the Black Social Gospel Tradition, social ethicist and professor of religion Gary Dorrien traces the development of the black social gospel tradition from the mid-twentieth century through the legacy of Martin Luther King Jr., uncovering the diverse intellectual and theological traditions which contributed to the civil rights movement and black liberation theologians and politicians who uphold the vision of the beloved community. The book won the distinguished Grawemeyer Award in Religion, given annually to works that inspire and empower human beings to attain wholeness, individually and in community, and is a sequel to Dorrien’s earlier book, The New Abolition: W. E. B. DuBois and the Black Social Gospel (New Haven: Yale, 2015), which traces the black social gospel movement from the period after slavery, Reconstruction through W. E. B. DuBois’ impact during the Progressive Era.

In Breaking White Supremacy Dorrien posits the thesis that while the civil rights movement was perhaps the country’s greatest liberation movement, bringing important legislative victories and social change, it did not break white supremacy. King, as the martyred figurehead of the movement, continues to hold great moral significance today, yet his significance is not viewed from the perspective of the black social gospel from which he drew his inspiration, nor are other leaders in this movement widely recognized. Indeed, as many readers of this journal will recognize, narratives of the social gospel movement in the United States
most often refer to the legacies of two white clergymen, Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbush, and exclude the contributions of African Americans like Mordecai Johnson, Benjamin Mays, and Howard Thurman. “King stood in a tradition of black social gospel founders and mentors who heard the prophetic gospel in the black church, who appropriated social gospel liberalism, who engaged Gandhi as soon as the Gandhian revolution emerged in India, and who called America to stop betraying its vaunted ideals” (22).

Throughout the book Dorrien argues that King’s identification as primarily a “civil rights leader” ignores his roots in the black social gospel tradition. He also argues that King eventually became more radical than those who surrounded him through his opposition to the Vietnam War, his later regret that he could not speak about democratic socialism, and his commitment to economic equality. “King did not become the most hated man in America on a misunderstanding. His supposedly unthreatening meliorism obliterated more structural evil than all his critics combined. . . . To King the power of the civil rights movement was precisely to transform the power of black Americans into creative, interpersonal, organized power” (441).

Important to readers of this journal, Breaking White Supremacy includes a substantial section on the legacy and influence of Episcopal priest, attorney, author, and activist Pauli Murray. After years as a lawyer and academic, Murray experienced a spiritual awakening, influenced by feminist church activism, eventually culminating in her experiences as the first black woman ordained to the priesthood in 1977. (She was also the first black American to graduate from Yale Law School.) Dorrien unpacks Murray’s long career as a civil rights activist, as well as her ongoing struggles, not only with racism, but also with sexism and gender oppression; her intersectional experiences and vision put her at odds with single-issue politics. Repelled by the sexism she experienced in the civil rights movement, and having come to theological education later in life, Murray did not find inspiration in the black social gospel tradition until after King’s death, when she viewed the church as an agent of liberation and reconciliation.
The depth and richness of this book is difficult to capture in this brief review. This book is critical reading for scholars, clergy, students, and the wider church community interested in the evolution of black theologies and the history of the church’s role in regard to racism and white supremacy.

A book on related themes is Khyati Y. Joshi’s *White Christian Privilege: The Illusion of Religious Equality in America*, which traces the fusion of Christian privilege and white supremacy throughout American history. Joshi is a professor of education at Fairleigh Dickinson University, and has written widely on the intersections of religion, race, and ethnicity. She examines the role of Christianity before the founding of the republic, through slavery, westward expansion, immigration, and citizenship laws, concluding that Christian privilege and white supremacy have always been related in American history. “Indeed, throughout U.S. history, *Christian, English, free and White* have been superimposed to form mutually supportive advantages on the co-construction of religion, race and national origin” (2).

Joshi argues that three interrelated and mutually supportive structural phenomena ascribe privilege to some and inequality to others—Christian privilege, Christian normativity, and Christian hegemony. White Christian norms, she argues, are entrenched in laws, institutions, and civic culture, and work to the disadvantage of racial and religious minorities. Joshi concludes that American religious freedom, as espoused in the First and Fourteenth Amendments, is aspirational, rather than a reality.

In addition to the historical arguments and examples she shares throughout the first three chapters of the book, Joshi examines the impact of the intersection of Christian privilege and white supremacy in the second three chapters, which are oriented toward social justice approaches and making religious freedom and racial equality a reality for all. Joshi’s expertise in teaching for social justice in diverse contexts is evident in these later chapters which skillfully blend theory and praxis. In addition to conventional scholarly sources, she uses the voices of those most impacted by Christian privilege and white supremacy to illustrate the nuances of the problem, along with the challenges facing those who are privileged and invested in changing the paradigm. “It is about
fixing the American social structure of Christian privilege and replacing it with a nation where all feel included and live freely with all of our histories, ancestries, and beliefs respected. That will be our more perfect union” (225). This book is an important look at the intersection of race and religion in the United States. It is of interest to scholars of religious history, clergy, educators, students, as well as those committed to interreligious engagement.

Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook Claremont School of Theology Bloy House, Episcopal School of Theology at Los Angeles


Katherine Gerbner adds a valuable work to the growing historiography tracing human categories in the colonial project as specific and contingent historical and ideological developments, rather than as sui generis and timeless aspects of cultural interaction and perception. Theoretically, her contribution to this literature is the idea of “Protestant Supremacy,” which predates and underlies the white supremacy of later centuries, and which underlies as well the development of proslavery Christian theology and practice.

Gerbner argues that, while racial categorizations became primary by the eighteenth century (black/white), in the earlier era, the religious categorization was primary (Christian/heathen). In this she follows much previous historiography, but her contribution is to connect the transformation of the Christian-heathen dichotomy into the earliest building blocks of racial dichotomies with a focus on conversion, the theoretical boundary between the two. In the time frame and geographical area where she places her primary attention—the seventeenth-century Caribbean—she is able to trace the shifting instability of this process, where religious categorizations are connected, disconnected, and transformed through their interactions with slavery and freedom,
and the mapping of these categories in turn onto the racial categories of white and black. As Christian supremacy became white supremacy, proslavery theology became part and parcel of missionary work to convert the enslaved.

In particular, Gerbner offers much useful material by moving beyond English-language sources to include primary sources in Dutch, German, and Dutch Creole relating to the Moravians. She also gives close attention to the early Quakers, including George Fox’s visit to the islands. Here she is able to demonstrate that Moravians, Quakers, dissenters, and Anglicans overlapped, competed, and established practices of conversion and race in a shared plantation cauldron, and effectively served up the same soup despite differing understandings of baptism and conversion. She shows, as have other scholars, a new attention to “capacity” for baptism for adults which was alien to the Church of England, but was easily taken up by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) nonetheless. Among denominations for whom adult baptism was already a meaningful spiritual transition, she shows that there was a developing suspicion of baptism for purposes other than spiritual.

African catechumens in all Protestant denominations were particularly suspected of desiring literacy, the forbidden fruit which planters associated with rebellion. Africans, whether enslaved or free, who desired to be baptized, had to contend with questions about their intellectual or moral capacity for true Christianity and their motivations, which were considered suspect. Gerbner pays well-deserved attention to Elias Neau and his program in New York City in her chapter on the SPG. Here she is able to make an effective connection between literacy, teaching, and the fear of rebellion which supported the arguments of masters that religious education for enslaved people could only lead to social instability and violence, even beyond the Caribbean plantation economy. Thus even those who actively desired to convert the heathen became less willing, over time, to baptize. Gerbner’s careful interpretive restraint and intention to honor the religious/spiritual agency of Africans keeps her from reinscribing this suspicion of “genuine” conversion and Christian identity upon enslaved and free African converts.
For a scholar of Anglicanism, the book is valuable in that it supports and clarifies earlier scholarship on race and enslavement in the early colonial church, and provides more context, and ecumenical comparisons, regarding the development of proslavery theology in the SPG. For a scholar of mission, her work adds welcome basic material for the challenging task of interrogating conversion, race, and power.

Jennifer Snow Church Divinity School of the Pacific


The largest diocese in the Episcopal Church is the Diocese of Haiti, which accounts for nearly five percent of the entire church’s population. It is also one of the few dioceses of the Episcopal Church that has grown since 2008. The formation of this diocese is a legacy of the American Civil War, when middle-class African Americans held up Haiti, the West’s first independent black nation, as an inspiration and as a possible destination for emigration from the United States. Missionaries were at the forefront of this effort, with James Theodore Holly, who would become the first Episcopal bishop of Haiti, one of the leading voices championing African American emigration.

This is the world that Brandon R. Byrd’s deep and elegant book explores. Byrd fills a significant gap in scholarship by focusing on the relationship of Haiti and the U.S. during emancipation, Reconstruction, and the establishment of Jim Crow. Byrd demonstrates how in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Haiti became the centerpiece for a complex dialogue among black intellectuals about black freedom, self-determination, and internationalism. Haiti was “unique albeit imitable, exemplary but imperfect, symbolic although real” (5), and black intellectuals constructed multiple versions of Haiti that suited their political purposes. In these decades these multiple Haitis regularly came into conflict. Some saw Haiti as a valuable diplomatic ally for a United States in the process of expanding black political
participation, while others believed that annexing Haiti would benefit Haitians through the cultural and economic presence of middle-class African Americans. Some leaders, especially from the African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) and the Episcopal Church, believed that a missionary presence in Haiti would elevate the island’s culture; others believed Haiti and its legacy of black independence had more to teach the United States than the other way around.

