

Presence and co-Presence: An Anglican “Virtuous Seeing” of Communion Posed between Community and Individualism¹

ERIC GILDER

Résumé: *Les tensions théologiques existantes à l'intérieur de la Communion Anglicane qui s'élargit globalement concernant la manière dont la Présence du Dieu est mieux comprise et rendue – soit comme une expérience personnelle intérieure, placée entre pathos et logos, soit comme une construction enracinée socialement, placée entre la déclamation sociale externe et la critique individuelle interne – sont devenues une stase centrale dans les arguments de la politique ecclésiastique ultérieure. Pour mieux dévoiler ce point tournant du débat, une mixture de perceptions de l'œuvre de Boulding et Watts, complémentée aussi par la construction de «la vue vertueuse» de Murdoch, avec un intérêt particulier pour la manière dont Rowan Williams, en tant qu'Archevêque de Canterbury a manié la tension dans sa contribution au Débat Lambeth 1998 sur la Décision morale.*

Keywords: *Anglican Communion, Presence of God, pathos, logos, “virtuous seeing”, Rowan Williams*

An Introduction to the Construction of Anglican Thought

My colleague and friend, The Rev. Martin Jacques of the Church of the Resurrection in Bucharest², has described the history of the Anglican Church and its mode of theological thinking thusly:

“Because of the unique history of the Anglican Church – retaining catholic ritual and Episcopal order, while accepting many, but by no means all of the reforms at the time of the reformation – left us in a special position. We retained enough of the characteristics of both traditions so that there would be enough recognition from both that we were in some ways “like them”, so a mediating role was born! The Orthodox too, see in our de-centralised tradition that broke away from papal control, though retaining the Episcopal system, creeds and a sacramental understanding of worship, which provides them with enough to convince them that we are not irredeemable.

This position has also had an interesting impact on the Anglican psyche. Our self-awareness consists of a fair degree of schizophrenia as to our own identity. This is played out in various ways in the world, (for example, the current fragile relationships within the communion itself) but the most positive characteristic of this identity crisis is one of openness and humility.

Anglicans are open in a way other communions are not – because of our self-awareness. We tend to come to any table, not in a spirit of arrogance, but in humility and the real expectation that we can learn from the other. In exactly the same way and for the same reasons, we are open to the world and cultural shifts in a way that other communions are not.

This combination of history and resulting humility and openness has been construed as a huge weakness by many and it is true that our willingness to learn and listen to others has resulted in some interesting anomalies in our bi-lateral talks. We sometimes “chameleon-like” take on the hue of whoever we are talking to at the time so we have the amusing position at the moment that in our bi-lateral talks with the Roman catholic church (ARCCIC) we have agreed in principle to the universal oversight of the see of St. Peter while in our most recent document “The church of the triune God” with the Orthodox we have agreed that this would be a terrible thing!

But this same perceived weakness – the humility, openness, willingness to listen and learn and change is a huge strength when acting as an interface or bridge between different communions. Indeed it is in this openness, I believe that we provide the space for the Holy Spirit to work in the church. Closed systems quench the Holy Spirit, because life is not closed but ever changing. “He will lead you into all truth” must certainly mean, in my book that we do not possess the whole truth and that there will be a progressive unveiling in time to react to changing contexts. This is ongoing – present continuous.

The defining characteristics of other communions by contrast seem at first sight to be unyielding conservatism – and devotion to various combinations of either tradition (variously understood) and the Bible (again variously understood) or hierarchical church authority. These combinations have resulted in certain communions seeing themselves as the *only* divinely ordained communions which then naturally sees all others as in some way in grave error which of course makes meaningful dialogue very difficult. Any average self effacing Anglican would never dream nowadays of making any such exclusive claim. In a world with over 1000 separate denominations we would say that this is self evident. We enter into agreements for example, with the Orthodox church in Eastern countries and with the Catholic church in the West and with Moslem authorities in places like Turkey for example not to actively evangelise. This is the proof that we acknowledge that we don’t claim exclusive access to all truth. Therefore we are not seen as a threat to any participants in ecumenical discussions.³³

A Possible Theoretical Grounding for Understanding the Theology of Rowan Williams

As a beginning to *theoretically* approach the conception of *via media* in the Anglican Communion that the Rev. Martin Jacques has succinctly laid out, and, by extension, the holistic thought of Rowan Williams, I think of parallels to the theoretical work of economist and social theorist Kenneth Boulding, supplemented by insights given by theologian and philosopher Alan

Watts⁴ – which has formed the foundation of heightened research in this area for the last few years, but based upon earlier work from my Ph.D. days (1985-1992)⁵.

