

ANGLICANS, CULTURE AND THE STATE

The Gospel and the Catholic Church St Stephen's House, Oxford

Rev Steven Richard Rutt, PhD

Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies

Arizona Christian University

26 April 2018

Psalm 2

1 ^aWhy do the heathen rage,
And the people imagine a vain thing?
2 The kings of the earth set themselves,
And the rulers take counsel together,
Against the LORD, and against his anointed, *saying*,
3 Let us break their bands asunder,
And cast away their cords from us.
4 He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh:
The Lord shall ^hhave them in derision.
5 Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath,
And vex them in his sore displeasure.
6 Yet have I set my king
Upon my holy hill of Zion.
7 I will declare the decree:
The LORD hath said unto me, Thou *art* my Son;
This day have I begotten thee.
8 Ask of me,
And I shall give *thee* the heathen *for* thine inheritance,
And the uttermost parts of the earth *for* thy possession.
9 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron;
Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.
10 Be wise now therefore, O ye kings:
Be instructed, ye judges of the earth.
11 Serve the LORD with fear,
And rejoice with trembling.
12 Kiss the Son, lest he be angry,
And ye perish *from* the way,
When his wrath is kindled but a little.
Blessed *are* all they that put their trust in him.

This messianic psalm advances the victory of God in time and in history. The psalmist prophetically declared that the LORD and His ‘anointed One’—the Messiah—sit in the heavens and laugh at those who oppose the LORD. As we look at this psalm today we are reminded by the historical fact that the LORD ‘held them in derision’ (i.e. contempt) already. This resistance truly took place on earth and is historically fulfilled at Calvary. For God set up His King on the holy hill of Zion—Jerusalem, the location where Jesus was crucified (Ps. 2:6). The exaltation of Jesus Christ in His resurrection, ascension, and session—discloses that Christ will reign while seated at the right hand of the Father until all His enemies will be made His footstool (Ps. 110; I Cor. 15:25). This is clear evidence that He is the established King over all things and that ‘His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him’ (Daniel 7:27). ‘Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; And *that* every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father’ (Phil. 2:9-11). These biblical passages disclose the timeless truth that—Jesus Christ is Lord—and proclaims the crown rights of King Jesus over all!

The promises of the development and victory of the messianic kingdom of righteousness, justice and peace was central to the language of the Older Testament prophets. Within the context of these covenant promises the prophet Isaiah reminded Israel that ‘the LORD is our judge; the LORD is our lawgiver; the LORD is our king; he will save us’ (Isaiah 33:22). It is with this covenantal understanding between God and His people that the historic Church has sought to live out Christ’s call to ‘be *in* the world without being *of* the world’, as she serves as ‘salt and light’ within the world. The structures that have supported Christendom for centuries stemmed from beliefs that the Church was called to engage with the State because Jesus Christ’s victory over death made it possible for *cultural transformation* to be realized through the proclamation of the Gospel. And, it is with this introduction that I now proceed to address the topic: ‘Anglicans, Culture and the State’.

PERSONAL THOUGHTS

A year ago Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali invited me to address this subject in light of my doctoral work on the Anglican missionary, the Rev Roland Allen (1868-1947). Of course, there’s an element of trepidation due to having an American speak concerning cultural relations with the state, especially here in England. I’m tempted to use the current approach within pop-culture’s *identity politics* and choose to ‘self-identify’ today as a Brit! And yet, that will not work because Bishop John Fenwick is present at this conference and he had to put up with ‘this’ American for four years while I served as presbyter-in-charge at St David’s Church, Preston, within his diocese.¹

¹ Bishop John was patient with my ‘diverse’ customs and went out of his way to educate me on proper protocol in certain ecclesiastical contexts, albeit, this was usually followed by a reminder that we Americans have ‘mucked-up’ the English language!

In spite of the past differences between Great Britain and the United States our country is indebted to the brilliancy of your ‘Christian’ Magna Carta and the development of English common law that helped shape the process and advancement of our Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, especially when it comes to the rights of life, liberty, religious freedom, and property. That said, I believe you would agree with me that America’s view of ‘liberty under law’ has more in common with Britain than it does with France!

However, the principles of ‘liberty under law’ are being dismantled by chaotic ideologies. The cultural war within Western civilization today stems from a disbelief and suspicion of conventional institutions which have been fortified by Christendom. The postmodern ‘left’ is committed to a revisionist agenda to uproot everything that Christianity has influenced over the past 2,000 years. These social constructionists—with their philosophy of dialectical materialism—are not afraid to marginalize and discredit Christianity and other religions. If you expect the media to provide objective, fair and accurate news reporting you might as well think again. Much of modern day journalism is dead. Even when there is ‘push back’ from conservative voices the social justice warriors (SJWs)—claiming to be tolerant—dig in and play the ‘political correctness card’ by labelling traditionalists as- racist, homophobic, anachronistic, xenophobic, and, that the ‘white’ patriarchy is to blame because, of course, masculinity is toxic. And, honestly, the statist enforcement of multiculturalism has cultivated tribalism. These are the revisionists who use the media (and civil government) to redefine the boundaries of what is right and what is wrong. As stated in ‘The Matrix’—should we take the red pill or the blue pill?

Dr. Jordan Peterson, a clinical psychologist and professor at the University of Toronto, has systematically confronted cultural-Marxism head on, as a critic of the leftist culture that is censoring free speech. In his recent book Peterson says:

The strong turn towards political correctness in universities has exacerbated the problem. The voices shouting against oppression have become louder, it seems, in precise proportion to how equal—even now increasingly skewed against men—the schools have become. There are whole disciplines in universities forthrightly hostile towards men. These are the areas of study, dominated by the postmodern/neo-Marxist claim that Western culture, in particular, is an oppressive structure, created by white men to dominate and exclude women (and other select groups); successful only because of that domination and exclusion’.²

Arguably, there is evidence of imperialistic tendencies within Western civilization’s expansion, in general, and with colonial hegemony of the past few centuries, in particular. However, to stereotype all Western ‘white men’ as imperialists is intellectually dishonest. The current shift within much of Christian missiology today tends toward the prioritization of social justice issues over against the advancement of Gospel ministry through evangelism and church planting. This seems to be a knee-jerk reaction to much of the postcolonial-guilt rhetoric evidenced today, and, therefore, tends to be a denial of Christ’s commission to disciple the nations (Matthew 28:18-20).

² Jordan B. Peterson, *12 Rules for Life: An Antidote to Chaos* (Canada: Random House, 2018), 302.

Recently, there appears to be an unwillingness among advocates of postcolonial theory to address the problems of *cultural* and *statist* hegemony, as evidenced through the actions of Islamist imperialism. This type of hesitancy among postcolonial theorists to confront ‘the imperialistic spirit’, especially with Islamic jihadism is academic hypocrisy (or fear). Both the Christian faith and the Islamic faith seek to advance their global mission. The cross-cultural question is: How does a religion advance its faith mission without being imperialistic?