One of the most powerful aspects of Byrd’s book is the way in which he demonstrates that U.S. political struggles and discussions were played out on Haitian terms. The retrenchment of white supremacy after Reconstruction resulted in political attacks from white Americans upon Haiti and its freedom. The American military increased its presence around Haiti, attempting to force a land sale for a U.S. naval base, while white writers like Spenser St. John portrayed Haiti as incompetent and childish. Much of the black press championed the Haitian resistance as a proxy for resistance in the U.S. Yet there were still multiple rhetorical Haitis. Some black intellectuals continued to adhere to the language of cultural uplift by championing industrial education in the U.S. for Haitians and the economic development of Haiti; others renewed the call for annexation. The beginning of the U.S. occupation in 1915 brought all of this ambivalence to a head. Byrd demonstrates how the violence of the occupation, and the vigorous Haitian resistance, made it obvious that the government’s actions did not have good intentions. Former proponents of intervention such as W. E. B. Du Bois changed course and condemned the occupation. The result was a black internationalist movement that opposed white imperialism and colonialism wherever it appeared—with Haiti at the center.

Byrd’s work is elegantly researched and written. He harvests political dialogue from the pages of Christian missionary magazines and black newspapers from across the United States, and convincingly shows how complicated and ambivalent the African American conversation about Haiti was. Although religious belief and practice are only a small part of the discussion, Byrd’s book contributes to a large literature on missionary activity and its relationship to imperialism and colonialism. The book rarely
incorporates Haitian voices, preferring to keep the emphasis squarely on American views and uses of Haiti. While this reader was often left wondering what the Haitian reaction to American paternalism was, Byrd’s argument is nevertheless striking and sound. His book reminds readers that American identity has always been bound up, for better or worse, with the fate of its neighbors.

Kevin M. Lowe
State College, Pennsylvania


The publication of Huston Horn’s biography of “Warrior Bishop” Leonidas Polk comes at a particularly important time, when American churches and other institutions are at last beginning to address the legacy of slavery in their corporate histories. Beginning at its 75th General Convention in June 2006, for example, the Episcopal Church officially committed itself to a process of inquiry and repentance regarding Episcopalians’ past complicity in the maintenance of slavery and the transatlantic slave trade. As part of this church-wide endeavor, the University of the South also inaugurated its own “Sewanee Project on Slavery, Race, and Reconciliation” in 2017. As the organizers of the Sewanee Project emphasize, the affluent white southerners who founded the university not only acquired their wealth by exploiting the labor of thousands of enslaved African Americans, but also believed that preserving the slave system was a sacred duty bestowed upon them by God. Although the University of the South once sought to downplay the distasteful facts surrounding its genesis, the Sewanee Project is now dedicated to illuminating the ways in which slavery and racism were fundamental to the founders’ original design.

Against this backdrop of historical truth-telling Huston Horn presents the career of Leonidas Polk, Sewanee’s principal founder and a clergyman who more than any of his contemporaries epitomized the antebellum southern church’s unswerving embrace of slavery. A larger-than-life figure, rightly characterized
by Horn as “an anomalous man of the cloth” (vii), Polk’s activities ranged widely over the course of his lifetime. Besides his role at Sewanee he exercised leadership as a plantation owner and major slaveholder; as the Episcopal Church’s missionary bishop of the Southwest and, later, first bishop of the diocese of Louisiana; as a key architect of the short-lived Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America; as a friend and advisor of Confederate President Jefferson Davis; and finally, as a high-ranking general in the Confederate army, felled by Union cannon fire in June 1864. As Horn demonstrates, moreover, in all his endeavors Polk was a man of his times and thoroughly representative of the slaveholding class, cruelly flogging those whom he enslaved or selling them away whenever it suited his needs. Although he thought whites would be better off without the so-called “‘dirty, careless, thriftless’” (58) African Americans they held in bondage, he also urged his slaveholding colleagues to guard their substantial economic investment in slave property by pressing for secession following Abraham Lincoln’s election in 1860. Arguably most troubling of all, Polk held command over Nathan Bedford Forrest’s forces during the Confederate attack on Fort Pillow in April 1864, when several hundred black Union soldiers were massacred while attempting to surrender to southern troops—an event, now considered a war crime, that Polk labelled a “brilliant campaign” (390).

Like his subject Horn is also a man of diverse talents, having pursued a journalistic vocation (including coverage of Muhammad Ali for *Sports Illustrated* in the 1960s) prior to entering the ordained ministry of the Episcopal Church. Throughout this book, in fact, Horn’s lively, almost chatty writing style gives ample testimony to the skills he learned as a journalist at Time-Life. Although Polk is far better known today as an army general than as a church leader, Horn has plumbed all the primary sources, and the resulting narrative, over four hundred pages in length, delves into every aspect of Polk’s life. While readers of *Anglican and Episcopal History* may wish simply to skim the second half of this book, which focuses mainly on Polk’s controversial career as a military strategist, they will genuinely appreciate the author’s
diligence in reporting fully on the ideas and actions of this most unconventional Episcopal bishop.

Nevertheless, Horn’s biography still lacks one very essential element: a recognition of the tremendous historiographical changes that have occurred in recent years in the study of the antebellum and Civil War periods. The author is an effective narrator of Polk’s life story, at least insofar as the “Warrior Bishop” and his posthumous defenders chose to present it, but he fails to engage twenty-first century historical scholarship on such critical matters as race and the economics of slavery in the Old South, the meaning and memory of the Civil War for African Americans, and the development of the postwar Lost Cause myth in which Polk figured so prominently. Although Horn cannot be faulted for missing the latest developments regarding his subject’s legacy at Sewanee, he certainly could have offered some commentary on the decade-long efforts of his denomination to scrutinize its role in the slaveholding ethos that Polk proudly championed. Despite Horn’s estimable research and writing, an informed critique of the social and cultural context in which Polk lived is missing from this book, and thus a valuable opportunity both to learn from this history and to aid the church’s process of repentance and racial reconciliation has sadly been squandered.

Gardiner H. Shattuck Jr.
Warwick, Rhode Island

_A Fiery Gospel: The Battle Hymn of the Republic and the Road to Righteous War._


“The Battle Hymn of the Republic” has been part of America’s musical heritage since its creation in 1862, yet few Americans know much about the woman who wrote the lyrics or the history and original meaning behind them. Richard M. Gamble’s book provides an understanding of Julia Ward Howe, the life she led, the ideals she held dear, and the circumstances in which she wrote the text which brought her fame. Gamble also demonstrates how Americans have used this hymn “to understand their nation’s meaning, to define their enemies, to justify their wars,
and to reaffirm God’s special plan for the United States in world history” (4). It has been used as a rallying cry in every war since the Civil War, including the Cold War (193). The Voice of America began broadcasting into the Soviet Union in 1947; the first broadcast opened and closed with the hymn (194).

Gamble discusses civil religion, religious nationalism, and Howe’s contribution to both. This includes discussion of other countries that adopted the hymn as their own. It also includes examples of how “The Battle Hymn of the Republic” and its violent imagery created problems for the author: “Howe, her family, and many others used the ‘Battle Hymn’ to extol wars of liberation as selfless . . . acts of sacrifice for the good of humanity” (92). However, her denouncement of the bloodshed of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870 led to charges of hypocrisy. “How could the poet who had so recently roused Union forces for a relentless bloody war now call for peace” (92)?

Gamble offers many examples of the hymn’s use in popular culture. Elvis Presley sang and recorded it during a laser light show depicting Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Jefferson Davis in Stone Mountain, Georgia (244). Both Ernest Andrew Ewart and John Steinbeck used the second line of the text as the title of their novels, Grapes of Wrath (New York: Viking Press, 1939) (177). Billy Graham used the hymn in every radio and television broadcast, every film, and every revival (196). Anita Bryant sang it on stage and television and for the troops in Vietnam; she also recorded it and used its first line as the title of her autobiography (199). She also used it during her campaign against gay rights (201). The Detroit journalist Brian McNaught fought back in print, using “The Battle Hymn” in his argument (202).

Perhaps the greatest value in this work is Gamble’s explanation of how “The Battle Hymn” has “served as conduit between church and state” (247). He continues, “The story of the maker of the “Battle Hymn,” its making, and its remaking shows the complex ways in which religious nationalism finds its voice and longevity over the generations, at times even consuming itself as raw material for a new version of the old-time civil religion” (248). He states that Howe’s text was intended to assist in the
creation of religious nationalism in America (243). However, he states that “The Battle Hymn,” “has endured as part of the nation’s ‘monumental’ history only on the condition that the particularities of its history remain veiled by sacred vestments” (244). His discussion of how the meaning of the hymn has changed through the years is fascinating. His view that “nationalist remembering requires a good deal of forgetting . . . and ‘historical error’ [or] amnesia” is well-documented (244). This book is extremely detailed and very well-written, and the material is interesting on many levels. It will be a valuable resource to historians, church scholars, musicians, and anyone who has ever sung “The Battle Hymn of the Republic.”

Nancy Saultz Radloff

Interlaken, New York


Baylor scholar Thomas S. Kidd has been impressively prolific lately, with work appearing on a variety of scholarly presses and popular outlets. His newest book is America’s Religious History, a brisk yet comprehensive overview of (one) religion’s role in the history of the United States, from early colonization to the rise of Donald Trump. Kidd introduces the book with a startling anecdote—the massacre by Revolutionary soldiers of a Moravian mission station among the Delaware Indians—followed by a litany of violence carried out among religious congregations up to the present day. This stark and surprising introduction sets the stage for a narrative in which Christian growth and change occur not in a straight line but in a constant state of tension between diversity and violence, “vitality and conflict” (30).

