

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Anglicans, Methodists and Intercommunion

1. WHY I CANNOT AGREE

BY OLIVER TOMKINS

EVEN though at the time of writing I am somewhat ecumenically and theologically punch drunk after eight weeks of continuous conferring, first at Uppsala and then at Lambeth, I am grateful for being invited to assess this book,* because I remember the patience with which one of the authors, Mr. Duffield, steadily and faithfully represented in his sole person the point of view of the Archbishops' Commission on Intercommunion which is represented also by his co-authors here. I welcome too the challenge to try to set in order something of the reasons why I cannot be satisfied with the point of view here presented. But first a word about the contents of the book. Dr. Packer's essay *Anglican-Methodist Unity: which way now?* rightly insists that the need to decide about the Anglican-Methodist scheme brings into the open some questions on which the Church of England must make up its mind and no longer hedge. After sketching something of his part in the Anglican-Methodist Commission he goes on to make four points about the scheme.

(a) *The Report is rooted in a bygone era of thought.* He sees it as significant that the unspoken assumption of Lord Fisher's proposal in 1946, the one thing about which there need be no argument at all, is that the united church of the future must plainly be episcopal. This he traces to the Tractarian perversion of the Anglican tradition which reached expression in *The Apostolic Ministry* edited by the late Bishop K. E. Kirk, which 'proved to be a lead balloon'. Thus the attempt to show that episcopacy is essential to the church on scriptural grounds has been a failure and the assumption can therefore no longer underly the attempts to define the nature of Christian Unity.

(b) Secondly he maintains that the *pledge* (that in Stage 2 the church resulting from union will remain in communion with all the bodies with which the constituent churches were in communion) has already invalidated the conception of full communion between two parallel episcopal churches on which Stage 1 is based. 'The ultimate effect of the scheme, will be to abolish once and for all, episcopalian exclusiveness at Holy Communion' (Page 23). This demonstrates not only the folly but the wrongness of basing Stage 1 upon a conception of full communion only made possible by the service of reconciliation.

(c) The third question is whether there is a *sufficient agreement in*

* *Fellowship in the Gospel* (Marcham Manor Press. 95pp. 15s. 6d.) Essays on Evangelical Comment on *Anglican-Methodist Unity and Intercommunion Today*, by J. I. Packer (Editor), C. O. Buchanan and G. E. Duffield.

doctrine to justify the two churches accepting each other in full communion and then in organic union. Church union, if it is not to be a mockery, must be based upon an honest adherence to truth, and he commends the final scheme for greatly improving upon the 1963 report in the extent to which it satisfies this requirement. He concludes that the new Ordinal, which is obviously an important expression of common doctrine in the two churches, is capable of being understood in a thoroughly evangelical fashion.

(d) Fourthly he contends that the report fails to provide for a proper expression of *fellowship in the Gospel at the Lord's Table* (page 33). Here he looks directly at the reconciliation procedures and finds them lacking. He refers to his own note of dissent in the report, the argument of which need not be repeated here, for it is presumably familiar to all students of the scheme.

Mr. Buchanan's essay, *Full Communion and the Historic Episcopate*, starts by taking issue with the phrase 'full communion' as 'a latter-day term which would have puzzled the apostolic church'. The oneness which Christians have in Christ is the basic unity. In New Testament understanding, to be in Christ is to be in the church. He then goes on to develop the history of 'exclusive episcopalianism' as it has grown in the Church of England since 1662. Like Dr. Packer he objects to the Anglican-Methodist scheme because 'it is the axiomatic character of exclusive episcopalianism which has built it in as the only unquestioned foundation of the scheme'. However 'domestic episcopalianism' is not objectionable, meaning a defence of episcopal ministry upon its pastoral virtues. He regards the kind of episcopacy which Methodists would have to adopt as the price of full communion with the Church of England as a pale copy for the wrong reasons of Anglican episcopacy in its worst features. The Service of Reconciliation therefore is to be rejected because episcopacy is made the foundation of the scheme, not a contingent part of it. Thus the Service of Reconciliation could result in five classes of ministers instead of two. On that background he concludes that it would still be 'a more excellent way' to press for a South India way of proceeding instead. But, if the scheme does go through, then evangelical Anglicans should react by treating all Methodist ministers, whether reconciled or unreconciled, in exactly the same way, thereby transcending the divisions which the Service of Reconciliation will have created by an actual full communion in practice.