According to St Paul this is nothing new for he described cultural decline—what we used to call ‘sin’—as futility and foolishness whenever people ‘exchange the truth of God for the lie’ (Romans 1:25). St Paul’s description of cultural degeneration was addressed in the milieu of Roman imperialism. Yet, he expressed hope at the end of this epistle by saying: ‘For your obedience has become known to all...but I want you to be wise in what is good, and innocent concerning evil. And the God of peace will crush Satan under your feet shortly’ (Romans 16:19-20).

The missional challenge to advocates of Anglican Patrimony is how to engage in Gospel ministry with the culture and the State within the context of a pluralistic society. Consider how Bishop Lesslie Newbigin—one whose missional thinking was shaped by Roland Allen—addressed this very thing in *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (1989):

The principle of pluralism is not universally accepted in our culture. It is one of the key features of our culture, and one that we shall have to examine in some depth, that we make a sharp distinction between a world of what we call “values” and a world of what we call “facts.” In the former world we are pluralists; values are a matter of personal choice. In the latter we are not; facts are facts, whether you like them or not. It follows that, in this culture, the Church and its preaching belong to the world of “values.” The Church is among the “good causes” which must be supported by good people, and without this support it will collapse. The Church is not generally perceived as concerned with facts, with the realities which finally govern the world and which we shall in the end have to acknowledge whether we like them or not. In this cultural milieu, the confident announcement of the Christian faith sounds like an arrogant attempt of some people to impose their values on others. As long as the Church is content to offer its beliefs modestly as simply one of the many brands available in the ideological supermarket, no offense is taken. But the affirmation that the truth revealed in the gospel ought to govern public life is offensive.³

The challenge is for us to move beyond our values (or preferences) to the proclamation of facts.

Fact: Gospel ministry in the marketplace quickly discloses that there is *no* cultural neutrality!

Fact: We are currently in a cultural war and should not genuflect to postmodern nonsense!

Fact: The Church has always been called to do cross-cultural Gospel ministry everywhere!

Fact: The Church of England has sinned by preaching a ‘different’ gospel of identity politics!

Fact: ‘For the LORD is our judge; the LORD is our lawgiver; the LORD is our king; he will save us’ (Isaiah 33:22).

³ Lesslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (London: SPCK, 1989), 7.

Courageous Christians: Transforming Culture with Truth

- This contentious culture seems to be ripe for revival, renewal, and restoration!
- The counter-cultural paradigm shift, as evidenced in Brexit, is a sign that postmodern ideological foundations have been built on sand and not on the Rock!
- Social media today—whether productive or destructive—appears to be similar to what happened 500 years ago when Gutenberg invented the printing press and a social media Augustinian ideologue—Martin Luther—emerged to address the culture and the state!

While addressing the topics of ‘Culture and the State’, this Anglican missiologist—one who is concerned with cross-cultural mission—will unpack this topic through the eyes (so to speak) of a High Church Anglican missionary and missions analyst—Roland Allen.

I. Anglican Ethos: Catholicity (universal) & Independence (particular)⁴ Restoring Old Paths (British Christians; Arles; Celtic Christianity)

The historic roots of Christianity in Britain seem to date back to the time when Christians travelled from the continent through the influence of the Roman Empire’s extension to this region. Much speculation exists concerning who these first Christians were but we do have early accounts from the African Tertullian (AD 208) when he mentioned Christians in Britain and about 40 years later when Origen in Asia (AD 239) ‘includes Britain among the places where Christians are to be found’.⁵ The former Bishop of Ripon, John R. H. Moorman discloses that in AD 314 three British bishops ‘attended the Council of Arles’ and that this revealed ‘the establishment of the Church on a diocesan basis’.⁶

Indigenous Bishops in England

Roland Allen had a vision of indigenization that was based on Pauline precedent and on the independent development of English Christianity. He argued that this was the historic practice of

⁴ Personal background: My parents mentored me in the Christian faith within the context of a Bible church tradition, associated with fundamentalist independent churches that were closely connected with Moody Bible Institute and Wheaton College. In fact, I still remember seeing the Evangelist Billy Graham preach to a packed audience in a football stadium in Chicago when I was five years old (the same year of my conversion to Christ). Over the years I was shaped by Reformed theology and was quite involved in the Jesus Movement as a teenager, which, interestingly, became the cross-cultural bridge for me to serve as a church planter and teacher within charismatic churches in Canada and New Zealand in my early to mid-twenties. While teaching at a Bible college in New Zealand, I was given a 1662 Book of Common Prayer by one of my students and began to use it as a daily devotion. The beauty of the liturgy within the prayer book shaped my spirituality, and, over the next twenty years influenced my pastoral and missionary work in Europe and the USA. In 2002 I took Holy Orders within the Reformed Episcopal Church (ACNA).

⁵ J.R.H. Moorman, *A History of the Church in England* (Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1980), 3. Cf. A.W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents* (1871), 3-4. Also, cf. G.R. Balleine and G.C.B. Davies, *A Popular History of the Church of England* (London: Vine Books Ltd., 1976), 13.

⁶ Moorman, *History of the Church in England*, 4.

Anglicanism: ‘In our own history, St Augustine was consecrated bishop, not of England, but of Canterbury (AD 597) ... and at that time all the bishops derived from Augustine were natives.’⁷

An argument can be made for ‘native’ leadership to emerge through the means of a ‘foreign’ representative’s prompting, as in the case of Augustine of Canterbury. I will refer to this as ‘trans-local’ apostolic ministry or what is generally called foreign missionaries. The English Church’s self-governing process was actually initiated by foreign leadership, and yet, was able to quickly propagate indigenous bishops and priests without foreign restraints. This in no way dismisses Celtic Christianity’s earlier influence before Augustine’s mission, especially St Patrick’s (British Christian) church planting in Ireland, Columba’s (Ireland) missionary work in Northumbria, and Aidan’s (Iona) and Chad’s (Iona) continuation of the mission work of Paulinus (York and Rochester).

PowerPoint Slide:

In Roland Allen’s *The Case for Voluntary Clergy* (1930) he highlights the significance of the indigenous episcopal leadership that emerged from Augustine’s ministry where:

- seven years later there were two other bishops, in Rochester and London
- forty years later (AD 644) a native [indigenous] was consecrated to Rochester, and he by himself consecrated the first native bishop of Canterbury in AD 654
- at that time all the bishops derived from Augustine were natives; that is within sixty years of St Augustine’s landing ... nearly all the clergy were natives
- the last of the Augustinian mission to be consecrated was Honorius (AD 627) to Canterbury
- Felix, a Burgundian, was consecrated to Dunwich (AD 627)
- after that the only foreign bishops were Theodore of Tarsus (AD 668) to Canterbury, Agilbert (AD 650) to Dorchester, and Leutherius (AD 670) to Winchester
- between the years AD 669 and AD 687 Theodore consecrated twenty bishops, of whom only one was not a native of this island (cf. Bishop William Stubbs’ *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*)
- the sees established – Lichfield was founded in AD 656, and all the names of its bishops are native
- Lindsey was founded in AD 678, and the names of all its bishops are native
- at Dunwich, after Felix the Burgundian, all the names are native
- at Elmham (AD 673 – AD 1055) they are all native
- at Worcester (AD 680 – 1095) they are all native
- at Hereford (AD 676 – 1079) they are all native
- and see after see was established with a native bishop⁸

⁷ David Paton, *The Ministry of the Spirit: Selected Writings of Roland Allen* (London: World Dominion Press, 1965), 179, as cited from the chapter entitled ‘Domination’ in Allen’s *The Case for Voluntary Clergy* (1930).