The first half of the book demonstrates clearly this perspective. Colonization created an extraordinarily diverse array of religious practices, some of which had originated in European communities of dissent. American Christianity was in some sense oppositional from the very beginning. Colonial settlement and denominational growth led almost immediately to anxiety over
the spiritual vitality of those church communities. Evangelical revivalism in the colonial period fueled the fires of more enthusiasm but also generated more controversy and conflict. One wave of revival bled into the next. Major conflicts like the American Revolution were understood in religious ways; the fight over slavery rested, for Kidd, on devoted Christians reading and interpreting the Bible in fundamentally different ways. Abolitionism would divide many American denominations, yet at the same time it led to the development of vital black church traditions. Vitality and conflict as two sides of the same coin could be seen also in the twentieth-century squabbles over fundamentalism, modernism, evolution, and biblical criticism.

The deeper narrative of the book is the growth of American evangelicalism. “At least since the Second Great Awakening,” Kidd writes, “evangelical Protestants had tended to see themselves as stewards of American society” (245). Over time that sense of stewardship became more strident, and especially in the twentieth century it became strongly entangled with politics. In the second half of the book, Kidd’s discussions of the world wars, the Cold War, and the civil rights movement show the growth of American civil religion and the degree to which that understanding of American patriotism came to look much more like evangelicalism. The final chapters then provide a strong summary of the codependent relationship between evangelicalism and the Republican party.

Any historian attempting to chronicle the full scope of American religion in a single volume is forced to make difficult choices. Kidd focuses in this book almost exclusively on Christianity. Other religions make cursory appearances (and often when they do Kidd’s interest is more in Christian evangelism toward non-Christians than in the details of those religions themselves), but Christianity is decisively Kidd’s narrative lens and driving force. Kidd is graciously open about this decision, but this reader is left thinking that the title America’s Christian History would have been far more appropriate.

Because of its wide scope and lack of footnotes, Kidd’s book is obviously not aimed at scholars. But Zondervan’s reach into American churches and classrooms should give the book a wide
(although probably mostly evangelical) public audience, and its readers will benefit from Kidd’s elegant distillation of a vast amount of historical material. There is some lightly slanted language that may dismay some readers; he states, for instance, that at the end of the Clinton impeachment trial the Senate “failed to remove him” rather than acquitted him (281), and refers to Bishop Gene Robinson as a “practicing homosexual” (290). Nevertheless the scholarship is sound, and the bibliographies Kidd provides at the end of each chapter will point readers to more in-depth sources. There is little material here specifically relating to Anglicans, and anyone interested in the diversity of American religion beyond Christianity will be disappointed, but as an introduction to the major conflicts of American Christianity, Kidd’s volume is accessible and attractive.

Kevin M. Lowe
State College, Pennsylvania


In the modern practice of history, the writing of biography is considered passé. Narrative is out, and analysis is in. Fortunately, Barbara L. Bellows, a retired professor of history from Middlebury College who has written a number of books on the history of Charleston, South Carolina, apparently did not get that memo. What we have as a result is not the story of a “great man”—or woman—but rather portraits of two native Charlestonians who lived completely separate lives, except for a brief moment when they met on a Civil War battlefield. In one book Bellows has provided a complete biography of both Thomas Pinckney (1828-1915), grandson of a South Carolina governor who was born into a wealthy rice planter family before joining the Confederate cause; and Joseph Humphries Barquet (1823-1880), a free black who fought for the Union before embarking on a political career in the North. This book is not Bellow’s first look into the Pinckney family; her book A Talent for Living: Josephine
Pinckney and the Charleston Literary Tradition (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University) was published in 2006 (Josephine was Thomas Pinckney’s daughter).

Since this book provides full-scale biographies of two individuals, it is organized differently than standard single biographies. Bellows follows a chronological format, addressing her subjects side-by-side, chapter-by-chapter. In other words, a chapter on Barquet is typically followed by one on Pinckney. Significant about Captain Pinckney is that he was captured and held prisoner at Morris Island. He was under pressure to renounce his rebel status and swear allegiance to the United States, but he was one of those so-called Immortal Six Hundred who refused. After the war, he returned to rice farming but could never make a consistent living under a free labor system and eventually left the family business. As for Barquet, by the 1840s South Carolina was becoming hostile even for a free black of mixed-race parentage, so he moved out west, and then north, to Illinois. In February 1865, during the final weeks of the Civil War, he returned to the now-devastated Charleston as a conqueror for his country. Returning to his Illinois home, he tried to become politically active as a Republican, but soon realized that even in the land of Lincoln, white supremacy remained a potent force. Moving to Iowa, he died nearly penniless and is buried in an unmarked grave.

This book’s most significant accomplishment can be found in its originality: this is the first complete biography of one of the troops of the Massachusetts 54th African American Regiment. A number of biographies have already appeared regarding the regiment’s white commander, Colonel Robert Gould Shaw, whose fame would have been negligible if not for the courage of his troops. In that light, the best chapter in the book may well be “Against Wind and Time,” which addresses the Civil War experience of Barquet. Bellows pieces together the battles in which he fought, including the failed attempt to take Fort Wagner. Although almost completely insignificant in terms of the outcome of the war, that battle was the climactic scene of the outstanding movie Glory, whose influence in spurring interest in the study of black Union soldiers continues. Barquet was one of the survivors of that battle, which devastated the 54th. Indeed, his promotion to sergeant was due in large part to the fact that this battle
knocked all of the sergeants out of action. A master storyteller, Bellows brings out the human side of this battle: the reader can almost envision Barquet in battle, terrorized as his middle-aged lungs struggled to work in the stifling humidity.

Although this book was published as an academic text by a university press, Bellow’s energetic prose makes this entertaining enough for lay audiences as well. But be warned—this is not an inspirational feel-good book. Rather, much sadness pervades the last half of the book, as the later lives of both men were filled with pain and disappointment, and not—shall we say—with glory.

Glen Bowman

Elizabeth City State University

_The American South and the Great War 1914-1924_. Edited by Matthew L. Downs and M. Ryan Floyd. (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 2018, Pp. vi, 248. $47.00, cloth.)

American involvement in what was once called the Great War, but now is more often known as World War I, was brief, scarcely a year and a half in duration, but its impact was significant. Military casualties, for example, were greater than those of the Korean and Vietnam wars combined. And on the home front, the effort to arm, train, dispatch, and maintain an army of half a million involved significant reshaping of the economy. That reshaping of the economy, in turn, involved a range of issues from the price of cotton to the lives of farmers and industrial workers. It challenged racial patterns in the South and sent a wave of black workers to challenge racial patterns in the North. A number of these consequences of the war are analyzed by various scholars in the various essays that comprise this useful book. At the heart of the matter, of course, is the fact that the Southern states had developed along separate lines than the rest of the country because of its “peculiar institution,” and that that separateness could not continue.

The Civil War settled that matter, and though the South struggled mightily to resist the consequences, it was doomed to fail. World Wars I and II simply hastened, in various ways, the inevitable. A study of the changes forced on the South by World War I illustrates the various ways in which the inevitable manifested itself and was resisted. Of the greatest interest, undoubtedly, are the ways
in which racial patterns were impacted. With armies of young men being drawn out of the labor force and into the armed services, for example, workers were needed for the cotton mills and Congress made life more difficult by passing a law restricting child labor. But not only did workers need to be replaced, more workers were needed. Production had to be increased and, since mill owners were more interested in their profits than the color of their workers, black women needed to be hired. After the war, as the need for cotton goods declined and owners attempted to reduce wages and workers, workers joined unions and went on strike.

South Carolina sent more black soldiers into the army than white and these young black men came home with new ideas. The need for workers had also drawn black workers north to Detroit and Chicago where new tensions were stirred and race riots broke out. All this, in turn, gave the newly organized NAACP issues with which to engage and impetus to recruit new members, especially in the South. Not to be overlooked is the impact on the place of women in an area where women had “not readily embraced movements such as suffrage (which) were considered somewhat radical” (128-29). Young women in colleges throughout the South, however, eagerly involved themselves in the war effort and the increased opportunities and new ideas that came with it in a number of ways. A state legislator, for example, who suggested that women did not really want the vote was burned in effigy at the State Normal College in North Carolina (130). Although the interplay of cause and effect in all this makes it hard to separate out the various issues, the essays in this book do manage to look closely at particular aspects of the changing South while building a useful mosaic picture of the whole.

Christopher Webber
San Francisco, California

Interpreting Religion at Museums and Historic Sites. By Gretchen Buggeln and Barbara Franco. (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018, Pp. xvi, 223. $45.00, paper.)

The intended principal audience for this volume is the public historian and the museum professional. The book addresses what
has been a source of anxiety and concern for that audience for many years: how to interpret a religious site (or a site with substantial religious overtones or content) for a general audience. It is quite clearly a far different task to welcome the faithful to a church building or shrine and show them around than it is to design a museum exhibition that targets the public with information about a religion and its practice. At the public site, without the assurance of at least a common vocabulary and with an audience that may range from fervent believers to antagonistic disbelievers, the risk that even the mention of religion can take the subject far from what was intended and into unresolvable controversy is always present.

This book, a publication of the American Association for State and Local History (AASLH), attempts, through case studies of successful exhibitions, to suggest ways to approach the interpretation of religious topics for a general audience. The examples of such interpretation, each represented by a short essay, are comprehensive, ranging from an historic site sacred to Mormons, to an historic synagogue, to Colonial Williamsburg, to the Delaware Historical Society. Each chapter includes a succinct statement of the problem the curator or designer was trying to address in their interpretation.

