

CHAPTER 3AFSA's RESPONSE TO ALIENATION

The "Principles" declared in AFSA's Manifesto began with a theological statement affirming that it is God's will that all should live in "brotherhood" and moved to condemnations of the economic system and the Church. This reflects the dual focus of the group. AFSA used its understanding of the Gospel to critique the life of society and it used its critique of society to criticize the Church. In both these movements AFSA expressed a tendency to alienation from the *status quo*. In this chapter we will explore this alienation and reflect on the theological images which informed it.

Alienation from Society

In the Manifesto AFSA condemned the capitalist system because its appeal to self-interest and its promotion of competition frustrated the will of God that all people should live in "brotherhood". This critique was developed in "A Christian Economic System", a pamphlet published by AFSA and written by John Peacock.¹ As Temple had done in *Christianity and Social Order*, AFSA argued for a more just and co-operative economy on the basis of a Christian understanding of human-ness. Peacock wrote that the will of God is "complete justice, love, co-operation and sympathy for all men." The love of God for his creation demands that human personality "be of highest value" and "receive first attention in all matters economic and educational." The economic order, therefore, should be primarily oriented to providing security in the means of survival for all through the equal distribution of wealth.

1. John Peacock, *A Christian Economic System* ("AFSA Bulletin #1"), Papers of Cyril H. Powles. Unless otherwise noted, quotations in this section are taken from this document.

Peacock wrote,

It is not His will that anyone should suffer so that another might live in luxury, for He loves His children equally. ...So commerce, industry, trade and the professions must be so regulated that the benefits thereof are shared by all according to the needs of each individual, and with some regard as well for those who bear greater responsibility than others.

AFSA hoped that such an equitable distribution would be achieved by a move to a co-operative society in which "a failure of crops in one place would not react against that locality only, but against the entire country and world, and people would be taken care of *according to their need*." In such an interdependent society, the dignity of the person would be recognized and respected, as persons would neither be exploited for the benefit of others nor devalued in the fight for profit.

AFSA condemned capitalism because competition for and the accumulation of profit made impossible such obedience to the will of God. Peacock claimed that selfish economic motives had supplanted the Christian understanding of human-ness and he used the popular maxim, "Business is business", to clarify "the unspoken assumption that business is of the first importance in any economy and that must go on regardless of all else." Because the capitalist economy claims such a primacy for itself and attempts to assert it in ways that are contrary to the divine purpose (e.g., "cut-throat" competition, "its almost universal emphasis on impersonal values", and "its obvious desire, through pressure advertising, to make men covetous."), AFSA concluded that Christianity and capitalism are necessarily in conflict.

Peacock wrote,

No amount of reasoning can reconcile this (Christian) attitude with the dog-eat-dog principle of private and international competition where all personal needs are supplanted by the impersonal ones of gain and profit, for their own sake in many cases, but in most cases for the sake of shareholders.

In proposing an alternative to this unacceptable *status quo*, the AFSA Manifesto declared that "the present social order cannot be changed without a change of heart and mind and will in the individual, and a corresponding change in the political and industrial arrangements."² AFSA never really addressed the issue of personal conversion, and I suspect that this reflects the group's primary reliance on a structural analysis of the Church and society. Indeed, as the group was critical of the individualistic assumptions of capitalism and Protestantism, it is likely that such a reference to personal transformation was merely an ideological safeguard intended to legitimize its advocacy of structural transformation. This explanation is supported by the fact that, with respect to this issue in the Manifesto, AFSA was quoting the Lambeth Conference of 1930, another legitimizing authority. The group's bias is evident in "A Christian Economic System", which identified only structural changes as necessary to bring the economic order into conformity with the will of God. These were: an end to the manipulation of capital for profit and the socialization of the land and natural resources. AFSA maintained that, while money and credit are necessary as media of exchange, they should not be used as a commodity to be bought or sold. Therefore, there should be no interest charged on investment or credit. Similarly, Peacock argued, the raising of capital for new projects should not be dependent on the profitability of the investment, but on the social merit or need for the proposed enterprise. Through the socialization of the land AFSA hoped that it would become possible for all to possess their own homes, "not forever, but for a reasonably long time." Thus, it was argued, the notion of ownership would begin to be re-

2. "Manifesto," Principle 4.

placed by that of tenure, and this would lead to a better understanding of stewardship. If the land and natural resources were "held in trust by the State for the use of all", no one could say "this is mine forever" and assume the freedom to develop or destroy it. Rather, all would be encouraged to co-operate in the care of the earth.

As these two specific proposals suggest, AFSA adopted a socialist stand in response to its alienation from the *status quo*. According to Vince Goring, the members of the group were all socialists in the sense that they "believed the next step in social evolution had to be a society in which the means of production and the land were owned and operated by representatives of the people, that private ownership had to go." This step was seen to be "the basic change that would allow us to move to an economically egalitarian society."³ This common commitment to socialism was not doctrinaire and it took different forms. Some members, such as Flynn Flanagan, were very closely associated with the CCF.⁴ Others were critical of the CCF because they feared that, under pressure, social democrats might move with the Right against other parties farther to the Left.⁵ *Anglican Outlook* voiced such a criticism of the CCF in 1949, saying the party had ceased to represent "an antithetical movement" because of its failure to disassociate itself from the American foreign policy being endorsed by the Liberal government.⁶ Some members, such as Ray Corbett, had strong Communist sympathies.⁷ While

3. Interview with Vince Goring

4. Flynn Flanagan ran for the CCF in Notre-Dame-de-Grace in 1945 and 1958. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

5. Interview with Vince Goring.

6. *AO* 4,12 (Oct. 1949) p.6.

7. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

the group tolerated a plurality of leftist opinion, both the social democrats and the Marxists shared the goal of common ownership.

In advocating such a specific change in the structure of the economy, AFSA was closer to groups like the FCSO, the Guild of St. Matthew, the Church Socialist League, and the Catholic Crusade than it was to groups like the Christian Social Union and the Christendom Group. These latter groups looked to the transformation of values as the fundamental step in the process of social change. AFSA, while basing its critique in the realm of ideas (e.g., the Christian understanding of human-ness), looked primarily to a transformation of economic relationships. Whereas the Christendom Group and, to a certain extent, Malvern had attempted to steer a course between the Scylla of "materialism" and the Charybdis of "idealism", AFSA opted more generally for a materialist analysis of society. This was expressed, with characteristic asperity, by Flynn Flanagan when he said, "Man doesn't live by bread alone -- but by God he's got to have some bread!"⁸ It was this emphasis in its analysis of society which informed AFSA's insistence on the need for changes in the economic structure of society.

William Temple understood the need for structural change, but he also understood better than AFSA did the limitations of such change. In arguing from the standpoint of a Christian doctrine of "man" and in condemning the selfish, competitive basis of capitalism, AFSA reflected the attitudes of Temple and Malvern. AFSA went beyond Malvern in calling specifically for the abolition of private ownership of the land and natural resources and in doing so without qualification, AFSA presented its position less carefully than Temple did. Malvern was unable to be as specific as AFSA

⁸. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

was on the abolition of private ownership and it qualified and defended its moderate position by claiming that "the church as such can never commit itself to any proposed change in the structure of society as being a self-sufficient means of salvation."⁹ In "A Christian Economic System" Peacock announced that the principles suggested by the Christian doctrine of man "can be logically developed into an economic system which not only works and is Christian but will also happen to bring about the Church's objective in its war on sin, the world and the devil -- God's Kingdom on Earth!"¹⁰ AFSA did not represent "the church as such", but it did identify the Kingdom of God with its particular kind of socialism. While Temple also saw the capitalist system to be based on self-interest and competition, and while he considered this to be contrary to the will of God, he shared Malvern's reservations.¹¹ In his "Appendix" to *Christianity and Social Order*, he was more careful than AFSA was with respect to specific proposals because he understood that, given the power of sin, structural changes such as the elimination of profit and socialization of the land and resources would not necessarily improve the situation. He argued that not all forms of self-interest are bad. For instance, it is appropriate for one to demand the means of fulfilling basic needs for oneself and one's family. He then expressed his reservations on communal ownership as follows:

Our need is to find channels for right self-interest which do not encourage exaggeration of it as our present order does. Communal ownership would entirely

9. "The Findings, Malvern" as reprinted in CSS, *Bulletin*, #103S (Feb. 25, 1941) p.6.

