

# The World Wide Web and a World Wide Church: The Use of Email Surveys in Studying the Anglican Communion

By

Jason S. Lantzer

Presented at the AAHC Conference, 2 February 2001

## INDEX:

- o Abstracts: [English](#) | [French](#) | [German](#) | Japanese | Russian | Spanish |
- o PDF files
- o .01. [Introduction](#)
- o .02. [Defining a Communion](#)
- o .03. [The Global Anglican Survey](#)
- o .04. [Uses of the World Wide Web](#)
- o .05. [The Effect of the Web on the Anglican Communion](#)
- o .06. [Conclusion](#)
- o .07. [Notes](#)

## .01. INTRODUCTION ([Return to Index](#))

On 21 December 2000, the *Indianapolis Star* ran an Associated Press story dealing with the use of the Internet by churches. The article said that increasingly congregations were using WebPages to attract visitors and to keep their members better informed. It went on to say that the Web was becoming an indispensable ministry tool for churches. Within the week, ABC News was also reporting on the story, which was based on the recent findings of the Pew Internet & American Life Project's "Wired Church, Wired Temples: Taking Congregations and Missions into Cyberspace."[\[1\]](#)

While it may have surprised some who picked up their papers or turned on their televisions, the story was not news to me. As a historian who has grown up in the digital age, I have witnessed first hand the importance of the Web and its transformative power on all sorts of institutions: from government, to schools, to houses of worship. I have even attempted to harness its power in my own work on religious history. Without it, much of my study of the Anglican Communion could never have even been attempted, let alone completed.

Historians have long known that both congregations and denominations are good sources of information when conducting research, because they are repositories of memory. The question that has arisen of late is how to tap into them in a digital age. My work with the Anglican Communion, on both the local and global scale, offers some insights into just how historians can utilize the tools of the Internet Age in their quest to recapture and chronicle the past. In addition, my work also raises interesting questions about institutional memory and the very idea of a global communion in the digital world.[\[2\]](#)

And that communion, the Anglican Communion, is a lively place. Today, it is officially home to seventy million members, within thirty-seven Provinces, in over 160 countries. The growing majority of these Anglicans, a figure that is fast approaching 75 percent, live in Africa and Asia. This is compared to two million Anglicans in the United States. Though the Communion is growing in Africa and Asia, it is still dominated politically by England and the United States. This is a problem because there is a theological rift within the Communion over female

ordination, matters of theology, and homosexuality.[\[3\]](#)

As a historian who is interested in this theological rift that has struck the Communion since the 1960s, the Web is a great place to view the different sides of the debate. The Web is a place where those issues are debated and where the future of the Communion may be determined. The Internet is a means by which I and other historians can gather both primary and secondary sources with relative ease on these and other subjects. It is a virtual archive waiting to be utilized.

## .02. DEFINING A COMMUNION [Return to Index](#))

The investigation I have undertaken has caused me to ask questions about just what a "communion" is. We must understand what it has meant and what it means today. This is important not only for Christians within and without the Anglican Communion, but also for historians who wish to study them. As such, this paper is a reporting of perception as much as it is a recording of reality. What follows is chiefly what people think the Communion is. Whether or not that **is** the Communion is another issue entirely.

Asking these questions and fashioning some possible answers is a monumental task. It is made more difficult by the fact that the Web is constantly changing. The moment an email has been sent or a WebPage posted, it is out of date. These difficulties do not mean that the task cannot be attempted, only that each attempt is just the start towards the goal of finding an answer, not the conclusive answer many might be seeking. As Bishop Michael Hare Duke said of the Web:

[The Web] keeps open lines of communication so that we are aware of what the grass roots are thinking as well as the official pronouncements of the Church. It is a great way to stop fresh ideas becoming the prerogative of those who can afford to get into print at an official level. This is the engine of the revolution, eve though there is an awful lot of chaff to sift from the wheat! [\[4\]](#)

It is time to start the sifting and see not only the affect of the Web on the Communion, but also the affect it has had on those studying global Anglicanism.

There is much that can be said for using email and the other tools of the Internet to gather primary information. I first had the idea while working on my Master's Thesis at Indiana University. It started out as a way to set up traditional oral history interviews, but soon grew into a way to reach large contingents of the congregations that I was studying in a fast and economical way. I have since adapted it for use in a global study as well. How I did these things may prove useful to other historians who wish to undertake projects where email and the Web would be beneficial.