Problems addressed run a gamut from interpretation of religions that are no longer active (e.g. Shakers) to those which have reservations about being interpreted at all (the Abbe Museum, where interpretation of the religion of the Wabanaki Nation encountered resentment and resistance based on claims of cultural appropriation and disclosure of religious secrets). Issues are often encountered when governmental sites have religious content (e.g. the United States Capitol building). Likewise, interpretation of a religion or of religious content can be problematic for governmental and quasi-governmental facilities like museums and historical restorations, such as Mount Vernon.

Less earth-shattering but no less real issues discussed range from what is an evidently-frequent assumption on the part of visitors that a costumed docent is actually a follower of and spokesperson for the religion being interpreted, to confusion in the public mind about specific faiths (e.g. confusion between
Christian Science and Scientology). In the case of active religions, there is the necessity of drawing a fine line between dispassionate discussion of the tenets of a particular faith in the context of the exhibition and proselytizing for that faith—or appearing to do so. The authors acknowledge that working with a religious group or faith community on interpretation of their faith requires a real effort on the part of those on the museum side to bridge the gap with representatives of the faith group who may be unfamiliar with museum practices and the kinds of problems identified in this volume. A set of five essays by the authors summarize, generalize, and point a way forward for those charged with interpretation of religion in the public sphere. One minor quibble: Why the U.S. Capitol is included in the chapter on religious sites instead of the one on historic sites escapes this reviewer. The book would certainly be of use to anyone preparing a religious site for public consumption, whether a museum professional or a representative of the religious faith represented.

Geoffrey Brown Salisbury, Connecticut


On his first page, Kerry Mitchell introduces the basic question of this thought-provoking book with an anecdote. One night, a fellow camper gestured toward the surrounding desert and announced, “This is my church.” It is a common sentiment, and yet a puzzling one. As Mitchell asks, “with no visible texts, rituals, doctrines, or structures, how was one to approach this church? How could one understand this kind of religion?”

What follows is a disciplined exploration of “nature religion” using National Parks as a kind of case study. After a chapter on the history of the National Park idea and management practices, he devotes a chapter each to the John Muir Trail, Yosemite National Park, and the Muir Woods National Monument. These chapters follow a generally common format: he describes the natural area itself and interviews visitors about their spiritual
experiences there. Mitchell’s surveys show that not everyone who hikes on a trail or visits a park claims to have a spiritual experience. But many do, and some common features emerge. As reported by Mitchell, spiritual experiences tended to be quite personal and individualized, on one hand, and to point in a more universal direction on the other. Absent was the mediation of any recognizable community or tradition. This was true even of hikers on the John Muir Trail, who typically placed high value on the community of hikers, and yet denied that this community enhanced their explicitly spiritual experience.

A recurring theme throughout the book is this paradox. Visitors typically value “nature” as “necessarily wild and outside the control of human.” But in National Parks, the nature they experience requires significant “human care and management for its integrity” (7). That care takes different forms. In a wilderness area, it means protecting nature from visible encroachments of civilization. In popular parks, it means harmonizing nature and culture in unobtrusive ways. But always the care is necessary and relies on state authority and power for its effectiveness. The nature that so many park visitors value is socially-constructed and maintained.

This social construction of nature, this ongoing work of maintenance, is largely invisible, and perhaps necessarily so given the importance placed by many on “wild nature.” Still, the fact remains that the National Park Service provides the conditions for visitors to have a spiritual experience of nature. In the process, this exercise of state authority comes to appear as itself “natural.” Mitchell summarizes his argument thus: “In national parks, the state is naturalized, nature becomes a state organ, and spirituality becomes a public religion” (8). This is a clever and persuasive argument.

Having made that case in the body of the book, Mitchell turns in his last chapter to a broader theory of religious individualism and secularity. He draws on John Wilson’s discussion of “public religion,” a kind of “meta-religion . . . that can be said to float among a myriad of institutions and practices” (170). The individualist spirituality described in his book clearly does that. And, because it is consciously constructed, or at least enabled, by the state, it is public as well. Mitchell adds that, because the exercise of state
authority is rendered largely invisible, it is a distinctively liberal form of public religion. Mitchell emphasizes this presentation of a liberal public religion as one of the contributions of his project (192).

In his conclusion, Mitchell sketches some of the implications of his research for how we understand secularity in general. The National Park Service is clearly a benign example of how a secular state exercises power to manage spiritual experiences and the subjectivity of park visitors. But, Mitchell insists, his research demonstrates just how far the secular state reaches in its exercise of power, even, perhaps especially, when that power is least visible. Some of Mitchell’s more theoretical points are difficult to follow. But readers have reason to be grateful for his presentation of nature spirituality and his unmasking of some of the paradoxes that underlie it.

Harvey Hill
Saint David’s Episcopal Church, Agawam, Massachusetts


It might seem strange to group these three texts together, and yet they are certainly connected and related. All three take a fresh look at the influence of notable women on our history and our common life, particularly in America. Interestingly the title of Vetter’s book could almost be the subtitle to Abrams book. Although the Founding Mothers are not widely referred to as feminists (nor would they have self-identified as such), if the question is about the betterment of all by valuing the roles of women and girls, then they certainly were feminists. Together these texts remind us that even if their voices were not a part of the dominant story, women have been thinking about, writing about, and
working to address the profound challenges of the human experience for centuries. All of the women whose lives and works are chronicled in these texts, as well as the scholars who bring their stories and lives to light, remind us that history is far richer and more complicated than many of our high school textbooks or contemporary political narratives might have us believe.

Hernandez’s book offers a theological response to the “atrocity paradigm,” a belief that desires to focus the reality of evil firmly in the human realm (as though God has nothing to do with it), so as to be able to hold humanity responsible for the realities of systemic evil in the world. Hernandez offers an important reminder that the conversation is not complete if it does not include the voices and experiences of women. We cannot talk about evil only in the theoretical and ignore half the population of the world. Hernandez begins by engaging with the atrocity paradigm and G. W. Leibniz’s seminal text *Theodicy* (Amsterdam, 1710). Ultimately, she finds Leibniz’s text insufficient in addressing the atrocity paradigm. Instead she offers a series of female scholars from the early modern period who take the realities of atrocity seriously as they address evil. These women are notable for shifting the conversation from examining evil as a purely theoretical, logical problem to one that is grounded in lived experience. These women scholars are: Mary Hays, Catharine Macaulay, Margaret Cavendish, Mary Astell, and Mary Wollstonecraft. These women are faithful believers who strive to reckon the existence of a perfect, loving Creator God with the reality of their lived experience of evil. They collectively offer an affirmation that “the moral process that is put into place to ensure freely chosen moral action also creates the conditions under which atrocity takes root” (97). Like the feminist and liberation scholars who would come after them, these women affirm God’s presence with and care for those who experience oppression, while also asserting the important and inspiring truth that humanity can do much to combat the reality of systemic evil in the world.

Abrams’s text is much more historical than philosophical, although it continues the theme of lifting up women’s voices and experiences. Given the dominance of male voices and male experiences in the commonly known history of America’s founding,
it could be easy to overlook the role of women. In her carefully researched text that draws frequently on their own words and correspondence, Abram’s text illuminates how vital and instrumental Martha Washington, Abigail Adams, and Dolley Madison were in shaping our government and our traditions. These women were not just hostesses who organized social gatherings or modeled ideals for women as mothers and wives. These First Ladies (as they were later known) were intelligent, strong women who exerted considerable influence on the issues and policies of the day. In fact, “they were often able to diffuse some of the significant polarization between opposing parties” (259). Abrams does a masterful job of weaving together the stories of each woman’s life while also providing significant detail about how they lived out their time as First Lady and the legacies they left behind. Abrams also provides valuable historical context, so her readers can understand how significant their actions were as First Ladies, even though they might not be what a twenty-first century woman would do. Ultimately, Abrams credits the three First Ladies with helping to “create a viable republic” and “laying the foundations for a democracy” (260). These are strong and well-deserved statements for these remarkable and distinct women. The details of their lives and work deserve to be more widely known. Abrams’s text is an engaging and insightful way to share this knowledge with the world.

It would be nice to think that women would have had far more rights and formal political roles within the lifetime of Madison or Adams, but, of course, it was centuries before that dream was realized. That fact makes it all the more important to chronicle the ongoing work through the centuries to advocate for women’s rights. Vetter brings to life female voices that expand the canon of influential political literature. Her work reminds us that Tocqueville, Smith, and Bentham are not the only influential voices of the era, even though their texts and views have dominated previous studies and our wider civil discourse. Vetter’s text brings together seven distinct and notable women scholars whose work enriches our historical understanding and our contemporary conversations. These are: Frances Wright, Harriet Martineau, Angelina Grimké, Sarah Grimké, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady...
Stanton, and Sojourner Truth. Vetter offers some basic biographical information and historical context for each writer, and then delves into engaging with each text. Collectively this book brings to the fore voices and perspectives that enrich our understanding of our own political history as a nation and invite us into a different future. As Vetter notes, the scholars she examines practice “intersectionality” (215) long before that concept is widely used or understood. Vetter’s work offers a profound and important reminder that historically the political conversation has been much wider and richer than news headlines or soundbytes would have us believe. The invitation from Vetter and from the inspiring writes she engages is to continue to expand our collective discourse so that it more accurately represents the diversity of our society.