10. Peacock, "A Christian Economic System."

11. See, Temple, *Christianity and Social Order*, p.27.

close one channel to it and open others -- especially the road to the bureaucratic aristocracy which is an evident feature of the Russian system. The art of Government is not to devise what would be the best system for saints to work, but to secure that the lower motives actually found among men prompt that conduct which the higher motives demand.¹²

AFSA's proposals do not reflect this depth of analysis of the human situation. One cannot dispute the fact that the group expressed valid concerns for the economic life of Canada, and in advocating the value of human personality and the principles of equal distribution and co-operative effort, AFSA was well within its scope as a group of concerned Christians. On the other hand, AFSA was perhaps naive in offering such specific proposals and in commenting on the possibilities of their implementation. This judgement is not made from an economic or ideological point of view. Rather, AFSA's naiveté in this respect is theological and it relates to a superficial understanding of sin and the Kingdom. In many ways, the subtleties of its British antecedents were lost on AFSA. The group failed to appreciate the wisdom behind Malvern's reservations with respect to the Kingdom and Temple's reservations with respect to sin in relation to socialism and communal ownership. Another example of this lack of depth is provided in Peacock's reference to the maxim "Business is business".¹³ He used it to describe the prevalence of the profit motive whereas Temple used it as an example of the dis-integration or compartmentalization of Western society which divorced religion, politics, and economics.¹⁴

The lack of refinement in AFSA's argument for socialism should be considered a reflection of the primacy of its concern for the Church. The

12. *Ibid.*, p.102

13. Peacock, "A Christian Economic System."

14. William Temple, *Nature, Man and God* (London: MacMillan, 1960) p.77.

group's purpose was to argue for what they perceived to be fundamentally Christian and in advocating socialism as Christian, AFSA was passing judgement on the Church's accommodation to an unchristian social order. The missing element in the argument was a description of the effects of capitalism -- the ways it denies human personality and its failure to provide for the basic needs of people. This was the basis of Peacock's judgement that capitalism is unchristian, and it is a much more powerful argument than the attempt to prove that socialism is essentially "of the Lord."

Alienation from the Church

With respect to the Church, AFSA's critique and vision were more fully developed. That this was the group's area of primary concern, to which it devoted most of its energies, is obvious from both the volume and the quality of the material written.

AFSA's critique of the Church was related to one fundamental insight: that "The Church is the handmaiden of society."¹⁵ The group considered the Church of England in Canada to be overly-accommodated to the ruling interests of a post-Christian capitalist society. Sam Pollard said that the Church had become "the tool of the rich and powerful, and failed to be the friend of the poor and dispossessed."¹⁶ Because of her attention to the needs of business, the Church had lost "the masses" and had become a class Church.¹⁷ Cyril Powles was describing the attitude of "contemporary man" to the Church when he wrote,

15. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

16. Sam Pollard, "The Church's Task", *CC* (Feb. 18, 1943) p.99.

17. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman* (April, 1946) pp.9f.

To him the Church means compromise with the power of this world: siding with the haves against the have-nots; with capital against labour; with white against colour; with imperialism against self-determination; in short with all the characteristics which our Lord condemned as belonging to the rulers of the Gentiles, and not to his friends.¹⁸

This classist bondage was attacked by AFSA on the grounds that it made the Church unfaithful to its mission and its Lord. According to Sam Pollard, the Body of Christ ought to be "the ferment and dynamite in any social structure", but commercial interests had ensured that the Church would be "content to sanctify the activities of the state and of the 'free individual'."¹⁹ The Gospel had been "sold out".

Given this understanding of the Church's function in sustaining the *status quo*, AFSA members were probably not surprised that official resistance to the discussion of unpopular opinions and the implementation of progressive programmes was defended with arguments based on an uncritical and individualistic understanding of the role of faith. Flynn Flanagan said that the "chief aim" of AFSA's opponents was "to restore religious individualism."²⁰ The establishment sought to safe-guard its position by maintaining that religion was primarily a matter of individual decision, personal piety, and inter-personal morality. This tactic on the part of "the opposition" prompted Ray Corbett to comment that the dominance of wealthy businessmen on the boards of the Church explained why "the church is so silent on all social questions except for an occasional splutter about some of the 'naughty'

18. Cyril Powles, "Christianity -- A Living Organism", *AO* 2,12 (Oct. 1947) p.6.

19. Sam Pollard, "The Church's Task", *CC* (Feb. 18, 1943) pp.99-100.

20. Flynn Flanagan, "Reflections on the meetings at Fort William", *AO* 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.15.

things people do in the careless pursuit of their freedoms."²¹ The basic contradiction in the establishment's religiosity was eloquently exposed by Sam Pollard, when he wrote,

It would seem to be glaring hypocrisy vehemently to urge that venereal disease is a moral problem first and a medical one second -- and at the same time to confess that "lending money at interest" is a financial problem first and a moral problem second (if at all).²²

AFSA addressed the ideological roots of the Church's classism by affirming that the Gospel is "essentially social,"²³ and that "there is no problem in community life that is not, at base, a theological one."²⁴ In criticising a society founded on the idea of the "individual", AFSA became critical of "the atomistic conception of Christianity" and asserted that "Christianity is a social religion."²⁵ This view was developed by John Kirby in a series entitled, "The Church -- A Family."²⁶ Quoting Emil Brunner, Kirby said that the Good News comes to us "not in the imperative mood but in the indicative," proclaiming "the nature of God, man and the material world" in terms of "is" rather than "ought". Part of the Gospel message concerns the essential solidarity of human life: that we are branches of the same vine, sheep of the

21. Ray Corbett, "Lay Representation at Synod", *AO* 6,3 (Jan. 1951) p.11

22. Sam Pollard, "The Diocesan Social Service Council and 'The Social Gospel'", *Montreal Churchman*, (July, 1944) p.20.

23. *Ibid.*

24. Flynn Flanagan, "Reflections on the meetings at Fort William" *AO* 8,10 (Oct. 1953) p.14.

25. See *AO* 4,7 (May, 1947) p.17; 6,12 (Oct. 1951) p.6; 7,7 (May, 1952) p.6.

26 *AO* 5,5 (March, 1950) p.8; 5,6 (April, 1950) p.17; 5,8 (June, 1947) p.9; 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.9

same shepherd, and members one of another. This human solidarity should find its fullest expression in the community of the Spirit. Kirby affirmed that the church is a family and its role in the world is to be the prototype of human solidarity, "to express on earth the pattern of the Common Life which is laid up in heaven." AFSA believed that, in the Incarnation, God had revealed the essentially corporate nature of human being and that the church, as the Body of Christ in the world, was called to re-present this revelation in the world by its example. For this reason, an individual faith is impossible. Faith in the Lord of the church necessarily involves participation with the community of believers in its mission in the world. Given its conviction that the existing order did not reflect the Common Life, AFSA held that, in order to fulfill its representative role, the Church would have to turn away from the *status quo*. An editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

What we need most at this time is a church deeply aware of the "cosmic setting of man's moral and spiritual struggle" and prepared to live a communal life that is entirely unlike the ordinary life of this world.²⁷

As long as the Church remained in bondage to a competitive social order based on self-interest, so long would it fail to embody the brotherhood revealed by its Lord.

These views on the essentially social nature of personhood and the representative, almost sacramental, role of the church formed the apologetic for AFSA's demand that the economic and political life of the institutional Church should be radically different from that of capitalist society. Human community should be most evident in the Church, and as the unity of persons is

²⁷. AO 6,12 (Oct. 1951) p.6.

denied in the *status quo*, the Church must stand over and against it. However, given that the Church was so deeply involved in the practices of capitalism, it was essential, as a matter of faithfulness to its mission, that the life of the Church be reformed. Sam Pollard wrote,

A Church whose practice is at such variance with its professed beliefs is split spiritually and must inevitably disintegrate, ... This situation can only be resolved in one of two ways -- either we revolutionize our practice in order to bring practice into line with our beliefs, our theories; or we throw over the Christian theories altogether and reduce them to the level of present practice.²⁸

AFSA called the Church to "become what it is" by reforming its political, economic, and worshipping life and making them reflect better the life of true community. Politically, AFSA supported strongly the synodical system of Church government and attempted to secure a wider representation of all classes of the laity on the Church's official boards and committees. Economically, AFSA challenged the Church to examine its financial supports, advocated a basic stipend, and criticized the attempt to strengthen the actuarial pension plan.

An implication of AFSA's understanding of true community was the sense that all persons had the right to participate in decisions which affected the whole. Therefore, AFSA reacted against the limitation of open discussion in Church meetings and other trends which seemed to contribute to an erosion of collective decision-making and "democratic" government in the church. On the national level, there were periodic suggestions that General Synod meet less frequently with a "reduced and less heterogenous membership." At the 1943 General Synod in Toronto, there had been an attempt to pare the

²⁸. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman*, (April, 1946) p.10.

Lower House, consisting of priests and laity, from 286 to 186, to convene every four years instead of every three, and to reduce diocesan representation to the three boards of the Church: the Missionary Society of the Church in Canada (MSCC), the General Board of Religious Education (GBRE), and the Council for Social Service (CSS).²⁹ Similar concerns were being expressed in 1949 and 1952.³⁰ In such attempts AFSA perceived a tendency to concentrate power in the Executive of General Synod and it was felt that this would only lead to "further bureaucratic control and more government by decree and the so called experts."³¹ In the argument for such change on the basis of economic and administrative considerations, AFSA discerned a "worship of financial efficiency and bureaucratic centralization at the expense of the cure of souls."³² Beginning in 1945, similar trends to "clerical Fascism" were perceived in attempts at Diocesan Synod to control the activities of synod committees and to limit the discussion of controversial subjects. For instance, it was suggested that Diocesan Synod meet every two years.³³ In 1946 a motion was introduced which would have prohibited committees of Synod from issuing any public statements or taking any public action which had not been approved by the bishop. Ernie Reed said this would have amounted to episcopal censorship and a deviation from

29. Sam Pollard, "Comments on General Synod", *Montreal Churchman* (Oct. 1943) p.20; *AO* 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.6.

30. Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments I, By 'An Observer'" *AO* (Nov. 1949) p.12; R.H. Corbett, "A Young Layman Reflects on General Synod", *AO* 2 (Dec. 1949) p.10; "Arteriosclerosis", *AO* 7,11 (Sept. 1952) p.7.