I believe both Boulding and Watts are of worth for our common thinking on *via media* in the Anglican Communion for they have articulated and expanded the insight that people in society are always responding to what they *perceive* to be true, as derived from what they *construe* reality to be, rather than any “objective”, trans-human understanding of what reality *is*. Through a series of three major books (*The Image*, *A Primer of Social Dynamics* and *Ecodynamics: A New Theory of Societal Evolution*) Boulding asserts that our behavior as humans in society depends upon the construction of our experiences into meanings in the mind, predicted towards the future: this process of construing life into mental patterns becomes our “image,” our reality (*Image* 3-18). In society, the interactions that people have with each other and among groups are based upon an “image of an image,” (45) a process which implicates language. As Watts had stated in “The Nature of Consciousness”, “Ideas of the world which are built into the very nature of the language we use, and of our ideas of logic, and of what makes sense altogether”.

By the symbolic processes of communication, people’s images confront other people’s images, and one or both are open to modification as a result – if any real communication is to actually occur. Learning results from this interplay of images between persons, leading to an enlargement of the extant human mental landscape, an area that Boulding (borrowing from de Chardin) called the “noosphere” (*ED* 199-200). Persons (both as individuals and in their social roles), and the institutions that resulted thereby over time, built up reified images of themselves, leading to what Watts had called the “ceramic” mode of thinking:

The ceramic model of the universe is based on the book of Genesis, from which Judaism, Islam, and Christianity derive their basic picture of the world. And the image of the world in the book of Genesis is that the world is an artifact. It is made, as a potter takes clay and forms pots out of it, or as a carpenter takes wood and makes tables and chairs out of it. Don’t forget Jesus is the son of a carpenter. And also the son of God. So the image of God and of the world is based on the idea of God as a technician, potter, carpenter, architect, who has in mind a plan, and who fashions the universe in accordance with that plan.

As Watts points out, such a model of thought, of “image-making” was best suited for a hierarchical world of divine kings and monarchical structures, grounded in its ontological/philosophical assumption of a clear, certain distinction existing between the maker and the made, the creator and the created. This ceramic model of the universe, originated in cultures where the form of government was monarchical, and where, therefore, the maker of the universe was conceived also at the same time in the image of the king of the universe. “King of kings, lords of lords, the only ruler of princes, who thus from thy throne behold all dwellers upon Earth”. I’m quoting the *Book of Common Prayer*. And so, all those people who are oriented to the universe in that way feel related to basic reality as a subject to a king.

This worldview supported Christendom throughout the Middle Ages, and provided a secure, if restrictive basis, for knowledge and action. However, the Renaissance and then the modern age came, bringing the new “God” of science in its wake, attacking the till-then solid (and solidly policed) image of reality and community. It was now under threat.

Drawing from Boulding’s triad of social organizers, “threat” is a primal social organizer based upon the premise that “You do something I want or I will do something that you do not want.” Cultures can issue threats to their members on the assumptive level because such prohibitions are accepted by most people of that society as *legitimate norms* [emphasis mine] (141-59). In Judaic-Christian theology, this threat is seen in the assumption that, if we do not do God’s will, we will not escape punishment and/or banishment in the next life. Perhaps this also explains why religious warfare (mental or physical) is *total* warfare, it is, by definition, a “zero-sum” game – one must be right, the other wrong, and the perceived stakes are high, because one participant is bound to lose. However, if carried to extremes (via “official” Jihads or Crusades, “unofficial” terrorism, especially with newly destructive means of warfare at hand) *all* parties can lose (ED 157).

