

THE ORIGINS OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA, 1910-1917

BRIAN DICKEY

Christianity began as an expansionist religion. The concept of evangelising the 'heathen' was taken up enthusiastically by Anglican Evangelicals in Great Britain as a direct result of the eighteenth century Evangelical Revival.¹ By 1804 the Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.), a creature of that enthusiasm, had begun operations in Africa. From 1814 the Society also developed work in India and New Zealand. The latter was at the enthusiastic urging and energetic supervision of Samuel Marsden, Senior Chaplain in New South Wales and an Evangelical from Yorkshire.²

Beginning in the form of an Auxiliary in Sydney established by Marsden in 1825, Australian support for C.M.S. had stabilised in Sydney and Melbourne during the later part of the nineteenth century. C.M.S. supporters in Australia gained renewed enthusiasm from the visit of a deputation from C.M.S. headquarters to the Australian colonies in 1892, made up of Dr Eugene Stock (Literature Secretary) and the Revd Warren Stewart (a long-time missionary from Fuh-Kien). This visit, carried out at the request of the committees of C.M.S. in New South Wales and Victoria, resulted in the transformation of the New South Wales C.M.S. Auxiliary into a Church Missionary Association, as had existed in Victoria since 1856.

While 'Church Missionary Association' was the title of the organisation within a diocese in England which operated in support of C.M.S., in Australia the New South Wales and Victorian Associations were independent and colony-wide organisations. Like all other missionary societies, their task was to arouse concern among Christians about evangelism among unbelievers overseas, to channel that concern into dedicated prayer, into donations, and into offers of full-time service. After the visit of Stock and Stewart the Australian Associations, with the full countenance of the C.M.S. in London, began to deploy fully-supported missionaries in Indian and African locations.³ This represented a major expansion of the work of the C.M.S. in Australia, the beginning of a real effort to tap the Australian Evangelical Anglican community for

missionary service.⁴

The situation in the diocese of Adelaide was less clear. It did not, by 1900, have an Evangelical tradition of great strength: indeed the story of the episcopate of Bishop Augustus Short, first bishop of Adelaide (1847-1881), was as much as anything the story of the erosion of the Evangelical tradition which had informed the foundation years of the colony of South Australia. Indeed, the Revd James Pollitt, founding incumbent of St Luke's, Whitmore Square, and the Revd William Woodcock, later archdeacon of Adelaide, had served as missionaries with the C.M.S. in the West Indies before coming to South Australia.⁵ In the 1860s some attention was given in the parishes to raising funds for the Melanesian Mission after the visits of Bishop Patteson of Melanesia in 1864 and 1865.⁶ There was, it seems, only modest evidence of any missionary interest among South Australian Anglicans in the years up to 1900, although more research is needed.⁷ The young colony of South Australia seemed still concerned about the struggle for survival, and few Anglicans presented themselves for missionary service. Much depended on the outlook of the clergy.

Only with the arrival of the Revd Frederick Webb at Trinity in 1895 and the Revd W.G. Marsh at St Luke's, Whitmore Square, in 1896 — both from outside the diocese, both convinced Evangelicals, both with exposure to the new C.M.A. in Melbourne — was there any evidence of an expansion of interest in missionary endeavour among Anglican Evangelicals in Adelaide. Their ministry coincided with something of a counter-attack by Anglican Evangelicals in the Edwardian years against the loss of influence which Evangelicals had experienced during the episcopate of Bishop Short. They were also years which saw a growth in Anglo-Catholic influence in the diocese of Adelaide.⁸ As Hilliard suggests, these years were then a period in which a greater degree of party spirit was abroad in the diocese. Indeed, a sense of party increasingly pervaded the Anglican church in many parts of Australia in these years. While Archbishop Saumarez Smith of Sydney had tolerated much, his successor, Archbishop Wright (1910-1933) placed severe restrictions on Anglo-Catholic clergy in the diocese of Sydney. In Melbourne Evangelicals were battling the authoritarian pretensions of Archbishop Lowther Clarke and securing their independent institutions, notably Ridley College.

One of the expressions of this resurgence of Evangelicalism and indeed of

party spirit in the diocese of Adelaide was the creation of a branch of the Church Missionary Society of Australia and Tasmania in December 1917. Such a development raises several issues, with which this essay is concerned. One is the way the principle of voluntary autonomy upon which C.M.S. had grown since its inception interacted with the authority claimed by the bishop of the diocese of Adelaide. Another is the way the creation of a viable C.M.S. presence was part of the process of self-identification for a minority group within the polity of Anglicanism in the state. A third is the way local tensions over questions of churchmanship could be influenced by negotiations at the level of General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania. Finally and most obviously, the emergence of the formal structure of the branch represented the expansion of committed support in South Australia for the missionary enterprise promoted by C.M.S., expressed in funds, prayer, conferences and missionary vocations. To the promoters of C.M.S. that was the whole point of their efforts.

Despite their fine credentials as Evangelicals, neither Webb nor Marsh set about immediately creating another C.M.A. in Adelaide upon their arrival. Certainly Gleaners Unions, groups of supporters of C.M.S., were set up in both parishes in 1896-97 but they do not seem to have been permanent. In addition, occasional funds began to flow to the C.M.A. in Victoria from St Luke's and other parishes.⁹ Going beyond that probably seemed too much when there were so many other tasks to carry out: Webb lost his voice in 'mission' preaching soon after his arrival, he was busy as gaol chaplain and he was seeking to encourage more regular attendance among his half-city half-suburban congregation at Trinity; Marsh appointed a deaconess at St Luke's and canvassed the whole of his run-down parish area in his first twelve months.¹⁰

The Victorian C.M.A., which regarded itself responsible for fostering C.M.S. interest in South Australia, made several efforts to expand C.M.S. work in South Australia over the next decade. Most of this was the work of the Victorian C.M.A. secretary, the Revd A.R. Ebbs.¹¹ It was to be his committed energy and tactful wisdom which would bring the nascent interest in the missionary cause among Adelaide Evangelicals to fruition over the next few years.¹²

In December 1910 Ebbs once more journeyed to Adelaide in search of greater commitment to the missionary vision of C.M.S. among South Australians. He rented an office on the third floor of the Bowman Building¹³ and gained the agreement of a new group of people to serve as the local committee.¹⁴ In addition, with Ebb's approval, Fanny E. Coleston, a missionary on furlough from China, travelled to Adelaide from Melbourne and commenced duties as office secretary in January 1911. The office and depot were opened on 17 January 'in the presence of 39 friends'. On that occasion 'the Secretary placed before those present just a few arrangements that had been carried out in connection with the inauguration of the centre. Miss Coleston emphasised why the Depot had been established ... whilst our President and Vice President gave [characteristically] stirring addresses on the work in general'.¹⁵

The launching of this revived committee, though not the beginning of formal C.M.S. work in South Australia has always been acknowledged as the foundation day of the branch, since organised activity can be documented from December 1910 onwards. Ebbs' initiative in committing Marsh and Webb was crucial. In succeeding in getting some energetic laymen to join with these two clergymen he shrewdly ensured that, while busy with parish work, they would not be left to carry the C.M.S. cause in Adelaide without support. Furthermore, by committing them to the notion of a 'Depot' Ebbs had gained their acceptance of the need to establish a visible presence on behalf of C.M.S. in Adelaide.