⁸ Ibid.

Roland Allen believed the Pauline emphasis on leadership gifting⁹ provided a contextual setting to argue for historic apostolic ministry once again, as evidenced by those first ‘wandering evangelists and prophets’ – not known by the established order of apostles – who had established churches throughout Antioch, Lydda and Rome.¹⁰ Within the context of leadership gifting he pointed out that these functions of prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers actually ‘follow apostles in a list of the gifts’.¹¹ Allen believed these apostles – ‘wandering evangelists’¹² – were the gifted missionaries who planted and equipped the churches. They were the ‘itinerant’ missionaries who were known to work outside of the established order,¹³ yet could function within the established structure wherever and whenever resident elected leadership (i.e. bishops, deacons)¹⁴ accepted their vocation. For Allen, this was the apostolic order that courageously influenced the English culture through Gospel evangelizing and church planting.

⁹ Romans 12:6-8 is cited in a formerly unpublished work by Roland Allen – ‘The Ministry of Expansion: the Priesthood of the Laity’ (1930), USPG X622, Box 3, Number 27, Oxford, Bodleian Library. Recently published edition: *The Ministry of Expansion: The Priesthood of the Laity*, ed. J.D. Payne (William Carey Library, 2017), Ch. 3: 6.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.; See also, Ephesians 4:11; I Corinthians 12:28.

¹² Ibid., Ch. 3: 6 and Ch. 4: 5.

¹³ Ibid., Ch. 3: 3.

¹⁴ Ibid., Ch. 4: 5.

Roland Allen's Contribution towards Missiology: A Contemporary Perspective

Roland Allen's Apostolic Principles¹⁵

Roland Allen's missiology was shaped by a *symphonic* blend of pneumatology and ecclesiology—that being, Spirit and Order. The central planks of this 'ordered' missiology extend from the quintessential apostolic principles of St Paul. Allen's *charismatic* missiology is systematically articulated in *Missionary Principles – and Practice*¹⁶ (1913), *Pentecost and the World: the Revelation of the Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles*¹⁷ (1917), and in a formerly unpublished work of his *The Ministry of Expansion: the Priesthood of the Laity* (1930), which was finally published last year by William Carey Library Publications (Pasadena, CA).

Subsequently, this broadly pneumatological understanding is interspersed throughout his sermons, teaching notes, articles and correspondence.¹⁸ His emphasis on pneumatology and ecclesiology – Spirit and Order – stem from his devotion to Pauline thought, especially with his instruction on spiritual gifts (I Corinthians 12-14),¹⁹ which the apostle's concluding emphasis underscores: 'Let all things be done decently and in order' (I Cor. 14:40).

¹⁵ Roland Allen archives, 'The Ministry of Expansion: The Priesthood of the Laity' (unpublished 1930), USPG X622, Box 3, Number 27, Oxford, Bodleian Library. My first analysis of this work by Roland Allen was originally published as 'Roland Allen's Apostolic Principles: An Analysis of his "The Ministry of Expansion"' *Transformation*, July 2012, 29(3): 225-243. My second analysis of this work has been recently published as a chapter in *The Ministry of Expansion by Roland Allen: The Priesthood of the Laity*, J.D. Payne, editor, Published by William Carey Library (Pasadena), © 2017.

¹⁶ Roland Allen, *Missionary Principles – and Practice* (1st edition entitled *Foundation Principles of Foreign Missions*, Bungay, Suffolk: Richard Clay & Sons, May 1910. Reprint, entitled *Essential Missionary Principles*, Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1913. Reprint, *Missionary Principles – and Practice*, 2006).

¹⁷ Allen, *Pentecost and the World*, 1-61.

¹⁸ Roland Allen's archives, USPG X622, Boxes 1-8, Oxford, Bodleian Library.

¹⁹ Allen: 'The Ministry of Expansion: the Priesthood of the Laity,' USPG X622, Box 3, Number 27, chapter 7: 4, (1930); see D.A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of I Corinthians 12-14* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989).

By ‘charismatic’ ministry I mean here a ministry which is exercised by a man who is moved to perform it by an inward, internal, impulse of the Holy Spirit who desires and strives after the salvation of men in Christ. I do not deny that men receive a charisma, a gift of grace, for their ministry in ordination; but I use the word ‘charismatic’ to express the ministry which is exercised in virtue of that direct internal impulse of the Spirit, as distinguished from the ministry which is exercised by those who have been ecclesiastically ordained or commissioned.²⁰

Additional disclosure of his pneumatology is located within an unpublished work entitled ‘The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit’²¹ which incorporates a *symphonic* blend of – **pneumatology**, **ecclesiology** and **missiology** – that shapes his overall missionary ecclesiology.

‘The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit’

Allen’s ecclesiology of ‘Spirit and Order’ resounds through his unpublished work, ‘The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit’, wherein he critiqued the ‘difficulties’ in the propagation of the faith through mission societies when: (1) they established mission stations that resulted in ‘sterility’ towards evangelism; and (2) they demonstrated an ‘absence of missionary policy’ to deal with the continual appeal for ‘men and money’, thus reinforcing *hegemony* instead of indigenization.²² He then provides an apologia for the significance of the Spirit’s descent at Pentecost and the

²⁰ Allen, ‘The Ministry of Expansion’, Ch. 3: 1.

²¹ Unpublished work by Roland Allen, ‘The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit,’ USPG X622, Box 3, 13: Introduction, 1-16, Oxford, Bodleian Library.

²² Allen, Introduction, 1-16.

ongoing empowerment of the Church. The role of the Spirit is, he argues, (1) to mobilize the Church for extending the ‘faith’ everywhere ‘from Jerusalem to the uttermost parts of the earth’²³ (Acts 1:8) and (2) to guide ‘bishops’ towards the recognition and ordination of indigenous Christian leadership. Such leaders, he pointed out, were already serving their communities as ‘farmers ... miners and traders’, as well as being ‘priests in their own houses’.²⁴ As such, they could quite easily serve the sacraments to ‘kinsfolk perishing for lack of spiritual food!’²⁵ The ‘ordered’ Anglican framework he envisaged was a Communion which actually practises what it preaches. Allen said: ‘If the sacraments are necessary we ought either to send clergy or ordain men on the spot; but we do neither sufficiently.’²⁶ At least, prior to Vatican II, Roman Catholicism took seriously the indigenization principle, and, as Francis Anekwe Oborji states, it was Pierre Charles (1883-1954) who ‘founded the Louvain school of missiology, which maintained that the aim of missionary activity should be the planting or formation of a church (with its own hierarchy, indigenous clergy, and sacraments) in non-Christian countries’.²⁷

For Allen, the **missionary Spirit** creates, nourishes, fills and empowers ‘the native apostles’²⁸ to plant the Church and provide sacramental spiritual food. His missiology of ‘Spirit and Order’ incorporates a central fostering of the faith through the sacramental means of grace. This argument for ‘native clergy’ presupposes the necessity of the sacramental life of the Church and demonstrates how his theology embraced the frequency of its administration. The organic nature of Church growth stems from people who have embraced the faith, he believed, and

²³ Ibid., Introduction, 1.