One way⁶ that modern society has offered to mediate these forces in a more productive fashion is the social organizer of “exchange,” described by Boulding as being a *relational* pattern based upon classical liberal economics, i.e. “You do something I want and I’ll do something that you want.” (Next to the money economy, exchange is often seen as a *modus operandi* in democratic political systems. This method of social organization is more stable and productive because, if handled properly, it is a positive-sum game (163-70). Participants in positive-sum interactions can come away from them satisfied if not fulfilled. Quite often, people are not conscious of the operation of exchange, and because of this subconscious element, exchange is a more powerful social organizer than it is usually assumed (PSD 25-26). But, as Watts points out, there are “problems of calculation” in this civilizing social organizer, making us humans open to weighing endlessly on matters of costs, risks and expected benefits. Thus, this forms the basis of the existential human problem: *we know, and we know that we know*. Then, unlike the animals, we worry and fret. Therefore, Watts argues we need to embrace the *dynamic pattern, and not the static object* in our human goals to obtain self-reflexive knowledge. This act requires the use of symbols – an august means of knowledge and control, but the wisdom comes at a cost – especially when symbols are taken as reality. A way out of the false dilemma of the two myths (the ceramic and the fully automatic) is to embrace the organic, evolving “dramatic image” of inter-connected human life – within our own bodies and “outside” of them. As Watts states, “consider the world as a drama. What’s the basis of all drama? The basis of all stories, of all plots, of all happenings – is the game of hide and seek.”⁷

This is articulated in a systematic way by Boulding in his *integration* mode, defined as a complex and diverse system of social organization that encompasses the creation of status relations, feelings of love or hatred, trust or mistrust (PSD 26). In integration, a person’s or group’s image of its identity is defined in relation to others (ED 190). In fact, to communicate, one must be able to see the other’s image of life in some degree, through the process of sympathy (or better still, empathy). The operative statement here is “I will do something or

I will ask you to do something because of what I am and because of who you are”, an interaction based upon the social roles that individuals or groups play in society (190-91).

One basic unit of society, the family, is based primarily upon the integrative model of organization. In families, people usually do things for family members for who they are, and the activity is reciprocated on the same basis. This is not to say that threat and exchange do not also operate within families, because they often do. Within a culture, in most social structures built upon a familial model (e.g., churches, schools, and even some aspects of government) the integrative impulse is predominant (*PSD* 27-28)⁸. “Integry”, Boulding states, is “part of the genetic structure of society. It is part of the noosphere” (*ED* 199). Symbolic communication is the major tool and facilitator of learning within the noosphere. Some notable communicators in history, Boulding suggests, operating at the level of “mysterious” symbolic systems (e.g., Jesus, Mohammed, Karl Marx) have been able to revolutionize history (an idea to which Boulding’s general evolutionary theory, paradoxically, is not amenable) (*ED* 219). Watts, however, is revolutionary in this regard; he takes Boulding’s thoughts where Boulding himself might not go, for he calls us to “wake up” to the illusion of *apparent* disunity of opposites:

Opposites and differences have something between them, like the two faces of a coin; they do not meet as total strangers. When this relativity of things is seen very strongly, its appropriate affect is love rather than hate and fear... It is fine for us to agree that we are different from each other, provided we do not ignore the fact that we agreed to differ. We did not differ to agree, to create society by deliberate contract between originally independent parties. Furthermore, even if there is to be a battle, there must be a field of battle; when the contestants really notice this they will have a war dance instead of war. (*Psychotherapy East and West* 44)

Also of importance for discussions of Anglican reasoning *via media*, we need to remember with Boulding that, despite the separate analytical treatment given each of these social organizers, threat, exchange and integration operate in synthesis.⁹ Every social interaction between people results from some combination of these factors (*PSD* 28-31). Following from this synthetic idea, I now seek to incorporate the thinking of American psychologist George A. Kelly into our discussion, using his Personal Construct Psychology to create sixteen combinations of possible understandings of religious claims, based upon four dichotomous constructs (which unify perceived opposites as Watts proposes)¹⁰.

Application: Facet Analysis of Possible Theological Starting Points

Thus building upon my understanding of Kellian construct psychology, I now develop the mentioned possible ways persons (and, by extension, institutions) construe theological messages and methods of reasoning. In so doing, I am also following the lead of Anglican theologian Ian Ramsay, who, in my mind, sought to develop a *Gestalt* model of Christian hermeneutics.

1. Historical, Constituted, Passive and Individualistic

In this mode of being, the person is a classical conservative, who believes in historical precedents and traditions; is of legalistic mindset, yet libertarian. Churches exist to provide needed social foundations for independent individual liberty, but not license. The “exchange” of liberty must not “threaten” social stability.