The character of the Committee's activities remained informal. Officially it acted on behalf of the C.M.A. of Victoria. The Committee members were well aware of the possibility that their activities could run into difficulties with the bishop of Adelaide. After all, while Marsh or Webb could authorise a parish presence for C.M.S., the Depot was something more: it had the character of a diocesan activity which might require authorisation or at least the goodwill of the bishop. At their second meeting the Committee members discussed copies of correspondence sent to them from Ebbs.¹⁶

Bishop Arthur Nutter Thomas, who had succeeded Harmer as bishop of Adelaide in 1906, had written to the C.M.S. General Secretary in London within a few days of the first Committee meeting in December 1910 discussing the standing that a Church Missionary Association might possess if it was established in Adelaide, given

that the C.M.A. of Melbourne 'is desirous of establishing itself here'. Clearly Thomas was well informed!

Thomas had brought to the diocese experience of the critique that had been developed in England within the Church of England since the 1850s about the idea of separate, independent voluntary societies such as C.M.S. acting as the missionary agents of the church. The alternative which was being promoted, from the 1890s especially, was that the whole church, and thus the diocese as its regional embodiment, should be the agent of missionary endeavour. The slogan was 'the Church as its own missionary society'. Such a view of the relationship between diocese and evangelism sat well with the high view of the historic episcopate promoted actively by the Oxford Movement and many others since the 1840s. It had been the basis of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce's efforts to gain authorisation for 'missionary bishops' such as J.C. Patteson of Melanesia, consecrated in 1861. It had also influenced the Australasian bishops to establish an 'Australasian Board of Missions' at their 1850 consultation, and subsequently for the Australian bishops to seek to reactivate the concept on several occasions after the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania was established in 1872.¹⁷

Soon after arriving in Adelaide, Thomas in 1907 sought to mobilise his diocese for missionary effort. He had a genuine missionary interest far exceeding that of his predecessors. He sought to express it in the diocese along the new lines by establishing the Adelaide Diocesan Missionary Association, often referred to as A.D.M.A. As he wrote to C.M.S. in 1910, A.D.M.A. 'controls all missionary contributions and activities, and everything must be done through the Association'. Quite sensibly, as Thomas pointed out, this was designed to avoid 'rivalries and frictions'. It was 'not a party society: it is in effect the Church organised for missionary work', he wrote in 1916. A.D.M.A. had created sub-committees for Melanesia, New Guinea, and the Aborigines, and had been specially supporting the C.M.A. Mission to the Aborigines on the Roper River'. Thus he would only admit a C.M.A. to his diocese within the framework of A.D.M.A., and not as a separate organisation.¹⁸

While Thomas described himself as a long-standing subscriber to the C.M.S. in his letter to C.M.S., there is little doubt that he was here concerned for his authority within the diocese. He wished to protect the procedures he had established to avoid

what he regarded as unseemly competition among missionary societies in the diocese. Thomas was also signalling his distaste for the independence of diocesan authority that he knew was a principle of C.M.S. operations. No doubt he was conscious that this Evangelical society had little in common with the Melanesian Mission¹⁹ or the work supported under the auspices of the Australian Board of Missions (A.B.M.) in New Guinea.²⁰

Notwithstanding Thomas's claims, the constitutional position defining the relationship between diocesan bishops and missionary societies was contained in Determination IX of 1905 of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia which provided:

2. The functions of the Board [of Missions] shall be to promote through its Executive Council the Mission work of the Church among the Aborigines in Australia, New Guinea, and in islands adjacent; and also among the various immigrant non-Christian races; to assist in carrying out the Missions established by the Church of England through her Missionary Societies and Associations; to co-operate in supporting the Melanesian Mission and other Missions to the non-Christian; to seek out, train, and support Missionaries to labour in such Missions as the Board may direct or may originate; and generally to further unity in the Missions of the Church. Provided that the Board may not interfere with the existing missionary institutions, except so far as they may place themselves under its direction.

4. Each Diocese shall be invited to form a Diocesan Corresponding Committee ... under the presidency of the Bishop ... And such Diocesan Committee and all Missionary Associations formed in any Diocese — with the consent of its Bishop ... shall assist the Executive Council [in various ways].²¹

While by no means precise, clause two could certainly be read to mean that C.M.S. organisations in Australia possessed independent powers of operation outside the reach of the diocesan bishops. However, clause four seemed to empower the bishop with an overriding veto upon the activities of missionary societies in his diocese. It was this clause which became the subject of heated debate between Thomas and the local supporters of C.M.S. in 1916.

The reply to Thomas by D.H.D. Wilkinson, General Secretary of C.M.S., was mollifying but unfortunately vague. He pointed out that unlike the English associations which were based within one diocese, the N.S.W. and Victorian C.M.A.s had a commitment within C.M.S. to promote the

cause 'for the whole State ... and for neighbouring States in which no similar organisation exists'. More importantly, he told Thomas, that they 'are practically independent Missionary Societies, collecting and administering their own Funds, accepting and sending out their own missionaries'. The C.M.S. in London acted in co-operation with the Australian associations in selecting and locating missionaries but did not control them in the way the English diocesan Associations were linked to C.M.S. He left it to the Victorian C.M.A. to act in negotiation with Thomas as diocesan bishop about establishing a similar association in Adelaide. He avoided canvassing any of the tricky constitutional questions which Thomas was trying to raise. In his covering letter to Ebbs he presumed that 'If the Bishop of Adelaide offers you a Diocesan Sub-Committee I suppose you could secure in some way that the Sub-Committee should be composed of men of a C.M.S. spirit?'²² As events were to show, this would prove to be a vain hope.