²⁴ Ibid., 7.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Francis Anekwe Oborji, *Concepts of Mission: The Evolution of Contemporary Missiology* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2006) 82-83.

²⁸ Allen, ‘The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit’, 12.

subsequently desire to share what they have received.²⁹ This is natural. Allen compares this with how Muslim missionaries – traders, soldiers, teachers – that is, common people who have embraced Islam, share their faith with people and eventually see that ‘a mosque springs up, a school is established, a Moslem community arises’.³⁰ He critiques his fellow Anglicans’ reluctance to share their faith in the way that Muslims do and concluded that much of the hesitancy in ‘our fellow churchmen who go abroad’ is due to a past reliance upon *professional clergymen* to provide for them all the ministerial services, especially the sacraments.³¹ This comparison serves as his charge for them to exercise **faith** in the missionary Spirit’s creativity. He cites how the 4th century layman, Frumentius (c. 300 -c. 380) – referred to as the ‘Apostle of the Abyssinians’ – evangelized Alexandria and was later consecrated bishop of Axum (Northern Ethiopia) by Athanasius.³² Roland Allen said ‘I suppose most of our Bishops would deny that they had ever met a Frumentius. So rare a thing is it for a layman to think that as a Christian he has the right [and] duty to propagate his religion and instruct the ignorant in his faith.’³³

The basis for Allen’s missionary ecclesiology originates in his interpretation of the way ‘the universal common priesthood of Christians’ functions through the presence, direction and ministry of ‘the missionary Spirit’.³⁴ This pneumatology, which, to a large extent, anticipates John V. Taylor’s pioneering 1967 Cadbury Lectures, published as *The Go-Between God: The Holy Spirit and the Christian Mission*, shaped Allen’s church-planting methodology, in that it

²⁹ Ibid., 3.

³⁰ Ibid. Allen’s engagement with Muslims intensified later in life. His son, John, wrote: ‘My father made notes for an introduction, of which only the first part is complete. He writes, “English readers familiar with the Hebrew story [of Job] in the beautiful English of the Authorized and Revised Versions cannot help comparing that poem with this Moslem Utenzi.”’ J.W.T. Allen, *Tendi: Six examples of a Swahili classical verse form with translations & notes*, (Nairobi, London and Ibadan: Heinemann, 1971. Reprint, London: Richard Clay [The Chaucer Press], 1971, 373-74).

³¹ Ibid.

³² F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, *Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997) 644.

³³ Allen, ‘The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit’, 4.

³⁴ Allen: ‘The Ministry of Expansion: the Priesthood of the Laity’, Box 3, Number 27, 1930, chapter 6: 7.

served both to advocate the oversight by **missionary bishops**³⁵ for the ordaining of a ‘specialized ministry’ and to support the administration of the sacraments by the ‘priesthood of the body’ (i.e., ‘the priesthood of the laity’)³⁶ whenever ‘they were outside the range of the organized Church’ due to the absence of ordained clergy. Again, his argument was always that ‘the universal priesthood cannot be annulled by an absent specialized priesthood’.³⁷ Allen’s second point here clearly expresses what he believes is the *missionary Spirit’s* validation for Eucharistic lay-presidency. In his formerly unpublished work from 1930 – ‘The Ministry of Expansion: the Priesthood of the Laity’³⁸ – he insists that this ‘ought properly to be addressed only to Christians who are geographically beyond the reach of any bishop. ...’³⁹ Again, Allen’s missiology, like Taylor’s, is rooted in the conviction that the Spirit transforms cultures through the missionary work of laypeople.

Le Zoute – A Critical Review of ‘The Christian Mission in Africa’ (1926)⁴⁰

In 1926 Roland Allen was upset that the governing body of a mission’s conference in Le Zoute had set the agenda and direction for missional work were clearly advocates of ‘a social gospel’ message.⁴¹ He was already suspicious of how various missionary societies had embraced the ‘social gospel’ idea, which he opposed. Allen said:

³⁵ Allen, ‘The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit’, 14.

³⁶ Allen, ‘The Ministry of Expansion: the Priesthood of the Laity’, 6: 7.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 7: 3.

³⁸ Recently published in 2017 by William Carey Library (Pasadena, California).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 7: 13.

⁴⁰ Roland Allen, *Le Zoute: A Critical Review of ‘The Christian Mission in Africa’* (London: World Dominion Press, February 1927).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 4, 15.

I recall that the missionary societies began to speak of preaching a Social Gospel, a Gospel of Health, a Gospel of Sex Equality, and all the rest, only after they had accepted the money which was given by people who would give nothing for evangelistic work. When they accepted money which was given by people who would give nothing for evangelistic work, then they began to find these terms to express their Gospel, and then they began to preach what the terms expressed.⁴²

Earlier in 1926, the evidence discloses that Roland Allen became more convinced that evangelism was compromised whenever the Church received finances from government agencies or humanitarian sources, which had their own ‘special interest’ agenda to implement. He argued that the Church need not receive money from these sources: ‘for to build upon money is to build on a foundation that is not of the Gospel; it is to bind the Church to the chariot wheels of Mammon.’⁴³

‘English Rule of Law’ for Individuals, Family, Church, State

PowerPoint Slide:

Rule of Law & Separation of Powers (rights come from God not civil government)

- Individual authority (self-government)
- Family authority (family-government)
- Church authority (church-government)
- Civil government authority (civil-government)

⁴² Ibid., 15.

⁴³ Roland Allen, ‘Money: the Foundation of the Church’, *Pilgrim* (July 1926): 428, USPG X622, Box 2, File 2: 20, Oxford, Bodleian Library.

The Spheres of Government

	<i>Internal</i> SELF	FAMILY	<i>External</i> CHURCH	CIVIL
Purpose:	To worship God	Marriage, children and child training	To speak truth to the other spheres	To protect & defend citizens
Property:	Conscience	Work ethic, finances-means of production	The Word of God	The Rule of Law
Punishment: (ultimate expression)	Hell	Corporal Punishment	Withdrawal of Fellowship	Capital Punishment

The covenantal boundaries of Britain's 'rule of law' is based upon the Ten Commandments. Christendom advanced an understanding of its way of life as God's sphere or jurisdiction because of its application of God's law-order. Sin causes the different spheres either to abandon their roles or usurp the roles of other spheres. That said, human flourishing and societal advantage is maximized when the boundaries between each sphere are respected and when each sphere accomplishes its God-given purpose.