Fellowship at Communion by Mr. Duffield first establishes his general lines of approach and then explains the way in which he was able to be a signatory of the report *Intercommunion Today* in spite of serious differences of approach. Starting, like the other writers, from the assertion that the unity which all Christians already have is the most important reality, he regards as 'sectarian' the attitude implicit in Convocation Regulations regarding communion with other churches, based upon their possession of an episcopal ministry. Rather the openness of the Lambeth appeal of 1920 is the correct attitude though it has not been consistently followed. He then goes on to develop an attitude (with which we became affectionately familiar during the arguments of the Intercommunion Commission) for National Churches

to be regarded as the truly scriptural form of the church rather than the pan-Anglican heresy which has taken its place. Like Dr. Packer, he regards Kirk's *The Apostolic Ministry* as a dead duck and, since episcopal church government cannot be demonstrated to be biblical, it must not be allowed to be the foundation stone of any schemes either for reunion or for intercommunion. However, he was able to sign the report because it does at least set out clearly the different understandings within the Church of England of the issues at stake and so to continue the discussion about them until we are able to come to common decision.

I hope that such a summary of the contents of the three essays does not do them injustice: it is not intended to. They consistently represent a point of view for which I have great respect but which I do not hold. Separately and together, they raise in my mind further questions upon which the debate must continue if we are to get beyond deadlock.

First I would take up Dr. Packer's point about 'theological fashion'. In a sense it is inevitable that any scheme of union should not be theologically fashionable by the time it is ready to be implemented. Whether it be the Anglican-Methodist scheme or negotiations that led to the Church of South India, it looks as though something between twenty to forty years of discussion is needed for a scheme to come to fruition. That is plenty of time for theological fashions to change. But how important is theological 'fashion'? Obviously Dr. Packer does not use the phrase in a derogatory or frivolous sense, for he is deeply concerned not with fashion but with truth. Yet evidently the emphases of theology do change from time to time and it is at this point I would challenge the theological assumption from which he starts with regard to the authority of scripture. His own presuppositions seem to me precisely 'unfashionable'. He does not take seriously one important aspect of contemporary theological thinking, namely that the dilemmas posed by the Reformation are not necessarily truly stated and therefore cannot find satisfactory answers. Part of the contemporary 'return to sources' has been the attempt, whether in liturgy or dogmatics, to get behind the antitheses of the Reformation to a period in the history of the church where the issues have not been falsified by exaggerated contentions on either side. It was in this context that the Faith and Order conference at Lund focussed the fresh look at the whole question of 'tradition and scripture'.

Scripture undoubtedly portrays the Church as including a ministry; it is not an invertebrate body but has a structure. Since *none* of the extant churches can make good a case for reading its form of ministry straight out of the New Testament, the question is inescapable as to the significance of tradition in amplifying the NT deposit in either faith or order. Yet the question is never faced by Dr. Packer—and even in the Scheme (pp. 18-23) the insights expressed at Lund (or, for that matter, in Vatican II) are insufficiently considered.

Secondly, the divine imperative to visible unity in the Church is underestimated, especially by Mr. Buchanan. The C view in the Intercommunion Report judges the A view (Catholic) as not giving sufficient weight to the reality of the given unity in Christ and the B

view (Protestant) as not joining sufficient weight to the wrongness of division. The ecumenical movements is, in part, the attempt to do equal justice to *both* poles. The argument is briefly set out in pp. 63-68 of that Report and these authors have not faced, let alone answered, its conclusions.