31. *AO*, 7,11 (Sept. 1952) p.7.

32. *AO*, 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.6.

33. "Synod Trends", *AO*, 6,6 (April, 1951) p.8.

the Anglican norm.³⁴ In a similar vein, an editorial in *Anglican Outlook* protested in 1950 that the bishop's authority as the chairman of Synod was being misused. This article said,

We deny that we have party government in the church, but we have steadily and carefully built up the prestige and power of the president-bishop of synod in order that he may speak for the ruling elite within the church.³⁵

Another example of hierarchical control was the procedural change made in 1950 which barred the presentation of motions from the floor of Synod without the unanimous consent of the delegates.³⁶ This was seen to confine the power to initiate discussion with the administration who set the agenda and to limit the ordinary members of Synod to asking questions or making comments from the floor.

There are indications that AFSA understood these trends in slightly different ways. Its fundamental analysis was that democratic decision-making in the Church was being destroyed, but this was variously attributed to a general trend in society to limit free discussion,³⁷ to a "power play" on the part of ruling elites,³⁸ and, more specifically, to a move to "muzzle" minority groups within the Church,³⁹ All of these are valid interpretations, but it should be noted that the latter was certainly the

34. Reported in Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments", *Montreal Churchman*, (Aug. 1946) pp.8f.

35. "The Episcopal Veto", *AO* 5,6 (April 1950) p.7.

36. "Memorials and Petitions", *AO* 5,9 (June, 1950) pp.6f.

37. "Here I stand", *AO* 6,10 (Aug. 1951) pp.7f.

38. "Memorials and Petitions", *AO* 5,9 (June, 1950) p.6.

39. "Here I Stand", *AO* 6,10 (Aug. 1951) p.7.

case in the Diocese of Montreal. Restrictions on the presentation of motions from the floor of Synod and the episcopal censorship of public pronouncements were introduced to control AFSA members' activities.⁴⁰ In defence, AFSA called for the free discussion and representative government of democracy and, quoting Bishop Gore, argued that the early church "was in fact the very nursery and the home of the principles of representative government."⁴¹ Quite apart from its ideological or apologetic function in the face of repressive opposition, this respect for democracy was a reflection of the group's understanding of "brotherhood". As baptised Christians, all members of the Church share an equal status as children of the Lord and each has the right to speak and to be heard by his family.⁴²

AFSA used this perspective to address the Church's bondage to the rich and powerful. Through the *Anglican Outlook*, the group noted that lay representation to General Synod and Diocesan Synod was "not really representative of our church people,"⁴³ as the majority of delegates were businessmen and professionals. Sam Pollard wrote.

When the vast majority of the laity, the common labourers, the artisans, the factory-hands, and the junior white collar people are hardly represented on the floor of general synod -- and not at all on the executive council or committees -- how can anyone with honesty argue that the church today is not a class institution in the hands

40. Interview with Flynn Flanagan.

41. Quoted in "The Episcopal Veto", *AO* 6,5 (April, 1950) p.7.

42. On AFSA's perceptions of trends in church government, see also, Sam Pollard, "Synod Reflections", *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1945) p.16 and "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman*, (April, 1946) pp.8f.

43. *AO* 7,12 (Oct. 1952) p.6.

of the privileged few who direct its policy, control its manpower and handle its finances?⁴⁴

The same was considered to be the case with respect to Diocesan Synod, and since 1943, AFSA members had been calling for changes in the timing and financing of Synod which would allow working people to attend.⁴⁵ Although some progress was made in this direction in Montreal,⁴⁶ AFSA was still advocating these reforms in 1951.⁴⁷

AFSA also addressed the Church's accommodation to capitalism as this was expressed in her financial organization. In this area the group was much more on the offensive than it was with respect to freedom of speech in synods. Whereas AFSA's arguments in defense of the synodical system were, at least in part, a response to actions taken against it, the groups's positive advocacy of financial responsibility and the basic stipend were a direct consequence of its notion of human solidarity. That AFSA should relate the economy of the Church to the value of community is not surprising, given its tendency to employ a materialist or structuralist analysis of society. However, to most of its audience, fixed in a tacit separation of spirituality and material existence, this concern for financial reform must have appeared somewhat extraneous to the Church's mission. Sam Pollard attempted to clarify this relationship when he wrote,

44. Sam Pollard, "General Synod Coments by 'An Observer!'", *AO* 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.12. See also, *AO* 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.4; *AO* 7,9 (Aug-Sept. 1952) p.7.

45. *SDMJP* 1943, pp.100f.

46. *Ibid.*

47. Ray Corbett, "Lay Representation at Synod", *AO* 6,3 (Jan. 1951) p.11.

The values of the Gospel are not those of the commercial world; and if we are to persuade men to accept the message of the Cross our behaviour in the ordinary things of life should be equally extraordinary. As Christ's witnesses we have to commend the Faith by our faith and by living a sacrificial Christian life -- not by following an ecclesiastical system that is based almost entirely on the philosophy of power and a commercial way of life.⁴⁸

He also said,

Until the church reorganizes her own economy with courage and integrity, and makes it conform to Christian values -- and not to the standards of the secular world -- just so long shall we be defeating our own purposes in winning souls to Christ.⁴⁹

AFSA believed that the Church's witness was "vitally affected" by the way it organized its business, and that, given the ecclesiastical *status quo*, there was needed "an economic reform which will be a sacrament of spiritual purpose."⁵⁰

Perhaps the clearest and least debatable example of the Church's participation in and perpetuation of the capitalist system was the fact that the Church was a shareholder, collecting profit on investments. AFSA did not even attempt to criticise the fact of investment. Rather, acknowledging or assuming that the Church would always have capital to invest, AFSA asked that the Church become a socially responsible investor, attending to the policies, wages, and working conditions of those companies in which she held shares. On this issue, Sam Pollard again quoted Bishop Gore, who had written,

... it seems to me a conspicuous instance of moral blindness that people should fail to see that in

48. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman*, (April, 1946) p.10.

49. *Ibid.*, p.9.

50. Sam Pollard, "The Diocesan Social Service Council and 'The Social Gospel'", *Montreal Churchman* (July 1944) p.21.

investing their money they make themselves -- within reasonable limits, but really -- responsible for the use to which their money is put: that to put one's money, or allow it to be put, into any 'concern' without enquiry into the moral or social tendency of the concern is to serve mammon at the expense of Christ.⁵¹

AFSA also called the Church to transfer investments from "big business corporations" to consumer and producer cooperatives, saying that "Christians must materialize their ideals by putting their financial resources into agencies that work for a basic re-ordering of our economic life."⁵² The members of the group advocated such a "purification of the Church's means of support" in both Diocesan and General Synods.⁵³

The financial reform to which AFSA devoted most of its energies and with which the group has become most closely identified was the institution of one basic stipend with allowances. While AFSA produced much material on this issue,⁵⁴ its arguments were quite simple. The unequal remuneration of the clergy was an obvious "negation of the idea of Christian brotherhood."⁵⁵ By paying larger stipends and better benefits to priests in wealthier parishes, the Church encouraged in the clergy the self-interest and competition typical

51. Quoted in Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments", *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.

52. *Ibid.*

53. See, e.g., *SDMJP* 1943, pp.100f., and Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments by 'An Observer'", *AO* 2,3 (Jan. 1947) p.17.

54. See *Montreal Churchman*, (Oct. 1943) p.8; Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments by 'An Observer'", *AO* 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.4; John O. Peacock, "The Problem of the Basic Stipend", *CSS Bulletin* #137, (Oct. 30, 1948) pp.8-12; "The Basic Stipend", *AO* 4,5 (March, 1949) pp.8-10; R.H. Corbett, "A Young Layman Reflects on General Synod", *AO* 5,3 (Jan. 1950) p.12; J.E. DeWolf, "Clergy Basic Stipend", *AO* 5,7 (May, 1950) pp.10-11 and 5,8 (June, 1950) pp.16-17; Letter from R.H. Corbett, "The Right or Wrong of Basic Stipend", *AO* 11,8 (Sept, 1950) p.15; and J.O. Peacock, "Basic Stipend", *AO* 11,8 (June-July, 1956) p.16. Cf. The pamphlet circulated by the Basic Stipend Committee of General Synod and reprinted in *AO* 15,2 (Dec. 1959) pp.8f and 15,3 (Jan. 1960) pp.8f.

55. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends", *Montreal Churchman* (April 1946) p.9.

of secular society which denied the Gospel's vision of community. It was hoped that the basic stipend would overcome "competition and rivalry for position and material benefit" and foster among the clergy an unconditional commitment to the work of the Kingdom of God.⁵⁶ An editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

The Plan's proponents believe that, under such conditions as the Plan envisages, the Clergy would truly reflect the lives of the Apostles in that "they would have everything in common", and that their witness would show the laity a living example of the moral soundness and efficacy of Christ's teaching to "bear one another's burdens."⁵⁷

AFSA also argued for the basic stipend on the basis of efficiency. While it was admitted that competition for higher positions might be considered appropriate in business, it was not appropriate to the ministry. Describing the effects of the existing system, Ray Corbett said,

(It) results in those areas which are poor in money but rich in people being either poorly shepherded or not shepherded at all, while rich parishes in many areas have more clergy than they actually need. There is something basically wrong when we of the church ask a man to work in a mission area on \$1400 to \$1600 per year, spending from \$300 to \$900 of that on a car to cover a vast area, while his brother minister in the city gets three or four times that amount and in addition sometimes has a secretary, travel allowance, a fairly well-contained parish and a curate. Surely those who are dedicated to the same Master need no financial incentives in front of them to work hard: surely it is not Christian or practicable for one man to lack the tools with which to do his job while another has enough surplus to travel thousands of miles visit (sic) the Mission areas only to go duck hunting.⁵⁹

56. John O. Peacock, "The Problem of the Basic Stipend," CSS, *Bulletin* #137, pp.10-11.

57. AO 4,5 (March 1949) p.9.

58. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", p.10.