The Church of England's prophetic voice to the Culture and the State

What evidence is there where a biblical Christian worldview did influence Britain's culture and state? Philip Quenby argues in *Magna Carta Unravalled: The Case for Christian Freedoms Today*:

The law code of Alfred the Great ... made it clear that English law looked first and foremost to the Bible for its inspiration. ... Saxon law acknowledged what continental legal systems did not: that a ruler is under judgment just as much as a commoner, hence his authority is always subject to the law and his power is limited. ... The preamble to Magna Carta made precisely this point by having King John declare that the charter had been given ... 'for the improvement of our kingdom'.⁴⁴

From this same book Lynda Rose stated:

Alfred the Great knew exactly what he was doing when he prefixed the Ten Commandments to his legal code, because it is our primary relationship with God that alone gives equal value and honour to the individual, and allows justice to prevail, protecting men and women against the arbitrary exercise of power by tyrants. It was an understanding shared by the architects of Magna Carta. It is for these reasons that we once again need to defend our rights.⁴⁵

King Alfred was informed by the Bible. And, we today would be wise to adhere to the biblical command: 'Do not remove the ancient landmark which your fathers have set' (Proverbs 22:28). It is with this historic understanding of our forefathers' belief in 'law and order' that we can now consider the reasons for Western civilization's development.

⁴⁴ Baroness Cox, Philip Quenby, Paul Diamond, Robert S. Harris, Rev Lynda Rose, John Scriven, Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali, Professor Roger Trigg, *Magna Carta Unravalled: The Case for Christian Freedoms Today* (London: William Wilberforce Publications Limited, 2015), 59.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 45.

That said, these *spheres of government* are divinely ordered to function because they are based on an orthodox understanding of the ‘one and the many’.

The Anglican use of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds

The ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (AD 451) provided an understanding of *liberty* for Western culture by establishing limits on ‘statist divination’ because of the Council’s emphasis of Jesus’ incarnation, as St Leo’s *Tome* so clearly declared that this was the faith of the fathers. The two natures of Christ Jesus—divine and human, ‘not by confusion of Substance but by unity of Person’⁴⁶—thus, restrained the state from assuming the role as saviour. The state cannot save because only Jesus Christ, the God-Man, is Saviour! From that apostolic understanding Western civilization was fortified because of its Trinitarian faith. The only way to understand ‘the one and the many’ is by looking to the Holy Trinity—the One and the Many. This was fundamental to Roland Allen’s Trinitarian theology for he embraced this spiritual understanding as natural to the *missio Dei*. Allen said:

How then did the Father send the Son? By a command? Certainly by a command. Christ speaks of a command, “As the Father gave Me commandment even so I do.” But not by an external command. Christ speaks more often of a community of will, “My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me.” The Father sent the Son by a command; but the command was a Procession of the Holy Ghost. The Spirit of the Father who sent was the Spirit of the Son who came. The command was an expression of the Spirit and the response was the expression of the same Spirit; because there was community of Spirit;

⁴⁶ The Athanasian Creed.

for the Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son. So Christ sends His people into the world not by an external command only; but by a giving of the same Spirit, “He breathed on them.”⁴⁷

Firstly, this statement discloses both Nicene and Athanasian Trinitarian theology – ‘the equal ultimacy of the one and the many’⁴⁸ – which establishes no disunity within the ‘community of will’, as he describes the relationship within the Trinity. Allen superimposes this theological grid upon the mission of the Church, thereby articulating an apologia for *missio Dei*. In a similar way, Rousas John Rushdoony argues that

in orthodox Trinitarian Christianity, the problem of the one and the many is resolved. Unity and plurality are equally ultimate in the Godhead. The temporal unity and plurality is on the basis of equal validity. There is thus no basic conflict between individual and community. ... Instead of a basic philosophical hostility between individual and government, believer and church, person and family, there is a necessary co-existence. Neither the one nor the many is reducible to the other.⁴⁹

That said, Allen’s Trinitarian belief shaped the way he understood both the ‘individual’ and ‘community’ in the social sphere, as well as the ‘local church’ and the ‘universal Church’ in the ecclesiastical sphere, for, he says: ‘the universal is in the particular as truly as the particular is in the universal Church’.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Ibid., 14-15; John 14:31; 20:22 (καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον).

⁴⁸ Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The One and the Many: Studies in the Philosophy of Order and Ultimacy* (Craig Press, 1971), 156; cf. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. 1, 133.

⁴⁹ Rushdoony, *The One and the Many*, 16; cf. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. 2, 115.

⁵⁰ Allen, ‘The Priesthood of the Church’, *Church Quarterly Review* (January 1933): 239.

By 1902, Roland Allen wrote two important articles for *The Guardian* entitled ‘A Church Policy for North China’ due to the Anglican Church’s proposal to establish a ‘new bishopric in Shantung’.⁵¹ He recognized the greater influence of the ‘Roman Catholic and Nonconformist bodies’ in China, and, this he believed, ought to cause the Anglican Church to consider what policy to pursue.⁵² That said, Allen proposed three points that he believed looked hopeful: (1) in light of the current court reforms the population would definitely ‘seek for a knowledge of Western affairs’; (2) that this ‘widespread thirst for Western knowledge’ would be hard to suppress even if these reforms eventually reverse back toward the former obstructionist position; and (3) that the ‘local magistrates’ preferred to appoint Protestant missionaries as teachers for their schools instead of the Roman Catholics who were ‘more powerful’ and expressed ‘political entanglements’ due to their ‘reputation for interference’ within the Chinese culture.⁵³ He then argued for the reasonableness of the *middle position*, which he believed to be ‘the key to the real purpose of the existence of the Anglican Church in the world’.⁵⁴ He argued that, by establishing a new bishopric in Shantung, the Anglican Church’s commitment to ‘historic Christianity’ placed them as a body in a better position with Chinese appreciation of ancient history than the ‘Protestant Nonconformists’ on the one side, and yet on the other, the ‘Roman Catholic methods’ portrayed themselves as a ‘despotic and intriguing body’⁵⁵ that many of the Chinese began to resent.

⁵¹ Allen, ‘A Church Policy for North China – I’, (1902): 879; and also, Allen, ‘A Church Policy for North China – II’, (July 1): 902.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

Allen's developing *missionary ecclesiology* sought to engage with Chinese culture, not negate it. This meant, however, that his missionary theology was concerned to make distinctions rooted in and developed from his evangelical understanding of biblical revelation which necessitated a belief in, for example, the story of creation where 'the simplicity of the first sentence of the Book of Genesis'⁵⁶ asserts God as Creator, in contrast to the Chinese system of thought concerning 'a source of Creation which is extremely vague, working by a law which is unintelligible, through innumerable agents whose conduct can neither be anticipated nor understood... for no intelligent purpose.'⁵⁷ His pithy answer to the Chinese system of what he believed to be 'chaos' was that 'Christianity brings order'⁵⁸ to the whole discussion of creation. He believed the religious system of Chinese culture prevented a purposeful direction of society, that being, a static approach to life, whereas the Christian faith declared the 'restoration of harmony by submission to Christ's control',⁵⁹ which in his opinion was the 'element which makes for stability' in any culture for it establishes an 'orderly progress' and which provides a basis for 'the moral support which is so grievously needed' in China.⁶⁰ His belief in the pre-eminence of Western learning to advance the Chinese culture differed from that of Viceroy Chang Chih Tung's. Even though Tung embraced the 'practical' side of Western learning, he did not make the connection of what constituted its significance. Allen pointed out that:

⁵⁶ Ibid., 449.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 448.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Roland Allen, Epiphany sermon on Matthew 8:23, Box 5, Sermon no. 13, (1905) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Roland Allen archives, USPG X622.