Thirdly, Mr. Duffield for all his professed zeal for theological truth, does not face the fact that 'confessionalism' in a divided Church is, at least in part, a witness to the importance of the theological integrity. The Roman Church, like Lutheranism or Calvinism, is a serious attempt to universalise and not simply to regionalise the faith upon which the Church is founded. The task of ecumenism is not only to unify the church 'in each place' but to do so in a way which reconciles each place with all places and all ages. Mr. Duffield's National Churches do not take catholic (i.e. universal) truth sufficiently seriously.

The debate continues—and approaches a climacteric. The approach epitomised by these writers is certainly a serious contribution to the debate, but it can not be conceded the last word. Fortunately, no one of us can demand the last word, for it has been spoken by One who is both first and last, to whom alone we owe final obedience. May He guide us all.

2. A MOMENT FOR DECISION

BY LESSLIE NEWBIGGIN

I HAVE been invited by the Editor to comment upon the present plans for Anglican-Methodist reconciliation, especially in the light of the Report—*Intercommunion Today* and of the book *Fellowship in the Gospel* by Dr. J. I. Packer and others. I gratefully accept this invitation. It is obvious that the Anglican-Methodist proposals are of immense interest to Christians everywhere, and very specially to Christians in South India who have often expressed the longing that their parent bodies might find their way to unity. It is also obvious that an observer from the Church of South India is sympathetic to the powerful arguments which Dr. Packer and others have advanced in support of the South India plan of union as preferable to what is now proposed in England. Many of us in the Church of South India have felt that the Lambeth Conferences of 1948 and 1958 would have been wise to give greater weight to the experience of South India as a possible guide to unity elsewhere and have regretted that such exclusive endorsement was given to methods of union which depended on other principles. It is therefore natural that I have followed the arguments of Dr. Packer and his colleagues, both in the present book and in the earlier volume entitled *All in Each Place* with the deepest sympathy. At the same time, however, and after weighing these arguments with as much care as I could, I have come to feel that I could not endorse the advice which is given in the present book that

Anglicans should decline to accept the Scheme proposed by the Anglican-Methodist Unity Commission. I would like very respectfully to put forward the following arguments for this conclusion.

1. The first point made by Dr. Packer is that the Report 'is rooted in a bygone era of thought'. This is perfectly true. The whole report rests upon its original foundation, which is the proposal made by Archbishop Fisher that other Churches 'should take episcopacy into their system'. This was in itself part of a whole way of thinking about the Church and the Ministry which has been rendered out-of-date by later theological development. It is not difficult to show that this is so. But it must also be said that, if the present scheme were to be scrapped and a new one planned on the basis of recent thinking on the doctrine of the Church, by the time it was ready for ecclesiastical action it would be theologically out-of-date. The South India Scheme was drafted in the early 1920's. By the time final voting was required it was theologically out-of-date. There were vehement critics of the Scheme in the 1940's who made this one of their chief points of attack. All the essential parts of the Scheme were written long before the revival of biblical theology had touched the Church in India. One might almost venture to formulate the following law: all schemes of union are theologically out-of-date at the time when they are ecclesiastically practicable. Unless theological fashions become more static, and ecclesiastical assemblies more dynamic (neither of which seems at the moment to be likely) one must expect that this law will continue to operate.

The point, however, is that a scheme of union which is theologically out-of-date need not prevent the united Church from developing its own vigorous theological thinking. The scheme is simply a starting point, a minimum basis for starting to live together. It need not be a limitation on further development.

2. From the point of view of an observer in the Church of South India, the part of the Scheme which is most open to criticism is the proposed service of reconciliation. It is well known that analogous proposals were twice made and rejected in the course of the twenty-seven years of negotiations in South India. In the North India Plan, in which similar proposals were originally a part, these were abandoned in favour of a service within the united Church in which the grace of God will be sought for all the ministers of the one Church. In the present Scheme the service will be a joint reciprocal action by two separate Churches which are not yet in a position to unite. Moreover there is an important difference in wording between the prayers used in the two corresponding parts of the service, apparently indicating that the grace which is sought for Methodist ministers is different from that sought for Anglicans.