2. Historical, Constituted, Passive and Communal

While sharing many of the modes of thought of 1, this character understands and embraces the social dimensions and demands of the inter-dependent world beyond self. He/She would, however tend to look towards “the invisible hands” of nature and history to order such extra-individual responses. The Church constructs the “individuals” who make human choices. “Integry” is a product of an invisible “exchange” of human values constructed over history, the sources of which are largely forgotten.

3. Historical, Constituted, Active and Individualistic

This character would tend to be an orderly evolutionary incrementalist in understanding, historically oriented towards appreciating the structured actions of a “few great” actors in particular time and place, active in persevering personal ideals strongly embraced. In Christianity, this could encourage a focus upon the unique role of Jesus acting in the world, search for the “historical” Jesus. “Integry” values are a product of conscious human action by exceptional individuals.

4. Historical, Constituted, Active and Communal

This person would differ from 3 in that, for him, society functions as an organism that changes according to historical patterns. Misdirected individual action can ruin a society if not checked, according to this view, for it is believed that even “Great Civilizations” have fallen (and still can) if the universal hierarchical ordering principles are forgotten. Churches play the role of disciplinary parent to the child of society. The integration of societies is open to both known and unknown threats to its health, so due caution is called for in proposing changes.

5. Historical, Predictive, Passive and Individualistic

While this person well appreciates historical traditions, she would nonetheless judge proposals for decision based upon their rational and futuristic merits. Her view of history would emphasize the growing rationality and perfective-ness of man, leading to the demise of the need of collective governance structures, at least in theory. Any ideal society would thus have to elevate the role of rational individuals, but strictly limit their remit of rule at the same time. Churches need to be “rational” to be believed, at least by the intelligentsia. The “exchange”

organizing principle, while primary, is to be governed ultimately by the integral values of the community.

6. Historical, Predictive, Passive and Communal

This construct combination would suggest a person who thinks similarly to 5, except for a teleological and systematic vision of how society functions. Social regulation would appear to run for this person as on auto-pilot. God has his structures, and we will inevitably follow them, despite (and maybe because of) our theological disagreements. God's "integry" values that teleologically govern the "noosphere" are in control.

7. Historical, Predictive, Active and Individualistic

This person would appreciate history, but only within the context of providing examples and counter-examples for making future decisions. Any such decisions would be predicated upon a libertarian understanding of freedom. Technology is seen as a friend and not a foe in making society advance. While formative to our present understanding, churches now need to "get with the program" of the future, changing society. "Threats" are best controlled by a combination of minimal "integry" values and "exchange" processes.

8. Historical, Predictive, Active and Communal

This technocratic person would share both the appreciation of history and vigorous pursuit of futuristic goals of 7, but his goal would be a smoothly functioning society, with individual freedoms subsumed to it. Churches need to "follow the leaders," as under the pre-1989 regime here in Romania. "Integry" values dominate, but are limited in scope by what can be "realistically" imagined by elites blocked in their vision.

9. Permeable, Constituted, Passive and Individualistic

This person would be a pragmatist in political/theological ideology, with the only absolutes being the rule of law and the freedom of the individual from undue social control. Government is seen by him as a necessary instrument to provide security enough for people to make projects of their own lives. Churches should fulfill the private faith needs of specific individuals, not abstract collectives. "Exchange" requirements dominate "integry" values to keep "threats" at bay.

10. Permeable, Constituted, Passive and Communal

Similar to 9 in every way, excepting the idea that individual freedom should lead to development of a matching sense of personal responsibility, for freedom of rights entails the obligations of matching duties to that society. Churches should foster individual responsibility,

as in American Methodism – “be doers of the word, and not hearers only”. “Integry” values as determined by specifically grounded individuals rule over the values of an unmotivated, ungrounded majority.

11. Permeable, Constituted, Active and Individualistic

This person is a pragmatic freethinker who believes in the rule of law. Government can be an engine of positive social change, as long as individual freedom is enhanced in the process. Churches should liberate us to know the truth and it will make us free. “Exchange” values, as determined by individualized valuations of core values, dominate.

12. Permeable, Constituted, Active and Communal

Similar to 11, except that he sees government as a necessary agent of social change in building a world that is universally just, law-abiding and able to deal with present and future challenges in a forthright and effective manner. Churches should be social actors for reform and progressive politics. ”Integry” values as determined by the vanguard of the collective are predominant.