The Adelaide committee members, in reviewing this correspondence, believed that our position was in the opinion of the C.M.S. fully justified'. They were certain that the Victorian C.M.A. could act independently of Bishop Thomas, and thus the Depot was a legitimate independent activity. There was no suggestion that the committee would accept Thomas's view that its official existence would only be within A.D.M.A. As a result they were to choose for some years to put off the establishment of their own branch just because they feared it would involve direct negotiations with the bishop who had already indicated his opposition to such a move.

Meanwhile they set to work, addressing problems of financial support, the identification of missionary candidates and the whole business of securing the long-term identity of the project. Measured in financial terms, the work which yielded between £100 and £200 in 1909-10, in 1917-18 produced nearly £1300, including £250 for the maintenance of missionaries overseas as well as the salary of the Depot manager and some capital accumulation.²³ St Luke's remained the strongest supporting parish, seconded by Gawler and Naracoorte. This growth in finances and support was to give confidence to the leaders of the Association in their negotiations with Bishop Thomas in 1916.

How and when to gain approval from Bishop Thomas was the main question.²⁴ During 1913 steps were taken with the assistance of the parent association in Melbourne to constitute the South Australian work as a Church Missionary Association. This decision was accepted at the second annual meeting on 1 April 1913.²⁵ This at least gave the promoters of C.M.S. in South Australia the right to negotiate on their own behalf with the bishop, with the banks, with landlords, and with potential missionary candidates.

The Committee also set about convening their first Summer School for the end of 1914. The Revd H.T. Langley, then rector of St Marys, Caulfield, Victoria, led a strong Victorian contingent, supported by the local proponents of C.M.S. This first School was held at Brighton, a seaside village near Adelaide, from Monday 28 December 1914 to Sunday 3 January 1915. The programme followed the well-established conference pattern, with bible studies and devotions in the morning, recreation in the afternoon and missionary talks at night. The rector of Brighton gave permission for his hall to be used and Bishop Thomas his permission for the School to be held in his diocese as well as giving the opening address,²⁶ an important action in the light of later events.

The crucial point about this School and the steady stream of Summer Schools which followed was that supporters of C.M.S. and its view of missionary work could gather together to be instructed and encouraged. Since there was no doubt that C.M.S. was an Evangelical organisation, it was also certain that these Summer Schools would contain biblically-based teaching. As the diocese of Adelaide was only thinly provided with Evangelical clergy in the early twentieth century the opportunity to gather publicly and corporately to hear such instruction was important. Here was self-identification and bonding, so crucial for a minority group. These C.M.S. Summer Schools thus had significance well beyond the limited role of promoting missionary causes: they were for many years a major element in the shaping of the Evangelical tradition in South Australia.²⁷

To maintain the momentum expressed in that Summer School and in the offer of several people as candidates for missionary training²⁸ the committee set about planning a major missionary exhibition to be held later in 1915. This went along with a return of Miss Erwood as Organising Secretary for the Association supported by a subsidy from Victoria, and continuing discussions with Ebbs about full

independence for the South Australian Association.²⁹

In order to conduct the exhibition, on the other hand, the committee had to gain the bishop's approval for the visitors who would be brought to speak at the associated meetings. This approval Thomas withheld in July 1915 until he was satisfied that 'relations of C.M.A. to the A.D.M.A. are adjusted upon a proper footing'. To that end he advised Knox that he would put forward some 'definite proposals'. He too recognised that a new stage had been reached in the life of the C.M.S. in his diocese and he was determined to maintain his authority.³⁰ The committee was clearly apprehensive of the meaning of this message from Thomas. It met specially to consider the situation on 20 July. Phair as secretary wrote to Ebbs soon after:

We believe there is a tendency on the part of A.D.M.A. to crush out C.M.A. It is imperative that we should put forth a supreme effort at once as they will be on the move directly.³¹

Privately, Phair replied to what must have been a rebuke from Ebbs:

It is *not* my desire to act in an antagonism to A.D.M.A. although *some* of its members may be, and are, antagonistic to us. My desire, and the desire of the Committee, is to strengthen our position in South Australia, and entrench ourselves firmly and extensively in the Church life of Adelaide and its environs, and it is necessary that we should do so at once. The A.D.M.A. is on the 'warpath' directly, and positions are likely to be held by those who are *first in*. It is imperative therefore that we should be first in; otherwise the doors of certain parishes may be closed to us. It is a question of expediency, not of antagonism ... you ... may rely on us being level headed enough to understand the requirements of Adelaide and we may be trusted not to do anything that will compromise us ... We desire to make, and prove ourselves so strong as to ensure their fuller recognition and respect; and at the same time to silence the lips of those who would criticise us adversely.³²

Bishop Thomas's proposals, when they were received later in August, confirmed the Committee's worst fears. The bishop proposed that C.M.A. sympathisers elect a committee as the C.M.A. Auxiliary of A.D.M.A., which the bishop would chair *ex officio*, and on which would sit two representatives from A.D.M.A. In turn, this committee would elect two members of the (thirty-person) A.D.M.A. Council.³³ In addition, the existing arrangement by which funds raised in the parishes for C. M.A. should go via A.D.M.A. should be continued; and the Depot should send a monthly statement of its finances to A.D.M.A. Such arrangements, the

bishop suggested, should remain in place until after the next session of General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania. This last point showed that the matter of General Synod's Board of Missions Determination of 1905 was already being canvassed with a view to achieving greater clarity and coping both with the expansion of the activities of the C.M.S. and the direct involvement of the A.B.M. in its New Guinea mission.³⁴

Thomas's proposals dominated the committee's concerns over the next few months.³⁵ The main exposition of alternative positions occurred at the interviews with the bishop, first by Phair as secretary on 2 November, then by the C.M.A. executive (Webb, Phair and Knox) two days later. All their letters and minutes reporting on these interviews agree on the essential points made by Bishop Thomas. He believed that the C.M.A. had been formed 'behind his back' and 'without his consent'. He referred repeatedly to Determination IX which, in his view, spoke of the necessary approval of the diocesan bishop for the activities of missionary societies. He also quoted letters from C.M.S. in London, presumably those already referred to from 1910-11, which showed that he had been concerned about the emergence of C.M.S. activities in his diocese for some years. He insisted that the work of the C.M.A. *'must cease to exist and C.M.A. work to begin again de novo'*.