However I would urge that the following points should also be considered:

(a) While one could have wished that such a service should be—as in the North India Plan—an act of the united Church rather than of two separate Churches, it is important that the service itself contains a very solemn pledge to unite, a pledge which surely cannot be entered into without the full intention on both sides to honour it. It will be

the business of all who are rightly concerned about the impropriety of such a service divorced from organic union to see that the pledge is honoured with all due urgency.

(b) It has always seemed to me that one's judgment of the service must depend upon the relation of it to the practice of intercommunion between the two Churches. If acceptance of the service of reconciliation were made the absolute pre-condition of eucharistic fellowship between the two Churches, then one would have to say that the view that the service conveys episcopal ordination to Methodist ministers was the only possible view of the service, and that statements of agnosticism regarding the meaning of the rite must simply be disbelieved. But if the service takes place *within* a growing eucharistic fellowship then the situation is quite different. In that case one can accept the statement of the Commission that the proposed arrangement 'does not foreclose the theological issue . . . between those who hold that the normative character of episcopal ordination admits of no exception, and those who believe that circumstances may justify or necessitate ordination in other ways than by bishops' (Scheme, p. 127). On the basis of recent developments in Anglican teaching about intercommunion, and especially of the recent action of the Lambeth Conference on this matter, one can surely feel justified in taking this latter position.

(c) The terms of the 'Declaration' (Scheme p. 147) to be made by every minister who takes part in the services of reconciliation are such as to make it impossible for anyone to hold thereafter that such participation implies a denial of the reality of the previous ordination as 'ordination to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of God'.

(d) There is a clear statement that the services of reconciliation 'are not intended to establish a norm of procedure'. No commitment is implied that the same procedure would have to be followed in subsequent acts of union or reconciliation. This seems to remove one of the most serious practical difficulties which critics have noticed.

(e) I am bound to confess that, even when all these points are borne in mind, I find this method of procedure much less satisfactory from a theological point of view than the one adopted in South India. But it has to be accepted as a fact of history that the South India method has been judged by responsible churchmen in England to be inapplicable to the situation here. While it is conceivably possible that, over a period of years, a majority of churchmen might be persuaded otherwise, this would mean the postponement of any possibility of union for a very long time. I think that this would only be justifiable if it could be shown that participation in the proposed services of reconciliation involves necessarily the acceptance of theologically intolerable positions. In the light of a careful study of the documents, and of the points made above, I do not believe that any churchman need feel that this would be so. Perhaps I may be allowed to put the point in the following way.

I believe that those churchmen who think that episcopal ordination is the indispensable precondition of valid sacraments are wrong. An act which implied necessarily that I accepted this belief would be

for me theologically intolerable. But I hold those who do so believe as my fellow Christians and I should think it intolerable to break communion with them on account of this difference. The same is presumably true of those evangelical Anglicans who hold the same belief as I do at this point, but who remain in communion with their fellow-Anglicans who do not. Dr. Packer's preface to the volume under review seems to imply—and I ask forgiveness if I have misunderstood him—that the moment has now come when this co-existence of incompatible views should be ended. I do not agree with this. I think rather that those Anglicans who believe as I do on this point should recognise this as an opportunity for charity towards those who seem to us to have an inadequate grasp of the greatness of God's grace. Provided it is clear (as I think it is) that acceptance of the Scheme does not commit anyone to the belief that episcopal ordination is indispensable, those who believe as I do on this point should be ready to go forward trusting in the intrinsic power of the truth which they hold.

3. One of the crucial points under discussion has been the question whether the united Church which is envisaged at the end of Stage One will be in full communion with those Churches with which the Methodist Church now has full communion. The Commission says: 'We are convinced that as our two Churches move forward into Stage One, they should do so with the firm and declared intention that ways shall be found by which at Stage Two no relations at present maintained by either Church will be broken'. This commitment is plainly quite essential, and one may accept it as adequate. It is true that there are unsolved problems ahead. It is not yet clear how this intention can be carried out. But it seems proper to make two remarks.