⁶⁰ Allen, 'Progress of Education in China,' *Cornhill* (November 1908): 665, USPG X622, Oxford, Bodleian Library.

Western learning is not based on materialism, nor is the greatness of Western nations.

Western civilization is rooted in Christian faith and Christian morals. That is the lesson which the East needs to learn.⁶¹

Allen argued for the uniqueness of Anglican policy while in North China but when he returned after serving as a missionary priest in China (1895-1903) and became the incumbent parish priest of Chalfont St Peter (1904-1907) he became quite disillusioned with the entrenched customs and laws in the established Church. Hubert Allen's biography of his grandfather discloses that 'Roland could not accept that the Church should be used as no more than a convenient and fashionable social service' when it comes to 'baptisms, marriages and burial services'.⁶² On one occasion, for *conscience* sake, he refused to officiate a wedding for

a wealthy bridegroom, who was a resident in the parish but a notorious unbeliever, pointed out to Roland that, even as incumbent parish priest, he could not lawfully prevent his wedding being celebrated in the parish church of Chalfont St Peter provided that another priest could be found, who was willing to perform the ceremony. Roland responded cheerfully: *Yes, that is perfectly true. And no more can you lawfully prevent me, as the incumbent parish priest, from tolling the funeral bell throughout the proceedings...*⁶³

Hubert Allen stated that many regional and national newspapers picked up the story and commented on Roland's 'remarkable statement' wherein headlines read as 'A Manly Vicar', 'Vicar's Sacrifice', 'Good Man Weary'.⁶⁴

The cross-cultural missionary work in North China provided a context for Allen to observe how Anglicanism functioned *outside* the context of the established Church of England. What weighed heavily on his *conscience* were the legal requirements, as Allen said 'to perform solemn religious ceremonies even for undeserving persons who habitually neglect their religious duties, or openly deny the truth of the Creeds, or by the immorality of their lives openly defy the laws of God'.⁶⁵ Much of the established Church's *system*, Allen believed, undermined the apostolic faith, order and principles. This is Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali's point when he refers to 'Erastianism' as 'Anglicanism's Achilles heel' for it is 'to compromise with or capitulate to culture'.⁶⁶

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Hubert J. B. Allen, *Roland Allen: Pioneer, Priest, and Prophet*, 79.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ See the *Daily Telegraph* (13.12.1907), *Cooperative Times* (21.12.1907), *Daily Chronicle* (15.12.1907), *Liverpool Evening Express* (16.12.1907), and *News of the World* (15.12.1907).

⁶⁵ Hubert Allen, *Roland Allen* (Appendix 2: The resignation letter to the Parishioners of Chalfont St Peter, November 25, 1907), 183-88.

⁶⁶ Michael Nazir-Ali, *How the Anglican Communion Came to be and Where it is Going* (London: The Latimer Trust, 2013), 13.

Anglican Culture Today in Africa: ‘Rule of Law’- Individuals, Family, Church, State

Roland Allen argued that Paul and Peter emphasized the equal forsaking of ethnic identity for the sake of their common or *non-culturally mediated identity* in what he believed was the holy nation (I Peter 2:9-10), that being, the Church (Galatians 3:26-29). To illustrate Allen’s argument here consider the sophisticated marginalization by the former Archbishop of Canterbury over the past years of ‘fellow’ African bishops and archbishops, who, although they numerically represent the highest percentage of Anglican membership, were treated as though Canterbury’s leadership knows best. This inequality among fellow Primates was addressed by the Primates of Nigeria (Nicholas Okoh) and Kenya (Eliud Wabukala), who, speaking to the Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans (FCA) in London on 6 April 2012, where delegates – representing some 55 million ‘churchgoing Anglicans’ in Africa – said:

It seems that the Church of England is not carrying along everybody in the Communion, and that is why you can see there is a crisis; if we solve the problem, we have to change the system. ... We have to go back to the basic principles and develop new structures while remaining firmly within the Anglican Communion. Our Communion has come of age, and it is now time that its leadership should be focused not on one person or one Church, however hallowed its history, but on the one historic faith we confess.⁶⁷

Roland Allen could not have said it any better than what was said by these two African archbishops. Two fundamental phrases came through their statements: (a) ‘we have to change the system’; and, (b) ‘we have to go back to the basic principles and develop new structures’.

⁶⁷ Ed Thornton, *Church Times*, ‘We should elect our chair, say Primates’ and ‘Wabukala: “Get back to basics”’ no. 7780, London (27 April 2012): 5.

On the one hand, for there to be a change to the current ‘system’ we ought to be ‘counter-cultural’, that being, Christ *against* culture. Is it possible that ‘traditionalists’ can function like the 17th century Congregationalists did by temporarily working ‘outside’ of the established Church by ‘restoring the old paths’ and by planting newer apostolic churches? On the other hand, should the ‘traditionalists’ remain within the Church of England and seek reform? In spite of the current ‘unrepentant’ leadership and chaotic direction within the Church of England’s institutional structure, we should probably stop and ask:

- Is God interested in visiting Britain again with a sovereign work of revival and renewal?
- What if God’s Spirit resuscitates a post-Christian Britain? Are we ready for that possibility?

With regard to church discipline Roland Allen commented on the situation of incest that Paul confronted in his letter to the Corinthian Church:⁶⁸

As regards the individual inside the [Church] [Christ] is Lord, outside is a [spiritual] power of Evil Satan. We hand over the offender to the Devil [which] result[s] [in] death to the body; but in hope of salvation of the Spirit. There is [great] dispute about this, but I [question] whether Africans [would] see any difficulty. They expect the solemn curse [to] cut off [from] all the social life of the community to produce physical results. And I see no reason why the death [should] be suppressed to precede the repentance. ... An offence of this kind is not a private matter. It affects the Body & the Body must be purged. Indifference to it is spiritually demoralizing, & lowers the moral tone of the whole Body. ... Purge the Body ... [and] become what you really are a body free [from] the leaven of sin.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Roland Allen archives, Outlined commentary on I Corinthians, USPG X622, Box 3, Oxford, Bodleian Library; I Corinthians 5 (handwritten notes).

⁶⁹ Ibid., I Corinthians 5:6.

Allen agreed with the Pauline practice to remind the Corinthian Christians of their mutual responsibility as a body to confront immorality directly. Because of his missionary experience, he stated that within the African context, the indigenous church would not hesitate to administer discipline to any of its members who committed incest. For example, in the *Africa Bible Commentary*, Dachollom Datiri's discussion of incest makes the point that 'Paul's strong response to immorality teaches a very practical lesson – church discipline must sometimes be administered for the benefit of the church, as well as for the correction of the person concerned'⁷⁰ and that 'while discipline must never be done in a spirit of hostility, a congregation that ignores immorality will end up with a sick and corrupted church'.⁷¹ GAFCON later stated: 'Most African Anglicans have affirmed monogamy; the prevalence of polygamy among some professing Christians, and also the keeping of concubines, are scandals requiring attention by the Church.'⁷² How does the Church reinforce traditional marriage, duty toward God, and ethics?