In varied and diverse ways, these three books bring to life the voices and experiences of women in our relatively recent history. In so doing, they invite us to examine our assumptions and what we thought we knew about God, ideas, knowledge, ourselves, and our own history. Each book invites us to a place of curiosity, to an awareness that there is so much more for us to learn about our past. As with all good historical studies, these books invite us to reflect in significant ways on how the past and our previously limited understanding of it have shaped our present reality. That, in turn, prompts the question of how we will live into the future. In bringing more voices into the conversation, these books offer a model of hope and possibility.

Molly James
The General Convention Office

_Southern Religion, Southern Culture: Essays Honoring Charles Reagan Wilson._
Edited by Darren E. Grem, Ted Ownby, and James Thomas Jr. (Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 2019, Pp. xix, 141. $70.00.)

This volume honors Charles Reagan Wilson, an eminently creative historian of religion in the American South. Wilson’s work is distinguished by a wide-ranging effort to grapple with a region whose only religion was and is often caricatured as a narrow, stultifying
fundamentalist Christianity, so awful as not to deserve much attention. Wilson has disputed this by showing readers southern religion through lenses anthropological and sociological that expose a fascinating and dynamic religious landscape, one that extends far beyond the walls of the churches. Wilson’s southern religion includes the cult of Elvis, church fans as material religion, the veneration of the Lost Cause, aspects of SEC football, and much more.

Long a historian at the University of Mississippi and the director of the Center for the Study of Southern Culture in Oxford, Wilson trained a generation of scholars to follow in his footsteps, furthering his diverse and expansive story of southern religion. The essays in this book explore southern religion as paradox, replete with “freedom and censure, inspiration and oppression, continuity and change, laughter and heartbreak” (xvi). The essays deal with the politics of religion in antebellum Arkansas, higher education in the Christian Methodist Episcopal (CME) denomination, Pentecostalism and the use of media, and, of course, football. The best essays in the collection are by Paul Harvey and Ted Ownby. Harvey’s essay credits Wilson with weaving “music, literature, art, and all forms of culture into a broad, sympathetic, empathetic, but not uncritical understanding of southern history” (4). The topical essays show how Wilson’s vision is playing out among younger scholars, as they take similar approaches in method and evidence.

Ownby puts Wilson forward as an originator of the study of historical memory, in his dissertation turned monograph Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980). He also integrates Wilson’s work with the larger themes of southern history, finding C. Vann Woodward in Wilson’s treatment of Bear Bryant, Samuel S. Hill in his exploration of Elvis, and H. L. Mencken in his exposition of religious creativity in the South (125). Ownby also points to the ultimate significance of Wilson’s omnivorous taste in methods and evidence; it has broadened the conceptualization of the scholarly field and even the region itself. Because of Wilson’s work, “South” and “Southern culture” cannot belong to “only white people, or wealthy white people, white landowning people, famous people, or people with deep roots in the region” (126). Wilson, his students, and his colleagues have reframed a region,
its faith traditions, and its broader culture in a manner that is edifying beyond the world of scholarship.

Specialists in the field will find some of the topical essays in this volume useful as they teach and undertake further research. More general readers of American or religious history will benefit from the introductory and concluding essays, which could lead them into Wilson’s own books and articles, a body of scholarship worthy of the celebration this book intends, featuring methods that can tell the story of religion better in almost any region or tradition.

Nicholas M. Beasley
Columbia, South Carolina

The Religious Left in Modern America: Doorkeepers of a Radical Faith. Edited by Leilah Danielson, Marian Mollin, and Doug Rossinow. (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, Pp. xv, 303. €103.00.)

Most historians of the American left have neglected the role played by religion. Focusing inordinately on the religious right, scholars have ignored how the social gospel has remained active since the days of Walter Rauschenbusch. The three editors of this volume seek to remedy this gap, drawing upon the discoveries of thirteen scholars to show that religion has played a vital role in modern reform. Some articles deal with broad movements. In examining the Gilded Age, Janine Giordano Drake describes how farmer-labor movements espoused a working-class Christianity that challenged the cultural authority of middle-class clergy. Christopher Evans finds the fixation on Reinhold Niebuhr undeservedly overshadowing the post-World War I social gospel as manifested by the YMCA. Angela D. Dillard questions the juxtaposition of a religiously oriented civil rights movement in the South in contrast to a secular Black Power movement in the North. Felipe Hinoehosa offers a case study of how the Catholic Interracial Council of Davenport, Iowa, protected the civil rights of Mexican Americans. Lilian Calles Barger sees standard histories of women’s liberation neglecting such feminist theologians as Mary Daly and Rosemary Reuther. David R. Swartz discusses the role played by missionary E. Stanley Jones, Bob Pierce’s World Vision, and today’s non-Western
migrants to the U.S. in advancing social reform within the evangelical tradition.

Other essays focus on individual Protestant figures. Leilah Danielson shows the ways in which pacifist leader A. J. Muste served as forerunner of the 1960s New Left movement. Douglas E. Thompson indicates how Martin Luther King Jr.’s ultimate vision remained grounded in a conception of a Christian America, albeit one vastly different from that of today’s Christian conservatives. Sarah Azaransky examines how three African American personages—Howard Thurman, Pauli Murray, and Bayard Rustin—drew upon the Third World for inspiration.

Still other pieces cover Roman Catholic and Jewish reformers. William Rademacher reveals why Roman Catholic reformer Dorothy Day rejected the welfare state, substituting a society based upon a decentralized community. Marian Mollin focuses on Ita Ford, a Maryknoll sister murdered in El Salvador in 1980 for organizing rural communities. David Verbeeten traces the career of Alexander Bittelman, whose political saga began with the radical Jewish Labor Bund in the Ukraine and ended with expulsion from the Communist Party in the 1960s. Doug Rossinow focuses the role the nation-state of Israel played in efforts of activist Arthur Waskow to create a Jewish left. All articles are clearly written and break new ground. Most are steeped in primary sources. This volume is one good place for historians of the religious left to begin.

Justus D. Doenecke
New College of Florida


Asian Christianity is considered a third Christian Millennium and characterized by various complexities, including the challenge to maintain a connection between old and new cultures. East Asia is a mosaic of many cultures, languages, beliefs, traditions, and responds reflectively to social, political, religious, cultural, and economic challenges. East Asian Christianity faces an ever increasing need to reach out to young millennials who thirst
for a deeper way to express their spiritual values. These movements have many of the elements of other new religious movements and are described in this book as "Being Asian." Phan lays out a map of East Asian Christianities in a deep and comprehensive presentation in an easy to understand format.

The book presents sixteen essays by the author and is divided into three parts. Part one presents the history of the East Asian religions and focuses on North and South Asian Catholicism, and the impact of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Part two addresses theology and the concept of “Christianities” or the idea that Asian countries do not fit the Western definition of “Christian.” The issues of migration and interreligious dialogue are addressed in detail since they are the challenges the millennials must tackle regardless of their religious preferences. Part three focuses on Christian practice and on the current and urgent issues of social spirituality, the practice of popular devotion and the ethics of migration, and ecological responsibility.

It is this section that provides the key to the holistic perspective of the book. Phan offers new eyes to interpret the "East Asian Christian social spirituality into social teaching in the situation of Asia" (231). The impact of globalization in Asia and the utilization of practical teachings, such as Pope Francis’ conception of *Laudato Si*, are extended to the Buddhist and Daoist perspectives on “universal harmony” (298). Contextual approaches to interreligious dialogue are addressed and offer thoughtful discussion regarding the interplay between Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, as well as the numerous other religions in East Asia.

Even though this book is not as detailed as Phan’s *Christianities in Asia* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), the author maintains Asian Christianities as vibrant and contemporary religion. In this book Phan offers an Asian pneumatology as "complementary and illuminating for interreligious dialogue" (196). Additional context is added by discussion of the intersection between Christianity and specific social groups, such as "race (black), ethnicity (Chinese, Indian, Latino, etc.), gender (white, womanist, mujerista, etc.), class (Dalit), tribe (American Indian, tribal peoples in Northeast India), geography (continents and countries), culture, and religions" (113). These perspectives
bring valuable considerations for all kinds of readers. This book is an excellent read. The book integrates East Asian Christianities into the progression of Asian theologies and practical applications. This a significant study and every scholar, student and pastor should have it on their bookshelf.

Angela W Tankersley  Claremont School of Theology


In Surviving Slavery in the British Caribbean, Randy Browne seeks to reframe the central questions asked as scholars study slave societies. As the title indicates, Browne emphasizes survival as he examines the lives of enslaved persons in the colony of Berbice. He offers a compelling case, demonstrating that historians, while preoccupied with the quest for freedom, have neglected a fundamental and universal aspect of life for the enslaved—the quotidian struggle for existence in brutal circumstances.

Browne opens the first chapter with a compelling vignette, the arrival of a slave ship at New Amsterdam in the spring of 1806. Moving to the general colonial context, Browne situates Berbice among the other slave societies in the West Indies and South America. Notably, having been under Dutch control, English Berbice retained a mechanism for slaves to file complaints, and Browne utilizes this record to gain access to the perspectives of the enslaved. While it is an especially rich body of source material, Browne does acknowledge its limitations.

The second chapter is as sobering as it is excellent. Browne discusses early nineteenth-century attempts to ameliorate the brutality of slavery, and to do so he describes the particular practices that prompted the reaction. With an impressive degree of specificity, he details the punishments that were inflicted upon enslaved persons. Though amelioration efforts were meant to lessen the severity of slavery, Browne illustrates how the reality implemented was much more complex, including increased surveillance of the enslaved.