Such startling and authoritarian claims had a clear rationale in Thomas's judgement and experience, as has already been shown. Thomas was saying that the local C.M.A. was fulfilling all his fears of uncontrolled action creating confusion and wasting precious missionary enthusiasm. Lurking in the background there was also the fear in the minds of the Evangelicals who confronted him that Thomas was hostile to the theology and practices of C.M.S. as an Evangelical organisation. Certainly his liturgical practices, such as wearing cope and mitre for the first time in Australia, might have promoted such a view.³⁶ But, to be fair, Thomas never admitted to such an attitude: on the contrary, Anglo-Catholics also developed a similar belief that the bishop was prejudiced against them. He can best be described as a High Churchman opposed to parties and extremes. However, when combined with his concern for authority and good order, such an attitude was unlikely to give much immediate comfort to Webb, Knox and Phair.

Their reply to Thomas's accusations and the resultant fiat was as forthright as their established characters would have led one to expect. Phair, who first faced the

bishop, refused to commit the C.M.A., and sought to reduce the negotiations to writing. Webb, at the interview, contested every point Thomas made. He pointed out that C.M.S. work had begun in the diocese in 1896, well before Thomas's time. He reminded the bishop of various occasions upon which he had spoken at C.M.A. events. He persuaded Thomas to agree that Wilkinson's 1910 letter had no specific relevance to the problem, and also to agree that C.M.S. in England had long since established its right to set up associations in any diocese independently of the local bishop. He argued, or rather 'I plainly told Bishop Thomas' (in his own record of the interview), that the General Synod Determination's reference to the authority of the diocesan bishop referred to activities which might involve non-Anglican associations, and that the specific rights of C.M.S. were guaranteed by the clause of the Determination which read: 'The Board [i.e. A.B.M.] shall not interfere with existing Missionary Institutions'. When Thomas still insisted on his interpretation, Webb, who was not without some experience of winning court battles in civil cases, 'could not help saying that I would be very sorry to go into a court of law with such an argument [as Thomas was advancing]'.³⁷

When the Dean of Adelaide, George Young, who was present at the interview for form's sake since the deputation was made up of fellow clergy of the diocese, sought to pour oil on the waters by asking the C.M.A. leaders to yield out of grace, Webb stoutly replied that 'we could not surrender our rights even to please a Bishop'. He suggested the proposed Auxiliary Committee be dropped, and that C.M.A. be granted equal numbers on the A.D.M.A. Council. When Thomas expressed doubt that C.M.A. could claim equality of support in the diocese, Webb conceded that among the clergy C.M.S. was in a minority, but argued that among the laity the reverse was true. He concluded his exposition by asserting roundly that he 'saw little hope of our acceptance of any scheme which did not give Evangelical Churchmen equal status with others'.

It was David Knox who then argued that the issue bore a theological character, and that (as Webb reported it to Ebbs) 'the divergence went to the very roots of belief and practice, and that he did not see how A.D.M.A. could sincerely co-operate with C.M.A. in many things and vice-versa'. Again here was the assertion about fundamental differences and a hint of the embattled minority, all flowing with strong Irish urgency and distaste for any truck with Romanism.

Knox carried the discussion of theological traditions across the frontline to ask about 'the C.B.S.', that is the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, and 'whether its members had sought permission to carry on its Romanising work here'.³⁸ It was a shrewd and characteristic blow: so often in the diocese Evangelicals had been criticised on formal grounds in synod debates about variations they had introduced in public worship when the same line might have been taken against others of different theological hue, but was not, because, it was believed among Evangelicals, of the covert sympathy of those in authority for the ambitions of some of these other organisations. It may well be that Bishop Thomas felt the justice of this criticism more keenly than the C.M.A. men understood, for he had already challenged Canon P. Wise of St George's, Goodwood, for introducing what Thomas believed were illegal, essentially Romish, practices and teaching, a process which was to drag out inconclusively over many years.³⁹ Whatever Thomas's private feelings, Knox's challenge revealed how suspicious and embattled these Evangelical leaders felt. Some might think he had overstated his case in talking of 'the very roots of belief and practice'. Yet the 'principles' of independent voluntary action upon which C.M.S. operated were designed to protect the Evangelical tradition from exactly such attacks as Thomas was mounting. In that sense Knox had every right to express such strong views.

Phair then emphasised the capacity of C.M.A. to find and fund new missionaries, its desire to work in co-operation with A.D.M.A., and above all its desire to effect an extension of the Kingdom of Christ. In this context Thomas's offer, to 'forget the past' if the C.M.A. fell into line with his demands, appeared to the deputation as weak and offensive. They were determined not to yield acknowledged and established rights. When the Committee received the report of their deputation at its next meeting on 7 December it was this view which was reaffirmed. For the time being there was a constitutional standoff between the South Australian C.M.S. and Bishop Thomas.

That same meeting, meanwhile, heard from Knox, its secretary, that the plans for their second Summer School had been mimicked by A.B.M., which had not only chosen the same dates for its Adelaide Summer School after these had been made public, but had modelled its brochure on the C.M.A. material. The Committee did not regard this as an expansion of missionary interest in the diocese, but as an act of

competitive interference. The manner of the A.B.M. initiative, especially as to the timing of their conference, supports their interpretation.

Consequently, the Committee went ahead as usual with their plans for a post-Christmas gathering at Brighton, offering A.R. Ebbs as chairman, and the usual mix of missionaries in support.⁴⁰ Unfortunately, W.T. Stanton, rector of Brighton, felt obliged to advise the Committee in mid-December that because the bishop had withdrawn Miss Erwood's status as a deputation[ist] he could not allow C.M.A. to use his church or schoolroom for their Summer School.⁴¹ It was a strong riposte which the bishop had devised, but one which the C.M.A. chose to ignore. They found an alternative venue, Brighton Town Hall, and went ahead with the School, despite another formal protest from Stanton at this 'Invasion of my parish' on the day it began.⁴² In the event, Ebbs did not speak formally at the School and the Bible readings were given on Hebrews by W.R. Cooling, rector of Mentone in the diocese of Melbourne, with contributions from several Adelaide and Melbourne Evangelical clergy, as well as the Revd H.G. White (from China), Mr Vizard (Roper River), Hilda Beever and Miss Erwood.⁴³

Ebbs did appear, however, at the committee meeting immediately after the School on 3 January, when he led the Committee in a decision to prepare a public statement explaining the relations between C.M.A. and A.D.M.A. With the help of G.W. Halcombe (a stipendiary magistrate and Chancellor of the diocese of Willochra from 1915, and of Adelaide from 1919, as well as a C.M.S. supporter), Webb successfully tabled the statement at the next committee meeting on 3 February. It was released to the press the same day, hard on the heels of Bishop Thomas's account of the case in the *Adelaide Church Guardian* for January 1916.⁴⁴

Thomas in his statement described his decision of 1907 to establish A.D.M.A. to avoid unnecessary competition and to improve co-ordination. He insisted it was not a party society and then proceeded to criticise the Adelaide promoters of C.M.S. for acting in just that party fashion by establishing a 'rival association' 'without any communication with the A.D.M.A. or with the Bishop'. He then summarised his offer to the representatives of C.M.A., which he reported 'has been twice refused'. As a result he announced that he had 'for the present refused to accept C.M.A. missionaries or deputations in the Diocese'.