59. R.H. Corbett, "Young Layman Reflects on General Synod", AO 5,3 (Jan. 1950) p.12.

Under the basic stipend plan, all funds designated for salaries and benefits would be pooled and redistributed according to a schedule of allowances for family, transportation, years of service, and, possibly, accommodation and the difficulty of the particular ministry.⁶⁰ It was hoped that by distributing funds on the basis of need, priests might be better enabled to fulfill their ministries.

The institution of such a system was a fundamental part of AFSA's programme as announced in the Manifesto.⁶¹ The issue was raised initially in Diocesan Synod in 1943, but the scheme was never approved by that body. Representatives of the Diocese of Montreal presented a motion on basic stipend to General Synod in 1943 and a committee was appointed. Continuation of the committee was voted at each successive General Synod but no specific action toward the implementation of the plan was taken.

The strongest opposition to the scheme was seen to originate, not with the clergy, but with influential laymen.⁶² John Peacock wrote,

They pay certain large sums of money into the church coffers and they demand proportionate services in return. They pay, so they want to get! They think that if they pay five thousand dollars a year to the salary of their rector then they ought to be able to "employ a five thousand dollar man."⁶³

AFSA did not "blame" the wealthy congregations and their priests for the

60. There was also a suggestion that the plan might include lay workers. On this and other variations, see Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", pp.11f.

61. Rule 5 of the Manifesto read: "To work for a system of clerical stipends based upon the Christian doctrine of brotherhood."

62. See *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.9 and *AO* 4,5 (March 1949) p.9.

63. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", p.11.

situation; the competitive system of stipends was "a corporate sin and responsibility."⁶⁴ AFSA also recognized economic security as a legitimate concern, but was not content to settle for an expedient or crisis-related solution to the problem. For this reason, the group resisted attempts to establish special funds for the poorer clergy. This might give the rural priest a degree of security approaching that of a priest in a wealthy urban congregation but it would not give him an equal status. Of such suggestions *Anglican Outlook* said,

These are most worthy plan (sic) indeed, but one cannot help wondering whether their introduction at a time of agitation for Basic Stipend was accidental or inspired, or a combination of both. In our present disordered arrangements, such plans can serve a pressing need, BUT THEY CANNOT REMOVE THE BASIC CONTRADICTIONS in the present system, though perhaps they will obscure them for a while longer. The crumbs may be a little bigger, but they will still be crumbs, and from the usual source.⁶⁵

AFSA was not willing to lay responsibility for the *status quo* entirely at the feet of the rich and powerful, nor was it willing to allow a charitable solution to the problems to circumvent the fundamental issue of brotherhood.

A further problem encountered in the struggle to implement the basic stipend was a general ignorance of the practicability and benefits of the plan. AFSA pointed to examples of such systems in foreign mission work, in the pension funds of some Dioceses, and in six Dioceses in Southern Africa.⁶⁶ The benefits would be a better sense of brotherhood among the clergy and greater efficiency in the use of the Church's human resources. Not only

64. *Ibid.*

65. *AO* 4,5 (March 1949) p.9.

66. *Ibid.*, pp.9-10

would priests be bound together economically, "sharing one another's burdens", but the social inequalities among the clergy would begin to be diminished as the inferiority or pride felt by priests because of their charges would begin to change.⁶⁷ Without the usual financial considerations, clergy would be much more mobile and could be placed according to their gifts for a particular ministry.⁶⁸ Depending on the size of the area participating in the plan, bishops could more easily move men, not only within a diocese, but between dioceses.⁶⁹ It was also likely that rural ministry would improve, as the incentive for effective priests to move to the city for a better living would be removed.⁷⁰ John Peacock said that priests would begin to receive their paychecks regularly and on time, freed from fluctuations in parish funds and the time constraints of treasurers.⁷¹

A final benefit of the scheme would have been greater fidelity to Christian truth and a more prophetic ministry. The existing system of stipends was seen to discourage the clergy from assuming unpopular or controversial stands on critical issues. Competition among priests fostered a tendency to "sell out" the Gospel as "getting ahead" depended on coming to the attention of and making an impression upon the rich and powerful laymen who served on the selection committees of the wealthy parishes. AFSA felt the basic stipend would free the clergy to speak according to conviction

67. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend", p.12.

68. *Ibid.*, pp.11-12.

69. Sam Pollard, "General Synod Comments by 'An Observer'", *AO* 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.4.

70. Peacock, "Problem of Basic Stipend" p.12.

71. *Ibid.*

and proclaim the Gospel without regard for the social class of the parish.⁷² Furthermore, the Church's adoption of such a cooperative plan would be a judgement on and witness to capitalist society, for it would proclaim that the life of the Kingdom is radically different from the life of the world.⁷³

AFSA also debated issues of economic security with respect to the Pension Fund. General Synod had established its pension system in the late nineteenth century. It was apparently based on early actuarial principles and, in AFSA's day, it incorporated the clergy from all but six dioceses.⁷⁴ During the 'forties, problems with clergy pensions, especially eligibility and the poor stipends involved, were widely felt.⁷⁵ Shortly after its appearance, *Anglican Outlook* noted the need "to do something rational and generous about the chaotic absurdity of pensions throughout the Church."⁷⁶ About the same time, AFSA began to speak to the pension issue. Firstly, the group felt it was inappropriate for the clergy to claim greater economic security than Canadians in general, "as though any true prophet of the Lord ever cared about securities, apart from the security of all men."⁷⁷ AFSA advocated social security as an alternative and rejoiced that the day was coming when the community as a whole would take responsibility for the care of the aged. One editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

72. AO 4,5 (March 1949) p.8

73. *Ibid.*

74. See AO 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.6; 3,1 (Nov. 1952) p.4.

75. For an example of the problems involved, see CC (Oct. 15, 1942) p.581; (Oct. 22, 1942) p.597; (Oct. 29, 1942) p.613; (Nov. 12, 1942) p.646; (Dec. 3, 1942) pp.695f; (Dec. 24, 1942) p.755.

76. AO 1,15 (June 1, 1946) p.9.

77. Sam Pollard, "Church Trends," *Montreal Churchman* (April 1946) p.9.

We have long prophesied that the real solution in our society is a statutory contributory pension plan for all citizens, whether clergymen, or artisans, or lawyers, or doctors; ...⁷⁸

This hope, that the ministers of the Kingdom would so identify with others in society, was a reflection of the group's understanding of human solidarity.

AFSA also thought it was inappropriate that some clergy should have greater security than others. Since 1934, pensions had been based on the principle of "equal pension for equal years of service".⁷⁹ When wealthy parishes, such as St. Matthias in Westmount, established private annuities for their rectors, AFSA saw their actions to be an indication of the inadequacies of the existing pension plans and "a mockery of the corporately acknowledged principle of equal pensions for equal years of service."⁷⁹ The group understood the provision of pensions to be a corporate responsibility and believed that the inadequacies in the system should be overcome for all and not only for those who had "succeeded" in securing a wealthy parish.

Finally, AFSA resisted some attempts to reform the Pension Fund. These reforms were intended to improve the system and increase the stipend paid. AFSA was sympathetic to these goals, but argued that the way in which they were being pursued would deny the brotherhood of the priesthood. One plan, suggested in 1943, would have paid a pension commensurate with the contributions made by the individual clergyman. AFSA resisted this because it would simply have accentuated the existing inequalities in stipends.⁸⁰ Another

78. "Our Pension Empire", *AO* 6,10 (Aug. 1951) p.6. See also, *AO* 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.6; 7,9 (Aug.-Sept. 1952) pp.7f.

79. "Pension Eschatology", *AO* 6,6 (April, 1951) p.6; see also, *AO* 5,5 (March, 1950) p.6.