(a) It will never be possible to see in advance the solution to all our problems. The South India Scheme contained a similar element of uncertainty in that it was impossible to state in 1947 how the united Church would in 1977 solve the problem of the terms of admission of ministers from other Churches while maintaining both the principle of episcopal ordination and the principle of communion with all the parent Churches. In a matter of this kind one can only go forward in faith and with a firm declaration of intention.

(b) There is, however, one factor which ought to make the problem less insoluble than it seems now. This factor is the progress of unity negotiations in other parts of the world. A study of the information given in the documents prepared for the Lambeth Conference regarding the unity negotiations in which the various provinces of the Anglican Communion are now engaged gives ground for hope that, by the time the two Churches in England are ready for Stage Two, the problem may be much less intractable than it now seems.

4. The Commission has been at pains to deal in detail with the matters of doctrine on which clarification has been sought by both Churches. Obviously not everyone will be satisfied, and it is always natural to look for safeguards at the moment when one is being asked for a final commitment. But the truth must be faced that written safeguards have a very limited value in preserving the faith of the Church. It is certainly necessary that all questions should be frankly

faced, and the range of variation in belief made clear. But in the last analysis the faith of the united Church will depend upon the intellectual vigour and spiritual integrity of its pastors, teachers and prophets. I think most of my fellow-members in the CSI would agree with me that the doctrinal development of that Church since 1947 has depended very little upon reference to the doctrinal statements enshrined in the Basis, and still less upon the numerical proportions of the various uniting Churches. Everything depends, under God, upon the vigour with which one faces new situations as they come and the fidelity with which one tries to follow Christ in new circumstances. It is not wise for evangelicals, or for any others, to put too much trust in verbal safeguards. Even the most impressive of them can become something of a Maginot Line.

5. The proposals which have been developed by the Anglican-Methodist Commission, and which are now before the two Churches, are surely not perfect. But it is upon them that decision has now to be made. It seems almost certain that, if the present Scheme is rejected the whole matter of union between the two Churches will be postponed for a long time—perhaps for a generation. The repercussions of this upon the related Churches all over the world would be momentous. There are moments given to us which do not return. I personally think that such a moment occurred when the Lambeth Conference of 1948 was invited to define its attitude to the recently accomplished union of Churches in South India. I believe that if the Lambeth Fathers of that day had had the courage to take the same generous and positive attitude to South India that has characterised later Anglican decisions, the whole subsequent history of reunion would have been different. That opportunity was lost. I have much sympathy with those who feel that the present Scheme is defective and who would like to see it bettered. But I think that this is the moment when decision has to be made. And, if I may quote the words used by the Joint Committee in South India when a similar point had been reached in the negotiations there, I would 'affectionately urge' those who would like to see the Scheme further amended, that the time has now come for decision. Whatever be the defects in the present Scheme, a decision by the two Churches now to go forward on this basis, would liberate new forces of faith and hope for the Church throughout the world.

3. INTERCOMMUNION TODAY

BY STEPHEN NEILL

INTERCOMMUNION is the most thorny, difficult and ever-present problem of the ecumenical movement. In practice no one engaged in whatever degree in the movement can avoid facing the problem; there is no subject on which there is greater confusion. It is good,

therefore, that it should from time to time be officially considered; the Archbishops were recognising a real need when they appointed a Commission to consider the matter from the standpoint of the Church of England*; a serious attempt was made to take account of range of opinion, and the Commission was adorned by the presence of three laymen and one laywoman.