13. Permeable, Predictive, Passive and Individualistic

This person, a pragmatic rationalist, believes that future goals can best be achieved by focussing upon individual behavior, since large-scale social intervention goes against her grain. Perhaps some subtle, non-directive educational approaches that don’t go against individual choice would be the best way to achieve necessary social ends would be allowable to her. Churches should focus on individual character-building and educational efforts “behind the scenes”. The development of “integry” values is a long-term process, driven by lofty pedagogical goals, yet limited by human shortcomings.

14. Permeable, Predictive, Passive and Communal

Similar to 13, except that this person would focus their subtle behavior-modification upon social institutions and the people within them. A somewhat dangerous combination exists here, in that the person would not be strongly influenced by the concrete effects of policies upon others, and this would lead to Skinnerism¹¹, albeit quietly. Churches would function as part of the larger integrated “control” system. “Integry” purposes are largely unconscious, if not mere epiphenomenons, of “threat” avoidance and “exchange” benefit-seeking.

15. Permeable, Predictive, Active and Individualistic

This person is a visionary freethinker who sees a rational society and government, focused on the future, as a positive force for change. The larger goal of society would be to enable

individuals to live creatively. Churches should liberate by example, i.e., “Jesus ‘acted up’.” The achievement of true “integry” values requires the taking of “threatening”, but regulated, risks.

16. Permeable, Predictive, Active and Communal

Similar to 15, except that the focus of the positive Governmental action would be the achievement of a society that functions well, that promotes social harmony, and that individuals can feel part of, i.e., government seen as loving parent, individuals are part of one contented family, each gaining their self-identity from the *socius*¹² around them. Churches should function as extended family units, as “compacted communities”. “Integry” values are achieved organically within the community, with little obvious “threats” or “exchanges” processes perceived as operating.

The Murdochian Meaning of an Anglican “Generous Orthodoxy” in Rowan Williams’ Address at 1998 Lambeth Plenary on Making Moral Decisions¹³

The Rev. Robert Theodore Simpson¹⁴ has similarly defined “generous orthodoxy” in an Anglican frame as such:

Historically, Anglicanism emerged as a Generous Orthodoxy in that it rejected controversial views not common to all Christians. Thus the Anglican Settlement involved the rejection of the specific views which differentiated the warring parties, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist etc. in favour of a middle ground common to all [...]. So long as Anglicanism sticks to the spirit of Elizabeth’s reformation, it is always a kind of Generous Orthodoxy.¹⁵

British novelist and philosopher Iris Murdoch is most remembered, in my mind, for the doctrine of “unselfing,” gained from within a Platonic conception of the “Good”. As described by Lița:

Virtue comes then through a complex process called “unselfing.” A shift occurs through knowledge of the good, from focusing on others’ outward conduct to cultivating one’s own inner life of virtuous consciousness, from choice to vision, from will to consciousness, from outward conduct to inward knowledge.

Murdoch holds that the primary moral faculty for knowing the good is vision or perception. Her answer to what virtue is grounds value in the nature of reality. We know the good first by *seeing* it through a complex form of moral vision. As virtue is partially “unselfing” through knowledge of the good, we must first understand the meaning of the good. The reality of goodness is not grounded in an epistemology according to which the good is directly apprehended through reason (as in Plato’s view); instead, for Murdoch, the good is mediated through a *reflexive* and *linguistic* turn with respect to

her account of consciousness. The good for Murdoch becomes *real* and *absolute* and not relative and optional; therefore, it cannot be related to human choice as in the Aristotelian tradition.

Murdoch is a cognitivist in that goodness is an object of knowledge. For her, the crucial connection of the good is with what is real. And what is real is necessarily true. However, this connection does not depend on the postulation of a supersensible world of forms as in Plato’s view. Murdoch’s connection of the good with what is real *hic* and *nunc* links the concept of value to human life as a whole. All human life is lived under the aspect of the good as it is the framework and the background of all existence. It is indefinable because we cannot see it; instead, it facilitates our *seeing*. The good cannot be known as other things are known. (150-51)

Using language that Rowan Williams has followed upon, Murdoch’s construct of virtuous “seeing” put to action, in Lița’s words, “contends that patient, loving regard, directed upon a person, thing, or situation, directs the will not only as unimpeded movement of reason but as something very much more like ‘obedience’” (160). I sense that he would ardently wish to think that practitioners of all of the sixteen ways explicated by which one can construe God’s Church and his will could find a place in the Anglican Church, although it might not be easy-going for any one to remain untransformed by the experience of living and listening to each one in the resulting community, under the key proviso, “as God wills”¹⁶.