80. See *AO* 5,2 (Dec. 1949) p.9.

solution sought to make the fund more sound actuarially. AFSA considered this to be another instance of the intrusion of capitalist principles into the life of the Church. The group argued against actuarial soundness because: first, it was folly to assume that the Church might "go out of business" and be obligated to pay accrued liability; second, its inflexible rates of return did not allow the community to respond to emergencies, such as illness, and so depersonalized and dehumanized what ought to be a caring act of corporate responsibility; and third, while a firmer actuarial basis might improve the pensions of those still in active service and contributing to the fund, it would do nothing to improve the situation of those currently retired and dependent upon an inadequate pension. AFSA believed that the Church, if it were to reflect the brotherhood sanctified by its Lord, should adopt a "pay as you go" or budget-based system whereby pensions would be raised annually and the retired members of the community would be supported directly by the others.⁸¹

AFSA's arguments in response to the political and economic organization of the Church were based on the group's particular understanding of human community revealed in the Gospel. As the Church adopted the practices of capitalism and its infrastructure betrayed a strong tendency to support the *status quo*, the Church failed to embody the life of brotherhood proclaimed by Jesus. As we have already noted, AFSA also perceived this tendency to accommodation in the dominant understanding of the faith. Not only had the Church become tied to the economic and political interests of the rich

⁸¹. See AO 4,10 (Aug. 1949) p.5; 5,1 (Nov. 1949) p.6; 5,3 (Jan. 1950) p.12; 6,10 (Aug. 1951) p.6; 7,9 (Aug.-Sept. 1952) pp.3f.

and powerful, she was seen to have altered her teaching as well. This ideological bondage was most evident in the theological dependency on the notion of the person as an autonomous individual. AFSA extended its critique of the Church to include the ways in which contemporary liturgical practices confirmed and perpetuated this bondage, denying the corporate nature of faith and worship. The group's attitude to worship was expressed architecturally in Roland Bodger's church, St. Cuthbert's, dedicated in 1948. The building was of cruciform design with the altar at the crossing and the congregation on three sides. As *Anglican Outlook* reported, "the purpose of this arrangement is to emphasize the central part which the Lord's Supper ought to play in all Christian living and working."⁸² By placing the altar in the middle of the building and having the members of the congregation facing each other, the design of St. Cuthbert's presented a sacramental and social faith. AFSA realized, however, that the Sunday worship of most Anglican churches failed in its recognition of one or both of these elements. It failed to be sacramental in the most obvious sense that it was often not eucharistic. Most churches of the day held Holy Communion at eight o'clock every Sunday and at the major service only once or twice a month. Some AFSA members favoured a weekly "Parish Communion" or "People's Eucharist" held at an hour when the majority could attend and make their communion.⁸³ The Sunday worship of most parishes failed to be social in the corporate sense because it tended to emphasize personal communion with God. AFSA claimed that the popular understanding of worship was

82. AO 3,7 (May 1948) pp.3f. Cf. *Montreal Churchman* (May 1946) pp.3f.

83. Cf. AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.9.

individualistic. John Peacock said, "In these services, regardless of outward form, the appeal is to the individual person -- a person *gets* something from the service, for *himself*."⁸⁴ In the liturgy, the laity did not experience themselves as the people of God, but as individual Christians engaged in an act of personal restoration. John Kirby said, "most congregations look upon themselves as a number of individuals saying their prayers in a public place."⁸⁵ The practice of private baptism provided a clear example and possible explanation of the problem. John Kirby wrote,

Public baptism has become the exception rather than the rule: while most baptisms take place in a Church building, very few take place in the church, i.e. in the presence of the family of God. If one of the meanings of baptism is incorporation into the Christian family, surely the custom of baptizing children at a private ceremony is something that should be forbidden except in case of emergency. We have so lost sight of the corporate nature of Christianity that we think of baptism solely in terms of the child and not in terms of the community life which ought to follow from baptism. Here, where we could make an effective attack on the rampant individualism which bedevils the church, by publicly receiving the child into the family of God, we have gone the way of the world and imported individualism into the beginning of the Christian life itself. We could probably do more to help Christians realize that the purpose of the church is to draw men out of isolation into the divine community by taking the font out of obscurity than by any other way.⁸⁶

The Eucharist was seen to be the act of community in which the personal and corporate, the individual and social achieved their synthesis.⁸⁷

84. AO 7,12 (Oct. 1952) p.12.

85. AO 5,12 (Oct. 1950) p.9.

86. AO 5,6 (April, 1950) p.17

87. Cf., AO 2,5 (March, 1947) p.4.

The Church as an Agent of Social Transformation

In the previous section I outlined some of the particular criticisms of the Church made by AFSA. The group called the Church to witness to the life of true community by reforming its political and economic organization. The group was also critical of the ways in which the worship of the Church supported the individualism which underlay its accommodation to the *status quo*. AFSA also hoped, however, that the Church would move beyond this simple disengagement from capitalism to address the critical issues of the day and become a positive force for social change. In effect, the group called upon the Church to adopt a different, pro-active, role.

AFSA noted the vigour with which the decision-making bodies of the Church avoided the controversy that would accompany a discussion of relevant social issues. An example was General Synod's failure to discuss the atom bomb in 1946.⁸⁸ The official Church found a defense for its irrelevance in the claim that the Body of Christ can never be identified with any political or economic system, and it could quote Malvern for support. AFSA, on the other hand, understood this reluctance to address critical issues to be a function of the Church's accommodation⁸⁹ and attempted to expose this ideological bias by pointing to the Church's support of the NATO pact.⁹⁰ If the official Church intended to remain free of secular affiliations, should it not, then, disassociate itself from Western capitalism? Sam Pollard used the opposition's argument against them and stressed disaffiliation from the

88. See, Sam Pollard, "Comments on the Sixteenth General Synod," *Montreal Churchman* (Nov. 1946) p.10 and AO 2,1 (Nov. 1946) p.11.

89. Cf. AO 3,12 (Oct. 1948) p.9

90. AO 5,2 (Dec. 1949) p.7.

status quo for the sake of a changed social order. He wrote,

The Christian can have few regrets over the destruction of any system; his great care and interest must be for future arrangements. This task will naturally bring tension; but surely the church is a dialectical organism, full of tensions, and we must be less squeamish, less politic and less expedient -- and much more forthright in word and deed.⁹¹

The Church's irrelevance was also seen to be a function of its individualistic approach to reality, another aspect of its accommodation to capitalism. In writing about a particular report to General Synod in 1946, Sam Pollard said that "there seems to be not the faintest realization that sin is social as well as personal, that it is embodied in the structure as well as the individual."⁹² AFSA hoped to move the Church toward a more vocal role in society and one which would support systemic change. Sam Pollard believed that the Church's charitable work in the community gave it the right to "thunder at the gates of tyranny."⁹³ He wrote,

Shall the Church confine itself to ambulance work -- picking up the derelicts of the ruthless competitive order to give them charity, and fail to co-operate with policies of governments or public bodies trying to substitute social justice for social injustice? Too often in the past the Church has -- I think -- taken less pains to prevent than to relieve poverty, and the duty of assisting the poor has been rather an exercise in charity than an obligation in justice.⁹⁴

Instead of "staunching the wounds of an acquisitive society"⁹⁵ the Church

91. Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments," *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.
92. *AO* 2,2 (Dec. 1946) pp.19f.
93. Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments," *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.
94. Sam Pollard, "The Church's Task," *CC* (Feb. 18, 1943) p.99.
95. Sam Pollard, "Synod Comments," *Montreal Churchman* (Aug. 1946) p.10.

should take an educational and activist role in promoting the cause of social justice. So AFSA hoped that the Church would begin, not only to reflect mutuality in its own life, but to advocate it in society as a whole. The role of the Church, expressed theologically, was to be the agent of redemption by which the sovereignty of God is extended over the creation. One editorial in *Anglican Outlook* said,

... the church as the Body of Christ must be His instrument for the "fulfillment of God's purpose in the world and beyond it." And since God's Kingdom cannot be created in a vacuum it must have something to say about the social and economic environment in which God's children live and move and have their being.⁹⁶

The Church, AFSA believed, was to be the means by which divine power affects the material relationships of persons and recreates the world.

AFSA did not specify how the Church was to fulfill this role. However, if one can consider the actions of the group to reflect its vision of the Church, then the Church was expected to work for a new social order by speaking boldly to the issues of the day from a Christian perspective and by aligning itself with other progressive and alienated groups in society. AFSA did describe the kind of liturgical life which ought to support and represent this role. The group believed that the worship of the Church failed to be social and sacramental in a much deeper sense than that which we have already described. The popular understanding and common practice of liturgy failed to be social in that it ignored the life of society and it failed to be sacramental in that it tended to spiritualize the Gospel by divorcing the spiritual and material realms of existence. Thus the Eucharist was seen by most Anglicans to be more of an act of the individual soul in relationship to the divine. AFSA, on the other hand, viewed the Eucharist as a

⁹⁶. "Where it Listeth...", *AO* 6,8 (June, 1951) p.6.

corporate act of the people of God on behalf of all persons in which the life of society was offered to God and transformed. The group believed the church's worship was closely related to the political, economic, and social relationships of everyday life.

The key to this view of the Eucharist is an implicit understanding of redemption as the process of re-ordering the chaos of a sinful world and a particular interpretation of the offertory. These were put forward by John Kirby in a series on "The Worship of the Church" in *Anglican Outlook*.⁹⁷ In these articles, Kirby described worship as the recognition of God as sovereign and sin as the absence of this acknowledgement. Chaos was seen to be the consequence of sin. Kirby wrote,

When man fails or refuses to recognize God as the Creator and ultimate Owner of the universe and attempts to run the world without reference to Him and to His laws, chaos results. ... With the widespread non-recognition of God and of God's laws in our time, man has moved steadily towards his own destruction; instead of realizing the glorious heritage of freedom which is his as a child of God, he has moved increasingly in the direction of slavery, slavery to race and blood, slavery to the state, slavery to the industrial machine. It is only in the acknowledgement of the God from whom we come, that man can ever achieve the freedom for which the Creator made him.⁹⁸

Through the Incarnation, God was bringing order to the world's disorder and in the Eucharist, this process of redemption was extended symbolically. The bread and wine were considered the product of human labour expended on the creation and, therefore, representative of the whole life of society and the sinful, disordered relationship which informs it.⁹⁹ In the offertory

⁹⁷ John C. Kirby, "The Worship of the Church", *AO* 1,9 (March 1, 1946) to 2,1 (Nov. 1946)

⁹⁸ *AO* 1,9 (March 1, 1946) p.19.