The liturgical use of the Ten Commandments

What does historic Anglican worship and mission offer to our current culture and its significant prophetic voice to the State? The Ten Commandments! This shapes the Church's faith so as to articulate God's boundaries—a moral compass—for culture and the state. The focus that Roland Allen placed on the *Ten Commandments* was that these were *timeless* words and discloses four principles of God's law as 'positive not negative, universal not limited, internal not external, the Law is a unity'.⁷³ It is important to point out that as Allen conducted this series of sermons on the

⁷⁰ Dachollom Datiri, '1 Corinthians' in *Africa Bible Commentary: A One-Volume Commentary Written by 70 African Scholars*, Tokunboh Adeyemo, (gen. ed.), (Nairobi: WordAlive Publishers, 2006), 1408-1409.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 1409.

⁷² Nicholas Okoh, Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden, (gen. eds.) *Being Faithful: The Shape of Historic Anglicanism Today*, a Commentary on the Jerusalem Declaration (London: The Latimer Trust, 2009), 55.

⁷³ Sermon notes on Deuteronomy 6:4-5, no. 210-11, Box 5, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Roland Allen archives, USPG X622. See *The Didache* (3.2-3.3).

Ten Commandments that he specifically reminded parishioners *how* the Church of England’s process for those preparing for Confirmation precisely emphasized these commandments within the Catechism, as articulated within the Book of Common Prayer.⁷⁴ Allen’s interpretation of the focus of the fourth commandment is defined by the Sabbath, which teaches ‘perfect service’.⁷⁵ He then addressed how this commandment has influenced society and culture by saying that to ‘break up Sunday ... [it] is a social crime’⁷⁶ (original emphasis). He stressed the importance of Sunday worship: ‘The Lord’s Day [is] a day of worship, devotion, consecration. To work on Sun [Sunday] is not to break the commandments. To forget God is to break it’.⁷⁷ Allen made the connection between Sunday worship and the direction of the fifth commandment’s emphasis to honour one’s father and mother: ‘For parents, to bring their children, to sit with them, to help them to learn the art of worship’ in church disclosed how his theology saw no divide between loving and honouring God with honouring parents and loving one’s neighbour. For Allen, cultural transformation begins with the family, a Trinitarian faith, the Anglican Church’s Quadrilateral, the Ten Commandments and the Gospel of Jesus the King !

Bishops and brethren, where are the George Whitefield’s and John Wesley’s—*apostolic* evangelists who are ‘counter-cultural’ and who can awaken this nation back to God? Is it possible that the Holy Spirit has already been working within this cultural milieu of *chaos* and has already been producing Spirit-led ministers of biblical *order*, who, although they are currently working outside of the apostolic succession, are nevertheless ‘trans-local’ leaders that the Spirit has called—like Jeremiah of old (cf. Jeremiah 1:10)—to ‘pluck up and to break down,

⁷⁴ The Book of Common Prayer’s chapter is entitled *A Catechism, that is to say an Instruction to be Learned of Every Person before he be brought to be Confirmed by the Bishop*.

⁷⁵ Allen, Sermon notes on Deuteronomy 6:4-5, no. 216.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 218.

to destroy and to overthrow the lies of cultural-Marxism, and then to build and to plant' apostolic churches that are self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating. God always has a 'remnant' and I believe that 'hidden' evangelists are being prepared—contemporary sons of Issachar—who 'understand the postmodern times' that we live in and can address with biblical clarity what 'spiritual Israel' ought to do at this time (I Chronicles 12:32)! Dear Bishops and clergymen of the Church Catholic, reach out to these men, engage with them, pray with them, encourage them and make yourselves available to them as spiritual shepherds 'for such a time as this'. Let's join together as courageous Christians and transform culture with the truth of the Gospel of King Jesus!

So what actually creates a culture and how does this influence the state?

A. Richard Niebuhr's Five-fold Template described in his *Christ and Culture* (1951)⁷⁸

PowerPoint Slide:

Overview of the 5-fold template: *Christ Against Culture*; *Christ of Culture*; *Christ Above Culture*; *Christ and Culture in Paradox*; and *Christ the Transformer of Culture*

What is the relationship between Christ and culture?

Does Christ stand against the prevailing culture?

Does Christ stand in (and is part of) the prevailing culture?

Does Christ stand above the prevailing culture?

B. Conflicting Worldviews: Secular Humanism; Marxism; Postmodernism (cultural Marxism)

C. Culture is religion externalized and stems from one's worldview

Firstly, humans are religious in nature and culture is religion externalized. Society's religion, therefore, stems from society's worldview. For the Christian who believes that Jesus Christ is King of kings and Lord of lords, we would do well to presuppose a *biblical Christian* worldview that is committed to the uniqueness of Christ's authority over all things. What then is a worldview? D.A. Carson says: 'By worldview I mean ... a reasonably comprehensive interpretation of reality (whether thought through or not) that affects all we do. Everyone has one'.⁷⁹ That said, there is *no neutrality* when it comes to how one views the world!

David Noebel summarizes a *biblical* Christian worldview this way:

PowerPoint Slide:

Theology: Christ Jesus is 'the fullness of the Godhead' (Col. 2:9)

Philosophy: Christ is the Logos (John 1:1)

Ethics: Christ is 'the true light' (John 1:9; 3:19-20)

Biology: Christ is 'the life' (John 1:4; 11:25; Col. 1:16)

Psychology: Christ is 'Saviour' (Luke 1:46-47; Titus 2:13)

Sociology: Christ is 'Son' (Luke 1:30-31; Isaiah 9:6)

Law: Christ is lawgiver (Genesis 49:10; Isaiah 9:7)

Politics: Christ is 'King of kings & Lord of lords' (Rev. 19:16; I Tim. 6:15; Luke 1:33)

Economics: Christ is Owner of all things (Psalm 24:1; 50:10-12; I Cor. 10:26)

History: Christ is the 'fullness of times' (Galatians 4:5)⁸⁰

⁷⁸ H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1951).

⁷⁹ D.A. Carson, *Christ and Culture Revisited* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 120.

⁸⁰ David A. Noebel, *Understanding the Times: The Religious Worldviews of Our Day and the Search for Truth* (Manitou Springs, CO: Summit Press, 1992), 30.

Secondly, it has been evident since the first century that whenever Christians publicly proclaim their primary allegiance to Jesus as King that conflict ensues within the culture whenever *statist* claims of sovereignty over individuals, families and churches becomes apparent. In this case, the state, therefore, assumes a messianic character. This raises a pertinent question- Does freedom and human rights come from God, from nature, or from the state?