The C.M.A. Statement canvassed the history of C.M.S. work in South Australia, going back to the 1890s. It emphasised the encouragement given by Dr Harmer. It stated that Bishop Thomas had been advised in advance of the opening of the Depot and rehearsed the evidence of his participation in C.M.A. affairs from 1911 to 1915, which, as the C.M.S. supporters rightly implied, made a nonsense of Thomas's claims about their action as recent and behind his back. The Statement reported the actions taken by the bishop since July 1915, and described his demands as 'idiculous': C.M.A. would be 'absorbed'. 'Such a contingency the Committee cannot view with complacency, as they believe the C.M.A. has a witness to bear for Evangelical Belief and Practice in the Anglican Church'. The Statement went on to narrate the exclusion of C.M.S. from St Jude's, Brighton, and the refusal by the bishop to authorise two Victorian clergy (including Ebbs) as speakers at the Summer School. Their case in defence of their rights was the same as that they had put to the bishop in November, especially their rejection of Thomas's interpretation of Determination IX. Once again they drew attention to the results of the work of C. M.A., which they confidently ascribed to 'Divine blessing'. The document carried the signatures of the whole committee.⁴⁵

The *Advertiser* headed its report 'Anglican Missionary Trouble: A Serious Position'. Millie Brown wrote to the Committee protesting at the bishop's ruling and the takeover of her box 'which belongs to C.M.S.' To her, and no doubt many other ordinary supporters of C.M.S., it was A.D.M.A. jealousy at the effectiveness of C.M.S. activities in South Australia which had brought on this situation. To say the least, Thomas's persistent rejection of the evidence of his own approval of a C.M.S. presence in his diocese is puzzling. His account of the events is not fair, and may even be untruthful. It is certainly evidence of that stubborn inflexibility which even the admiring biographer Lionel Renfrey admits was an important trait in his character.⁴⁶

There the matter rested for some months. Privately, the Committee sought to work through the procedures by which the work in Adelaide could become a separate and independent branch. Two members of the Committee were appointed to attend C.M.S. Commonwealth Council to be held later that year.⁴⁷ The ongoing work was recorded in the annual report presented at the annual meeting on 2 May 1916.⁴⁸ The departure of TEL. Lawrence and Mabel Miller, the latter the first missionary fully

supported from South Australian sources, was reported. So were the work of the Depot, the holding of the Summer School, candidates' classes, the distribution of collecting boxes, the holding of prayer meetings and (briefly) the difficulties with A.D.M.A.

When Ebbs wrote to David Knox on 5 June 1916 he offered Miss Hiller of C.M.S. West India as a 'good tactful deputation' whose 'outlook on church matters fits her for work in S.A.', and also promised another lady missionary for later in the year. More significantly, he advised Knox and the Committee privately that 'there is every possibility of a satisfactory settlement of the relations of C.M.A. to A.B.M. and our standing in the Church in Australia'. The key was the plan for a special committee of the three archbishops and two other bishops to draft a new determination on missionary societies for the next General Synod. '*we must not do anything to endanger this*'. Consequently Ebbs urged the South Australians to accept any bans imposed by their bishop in the meantime, for example upon their renewed attempt to mount a missionary exhibition.⁴⁹ Indeed, the very next day Bishop Thomas advised the C. M.A. that he would continue to decline C. M.A. deputations 'until the supporters of C.M.A. in this Diocese can see their way to accept the proposals I have made'.⁵⁰

The tone of Ebbs' next letter to Knox (who had by now combined his duty as representative of the Victorian C.M.A. with that of clerical secretary in place of Phair) in November 1916 suggests that the Adelaide Committee were chafing under the restrictions Ebbs had requested. Certainly he could report the passing of the new A.B.M. Determination at General Synod in October that year which he expected 'would avoid any more disputes such as unhappily took place in South Australia'. It read in part:

9. The Board may recognise Missions or Missionary Societies as Agencies of the Church in her missionary work in connection with the Board. The Church Missionary Society of Australia and Tasmania shall be deemed to be so recognised ... Such Agencies shall work under their respective Constitutions, ... and the Board ... may participate in the management of its internal affairs only when invited to do so ... Such Agencies shall recognise the authority of the Diocesan Missionary Committee in the arrangement of Missionary campaigns.⁵¹

Even more significantly he told Knox of the forthcoming creation of the

Church Missionary Society of Australia and Tasmania that the new Determination had made possible, including the 'glad recognition of their [i.e. the archbishops and bishops] leadership, and the making of the provision that they, if they will, may be Vice Presidents of the C.M.S.'. In this way the long-standing concern that C.M.S. was somehow inimical to episcopal interests was dealt with.⁵² True, C.M.S. retained its separate identity in the new constitution, but it gained a major accession of episcopal representation. Given these facts, Ebbs went on in the strongest terms of any letter he had written to his Adelaide clerical secretaries, to say

very emphatically, that the actions of our representatives in ... Adelaide are endangering all the arrangements ... and are calculated to ruin our cause in South Australia. It is petty in the extreme to perpetuate the quarrels of the past.

He therefore urged Knox to adopt a conciliatory style by making formal approaches to Bishop Thomas to open the next Summer School and to print nothing until he had gained a reply from him. Ebbs even threatened to deny missionaries to the South Australian C. M.A. as speakers for the School if these procedures were not followed. He offered to come to Adelaide to talk it all through if that would help. Instead, Webb hurried to Melbourne, where the importance of maintaining formal proprieties with Thomas were re-emphasised.⁵³ On that basis the Revd E Brammall spoke at the Third Summer School which was held at St Jude's. Thus, although Bishop Thomas made no appearance on the program it appears that the necessary permissions were properly gained.⁵⁴

The focus now shifted to the completion of formalities for the C.M.A. to become a branch of C.M.S. The negotiations were prompted by the knowledge of a bequest of £250 in Sir Samuel Way's will which was at risk if their status was legally imprecise, as well as by the terms of the new General Synod Determination.⁵⁵ Evidence of a more tractable attitude at Bishop's Court, meanwhile, came with the approval by Bishop Thomas for Mr Arewer to act as locum for David Knox at St Luke's and to serve during those three weeks as a C.M.S. deputation, details to be arranged with the secretary of A.D.M.A.⁵⁶ As requested by the Federal Council of C.M.S., the Committee named trustees and prospective office holders⁵⁷ and then received progress reports on the state of their application as it came to the top on the agenda during the

rest of 1917.⁵⁸ Most promisingly, Ebbs advised the South Australians that Bishop Pain, formerly bishop of Gippsland, and now Honorary Secretary of C.M.S. Australia would chair the next South Australian Summer School, and that Pain had already gained Bishop Thomas's agreement to open the School as well as an invitation for Pain to stay at Bishop's Court while he was in Adelaide.