⁹⁹ Cf. John C. Kirby, "The Laity and the Liturgy", *AO* 8,8 (June-July 1953) p.15.

then, the church was seen to be offering up to God the economic, political, and social life of the world with all its ambiguities and sinfulness. Kirby understood the imperfection of the bread and wine on several levels when he wrote,

Our Offering has in it the Sins of the Individual, his selfishness, his pride, his apathy, and all the rest.
 Our Offering has in it the Sins of the Church, her faithlessness (sic), her worldliness, her cowardice, her compromise, and all the rest.
 Our Offering has in it the Sins of Society, its oppression, its corruption, injustice, and all the rest.¹⁰⁰

In the Consecration, as the bread and wine are transformed and become vehicles of Christ's presence, the ambiguous life of the world is transformed and conformed to God's order. This process was considered the extension of the Incarnation, for in the world-made-flesh, God had assumed matter for a spiritual purpose, the redemption of the world. In the Eucharist, God assumed the material elements of bread and wine, making them the means of Christ's presence among his people and symbols of his new creation.¹⁰¹ The Eucharist, then, was seen by AFSA members to be an act in the progressive re-ordering of the life of humanity through the Incarnation. John Kirby wrote,

In that service man takes the things of nature, bread and wine, and offers them to God; God receives the bread and wine, purges them of the corporate sin of mankind with which they are stained, and having blessed them, gives them back to man, charged with His very Presence and His very Self. ... The bread of earth becomes the bread of heaven that earth might be lifted to heaven...¹⁰²

This view of the Eucharist was both a support to and a demand for Christian

100. AO 1,14 (May 15, 1946) p.19.

101. AO 1,15 (June 1, 1946) p.20.

102. AO 1,9 (March 1, 1946) p.19.

involvement in social change. It was a support in that it assumed that the transformation of society, and not only individual persons, lies at the heart of the sacrament. It was a demand in that it brought the sin of the world into the liturgy, and so brought into focus the dissonance between the *status quo* and the Kingdom of God. John Wagland wrote,

... through the offering of bread and wine in the Eucharist, the Church is unavoidably involved in the moral problems of production, labour relations, distribution and all the injustices of our complicated economy.¹⁰³

How could the church remain satisfied with such an imperfect offering? The notion that the bread and wine represented the whole life of society prompted the church to make of them as pure an offering as possible by working to re-order the dis-ordered relationships found in society. The transformation of the elements in the Eucharist also prompted individual Christians to carry forward the transformation of society in their daily lives.

Theological Ideas

There are no specifically theological texts by AFSA members. The group's literary legacy is not a work of systematic theology, but an assortment of polemical and didactic articles in various religious periodicals. This renders impossible the task of presenting a clear and consistent "AFSA theology". The group did much of its thinking "on its feet" and none of the members' writings were directed to an academic audience. AFSA was primarily action-oriented and, therefore, its literary output was intended more to gather support for its activity in the Church and society than it was to argue a particular theological point. This does not mean that the

103. J.F. Wagland, "Labour in the Eucharist," *AO* 3,11 (Sept. 1948) p.18.

group had no theological terms of reference. It should be apparent from the preceding discussion that the group shared some very strong opinions on the meaning of the faith in the context of post-war Canada. However, in advocating a theological position, AFSA was only concerned to promote a "new orthodoxy" to the extent that it led to a radically different praxis. In this section, I will sketch the central ideas which appear to have supported and informed AFSA's activity. I will then complete our view of these ideas with reference to other groups and individuals whose thinking influenced the group in Montreal.

AFSA's theological position was dependent on two themes: the Incarnation and human solidarity or "brotherhood". The first of these is related to process or method and points to a sacramental understanding of the universe and redemption. The second is related to content or direction and points to a social understanding of personhood. Both have their roots in a critique of Western capitalism -- the individualism which informs the *status quo* and the spiritualized Christianity which supports it.

In the "Wordmade Flesh", AFSA discovered an understanding of the relationship of God to the created order. The "co-operation of the human and the divine" in Jesus affirmed human-ness. That God "was made man" demonstrated unequivocally "that God uses human faculties as the vehicle for His revelation instead of overriding or suppressing them."¹⁰⁴ In and through Christ, then, the ultimate value of personhood is affirmed and our true humanity is revealed. Furthermore, the Incarnation was seen to affirm the whole material order. It established that "the world of space and time and history, with

¹⁰⁴. AO 7,2 (Dec. 1951) p.6.

all its confusions of ignorance and error and sin" is the locus of divine activity and the arena of salvation.¹⁰⁵ The Incarnation was thus seen to be the final statement in the relationship of God and the world.¹⁰⁶ At the same time, AFSA understood it to be the first act in the redemption of the world. The group considered this redemption to be an historical process in which a new order is established as the Incarnation is "extended".¹⁰⁷ As men and women open themselves to Christ and receive the Word made Flesh, both individuals and their social relationships are changed -- the created order is restored to God and His Kingdom is established.

This view of the material world as the realm in which God has established the process of redemption was AFSA's apologetic for social action. If Christ is active in us, then we must be active in the world. AFSA's view of the Church as the means by which the Incarnation is extended was the basis of the group's demand that the Church should be different from the mainstream of society. Because the world as it is fails to fulfill the vision of human-ness revealed in Christ, the Church, as Christ's agent in the world, must stand apart from it.

Whereas capitalism invested meaning in "having", seeing the value of persons to be a function of what they possessed, AFSA held that the Gospel invested meaning in "being", seeing the value of persons to be unconditional and a function of our status as children of God. More specifically, the group considered the primary mode of human-ness to be "being with", as all persons

105. *Ibid.*

106. *Ibid.*

107. See, "The Incarnation Today", *AO* 6,2 (Dec. 1950) p.7.

share a common status with respect to the Creator. This was the human solidarity revealed in Christ.

AFSA's view of personhood was a judgement on the social and ecclesiastical *status quo*. It was expressed most clearly in an *Anglican Outlook* editorial which read, "A new faith must be worked out in which community replaces property as the sacrament of life."¹⁰⁸ A similar attitude can be found in other groups of the time. The Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, in its "Basis of Agreement and Constitution, 1935", affirmed that "the impulse to multiply possessions, which is encouraged by institutions based on private property, is an effectual barrier to spiritual development."¹⁰⁹ This impediment was seen to be a product of laissez-faire capitalism and its individualism.¹¹⁰ In response, the FCSO promoted an organic view of society and an understanding of human-ness as related-ness. They saw the person primarily as a member of "mutual relations"¹¹¹ and they considered Christianity "a religion of persons-in-community."¹¹² In *Towards the Christian Revolution* John Line wrote,

But whereas totalitarianism imposes unity or solidarity from above, Christianity creates among men a common spirit; and it is through this that it promises to preserve a true individualism while

108. "Whither Bound?", *AO* 7,1 (Nov. 1950) p.6.

109. FCSO, "Basis of Agreement and Constitution, 1935" in Roger Hutchison, *FSCO*, p.273.

110. Cf., John Line, "The Philosophical Background" in R.B.Y. Scott and Gregory Vlastos, eds., *Towards the Christian Revolution* (Chicago & New York: Willett, Coark & Company, 1936) pp,1-25

112. Cf., R.B.Y. Scott, *Ibid.*, p.76. See also, Hutchison, *FSCO*, pp.28f.

gathering men into a unified life. The will toward mutuality which it inspires and enjoins is at once the law of inner social cohesion and the expression of the highest attributes of personal nature. Socialist Christianity rests upon the conviction that because of the natural unity of life this law of mutuality must be applied to outer relations as well as inward.¹¹³

Another contributor wrote,

The church's special function, then, is to keep men conscious of God and the community, for they belong to both. These are not independent and unrelated, but two aspects of something that is an organic whole. Intimacy with God involves mutuality among men, and that not alone within a select, congenial group, but among all men.¹¹⁴

In response to the individualism of capitalism, then, both AFSA and the FCSO used a vision of human-ness as "being-with" and an understanding of Christianity as a social religion.