Slave drivers are the focus of the third chapter, which is filled with numerous accounts of drivers and their various approaches
and experiences. Here again, Browne provides an abundance of evidence for his readers. He explains that drivers were intermediaries, forced to maintain the confidence of their own masters while creating a viable working relationship with their fellow enslaved subordinates. Readers will appreciate the nuance Browne offers in considering these central figures in the slave system.

Turning to marital relationships and sexual dynamics in the fourth chapter, here again Browne presents a richly-detailed examination of an important facet of life for the enslaved. British colonial authorities sought to instill metropolitan values, which, in theory, would promote monogamous relationships and protect enslaved women’s virtue. In reality, deeply-held patriarchal assumptions, shared by male enslavers and enslaved alike, made for a treacherous environment for enslaved women in Berbice. Browne effectively illustrates the perilous position of enslaved women, who were forced to navigate a sexually violent world in addition to the numerous other obstacles common to all enslaved persons.

In a narrowly focused fifth chapter, Browne ventures into the nebulous realm of Obeah practice. Employing a balanced approach, acknowledging colonists’ misconceptions and the very real potential harm for the enslaved, Browne closely examines a harrowing instance of Obeah. After a fatal bout of illness on a plantation, an Obeah practitioner was summoned to identify the source of the affliction. In a ritual dance, an older enslaved woman, Madalon, was identified. Browne recounts the torture she endured and her death at the hands of the Obeah man. Obeah, which could assist in the survival of slavery, proved to be a double-edged sword.

In the book’s final chapter, Browne explores the “moral economy of slavery,” which encompasses the many arrangements and negotiations by which the enslaved sought to protect rights that they had gained through struggle, law, and via custom. In the epilogue, Browne posits that focusing upon the master-slave binary distorts consideration of slavery; doing so ignores the web of relationships that slaves navigated as they sought to survive.

This is an excellent volume—it provides a vast body of evidence and a unique amount of material from the perspective of the enslaved. Browne’s style is quite accessible, which will allow both specialists and general readers to benefit from his work. However, it is
worth noting that the fact that the main block of evidence involves complaints and punishments limits Browne’s motif of survival to focus narrowly upon practices that were forbidden in Berbice. But, the enslaved also employed practices that were legal, such as conversion to Christianity, as a means to survive slavery. These methods of survival did not feature prominently in the fiscal’s records used by Browne. Of course, these methods of survival are more difficult to document, and this represents another avenue of enquiry not a defect in this volume. Surviving Slavery is an important contribution to our understanding of the lives of the enslaved and should help to shape future explorations of this realm.

Kyle Welty    University of Texas Rio Grande Valley


The present edited volume contains twelve case studies demonstrating trans-imperial British and Iberian entanglements—commercial ((il)legal), ethnic, epistemological, imperial, etc. (1500-1830). The introduction and afterword are by preeminent leaders in the field (Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra and Eliga Gould). The breadth of subjects includes Anglo-Iberian powerbrokers in northeast Florida, Iberian Jewish merchants in British contexts, Hispanicized English and Anglicized Spanish merchants, Anglo-African cooperation against the Portuguese, and Anglo-Portuguese connections in pharmaceutical knowledge. The compilation provides a variety of case studies that “complicate” (81), “reorient”, and “challenge” (86) “standard” historiographies on the Atlantic spheres, that insist on compartmentalized imperial histories, erase each other’s influence and contributions on the other, and problematize the presumed provenance of knowledge (5, 177, 219, 237). Rather than maintaining severed histories, the focus is on areas of cooperation and interconnection, which are entangled poly/multicentered histories, albeit asymmetric (198, 215, 256). The idea of “entanglements” is also a methodology, which intentionally required going beyond distinct national archives (256).
Notwithstanding its epistemological focus, generally, the essays do not delink themselves from existing frameworks. Indeed, the book is about the British and Spanish empires, yet, it is still highly Eurocentric and focused on eastern Atlantic actors, even across the ocean, and fails in not including more accounts from indigenous or black populations on the Atlantic western fronts. This could be addressed by looking at similar case studies that gaze from west to east, or by using a more decolonial approach to the study of empires.

To this reader, the most interesting aspects are found in case studies that bring in a third element. For example, the borderland entanglements in northeast Florida (Spain) and Georgia (Britain/U.S.) showing the various responses from indigenous communities. Another interesting aspect are in the examples of British use of earlier Spanish discourses even at the expense of being counter to the more prevalent discourses (from the British side) of the black legend. I found each case study of added value in demonstrating the entangled nature of the Atlantic imperial realm, yet, they were uneven in their presentation and in holding to the overall premise of the book. Although an edited volume of multiple authors, it would benefit from more explicit connections across contemporaneous case studies, whether based on a shared timeframe or focus. The most recent examples felt the most disconnected from the narrative.

This is an important book, yet, I believe that there are three important historiographical challenges that remain unanswered in the book, although alluded to by three collaborators. In the introduction, Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra rightfully points out the problems with historiographies that minoritize certain voices, thus being “complicit in their marginalization” and continues by stating that “Amerindians, Blacks, and Latinos ought not to be considered minorities to be included into a larger narrative canvas. This book seeks to demonstrate that without “Latinos” there is no canvas” (4). It doesn’t seem that the case studies presented accomplish this important task. Second, Benjamin Breen in the essay on the Portuguese epistemological contribution to British pharmaceutical knowledge ably shows how the historiographical record is purposely erased (70, 78). Notwithstanding,
Breen cites a warning from James Sweet about how recent scholarship “on ‘entanglements’ and ‘hybridity’ can flatten out the unequal power relations that defined the early modern world” and distort the reality on the ground and participation of other subjects (80). This is an inherent challenge in the subject matter that aims to show the Anglo-Iberian entanglements (both European), but forget about Amerindians, blacks, and other minoritized groups in the various colonies. Finally, Eligia H. Gould in the afterward, citing Cañizares-Esguerra and James Sidbury, notes the need to avoid the “too-often unselfconscious Eurocentrism of Atlantic history”—the fundamental epistemological problem (257).

Carla E. Roland Guzmán


Historians have long mined newspaper advertisements for information on escaped servants and slaves. The descriptions have been used to tell us about the lives, skills, and origin of these bondspeople and those who claimed their labor. Sharon Block has done a quantitative content analysis of these descriptions from several newspapers to outline ideas of race and culture in eighteenth-century British America. Then using traditional research techniques, she explores what it means when the ads mention color, ethnicity, gender, dress, or other distinguishing marks. Block carefully notes that eighteenth-century people used terms such as “lusty,” “fresh,” or “pale” as indicators of health, in ways quite different from their current meanings.

Block’s discussion of the use of color illustrates both her insights and the problems with her interpretations. She argues that color was not yet fully equated with race. Although there were cultural norms that meant slaves were supposed to be black, Europeans fair skinned, and Native Americans a shade of brown, the advertisements mention color in ways that distinguish certain runaways as being outside the assumed norms. Slaves of African background, Native Americans, Spaniards, Irish and others all
might be described as having complexions that were in some way yellow. Hair color worked somewhat differently. It was often used to distinguish between different European ethnicities. But for blacks, hair was about texture, not color, and appears only if it deviated from the norm of “wool.” What the author does not accept is that these descriptions might be accurate, and of course, there are no pictures or artifacts of those runaways to compare with the word descriptors.

What is most problematic in Block’s interpretation, however, is her reading of descriptors such as clothing, place of origin, speech, and work skills. For the author, what the advertiser says or omits is an indication of what that person knew about the runaway. So the inclusion of national origin for those born in Europe or America, but the lack of tribal or nation for Africans was a sign of the way slaves were stripped of culture and seen as interchangeable by their masters. However, placing an advertisement could be costly. Was the choice of descriptors more related to what the advertiser thought would be most obvious to a reader rather than what the master or mistress knew about the slave? Despite these cautions, Colonial Complexions should be read and considered by those trying to understand how racial tropes developed in early America, while reminding us that the language used to describe race and ideas about race have changed over time and was more fluid in colonial America than many would imagine.

Joan R. Gundersen California State University, San Marcos

Strangers and Friends at the Welcome Table: Contemporary Christianities in the American South. By James Hudnut-Beumler. (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2018, Pp. 278. $34.95.)

Though it has long been common knowledge that the South has remained the most religious section of the United States, few realize just how diverse are the expressions of its faith. James Hudnut-Beumler, historian at Vanderbilt University Divinity School, now dispels long held stereotypes, drawing upon a decade of interviews, field trips, and research in a host of primary and
secondary sources. On the surface, the South still appears strictly white, evangelical, and politically conservative. Admittedly snake-handlers still exist in Kentucky and Tennessee and public education can be held in such suspicion that homeschoolers can hold massive conventions every year. Yet Hudnut-Beumler finds the region so diverse that he uses the plural noun "Christianities." In the South, "There is no essential form of Christianity" (4). Admittedly the South produces a Roy Moore, the chief justice of the Alabama State Supreme Court, who sought to place a huge granite monument of the Ten Commandments in the court’s rotunda. But, as the author shows, the Yellowhammer State can also yield four bishops—Anglican, Methodist, and Roman Catholic—who buck state laws to provide food, shelter, and transportation to undocumented immigrants.

Hudnut-Beumler begins by stressing the southern tradition of hospitality, something he finds "key to the identity of southerners" (16). Yet he concedes this folkway is ambivalent. The very people who offer a sumptuous table to extended families still harbor deep suspicions of government social programs. At the same time, in reacting to Hurricane Katrina, church relief efforts in New Orleans and Mississippi far exceeded any federal aid, both in scope and in personal care. The region, the author notes, is still very much devoted to the lost cause, baptizing the defeat of the Confederacy in 1865 with Christian symbolism and a sense of moral superiority. As a sign of changing times, however, the Sons of Confederate Veterans now overtly recruits Native Americans, African Americans, and descendants of Mexican Texans. Moreover, the 2015 killings in a black church in Charleston caused a surprising turnaround on a still sensitive topic, the flying of the Confederate flag.