By now the Adelaide diocesan synod had adopted the new Determination on the A.B.M. without debate. So once again the Summer School convened, this time at St Peter's, Glenelg, with the customary array of missionaries and bible teachers. The highlight of the School was the reading by Bishop Pain of the formal advice from the Council of the creation of the South Australian Branch:

the Council have unanimously resolved that it is desirable in the interests of the work of the Society that the proposed Branch should be formed, and I am commissioned by the Council to declare it, here and now, to be formed.

Pain went on to declare on behalf of C.M.S. that the provisions of the 1916 Determination were being followed, and that 'they had the great satisfaction of knowing that, in so doing, they have the sympathetic co-operation of their Lordships the Bishops of Adelaide and Willochra, Vice Presidents of the Society, who are in harmony with this procedure'. What is more, Pain announced, the South Australian Branch was the first to be formed under the new Constitution of the C.M.S. of Australia and Tasmania. His expression of the Council's hopes that the Lord of the harvest would be pleased to endue all the members of the Branch with zeal, wisdom and devotion, and abundantly bless their efforts for the extension of His Kingdom' were therefore far more than tired conventional phrases.⁵⁹

To bring the whole process to its fitting conclusion, therefore, and to inaugurate the new era, the Committee as nominated by the C.M.A. and authorised by the Commonwealth Council met to elect its new office bearers: Frederick Webb as chairman, David Knox as secretary, H.N. Bainbridge as treasurer, Frederick Webb with G.W. Halcombe, J.C.B. Moncreiff and H.M. Mudie as trustees, and as branch committee the Revds S.T.C. Best, W.M. Corden, W.H. Irwin, D.J. Knox, W.G. Marsh, J.T. Phair, E Webb, W.H. Winter and Messrs H.N. Bainbridge, R.V. Davis, W.J. England, H.C. Flehr, G.W. Halcombe, A.B. Moncreiff and H.M. Mudie. As might have been expected, the clerical list was a roll call of Evangelical clergy in South Australia, while the laymen included senior Adelaide citizens who supported C.M.S.

for decades. The new committee formally took over the business, assets and liabilities of the former Association and proceeded at once to work: once more the possibility of a major missionary exhibition was on the agenda.

There was of course much more continuing business relevant to a society whose central task was to promote evangelism: the sinews of prayer, personnel and funds constantly had to be searched out, and there were always changes confronting the members of the Branch. The leaders of the new Branch could reflect on the gains of eight years steady work. The persistence of a team of clergy and laypeople in the diocese all sharing a commitment to the Evangelical tradition had been the key to their success. Despite the Great War, or perhaps even because of it, funds and candidates had come forward for overseas service: possibly a heightened sense of the world crisis prompted such offers. For the women it was an alternative form of active service. There were now enough people of experience and dedication to manage these matters, some quite sensitive, and to offer teaching and judgement to the larger body of supporters in the state. Many, but by no means all, were concentrated in a few Anglican parishes where the Evangelical tradition had been maintained for several decades, notably St Luke's and Holy Trinity.

The support of the Victorian Association was also significant: indeed the South Australian Branch entered into its new life owing the Victorian Branch money with which the branch had set up their Depot. A.R. Ebbs's continued counsel, his many visits, and his perceptive letters all showed the South Australians the way forward.

On the negative side, the ethos of the diocese had given little encouragement to the C.M.S. cause, and there is no doubt the pro-C.M.S. clergy felt opposed by those who preferred the outlook of the A.B.M. The C.M.S. men were a minority and some of their behaviour reflected that embattled outlook. Thus, the establishment of the Branch was an act of self-identification in an unfriendly clerical environment. The caution and then outright opposition of Bishop Thomas was the most difficult problem. Thomas might have had reservations about the Evangelicals who promoted C.M.S., but his main concern was for constitutional propriety and a due recognition of his powers. Perhaps too there was an appearance of stubborn, cold

rigidity in his treatment of Knox and Webb. The trouble was, he treated everyone with this same cold official style.

Again, much turned on the decisions of General Synod and the reconstruction of the constitution of the C.M.S. of Australia, together no doubt with the mollifying words of pro-C.M.S. bishops such as Wright of Sydney in private. Ebbs's concern for proper procedure suggests that he perceived that Thomas was a constitutionalist intent on the recognition of his own authority in his diocese, rather than an out-and-out enemy of the Evangelical cause. Thomas's willingness to accept office as a vice president of C.M.S. Australia, which set the seal on the Branch's formal acceptance within the diocese, clearly made that point.

It was easy for Ebbs to be critical of outspoken, worried Adelaide Evangelicals, but it had after all been the bishop's unexpected reversal of attitude which had placed the supporters of C.M.S. in such a difficult position. So the firm line taken by Knox and Webb was essential if C.M.S. was to survive as an Evangelical agency in South Australia. It is probable that their minority status in the diocese made them more belligerent and defensive than they might otherwise have been. It would have been easy to compromise, but the cost would have been the integrity and independence of the C.M.S. in the state. Since the Summer Schools and the deputations represented significant access to Evangelical teaching and publicity, especially to those cut off from Evangelical ministry in their parishes, the long-term strategy adopted by Webb and Knox, sustained as it was by stable and competent support from both men and women who made up the committees, proved to be the basis for the establishment of this important Evangelical agency among the Anglicans of South Australia.

¹ Eugene Stock, *The History of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1982, 3 vols. Thanks are due for comments on earlier drafts of this paper to David Hilliard, Jim Doust, and Stuart Piggin. The records of the SA Branch of the CMS are held by the Branch, and are used here by permission. They are complete and, thanks to R.V. Davis and Rene Jeffreys, former secretaries, in excellent order. They are cited by item and box number. [Note, 2010: these numberings have since been revised.]

² A.T. Yarwood, *Samuel Marsden: the great survivor*, Melbourne, 1977, chs 9, 10, 12, 17.