AFSA and the FCSO also shared a similar understanding of the religious value of the historical and material world, although they arrived at that valuation in very different ways. The FCSO's position developed as that group attempted to deprivatize salvation and locate the Kingdom of God within history.¹¹⁵ John Line avoided a discussion of "theoretical or metaphysical materialism" in *Towards the Christian Revolution*, but he used a discussion of Evangelical Orthodoxy, Liberal Modernism, Barthianism, Neo-Thomism, and Whitehead's process thought as the basis for projecting a "Radical Christianity".¹¹⁶ This faith was materialistic in the sense that it removed

113. John Line, *Toward the Christian Revolution*, p.22.

114. J.W.A. Nicholson, *Ibid.*, p.176.

115. See Hutchison, *FCSO*, pp.138f.

116. Cf., John Line, "The Theological Principles" in *Towards the Christian Revolution*, pp.26-50.

religion from its bondage to a narrow definition of spirituality. Line extended the Evangelical notion of sin to include those acts and processes by which power is used and wealth is amassed, and he considered the fruit of repentance to be the will to transform the unjust conditions found in society. While this Religious Radicalism was critical of the naive and Utopian immanentism found in the pre-war social gospel's reliance on the notion of progress, it also rejected as "Manichaeism" the Barthian view of the disparity between the human and the divine. Line wrote,

(Radical Christianity) will agree that man has not the means to save himself but must look to forces in the universe and in history that are not his to command. The action of these forces, in an era like ours, may be catastrophic, events moving too swiftly for their triumph to come solely through the gradual increase of good will and confidence. Thus the theology of Religious Radicalism will be eschatological; it will picture God as judging the world and taking sides. And this will dictate the strategy of a revolutionary Christianity, which will clearly include alignment with the forces God is using to accomplish the next stage in man's deliverance.¹¹⁷

This affirmation of history was shared by AFSA, although a more metaphysical orientation is suggested by the Anglican group's reliance on the Incarnation. The FCSO did not rely on an understanding of sacramentality, but argued for the importance of material relationships on the strength of the biblical tradition. R.B.Y. Scott wrote:

The religion of the Mosaic tradition, expounded and clarified by the prophets and culminating in Jesus' gospel of the Kingdom, is a religion of persons-in-community. ... It is not an other-world religion but concerns itself in a frankly realistic manner with the way men live together here and now.¹¹⁸

117. *Ibid.*, p.48.

118. R.B.Y. Scott, *Ibid.*, p.76.

The position indicated by the "Group of Churchmen" who published *The Return of Christendom* was much closer to AFSA's. Percy Widdrington wrote that "the two foes the Church must defeat are Manicheism within its own borders, and Materialism in the world outside."¹¹⁹ He and his followers believed that the Materialism of society had removed from politics and economics the consideration of spiritual values, while the Manicheism of the Church had removed the consideration of material relationships from the purview of religion.¹²⁰ Widdrington hoped that a restoration of eschatology would lead to an understanding of the Kingdom as this-worldly or next-worldly, rather than other-worldly. In this sense, then, he shared with AFSA and the FCSO a positive valuation of the historical plane as the locus of salvation. Unlike the FCSO, however, the contributors to *The Return of Christendom* tended to see in the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Eucharist the fundamental expressions of and apologetic for a materialist faith and the unity of spiritual and material goods. For example, L.S. Thornton wrote,

All social relationships are through the medium of our bodily life. A full redemption of man, therefore, will take into its scope the whole social structure and all the outward order of human life as it is lived in the body. The dogma that "the Word was made flesh" declares the goodness and value of everything that belongs to the common life of man and its outward expression. It reasserts the truth of Creation that "God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good." The same truth is emphasized in another way by the miracle of the Resurrection. The body of the Lord was raised from the tomb as a natural corollary of all that had gone before.

119. P.E.T. Widdrington, "The Return of 'The Kingdom of God'," in A Group of Churchmen, *The Return of Christendom*, p.109.

120. Cf., *Ibid.*, pp.83f.

... In this way it was made plain that the whole of human life, body as well as spirit, had been redeemed.¹²¹

AFSA reflects such an approach to traditional doctrines.

A more explicitly materialist understanding of the process of redemption was expounded by Frederick Hastings Smyth, a thinker whose Society of the Catholic Commonwealth attracted some AFSA members, as we have already noted. There are, to date, no studies dealing specifically with Smyth's thought in a detailed and systematic manner, and this indicates a gap in the theological literature.¹²² I will only describe his thinking briefly in order to relate it to AFSA's position. Smyth shared in the positive valuation of the created order,¹²³ but he differed from the FCSO and the "Group of Churchmen" in his emphasis on the priority of the material over the spiritual in the process of redemption. He made his argument for this priority in his major work, *Manhood into God*. There he wrote,

It is very significant that God initiates His process of re-ordering the world, on the level of what we call *matter*. The Process of the Incarnation, that is, of re-creation of the world, begins logically, as did the first creation, within the material world. Only later does this Process extend itself into the levels of mind and spirit. Thus, the Catholic Religion, as the Religion of the Incarnation, is, in a sense, rooted in a proper and throughgoing materialism; for the method of the Incarnation demonstrates to us that the necessary and prerequisite foundation for all intellectual and spiritual order is, so far as this world is concerned, the development of an organized material body.¹²⁴

121. *Ibid.*

122. I have found one short article. See, John L. Kater, Jr., "Forgotten Prophet: A Note on the Theology of Frederick Hastings Smyth", *Anglican Theological Review* LV,1 (Jan. 1973) 73-77.

123. See, Frederick Hastings Smyth, *Discerning the Lord's Body: The Rationale of a Catholic Democracy* (Louisville, Ky.: The Clister Press, 1946) pp.1-9

124. Frederick Hastings Smyth, *Manhood into God* (New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1940) pp.108-109.

Smyth attempted to describe the process of redemption or the extension of the Incarnation with reference to a particular interpretation of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The element of that traditional doctrine on which he focused was the perfection and transformation of the bread and wine, but he wished to expand this idea by relating it to the whole created order and making it a paradigm for the whole process of redemption itself. The term he used to refer to this transformation of the created order was "metacosmesis" or "transordination".¹²⁵ The Incarnation, understood in this sacramental sense, was for Smyth the prototypical metacosmesis. The process was seen to involve three stages: first, the lifting of the human to the order of the divine, as God took human nature into Himself; second, the perfection of that humanity through sacrifice and, ultimately, the sacrifice of the Cross; and finally, the return of the perfected or re-ordered humanity to the disordered creation as an agent of the continuing process of re-ordering. The ultimate expression of this stage was the Resurrection.¹²⁶

Generally speaking, AFSA did not employ Smyth's metaphysics. However, his concept of metacosmesis would appear to have influenced the interpretation of the Eucharist presented by John Kirby and outlined above. This is interesting because Kirby did not join the SCC. The parallel between Smyth and Kirby is very strong, as both related the Eucharist to the extending of the Incarnation and the process of redemption, seeing the bread and wine as representative of the sinful, contingent life of the world, and both emphasized the process of the Mass in which the elements are offered to God, transformed,

125. These are terms which Smyth came to prefer to "transubstantiation". See *Discerning the Lord's Body*, Preface and p.48, n.21.

126. See *Ibid.*, pp.46ff.

and returned to His people charged with divine power.¹²⁷

While Smyth's thought was used by AFSA members to interpret the Eucharist, his was not the strongest influence on the group. Rather, it would appear that the group was most conscious of its dependence on the thought of William Temple, particularly as this was developed in *Christianity and Social Order* (1942).¹²⁸ Temple focused on both of the themes we have identified as basic to AFSA's position, but his treatment of them differed from that of the others we have been considering. While elements of a sacramental view of the universe and an understanding of personhood as social can be found in the FCSO, the "Group of Churchmen", and Hastings Smyth, both themes are fully developed and united in Temple. They form the foundation of his social teaching.

Temple worked toward these themes from an analysis of modernity. This analysis is most clearly presented in Lecture III of *Nature, Man and God*, although elements of it are found elsewhere in his writings, notably in *Christianity and Social Order*. He began by explaining the Medieval synthesis in terms of the authority of the Church over Theology. He likened the pre-modern thought-world to an arch comprised of philosophy, metaphysics, logic, politics, ethics and economics, with Theology as the "keystone of its arch." Given the "monolithic"¹²⁹ nature of that world, Temple concluded that the only breach in the

127. See *Ibid.*, pp.63ff.

128. "The Arundel Group and the Anglican Outlook", *AO* 11,1 (Nov. 1955) p.10; "Farewell -- And Hail", *AO* 15,8 (June-July, 1960) pp.6f.

129. Such a view of the medieval world as a monolith has been challenged. In objective terms, a point of view accessible to us only by the grace of time, it is true that there existed within medieval Europe a certain diversity of opinion and practice. However true this may be, it does not invalidate Temple's analysis, but sharpens it, for the world of Erasmus, Luther, da Vinci, Galileo, and Copernicus was, no doubt, experienced as something of a monolith as far as the authority of the Church was concerned.

structure could have been sustained by some sort of individualism, as was the case. He wrote,

If a man's thoughts and purposes were no longer to take their start from the only tradition available, where could they begin? And the only possible answer was "with himself". If a man was not going to start as a member of a system, accepting that system and his own place in it, then he must start with his isolated self. ... So the modern movement was bound to be a movement of individualism. We owe to it the distinctive blessing of modern life, but also its distinctive ills.¹³⁰

According to Temple, this individualism found its spiritual expression in Luther's *Hier ich stehe, ich kann nicht anders* and its philosophical or metaphysical expression in Descartes' *Cogito ergo sum*. Both of these express the principle of "private judgement", not only as a right, but as a duty. Temple considered this principle to be most dangerous as expressed by Descartes by virtue of "the inherent error of its initial assumption that in knowledge the mind begins with itself and proceeds to the apprehension of the external world by way of construction and inference."¹³¹ Thus the *Cogito* promotes "the assumption of an epistemological and (consequently) ... a metaphysical priority of the Subject in the Subject-Object relation of knowledge."¹³² The knower somehow takes on a greater reality than that which is known. This aspect of the principle of private judgement implies that the individual's ideas and experience are somehow more important, more trustworthy, and more "real" than those of others around him. The implications of this tendency for the medieval world view and its "keystone", theology, were devastating.