Again, Newbigin said:

It is no secret, indeed it has been affirmed from the beginning, that the gospel gives rise to a new plausibility structure, a radically different vision of things from those that shape all human cultures apart from the gospel. The Church, therefore, as the bearer of the gospel, inhabits a plausibility structure which is at variance with, and which calls in question, those that govern all human cultures without exception. The tension which this challenge creates has been present throughout the history of Western civilization.⁸¹

The Church of England's prophetic voice to the Culture and the State

What evidence is there where a biblical Christian worldview did influence Britain's culture and state? Philip Quenby argues in *Magna Carta Unravalled: The Case for Christian Freedoms Today*:

The law code of Alfred the Great ... made it clear that English law looked first and foremost to the Bible for its inspiration. ... Saxon law acknowledged what continental legal systems did not: that a ruler is under judgment just as much as a commoner, hence his authority is always subject to the law and his power is limited. ... The preamble to Magna Carta made precisely this point by having King John declare that the charter had been given ... 'for the improvement of our kingdom'.⁸²

From this same book Lynda Rose stated:

Alfred the Great knew exactly what he was doing when he prefixed the Ten Commandments to his legal code, because it is our primary relationship with God that alone gives equal value and honour to the individual, and allows justice to prevail, protecting men and women against the arbitrary exercise of power by tyrants. It was an understanding shared by the architects of Magna Carta. It is for these reasons that we once again need to defend our rights.⁸³

King Alfred was informed by the Bible. And, we today would be wise to adhere to the biblical command: 'Do not remove the ancient landmark which your fathers have set' (Proverbs 22:28).

⁸¹ Lesslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 9.

⁸² Baroness Cox, Philip Quenby, Paul Diamond, Robert S. Harris, Rev Lynda Rose, John Scriven, Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali, Professor Roger Trigg, *Magna Carta Unravalled: The Case for Christian Freedoms Today* (London: William Wilberforce Publications Limited, 2015), 59.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 45.

It is with this historic understanding of our forefathers' belief in 'law and order' that we can now consider the reasons for Western civilization's development.

The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (Article 37)

The established Church's confessional statement approved by Parliament in 1571 discloses this emphasis on 'sphere sovereignty' for the state: Article 37 *Of the Civil Magistrates* says-

... The Bishop of *Rome* hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of *England*.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences. It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.⁸⁴

During the 17th century conflicts emerged between conformists and non-conformists over various cultural issues within both church and state. The puritans wanted the Church of England to reform but under ecclesiastical and statist pressure the established Church removed many from parish ministry and academic profession.

The 17th Century English Puritan: to be counter-cultural or to transform Culture?

In light of these conflicts, William Ames (1576-1633)—a fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, and sometime puritan minister within the established Church of England—met up with John Robinson in Rotterdam who argued

that the Puritan churches should separate "root and branch" from the Church of England; Ames on the other hand argued the non-separatist position, namely, that the new churches should be considered as independent congregations within the established church working for its reformation. Ames's partial persuasion of Robinson helped to account for the generally good relations existing later in New England between the Plymouth settlers and the Salem-Boston Puritans who followed the Amesian way of non-separating Congregationalism.⁸⁵

These English Puritans as you know were theologically impacted by John Calvin's biblical worldview which articulated how God's sovereignty extended to every area of life. Henry R. Van Til argued in *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* the following:

⁸⁴ Evans, G. R., & Wright, J. R. (1991). [*The Anglican tradition: a handbook of sources*](#) (p. 242). London: SPCK (Article 37).

⁸⁵ John D. Eusden, ed., *The Marrow of Theology: William Ames (1576-1633)*, translated from the third Latin edition, 1629, (Durham, North Carolina: The Labyrinth Press, 1983), 4-5.

The impact of Calvin's ideas in the political sphere inaugurated a new era, giving a new character and direction to national existence in many lands. The Greek state had been totalitarian, in which religion served as a means unto the end, namely, the glorification of the state. In the Middle Ages the roles were reversed so that we find a church-state with supreme authority vested in the pope, who loaned temporal power to the earthly ruler for the service of the church. Calvin saw the church and the state as two interdependent entities each having received its own authority from the sovereign God. In this conception the state is never secular nor are state and church separated in the modern sense of the word. Atheistic democracy and popular sovereignty cannot claim Calvin as their father.⁸⁶

John Cotton's: *An Abstract of the Laws of New England, as ... Now Established (1641)*

In a journal article entitled 'Introduction to John Cotton's *Abstract of the Laws of New England*,' Greg L. Bahnsen says

It is well known that the rise of Puritanism in Britain led to the founding of America's New England. ... Their goal was to see the kingdom of Jesus Christ come to expression in society as well as the private inner heart of man. They wanted a government that would take seriously its obligation to enforce God's commandments'.⁸⁷

As a convert under Richard Sibbes' preaching ministry, John Cotton (1584-1652) was a faithful churchman and served the parish ministry for twenty-one years. Eventually his reputation as a puritan caused a stir and he was summoned before the High Court to answer to Archbishop William Laud in 1632. But the well-organized *Puritan underground* concealed him and assisted him to take voyage to New England, where his presence was eagerly anticipated.⁸⁸

John Cotton's biblical approach to civil law influenced the formation of this new commonwealth and was based on the 'regulatory' principle that 'no law was to be prescribed contrary to the word of God'.⁸⁹ This document ended with Isaiah's words: 'For the LORD is our judge; the LORD is our lawgiver; the LORD is our king; he will save us' (Isaiah 33:22). Interestingly, by the late 18th century America's constitutional forefathers used this verse as a basis for the three branches of civil government, that being, the judicial, legislative and executive. This renewed interest in applying God's law-word to the civil realm seems to be a return to King Josiah's reform for Israel, as well as King Alfred's approach in England.

⁸⁶ Henry R. Van Til, *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1972), 95; Ibid. 19: 'For the Reformers the natural was holy as well as the spiritual, and the work of the Father in creation was considered of equal significance with that of the Son in redemption. ... Through the Reformation the mechanical relation of nature and grace was superseded by an ethical one, so that the restoration of the law of God in every sphere of life became the concern of the believer'.

⁸⁷ Greg L. Bahnsen, 'Introduction to John Cotton's *Abstract of the Laws of New England*' in *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Symposium on Biblical Law, Volume II, Winter 1975-76, No. 2 (Vallecito, CA: Chalcedon), 110; see J.M. Blum, *et. al.*, *The National Experience*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963, 21-23

⁸⁸ Cf. Joel R. Beeke and Randall J. Pederson, *Meet the Puritans* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006), 155; also, Bahnsen, *Abstract of the Laws of New England*, 112.

⁸⁹ Bahnsen, *Abstract of the Laws of New England*, 114.

And, here we are today with these very same concerns about the Church of England.⁹⁰ What, then, can we learn from the New England Puritan response to ecclesiastical marginalization, cultural paradigmatic shifting and statist restraints on religious freedom? Let's move from the 17th century to the contemporary milieu in order to consider the wider Anglican Communion in light of Roland Allen's theology.

⁹⁰ The oppressive nature of the State is nothing new throughout history. And, for the British, this is nothing new, since you have a long history of statist conflicts and cultural wars. I frequently refer to a famous quote from Lord Acton (1834-1902) and have my students at Arizona Christian University memorize his pithy statement: 'Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely'. Powerful elitists exist in all institutions but it is disastrous when ungodly cultural trends influence an established Church to legislate immorality contrary to the clear teachings of the Bible.