³ Keith Cole, *A History of the Church Missionary Society of Australia*, Melbourne, 1971.

⁴ Studies of other missionary organisations among Australians c. 1900 include David Wetherell, *Reluctant Mission: The Anglican Church in Papua New Guinea, 1891-1942* (St Lucia, 1977); A. Harold Wood, *Overseas Missions of the Australian Methodist Church* (Sydney, 1977-80) 4 vols.; J. Graham Miller, *Live: A History of Church Planting in the New Hebrides to 1880*, Bk. 1 (Sydney, 1978-81) 2 vols.; Herwig Wagner and Hermann Reiner (eds.), *The Lutheran Church in Papua & New Guinea: The First Hundred Years, 1886-1986* (Adelaide, 1986); G. Ball, 'The Australian Baptist Mission and its Impact in Bengal 1864-1951' (M.A. thesis, Flinders University, 1978).

⁵ Brian Dickey, 'The Evangelical Tradition in South Australia', in Robert S.M. Withycombe (ed.), *Australian and New Zealand History: A Collection of Papers and Addresses* (Canberra, 1988), pp. 157-174. Janet Scarfe, "'Bridge of Polished Steel as Fine as Hair': The Oxford Movement in South Australia, 1836-1881' (M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1974), pp. 81-3.

⁶ Occasional amounts are recorded in the annual reports of Holy Trinity following the visit of Bishop Patteson. Brian Dickey, *Holy Trinity Adelaide: the history of a city church*, Adelaide, 1988, p.63. The Norwood Melanesian Missionary Association suffered a similar fate, raising £24 in 1864, but becoming moribund by 1867. David Hilliard, *God's gentlemen: a history of the Melanesian Mission*, St Lucia, 1972, p.45.

⁷ Six South Australians can be identified as becoming missionaries with the Congregational London Missionary Society from c. 1880 to 1914 from James A. Sibree, *Register of Missionaries, Deputations, Etc., from 1796 to 1923* (London, 1923), 1924.

⁸ These are discussed in some detail in David Hilliard, 'The Transformation of South Australian Anglicanism, c. 1880-1930', *Journal of Religious History*, Vol. 14, June 1986, pp.38-56. Another inter-state clerical recruit to the diocese makes the point. S.J. Houison, Sydney Evangelical in training and roots, had switched to a vigorous commitment to Anglo-Catholicism as a curate at Christ Church St Laurence's, Sydney. His intense anti-evangelical stance was combined with a firm resistance to the ambitions of bishops: he supported P. Wise against Bishop Thomas. In a sense such Anglo-Catholics shared with the Evangelicals this desire to let the people, not the bishop, decide.

⁹ S.M. Johnstone, *A History of the Church Missionary Society in Australia and Tasmania* (Sydney, 1925), p. 254. St Luke's Sunday School and the Ladies Bible Class there were also contributors. Webb was local secretary, Miss Fry the literary secretary. Even so, Holy Trinity annual financial statements reveal that the first funds for C.M.A. which passed through their hands did not do so till 1912: £8 and £4 to the C.M.S. work at Roper River, with £3 to A.B.M. S.R.G. 94-2-42, SLSA.

¹⁰ Dickey, *Holy Trinity Adelaide*, ch. 5; *St Luke's Adelaide: Centenary Booklet*, 1955, p. 5.

¹¹ An Ebbs had served as a clergyman in the diocese of Adelaide. There may have been a connection based on Glenelg. Ebbs later organised the Church of England Men's Society in Sydney with great effect, and exercised significant parish ministries at Lismore and Manly. L. Abbott to author, 27 Aug. 1989.

¹² A ms page of notes about the history of C.M.S. in S.A., encl. at 7 Nov. 1911 in Branch minute book 1911-16; R.V. Davis, *A History of the C.M.S. of Australia, S.A. Branch, Including W.A. 1910-1960* (Dulwich, S.A. [1960]), p. 3; S.M. Johnstone, p. 254.

¹³ 25s. per week, 2s. 6d. for cleaning. Introductory narrative accepted at first meeting of new committee, 13 Feb. 1911, Minute book 1911-16, Box 2. [Hereafter 1911 narrative].

¹⁴ They were the Revd Frederick Webb, president, the Revd W.G. Marsh, vice-president, Mr A.M. Williams, literature secretary, Mrs Webb, Hermann Flehr and R.V. Davis, secretary.

¹⁵ 1911 narrative.

¹⁶ Copies of correspondence, Thomas to C.M.S., 16 Dec. 1910; Wilkinson (of C.M.S.) to Thomas 18 Jan. 1911; Wilkinson to Ebbs, 20 Jan. 1911, all in Correspondence 1911-23, Box 15. Committee minutes 13 Mar. 1911.

¹⁷ Hilliard, *God's Gentlemen*, ch. 1; S. Piggin, *Making Evangelical Missionaries* (Appleford, 1984), p. 187, n. 176 and works cited therein.

¹⁸ Thomas to C.M.S. (copy), 16 Dec. 1910, Correspondence 1911-23, Box 15, Thomas, 'A.D.M.A. and C.M.A.', *Adelaide Church Guardian*, Jan. 1916, p. 20.

¹⁹ David Hilliard, *God's Gentlemen*, p. 14.

²⁰ Eugene Stock was well aware of this critique of the voluntary missionary societies and wrote scathingly of it in the last volume of his great history, published in 1916: 'Of course it is true that there has been in certain quarters a good deal of wild talk about the Church being her own Missionary Society and occasionally a rather contemptuous reference to "societies" as if they were stupid things, very much in the way'. *The History of the Church Missionary Society: Supplementary Volume The Fourth* (London, 1916), p. 548. Some of the debate is quoted in Gordon Hewitt, *The Problems of Success; A History of the Church Missionary Society 1910-1942, vol. II Asia: Overseas Partners* (London, 1977), pp. 358-371.

²¹ *Year Book of the Church of England in the Diocese of Adelaide 1906-07* (Adelaide, 1907), pp. 194-6.

²² Wilkinson to Thomas, (copy) 18 Jan. 1911; Wilkinson to Ebbs (copy), 20 Jan. 1911: Correspondence 1911-23, Box 15. Committee minutes 13 Mar. 1911.

²³ Financial details are from the annual reports of Victorian, South Australian and Australian C.M.S. organisations 1910-1918, Box 4.

²⁴ Discussed but postponed, minutes, 25 June 1912. One reason for caution was probably that David Knox quickly fell into disagreement with Thomas over Knox's introduction of evening Communion at St

Luke's, 'contrary to my wish' as Thomas wrote: Thomas to Knox, 18 Sept. 1912, D.J. Knox Papers, box 1, Samuel Marsden Memorial Archives, Moore Theological College.