Particularly fascinating is Hudnut-Beumler’s discussion of the "pentecostalization" of southern Christianity. By this term, the author is not referring to glossolalia but rather to the presence of praise music, emotional sermons based on storytelling, women as worship leaders, and interracial congregations. Similarly, the South has experienced a disproportionate increase in the number of megachurches, that is parishes possessing a membership of at least two thousand. Several are discussed in detail: one centers
on aiding at-risk youth, another on advancing the "prosperity gospel," and two on proclaiming rigid fundamentalism. Many are unaware of the Roman Catholic presence. Yet Cullman, Alabama, is host to St. Bernard’s Abbey, a popular retreat center. Similarly, Hanceville, Alabama, is the center of the Eternal Word Television Network, located in the Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament and dedicated to a form of piety and doctrine that preceded Vatican II. Hudnut-Beumler also covers the growing presence of Hispanics, who have found their way to such cities as Nashville, Charleston, Richmond, and Little Rock. Gay Christians, too, are making their presence known. Gay people were quietly accepted in much of the South before the AIDS/HIV crisis of the mid-1980s. Then panic hit the region, with Franklin Graham warning congregations against welcoming "the Enemy." The number of open and affirming parishes in the South, 1,050 as of January 2016, remains small in comparison to Dixie’s total of 115,000, but the region is clearly offering options that had not existed thirty years ago. We have here an engaging work.

Justus D. Doenecke  
New College of Florida


Eric Taylor Woods’ study of the legacy of residential schools for the Anglican Church of Canada provides important historical background to one of the most significant issues in the life of the Canadian church. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the primary way in which many Anglicans in Canada understood Christian mission was through their participation in boarding schools for indigenous children. More recently, however, the church has struggled to come to terms with the physical, cultural, sexual, and social abuse that took place in those schools and the cultural genocide that resulted. Woods’ book is dedicated to the sweep of this history, documenting the changing
ways in which Anglicans understood mission, indigeneity, and residential schools.

Woods points to three phases in the church’s understanding of and relationship to residential schools. Each of these was “a struggle for the imaginations of church members” (111). In the first phase, lasting for the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, Anglicans in Canada had a “triumphant narrative” that saw residential schools as their part of a civilizing mission to the indigenous inhabitants of Canada. Even the publication of the Bryce Report in 1907, documenting the overcrowding, insufficient nutrition, lack of sanitation, and myriad other problems at residential schools failed to shake this narrative. Although some Anglicans seized on the report to argue against residential schools, Woods argues that western Anglicans, who were deeply involved in the schools, still had sufficient political influence to ensure that the church continued to see the schools as an essential element of their missionary work.

Charles Hendry’s 1969 report Beyond Traplines (Toronto: Anglican Book Store) provoked a second phase by providing another moment for the church to reckon with residential schools. This time, the church moved to shut its residential schools and topple the “triumphant narrative”—but not entirely. Woods argues that the new narrative was “progressive”: it saw residential schools as a thing of the past as the church moved towards a more positive relationship with indigenous Canadians. But the church failed to take the opportunity to fully reckon with the true reality of residential schools and reconcile itself to its past.

In the third phase, this disjuncture between the reality of the past and the church’s understanding of its past came fully into view in the late 1980s and early 1990s as residential school survivors (who now began to use this term) came forward to reveal the full scope of abuse they had endured. Woods calls this a “trauma of the perpetrators” (101) in which the Anglican Church of Canada began to realize that its past was not as heroic as it had let itself believe, culminating in the primate’s 1993 apology for past harm. This laid the groundwork for legal settlements and eventually the establishment of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Canada that issued a final report in 2015. The years since
1993 have seen the development of an indigenous Anglican church. Recent general synods have been concerned with the development of a canon on indigenous ministries. This has resulted in the appointment of a National Indigenous Anglican bishop and new steps towards self-determination for the indigenous church.

Woods draws deeply on archival sources and writes well. At times, however, the focus of the book is overly structural: he writes of competing narratives, divisions within the church’s elite, and the actions of indigenous activists. But he does not tell us much about who these people are. The individual who gets the greatest description is Michael Peers, the primate who apologized in 1993. But even this description feels cursory; what matters more to Woods is the apology as a symbol of the changing meaning in the church. But “the long road to apology” has been as much a human tale as a structural one and there was an opportunity here to tell a story of people. Still, this book is a valuable contribution to the study of Canadian Anglicanism and many Anglicans would do well to learn this story.

Jesse Zink Montreal Diocesan Theological College


American Sutra, written by Buddhist priest Duncan Ryuken Williams, sheds light on an under-researched and under-publicized portion of the story of the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. The book focuses on the stories and experiences of the Buddhists who were incarcerated. Williams notes that, while all Japanese Americans were discriminated against because of their race, the Japanese American Buddhists were doubly discriminated against because of their religious affiliation. Most of the internees who claimed a religious affiliation were part of a Christian denomination.
There was frequent collaboration between the Christians and Buddhists in the camps. The interfaith collaboration between Buddhists and Christians provides some of the most compelling stories in this book. Buddhist priest Shinjo Nagatomi spoke at a Christian gathering at the Manzanar camp where he said, “The fundamental teachings of Christianity is Love. The fundamental teachings of Buddhism is Mercy. In this great Circle of Love and Mercy we strive to live our daily living harmoniously. Thus, let us stand together regardless of the religion and cooperate peacefully, work and live for the benefit of this Manzanar Center” (136). Buddhists and Christians celebrated Christmas together, although the Buddhists put a different spin on it by celebrating Buddha’s entrance into nirvana, which is said to take place on 8 December, close to the Christmas holiday on 25 December. Some of the buildings where worship services were held at the camps would be used by both Buddhists and Christians, usually separately, but sometimes together. An Episcopal priest, Daisuke Kitagawa of Seattle, described one Thanksgiving service at the Tule Lake camp attended by both Christians and Buddhists saying “the service was as close to the ancient agricultural festival as any Thanksgiving Day I had ever celebrated” (136). Buddhists and Christians also collaborated at Manzanar to build a cemetery where those who died could be buried. Many camp residents participated in the Buddhist summer festival of Obon, which commemorated the lives of the departed.

The Japanese American soldiers who fought in the war were part of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team and 100th Infantry Battalion. The 442nd is the most decorated unit in United States military history. In one section of American Sutra, Williams explains that, while most of the unit was comprised of Buddhists, the chaplains assigned to them were Christian. Buddhist soldiers faced added discrimination when asked for their religious affiliation to be identified on their dog tags. The only choices offered were Protestant, Catholic, Hebrew, or blank. One chaplain, Lutheran pastor Israel Yost, had many conversations with Buddhist soldiers and, while he never attempted to conduct a Buddhist rite, “he prayed with any soldier who wanted a prayer” (208). Yost realized that no spiritual provisions were made for Buddhists
or Shintoists and that his standard condolence letter that quoted a Bible verse likely was not very meaningful for the Buddhist families that received the letters. The Buddhist families were able to have private family funerals at the camps with Buddhist rituals and a Buddhist priest present. Unfortunately, funerals held outside the camps were sometimes met with opposition and they had to gather in Christian churches.

Although the Buddhist internees had to deal with religious discrimination, the Buddhist clergy were not subject to the violence that some Christian clergy suffered. John Yamazaki, an Episcopal priest from Los Angeles, served as a translator from Japanese to English and became a target of violence from some young men. Yamazaki’s injuries were so severe that he was taken to the hospital. A stunning artistic rendering of this incident is included in American Sutra (191). This book is highly recommended reading for all people, especially people interested in interfaith experiences, United States history, specifically the World War II internment, or learning more about Buddhism.

Kathryn Nishibayashi
Glendale, California

*Christian Psalms for Worship and Prayer. By Christopher L. Webber. (Eugene, Oregon: Resource Publications, 2019, Pp. xvi, 293. $36.00.)*

This evocative book by Episcopal priest and author Christopher L. Webber is grounded in both the tradition of the Hebrew psalms and Christian spiritualities. In his introduction, Webber, a frequent reviewer for this journal, notes the importance of the psalms in worship and for meditation in both synagogues and churches for thousands of years. Readers of this journal will appreciate the central role of the psalms in prayer book worship. Webber argues that some modern Christians find the context and worldview of the ancient psalms unfamiliar and inaccessible in today’s world. It is also true that many truly remarkable texts from the Christian tradition are never used in worship, or made accessible for prayer and reflection. Webber’s aim in this book is to adapt these Christian texts into the rhythms of
the Hebrew psalms to make them available for wider use in worship and private prayer.

The list of Christian writers included in this book is expansive and covers the breadth and depth of the Anglican/Episcopal and Christian traditions. Those looking for voices from the Anglican/Episcopal tradition will encounter the likes of John Donne, George Herbert, Evelyn Underhill, Madeline L’Engle, Absolom Jones, and Harriet Beecher Stowe, among others. Fans of medieval mystics will find Julian of Norwich, Richard Rolle, Hildegard of Bingen, Bernard of Clairvaux, to name a few. Early Christian figures such as Augustine of Hippo are intermixed with modern Christians like Dorothy Day; Martin Luther makes an appearance, as does Oscar Romero and Desmond Tutu. Needless to say, Webber has provided texts from many eras, and has intentionally included a diverse collection of voices.