In my opinion the most valuable section of the report, to which we come after somewhat lengthy preliminaries, expressed in the inflated style which is common to the majority of ecumenical documents, is the clear statement of the three varying points of view to which the members of the Commission (with individual variations) found themselves committed. These views are: 1. The traditional Anglo-catholic view that episcopacy is of such importance in the life of the Church that few if any exceptions can be made to the rule of the Church of England that the minister at the Eucharist must be a priest episcopally ordained. 2. The view widely held by Evangelicals that intercommunion in both directions, admission of unconfirmed persons to Holy Communion in the Church of England, and reception of communion by Anglicans in non-episcopal churches, has been widely practised and recognised, and that there are no convincing theological arguments against it. 3. The mediating view that, though the traditional Anglican view is based on theological considerations which in their time were valid, the ecumenical movement and the approach of the churches to one another have produced an unprecedented situation; there is an immense difference between churches which defend and even glory in schism, and those which deplore schism and are deeply committed to discovering unity with one another in Christ Jesus, therefore much is laudable today which would not have been possible a century ago.

Since all these views were represented on the Commission, it is not surprising that their recommendations were not unanimous. Mr. G. E. Duffield felt it necessary to append a personal statement, and the three distinct points of view are registered in the recommendations on the Church of South India.

This by no means implies that the report is without value; it deserves careful study, and we must be grateful for the excellent collection of statements by various Anglican Churches on their approach to the question and on their attitude to Churches outside the Anglican fellowship. The report does however point to the need for continuous and much deeper study; it must be taken as a beginning and not an end. What I have in mind may become clear if I set out some of my own difficulties.

We are told that, on occasion, it may be right and desirable for Anglicans to receive communion in non-Anglican groups and fellowships. But how far do we go? Not long ago, when I was in Nepal and visiting a station where there is no ordained pastor among the members of the mission, it was suggested that, as it was Holy Week, it might be welcome if I celebrated the Holy Communion for the small Christian fellowship. The answer was that this was quite unnecessary, as a lay member of the staff would celebrate Communion

**Intercommunion Today*, CIO, 174 pp., 8s. 6d.

the day after my departure. In such a situation of fellowship in a remote outpost of the Christian world, should a Christian join with his brethren in the Eucharist? Some Evangelicals would answer unhesitatingly, Yes. Others would feel hesitation, holding that some ordination should be required of the celebrant of the Eucharist. But on what grounds? What do we understand by ordination, and what kind of ordination are we prepared to accept as valid? The older among my readers will remember that the Church of South India almost foundered on the desire of the Congregationalists, most strongly pressed, that lay celebration of the Holy Communion should be provided for in the Scheme of Union.

What measure of theological agreement on the nature of the sacrament and of the church should be required? It has just been recorded in the *Catholic Herald* that at a recent meeting four non-Roman Catholics received the Communion in both kinds. But is this something that I myself could honestly do? The Roman Catholic Church is committed to the doctrine of transubstantiation; I do not believe in this doctrine, in fact I regard the definition of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist in terms of accidents and substance at the Latheran Council of 1215 as the beginning of the doctrinal downfall of that Church. Ought I to put a priest of that Communion in the position of administering the Sacrament to a believer of another fellowship whom he is bound to regard by the standards of his own church as an incurable heretic? A friend to whom I put this conundrum answered that he would regard the Roman priest as one who is doing and can do only what our Lord Himself intended in the institution of the Lord's Supper ('Christ was the Word who spake it', etc.), and that therefore he would accept the invitation without hesitation; I am not sure that I could myself honestly go so far.

My Baptist friends make no secret of the fact that they regard me as an unbaptised person; in their communion participation in the Lord's Supper is generally reserved for those who have been baptised. If invited to receive Communion in a Baptist Church, ought I to put the minister in the position of going against what from the beginning has been the doctrine and tradition of the Baptist churches?

What do we mean, when we receive Communion in a non-Anglican Church? With regard to the admission of non-Anglican communicants to our Communion I have no difficulty at all; I accept their baptism, if they have been baptised, as the one vitally important qualification; if they are communicants in any known form of the Christian fellowship, I would have little hesitation in admitting them. But the matter is otherwise when it comes to my receiving communion elsewhere. If I agree to do so, I am passing a favourable judgment on the ministry and doctrine of another Church; and this is something that my own church has not done. Ought I to take an individualistic position in the matter without regard to what my church has said, not on the question of intercommunion, but on the much deeper questions of church, ministry and sacramental doctrine?