¹³⁰. William Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, The Gifford Lectures of 1932-33 and 1933-34, (London: Macmillan, 1960) p.62.

¹³¹. *Ibid.*, p.73.

¹³². *Ibid.*, p.72.

All of this is the groundwork for Temple's insight into the state of modern life. He said,

... the chief characteristic of the modern or post-Reformation period has been departmentalisation. The great enterprise of all-inclusive unity, which was characteristic of the Middle Ages, was progressively abandoned.¹³³

As the focus of knowledge moved from Theology or the Church to the judgement of the individual, so the various areas of human endeavour became focused on themselves. Politics, art, literature, science, philosophy, and religion all sought to understand the world from within their own perspectives and without reference to each other. With respect to the place of religion in this departmentalisation of human experience, he made his point most clearly when he spoke of World War I. He saw the war as the result of "various instances of national self-assertion", and said,

The check which it might have been hoped that Religion would exercise could not be applied, for Religion also had become departmentalised, and was by most people regarded as a "private affair between a man and his Maker", so that its main if not its only concern was with personal piety.¹³⁴

It was such an analysis which informed AFSA's assertion that Christianity is a social religion. AFSA perceived such an over-riding concern with personal faith, to the exclusion of most other concerns (except, of course, the preservation of the institution), in the official Church when its critique of the political and economic life of Western capitalism was met by the claim that the faith has nothing to do with these things, that its proper concern is the relationship between individuals and their Lord. Temple showed that

133. *Ibid.*, p.76.

134. *Ibid.*

this attitude is rooted in modernity and its malaise: it was the departmentalisation of the whole of life and the Church's accommodation to that trend which rendered it "improper" for the church to speak on any issues except those within its "proper" sphere of personal piety. Neither AFSA nor Temple denied the importance of personal faith, but they were critical of such a limitation of religion.

In his argument against this limitation, Temple did not deny the importance of special expertise in the various "departments" of life. Rather, he was concerned to indicate the dangers inherent in the principle of private judgement: the fact that, while emancipating different areas of human endeavour from the overbearing authority of Theology, it also severed the relationships of every part of life one to another and, at its worst, permitted a licentious detachment of the claims of one area from those of another. He illustrated this well by using some familiar folk maxims. He wrote,

"Art for Art's sake" ... is perhaps the most refined form of the principle of departmentalisation which finds its grossest expression in the formula "Business is business" and its most immoral in "My country, right or wrong."¹³⁵

In response to this dis-integration and the relegation of religion to matters of personal piety, Temple said that "the Church has to regain lost ground" and reassert its right to be heard on matters of politics and economics.¹³⁶ He was not proposing that the Church take over the task or the work of politicians and economists. In fact, he warned against compromising the Church's right to speak by ignoring "the autonomy of technique." In so doing, he expressed a certain respect for the divisions created by modernity,¹³⁷ and made it clear

^{135.} *Ibid.*, p.77.

^{136.} William Temple, *Christianity and Social Order* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1942) p.30

^{137.} *Ibid.*, pp.16f.

that he was not advocating a return to the Middle Ages. He considered this undesirable, let alone impossible. However, he did say,

It is our task consciously and deliberately to construct a "synthesis" of the classical and medieval "thesis" with the modern "antithesis", and this in some fundamental respects will resemble the "thesis" more closely than the "antithesis".¹³⁸

He was not advocating a total repudiation of modernity, but he believed that, while "the autonomy of the individual conscience", "the duty of private judgement", and "the integrity of the individual mind" would not be forgotten, the new synthesis would strive to resolve the apparent contradiction between the principles of individual autonomy and corporate authority in favour of the latter. Given the contradictions of modernity, what was needed was "a fresh recognition of the essential nature of Authority as distinct from either coercion or dictation" and "the appreciation of man's ethical problem as primarily one of conversion and vocation".¹³⁹ Temple did not address this problem directly. In a sense he by-passed it by looking to Christian theology to provide a normative view of humankind in the world. He discovered in the Incarnation or "the sacramental principle" the basis of an organic understanding of the material world as a unity and a relational understanding of personhood.

In *Nature, Man and God*, Temple used the sacramental principle to describe "the special relationship of spirit and matter" or "the reality of matter and the supremacy of spirit." Quite simply, this principle refers to "a spiritual utilisation of a material object whereby a spiritual result is effected"¹⁴⁰ or "an actual conveyance of spiritual meaning and power by

138. Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, p.80.

139. *Ibid.*, p.81.

140. *Ibid.*, p.491

a material process."¹⁴¹ He explored the sacramental principle in discussions of the relationships of Time and Eternity ("The Meaning of History") and Spirit and Matter ("The Sacramental Universe"),¹⁴² and worked toward the conclusion that,

By the nature of its central doctrine, Christianity is committed to a belief in the ultimate significance of the historical process, and in the reality of matter and its place in the divine scheme.¹⁴³

Temple began his argument from the point of view of Natural Theology and the scientific worldview. He assumed an evolutionary process of development from inanimate matter to human personality and focused on the emergence of mind and human knowing to prove that spirit emerged from matter. Temple suggested that, in order for mind to emerge within the material process, it must have been present in some form from the beginning. Thus he arrives at the sacramental principle as the expression of spirit through matter. Unlike Smyth, who emphasized the priority of matter, Temple emphasized the priority of spirit. He said,

In the sacrament then the order of thought is spirit first and spirit last, with matter as the effectual expression or symbolic instrument of spirit. That is the formula which we suggest as an articulation of the essential relations of spirit and matter in the universe.¹⁴⁴

The theological statement of Temple's conclusion was that God who created and informed the material world, who became incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, continues to inform and sustain the world. God first and God last, with

141. *Ibid.*, p.484.

142. See *Ibid.*, pp.427f. and pp.473f.

143. *Ibid.*, p.478.

144. *Ibid.*, p.492.

matter as the instrument of his purpose. Thus Temple arrived at a view of the universe in which Spirit encompasses all. God initiates, informs and consummates the world process, and all of human existence, material, individual, and social, comes under the plan of redemption. This incarnational or sacramental perspective was the basis of all of Temple's social teaching.¹⁴⁵ Within it, no sphere of human activity was "left to its own devices", but the whole of life was presented as acceptable to God and the object of his purposive love. Temple wrote,

It is in the sacramental view of the universe, both of its material and spiritual elements, that there is given hope of making human both politics and economics and of making effectual both faith and love.¹⁴⁶

The departmentalised view of religion and its limited notion of redemption was thus rendered a theological impossibility and the church was thrust into the problem of politics and economics.

The important difference between Temple and AFSA's position, on the one hand, and that of Smyth, on the other, was the order of their presentation. Smyth began with the material process of the Incarnation through which the fallen, created order is trans-ordered. Temple acknowledged that the process is material, but stressed its spiritual origin and end more strongly than did Smyth. Therefore, whereas Smyth understood salvation to be the participation in the process of the extension of the Incarnation through the Church, as Christ's Body in the world, Temple and AFSA understood salvation to depend on the realization of certain spiritual values. AFSA is obviously

145. Cf., Robert Craig, *Social Concern in the Thought of William Temple* (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1963) p.16.

146. Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, p.486.

closer to Temple in that it argued for the transformation of material relationships in accordance with the human solidarity revealed in Jesus and the mutuality implied by our common status as children of God.

Temple's view of personhood as social was related to his critique of modernity and its focus on the individual. Whereas the medieval synthesis has been broken by the assertion of individual autonomy, the new synthesis required a re-assertion and a new understanding of the individual's related-ness. Temple firmly believed that persons are essentially and necessarily social. He said, "we are all part of one another" and "by the constitution of our nature we are bound up with one another."¹⁴⁷ In *Nature, Man and God* he argued this point on the basis of the universal human experience of "obligation". While moralities differ, ethical questions are asked by all persons and, as these questions inevitably involve the relationships of persons, Temple concluded that membership in a community of persons or society is "part of the constitution of our nature".¹⁴⁸ This understanding of the social nature of human being was also developed in Temple's discussion of sin, as he considered sin to be self-centredness -- the subordination of the claims of other conscious beings to the claims of the self.¹⁴⁹ This approach addressed the departmentalised view of religion which implied that sin and righteousness were only issues in the relationship of the individual believer and the Creator. These were understood by Temple to be relational issues involving the individual, God, and the community. AFSA shared such an understanding of the person-in-community.

147. *Ibid.*, p.xx

148. *Ibid.*, p.189. See also pp.166f

149. See *Ibid.*, pp.356f.

The picture of AFSA which emerges from this discussion of theological foundations is one of a group which borrowed ideas from a number of contemporary sources and used them to support its action in the Church and society. The themes of an incarnational or sacramental understanding of reality and a relational vision of human-ness are primary in AFSA's thinking, but these were variously informed and nuanced by the thought of other groups and individuals. While this eclectic tendency sometimes makes it difficult to discern the group's position, it helps to explain why AFSA never produced a systematic theology for itself. It did not consider such a task to be necessary. The theological groundwork supportive of radical Christian social action had already been produced in the work of others such as Temple, Smyth, and the FCSO. The group's dependency on these others and its failure to introduce new ideas suggest that the intellectual milieu provided ample resources for the movement. What was needed was not more theology, but more action.