²⁵ Minutes, 28 Jan., 31 Mar. (Ebbs present).

²⁶ Nutter Thomas to A. Ebbs, 3 June 1916; to T.L. Lawrence (curate at St Luke's, a prospective missionary for Uganda when priested and, here, organiser of the Summer School), 8 Aug. 1914, both in box 32.

²⁷ There is a bundle of Summer School brochures 1913-1931, box 32, which illustrate the range of speakers and the rhetoric used to encourage enrolment. Some attendance records and formal descriptions of proceedings are also to be found in the C.M.S. records.

²⁸ Davis, 8; minutes 2 June 1914. By the middle of 1915 the Association was appealing for financial guarantees which would permit the departure of T.L. Lawrence and Miss Mabel Miller to Uganda, and Miss Hilda Beevor to Calcutta: 'An Appeal', S.A. Church Missionary Assn., n.d., pasted in 1916-1922 minute book.

²⁹ Minutes, 6 May, 1 June, 6 July 1915; Nutter Thomas to Knox, 14 July 1915 in Correspondence 1911-1923, Box 15.

³⁰ Which about this time was contracted by the creation of the diocese of Willochra under the leadership of Bishop Gilbert White, another of Thomas's initiatives. Hilliard, *Godliness and Good Order: A History of Anglicanism in South Australia* (Adelaide, 1986), pp. 80, 82.

³¹ Phair to Ebbs 29 July 1915, Letterbook (John Phair) 1915-16, Box 16. It has not been possible to test Phair's assertion by a full investigation of the history of A.D.M.A. It is a project needing research. The 1915-16 Council had thirty members, chaired by the bishop, and included the senior clergy of the diocese. Its income (inclusive of donations being forwarded to other agencies such as C.M.S.) was £1565 in 1915, £1576 in 1916, and £1820 in 1917. Its reports are in the *Year Books*.

³² 6 Aug. 1915, same location.

³³ The fifteen elected lay members were all women, the men all clerical appointees of the bishop.

³⁴ No mss version of Thomas's proposals, dated 11 Aug., has yet been found. They were printed with the C.M.A., 'Plain Statement' of Feb. 1916, copy in Cutting Book, Box 32.

³⁵ Minutes, 1, 3, 15 Sept., 2, 17 Nov., 7 Dec. 1915; Phair to Ebbs 4 Nov. 1915, Letterbook (Phair).

³⁶ Lionel Renfrey, *Arthur Nutter Thomas: Bishop of Adelaide 1906-1940* (Adelaide, 1988), p. 62.

³⁷ On Webb's previous foray, Dickey, *Holy Trinity Adelaide*, p. 91.

³⁸ This was the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, a thorough-going Anglo-Catholic group, mainly composed of clergy, established in England in 1862 which aimed to promote eucharistic devotion. The Revd Charles Marson of St Oswald's, Parkside, introduced it to Adelaide in 1889-90. Hilliard, 'Transformation', p. 45.

³⁹ Renfrey, pp. 55ff; Hilliard, *Godliness*, pp. 87-91.

⁴⁰ Brochure for Summer School, 27 Nov. [elsewhere in brochure, Dec.] 1915-1 Jan. 1916, in packet of printed materials, Box 1. Quite obviously in an attempt to differentiate their product, the final brochure was a peculiar folded effort that opened out in concertina form displaying a series of questions such as 'when' etc. followed by the relevant answers.

⁴¹ Stanton to Sec. C.M.S. Summer School, 16 Dec. 1915, minutes 1 Feb. 1916.

⁴² 27 Dec. 1915, also in minutes of 1 Feb. 1916.

⁴³ Enrolment pamphlet for Summer School in Minute Book 1911-1916, box 2.

⁴⁴ Minutes 3 Jan., 3 Feb.; 'A Plain Statement of the Present Position', 1 Feb. 1916, in Cutting Book, Box 32; *Advertiser*, 3 Feb. 1916; Millie Brown to C.M.A., 3 Feb. 1916. Correspondence 1911-1923, box 15.

⁴⁵ Which by now comprised the Revds Walter Corden, William Irwin, David Knox, John Phair, Frederick Webb, W. Winter, and Messrs R.V. Davis, John England, Hermann Flehr, George Halcombe, Alex Moncrieff, H.M. Mudie and A.M. Williams.

⁴⁶ Renfrey, p. 146.

⁴⁷ Minutes, 29 Feb. 1916.

⁴⁸ Annual Report in Minute Book 1916-22; Annual Meeting (printed minutes) inserted in Minute Book 1911-16.

⁴⁹ Ebbs to Knox, 5 June 1916, Correspondence 1911-23, box 15.

⁵⁰ Minutes 6 June 1916.

⁵¹ *Year Book of the Church of England in the Diocese of Adelaide and the Diocese of Willochra, 1917-18*, Adelaide, 1917, pp. 194-201. Adelaide Synod adopted this Determination on 5 Sept. 1917 unanimously and without debate at the request of Bishop Thomas, who reported in his pastoral address earlier in the same Synod that the Adelaide representatives at General Synod had vigorously opposed the passing of the Determination. Almost certainly this General Synod debate was the scene of David Knox's bitter private condemnation of Nutter Thomas which lives on in oral tradition.

⁵² There had been previous explosions on this issue; in England in 1818 pamphlet war provoked by Archdeacon Josiah Thomas of Bath had resulted in the acceptance of the right of the C.M.S. to independent existence and the invitation of the bishops to become vice presidents. Stock, Vol. I, p. 147.

⁵³ Ebbs to Knox, 4, 23 Nov. 1916, Correspondence 1911-23, box 15.

⁵⁴ Brochure, Third Summer School, Packet of printed materials, box 1.

⁵⁵ C.M.S. S.A. Minutes, 30 Dec. 1916, 27 Feb. 1917.

⁵⁶ Thomas to Knox, 5 Mar. 1917, Letterbook 1916-19, box 16.

⁵⁷ Minutes, 17 Apr. 1917.

⁵⁸ P.J. Bazeley, C.M.S. A. & T. to D.J. Knox, 9 July 1917; Ebbs to Knox, 29 Oct. 1917, Correspondence 1911-23, box 15; minutes 14 Sept. 1917.

⁵⁹ Bishop Pain, secretary C.M.S. A.& T., to S.A. Committee, 27 Dec. 1917, copy written into minutes 1916-22 at date; minutes of first meeting of branch committee 29 Dec. 1917.