Following this, it is thus my intention for the published article to analyze Rowan Williams’ seminal discussion on making moral decisions at the controversial 1998 Lambeth meeting, where deep divisions extant within the Anglican Communion over homosexuality first appeared. In it, he well-employs Murdoch’s vision of *seeing* and *being seen* at being in Communion (via the key term “recognize,” repeated numerous times), a central foundational part of the controversy. I will tie these findings to the fact model of reasoning noted above.

WORKS CITED

- ¹ This essay builds upon three previous writings, “The Anglican Conception Of “Via Media”: One Theoretical Explanation And Exploration”, “The Anglican Church as Ecumenical/Social Mediator in a Globalizing World” International Conference “Tradition and Modernity in the European Union – Comparative View,” The Orthodox Faculty of Theology of Oradea (8-11 October, 2007), “Just as I am” versus “Just as we ought”: Theological Legitimation in an Anglican Frame” presented at the University of Bucharest 3rd International Conference on Legitimation in November, 2006 and “Of Prophets at Home and Abroad: The Intricate Construction and Reception of an Authorial Self Within Varied ‘Stations’ of Existence” Faculty of Letters/English Department“, (Ex)Patriation” Conference, Ovidius University, Constanta, Romania, 20-22 September, 2007, along with earlier explorations of Kenneth Boulding’s work.
- ² For more information on The Church of the Resurrection, see www.churchoftheresurrection.eu/contact_us.htm
- ³ Personal Communication, 17 October, 2007.
- ⁴ Alan Watts (b. 1915, d. 1973) was an English philosopher and theologian who became the primer authority in the West on oriental philosophies such as Zen Buddhism and Taoism in the 1950s and 1960s. The work quoted herein is “The Nature of Consciousness,” with the most relevant background work being *The Two Hands of God: The Myths of Polarity* (New York: George Braziller, 1963). See “Who Was Alan Watts?” at

5 <http://www.alanwatts.net/watts.htm> for an overview of his large body of writings and speeches (accessed 2 May, 2007).

6 Gilder, Eric, *Man and Mission: Construing Wayne Booth's Theology of Literature as Rhetoric* (Sibiu: University of Sibiu P, 2003). This book is a revised form of my 1992 dissertation, which formed the theoretical foundation of this ongoing body of work.

7 The other, and less humane, way of ordering was articulated by Watts as the “fully automatic” model of reasoning which the mechanistic and behaviorist scientific thinkers led us to. Beginning as a way of making a truce in the modern era between the Church and Science, when the Church lost dominance, scientists “got rid of the lawmaker and kept the law” conceiving of the “universe in terms of a mechanism.” As he describes it: “Well now, in the course of time, in the evolution of Western thought. The ceramic image of the world ran into trouble. And changed into what I call the fully automatic image of the world. In other words, Western science was based on the idea that there are laws of nature, and got that idea from Judaism and Christianity and Islam”.

8 Major work on this intersection of human action via symbolic means has been done by American literary and social critic Kenneth Burke. See his “Dramatism” essay in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Volume 7 (New York, 1968): 445-452 and, for applications of this thinking to religious matters, *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology* (Berkeley, et al.: University of California P, 1970).

9 I am drawn to think of social-psychological research by Harold Garfinkel, when he asked students to act like guests in their own home. When they did so, the parents thought their sons and daughters were losing their minds. See “Studies in the Routine Grounds of Everyday Activities,” *Studies in Social Interaction* (D. Sudnow, Ed.). (New York: Free Press, 1972 [originally published in 1964]) (pp. 1-30).

10 As evidenced by the synthesis which, in Anglican thought, maintained the Elizabethan Settlement (as reflected in the Book of Common Prayer of 1662) between Protestant and Catholic elements in the Church, based upon what came to be referred to as the “three-legged stool” approach to scripture, tradition, and reason of divine Richard Hooker, as explicated in his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*.