Notably, Webber made the decision not to present the texts in chronological order, so as not to frame the texts in a particular time period. Instead, those using the book for public worship or private prayer may choose thematically or by author. (An author and a thematic index are included.) The texts could also be pointed for use with chant. Obviously, these texts are not intended as a replacement for the prayer book psalter, but they present a deeply moving option for those interested in expanding worship by making the words of some ancestors in the faith more widely known. Clergy, Christian educators, liturgists, and those interested in the study of Christian spiritualities will be intrigued by this book.

Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook Claremont School of Theology Bloy House, Episcopal School of Theology at Los Angeles


Scholars have championed the concept of the Atlantic World, and its subset the black Atlantic, for over two decades. Two works,
from historian John Catron and literary scholar Stefan Wheelock, make a strong case for scholars to emphasize black Christianity in this Atlantic setting, and in so doing chart new ways to analyze black agency and resistance.

In *Embracing Protestantism: Black Identities in the Atlantic World*, John Catron argues that black conversion to Protestantism created a new Afro-Atlantic national identity. Catron disputes earlier scholarship that labels conversion a cynical acquiescence to western Christian imperialism, or the actions of a shape-shifting creole culture that was more Atlantic than African. Rather, Atlantic blacks’ Protestant identity was wholly theirs, even as it was plural and sometimes rested on coexisting African identities. Catron pushes the chronology of black conversion earlier than most prior scholarship. Mining primary sources from travelers, traders, and ship captains, Catron emphasizes that most first-generation Africans had already comprehended the Christian religion before their encounter with the New World slave system. This was certainly true of slaves from Central Africa, who had long exposure to Africanized Roman Catholicism. Catron provocatively argues that while less pervasive in West Africa, Christianity was far from exotic or foreign there, either. Islamic use of Arabicized Hebrew scriptures, missionary efforts from Europeans, and creole traders on the coast and interior provided many Africans with knowledge of a faith tradition that they would see more closely in the New World. Catron argues that these new Afro-Christians were not racial separatists, but worked with white allies. He debunks older assertions that forms of revival Christianity (such as Baptism or Methodism) resonated with an essential black African identity, rather focusing on blacks’ pragmatism to identify with groups who might sympathize with minorities. As marginalized groups, dissenting Protestants were more likely to accept non-whites who likewise lived on the margins of society, albeit in more dire circumstances, and to educate blacks and offer them leadership positions. From Antigua a network of black missionaries, slave and free, spread the gospel to the New World. From there, slaves densely settled in the South Carolina Low Country and the West Indies sugar islands each embraced forms of revivalist Christianity. In this process black Christians created a new African and
Atlantic culture that was plural, adaptive, and creative, even as it held to African traditions in some places when individuals could preserve them. Evangelicals white and black increasingly recognized that they should work for the Kingdom of God here and now, including in social activism in condemning slavery.

In contrast to Catron’s broad base, in *Barbaric Culture and Black Critique*, Stefan Wheelock uses theory and literary analysis to focus on a number of key works in black antislavery literature. Wheelock begins chronologically where Catron ends, with the entrance of black Christians into the public sphere via antislavery publications. His analysis insightfully unpacks why it mattered that Catron’s subjects embraced black Protestantism: religion offered a methodological base and heft that could forcefully take on slavery at its root. The works, well-known in the black literary canon, range over a half century and across the Atlantic. Wheelock begins with the antislavery essay by Ottobah Cugoano, and continues with perhaps the best-known piece, today, of black Atlantic writing, Olaudah Equiano’s *Interesting Narrative* (London, 1789). In later chapters Wheelock moves to the nineteenth century in considering David Walker’s *Appeal* (Boston, 1829), and finally the political essays of Maria Stewart. His book is largely free of jargon and is clearly written, a strength not often true in literary analysis.

Wheelock argues that a common religious motivation undergirded the authors’ works. Such religious perspective gave the authors a radical base from which to clearly see and critique Western society. Whereas secular Enlightenment authors imagined their era heralded progress, Wheelock’s writers argued that slavery was no accident to that world, but a deep-seated barbaric institution that marred everything it touched. To call the Atlantic World enlightened as ships carried millions in chains across the ocean was a perverse, or (to religious ears) heretical and even demonic perspective. This religiosity offered a radicalism that presaged Marxian ideas about labor or progressive conceptions of justice. Indeed, modernity could not be criticized within the Enlightenment box, as only a perspective with a foot outside it, as
black Christian principles were, could recognize the trap that slavery set.

Such insights occurred progressively. Each chapter from Wheelock offers a more rounded critique of slavery, and each author presents as increasingly radical. The earlier authors, Cugoano and Equiano, sometimes struggled as they tended to cling to Enlightenment hopes of natural or gradual reforms, and embraced British cultural norms that in the end were impotent to limit slavery. However, Wheelock notes that even in the least radical-sounding works, black authors complicated white assumptions and reworked Christian theology. By the antebellum era, the fault lines were clear: Wheelock notes that a voice such as David Walker’s, derided as “wild,” had to be extreme to get at the heart of the barbarity of the system. The narrower base of this work is further highlighted in the social relationships of the authors; Cugoano and Equiano were associates who worked together, as were Walker and Stewart. Other bases of resistance, and other social networks outside this particular literary and intellectual heritage, offered different strains of black critiques—religious, secular, and agnostic—toward white society.

Both Catron’s and Wheelock’s works contain vivid arguments and striking examples. Their work in religion emphasizes black agency, rather than the oppression of slaveholding elites and whites. This agency also lends to emphasize the resisting and revolutionary, rather than accommodating or moderate, strains of black experience. Other scholars may benefit in pursuing individuals and groups outside the main categories of both authors. These may include non-evangelical black Christians, such as black Anglicans or Roman Catholics, or formal Calvinists. A half-generation after Maria Stewart, for example, Alexander Crummell articulated forms of black nationalism based in Anglican/Episcopal theology. A few years after Crummell’s death, W. E. B. du Bois immortalized Crummell’s bravery in his classic *Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago: McClurg, 1903); du Bois would follow Crummell to Africa, albeit as an atheist. Such connections suggest that the complicated journeys of
individuals across the black Atlantic remain fruitful avenues for scholarship; Catron’s and Wheelock’s works show us ways there.

Kyle T. Bulthuis
Utah State University

_The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America._ By Andrés Reséndez. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016, Pp. xiii, 431. $30.00.)

Slavery was, and is, more significant than we may know. At the beginning of _The Other Slavery_, Andrés Reséndez notes the “very word ‘slavery’ recalls African bodies” even though the “earliest European explorers began this process by taking indigenous slaves” (1, 3). This observation may not be epiphanal for those who have studied the history of American enslavement, but the relative scarcity of scholarly (or even popular) study of this subject questions why our historical vision of indigenous slavery is so impaired. _The Other Slavery_ seeks to improve our vision and proves to be a profound contribution to our understanding of the horrific impact of slavery.

Beginning with what he titles “The Caribbean Debacle,” Reséndez follows Indian enslavement in America over four centuries. Examples of enslavement, practiced by indigenous peoples and European invaders, provide poignant stories that are engaging and thought provoking. Some indigenous enslavement comes because of military conquest, but as Reséndez shows, its major impetus is economic and built on racial bias. Religious systems are also used to support enslavement systems. Reséndez illustrates how Indian slavers were able to slip under laws which made slavery illegal. The Spanish crown prohibited native bondage and crusaded to free all Indian slaves held in bondage. Mexico proscribed all forms of bondage and extended citizenship to Indians. Such actions resulted in growth of different forms of enslavement such as indentured servitude, forced labor, convict leasing, and debt peonage. In the United States, he notes Indian slavery “had no legal basis [like U.S. laws regulating the African slave trade, so] it was never formally abolished” (8).
The Other Slavery is a solid beginning for future scholarship. Ninety pages of sources provide an excellent source for future research. Because the other slavery “was never a single institution, but instead a set of kaleidoscopic practices” (320) hints at the wealth of material to be explored. Because hearing a spoken book is becoming more common, I actually “read” the book twice. The first time was reading the words on the page. The second was hearing the words spoken from an Audible.com recording. I expressly wanted to observe how different media may impact my interpretation of the information. I did experience an interesting difference. Reading the words on the page, I was focused on details as they were presented. With the spoken word, I focused more on themes as they developed. In using both, I discovered a deeper understanding. While doing so takes extra time and effort, it is worth the expense.

Matthew P. Payne
Episcopal Diocese of Fond du Lac
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The Historical Society of the Episcopal Church Seeks an Editor-in-Chief for Anglican and Episcopal History

The editor-in-chief of Anglican and Episcopal History (AEH) is responsible for the direction, review, and guidance of all editorial decisions and activities pertaining to the journal. A primary responsibility of the editor is to determine the contents of each issue, including solicitation of articles (by attending pertinent conferences), selection/rejection of solicited or submitted articles, arrangement of blind peer review, requests for revisions of articles, as well as the order of presentation of articles in each issue. The editor also has general oversight of the journal and, as required, specific direction regarding layout, style, tone, syntax, and linguistic and argumentative coherence.
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The schedule for this search calls for appointment by January 2021. Following a transition for transferring the office, etc., the new editor shall be solely responsible for the September 2021 issue of *Anglican and Episcopal History*. Applications stating interest and qualifications, along with a current C.V., should be sent electronically with the heading *Anglican and Episcopal History* Editor Search to Canon Matthew Payne, Director of Operations of the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church at administration@hsec.us and received no later than 2 October 2020.
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