What has been the effect of intercommunion in the past? We need not here rest on theory. In the United States many denominations have for years practised freedom of communion; this has not brought

them one inch nearer to corporate union—each denomination still exists in the total separateness of its organisation and polity.

Why, then, do some of our non-Anglican friends press so strongly for a measure of intercommunion on the way towards corporate union and not at the end of the way? There is no doubt at all as to the reason for which they desire it. They wish to see in it a final abandonment of the Anglican claim to some special character and quality in the episcopal form of ministry—this claim being for them one of the main stumbling-blocks in the way of union with the Anglican churches. Once again, we do not here have to depend on theory. In 1932, faced by extremely strong pressure from the non-Anglican brethren that there should be two-way intercommunion at meetings of the Joint Committee in Church Union in South India, the Episcopal Synod passed a carefully safeguarded resolution which made it possible for such of the Anglican delegates as felt so minded to receive communion at a non-Anglican celebration of the Communion. This was regarded on our side as an act of humility, and of recognition of the sincere desire of the brethren for unity; those of us who thought theologically would, I imagine, have called in the oriental doctrine of economy, though this does not really exist in the Anglican tradition. It was disturbing to us to find that to our brethren this act of charity on our part had far greater significance, and was interpreted precisely in the sense that I have mentioned above, as an abandonment of any exclusive claim on the part of Anglicans for the episcopal tradition of the ministry. Some Anglicans were so deeply disturbed by this interpretation that for a time the whole progress of the discussions was in doubt.

The churches in Nigeria, when left to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, had worked out a scheme of unification very much on South India lines. Under extreme pressure from the Lambeth Conference of 1958 the Anglicans in Nigeria abandoned their own convictions, and pressed for a reconciliation service on the North-India-Ceylon lines. This was accepted with ill grace by the non-Anglicans, and had to be paid for by the Anglicans through the insertion in the Scheme of Union of an unconditional recognition of the full equality and validity of non-Anglican ministries before union. This is something that we had carefully avoided in South India; we never used the term 'validity', a legal term which does not seem to correspond to any spiritual reality, and we did not pass any judgment on one another's ministries, simply recognising that God had used them all, and that we were not prepared to pronounce on matters that we saw to be beyond our competence.

What I am pleading for is careful recognition of the theological implications of all that we do and say. Naturally I am inclined to be in favour of any closer fellowship between the Church of South India and the Anglican Churches. But I note here a shift of opinion from the position that we took up in earlier years. I am the only survivor among the seven Anglican bishops who wrestled with the South India problem in the classical days of the negotiations. We were quite prepared to wait, to recognise that what was decided in South India would not confer on anyone any privileges which he had not had prior to the Union, and that we for our part would be excluded

from the Lambeth Conference. The demand for full communion with the CSI introduces a principle for which we did not contend; if this had been strongly pressed for at the Lambeth Conference of 1948, we would have split the Anglican Communion, and this we were not prepared to do. The younger generation, including men of the distinction of Bishop Lesslie Newbiggin, is perfectly entitled to take up a different position; but I am concerned that all the implications of the new position should be recognised.

So I find myself in a curious situation in all this. I suppose that I am myself nearest to the third of the three positions outlined above. But I find that in practice I am not prepared to go nearly so far in the direction of intercommunion as some of my friends who would regard themselves as much more 'catholic' than I am. It would be interesting to consider why this is so, but this would require a book and not a review. I think the basic reason is that, during the long and often agonising discussions which led up to the formation of the Church of South India, I learned the necessity of absolute honesty with one another, and that I have built into me a profound suspicion of anything that seems to put expediency before principle and that, on the basis of what is often called charity, is prepared to be less than ruthless in maintaining what is felt to be the truth.