11 The four foundational construct pairs employed are: Historical/Permeable, Constituted/Predictive, Active/Passive and Individualistic/Communal. The first is a construct of how a person construes history (as making something static that humans can only submit to versus permeable, which means that people make history); The second, that “selves” are essentially fixed knowing subjects (constituted) versus subjects that are open to being changed by their social encounters and oriented towards new created futures (predictive); The active/passive construct is based upon the common understanding of the terms, as is the individualistic/communal construct.

12 Referring to the theory of American behaviorist psychologist B. F. Skinner, who believed that freedom and dignity were mere myths of humans, who actually did what they did as a result of systematic operant conditioning. See his *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (New York: Knopf, 1971).

13 The term comes from Paul Pfuetze, *Self, Society and Existence: Human Nature and Dialogue in the Thought of George Herbert Mead and Martin Buber* (New York: Harper, 1961).

14 22 July 1998.

15 Former President of the Federal Theological Seminary, Associate Professor of Theology at the University of Swaziland, and London Director of Studies, North Thames Ministerial Training Course, now retired. The quoted material following is from his website, <http://generousorthodoxy-anglicanstyle.blogspot.com/> (Accessed 20 October, 2007).

16 Unfortunately, current controversies over the issue of same-sex unions and outwardly gay bishops in the American broach of Anglicanism, the Episcopal Church of America, has re-ignited the old controversies between the Protestant, Catholic, as well as between Broad and Liberal wings of the global Anglican Communion, with the conservative, mostly Protestant, “Global South” Anglican churches having much new-found influence upon the debate, given their growing numbers of congregations and adherents (versus a declining number of congregations and adherents in the “Global North”). A “generous orthodoxy” would hold that, while persons or faith communities may legitimately differ on their views on such issues, no one person or body can, with certainty, claim to know the “mind of God” on the points of contention.

17 Related to this, the Archbishop of Canterbury sparked some controversy in his 19 April, 2006 statement to a Dutch journalist, Wim Houtman (“The Church is not Inclusive”, available at <http://www.nd.nl/htm/dossier/seksualiteit/artikelen/060819eb.htm>, accessed 20 October, 2007), re-opening the question of allowing the immediate full inclusion of active homosexuals to the Church (when in previous writings he had indicated support for the possibility for such inclusion):

“I don’t believe inclusion is a value in itself”, says the Archbishop. “Welcome is. We welcome people into the Church, we say: ‘You can come in, and that decision will change you.’ We don’t say: ‘Come in and we ask no

questions’. I do believe conversion means conversion of habits, behaviours, ideas, emotions. The boundaries are determined by what it means to be loyal to Jesus Christ. That means to display in all things the mind of Christ. Paul is always saying this in his letters: Ethics is not a matter of a set of abstract rules, it is a matter of living the mind of Christ.”

After some thought and study on the matter, I think the Archbishop is simply stating the obvious – answering the Call to the Church implies an openness to change. But this Call I think he would say, means a call for transformation of *all* the persons in the Church, and *not* just the historically silenced minority. And I would further posit that he would agree that, while the historical mind of the worldwide Anglican Church has not changed its traditional view on the matter of homosexuality, as a Communion we still need to be humbly open to all voices within community, as God’s will *could* be different than even the Church currently supposes.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boulding, Kenneth E. *The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society*. Ann Arbor: The Univ. of Michigan Press, 1961.

Idem. *A Primer on Social Dynamics: History as Dialectics and Development*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1970.

Idem. *Ecodynamics: A New Theory of Societal Evolution*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.

Chardin, Teilhard, de. *The Divine Milieu: An Essay on the Interior Life*. New York: Harper, 1960.

Kelly, George A. *The Psychology of Personal Constructs: Vol. One--A Theory of Personality*. New York: Norton, 1955.

Lița, Ana. “In “Seeing” Human Goodness: Iris Murdoch On Moral Virtue”, *Minerva – An Internet Journal of Philosophy* 7 (2003): 143–172.

Ramsey, Ian. *Religious Language: An Empirical Placing of Theological Phrases*. New York: Macmillan, 1957.

Watts, Alan. “The Nature of Consciousness”. Available at http://deoxy.org/w_nature.htm (Accessed 2 May, 2007).

Idem. *Psychotherapy, East and West*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1961.

Hannam University