My interest in all things Anglican began while I was working as part of the Polis Center's Religion and Urban Culture Project.[\[5\]](#) It was there, while working as a research assistant, that I first discovered Eli Lilly, the powerful Hoosier Episcopalian businessman, whose pharmaceutical company still bears his family name. What I found in Lilly's story was a man at love with a church, and often at times at war with the forces that were attempting to change it in ways he perceived as wrong. My interest in Lilly's story led me to consider how the Episcopal churches in Indianapolis dealt with the same issues of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, and if there was a relation between what they experienced and the larger, national battle within the denomination. As I embarked on doing research for my thesis, however, I quickly discovered that I wanted more information than I could find in church archives. I needed a way to access Episcopal sources that could not be found in local congregations.[\[6\]](#)

The tool I needed, and decided to utilize, was the World Wide Web. By using search engines, I was able to find out what had become of priests who had long ago left the area. Likewise, I was able to look at other congregations from around the country who had reacted in differently to the pressures of the time period. And by using email, I was able to survey local congregations in a manner that otherwise would have been impossible.

The results of the diocesan study were published in the Journal of the Association for History and Computing. The survey I sent out centered around issues of history and memory within congregations that I was studying for my thesis. It included an introduction, which introduced both myself and the project to the potential respondents, followed by questions about the target areas of my study (1950-1980): important events, church life, and the pastors who served the parishes, as well as questions about the respondent's background, and finally a conclusion that served as both interview release form and as an invitation for more information.[7]

The survey got to the heart of mainline decline, by helping me to make arguments about how national issues played out at the local level. What I discovered was that the battles that were raging at the national level over Civil Rights, Vietnam, the introduction of a new prayer book, and female ordination, were also taking place on the local level. I also found that peoples' memories of the events reflected the information that I was already finding in the church archives I was visiting.[8]

I learned a great deal from the initial survey about what advantages email and the Web offer to the researcher. For one, they open up more avenues of inquiry. By using WebPages, the researcher can discover a great deal about an institution prior to making contact (by email, letter, or phone) with it. WebPages are also a good place to find email addresses. Email offers an efficient means to get and stay in contact with people, though there are other reasons to consider using email as well. It is faster and more cost effective than either the phone or post office, and as my congregational study showed, an email survey is just as effective as a traditional mail survey in getting responses.[9]

There are, of course, problems with using email and the Web to garner information. Anything found on the Web can be outdated the moment after it is posted. The researcher must be diligent and not assume that all the information provided is still current. When it comes to email, bad address inputting is the bane of the researcher. A wrong email address can come about from so many different sources that if a researcher decides to conduct an email survey, they have to assume that not all of the addresses are going to be correct. There is also the problem of account duplication. You may be contacting a person or their family more than once, thus the researcher may only get a single response despite having sent multiple emails. Additionally, not every one or thing that you may want to contact is going to be Online, so the researcher cannot find all that they want.

But the benefits far outweigh the potential problems. The Web and email offer the researcher an opportunity to contact people literally all over the world, as well as those who are closer to home. And the researcher can do this on a budget of almost nothing. The Web is a means to hear more than the "official" voice, and a tool that corroborates very well what oral historians have been arguing for nearly thirty years, that every person's story is important.[10]

### .03. THE GLOBAL ANGLICAN SURVEY ([Return to Index](#))

I utilized my knowledge of how email surveys could work, and launched a global Anglican survey in May 2000. Not everyone was confident that it would be very effective. David Sumner, a professor at Ball State University and someone who has written about the Episcopal Church, told me that he was not sure how I would "measure a feeling of communion." Likewise, David Bundy, professor at Christian Theological Seminary, warned that most of what I would be dealing with was "oral history" of some sort, and as such, would be difficult to move beyond. The retired Bishop of Indianapolis, Edward Jones, thought the idea was a good one, but worried that my findings would be skewed towards those areas of the world where technology was better entrenched, which meant I would miss the largest concentration of Anglicans. He also worried that retired bishops, who I planned on contacting as well, might not be in touch with the Communion enough to provide the answers I was seeking. All three of them were right in their worries to varying degrees. The task did prove to be more difficult than I had first imagined, but it was also more rewarding.[11]

The Communion survey physically followed along the same lines as the earlier congregational study. I acquired my list of past and present bishops from a website dedicated to the Episcopal Church,[12] and then developed my questionnaire. My queries about the affect the Web was having on dioceses and the Communion were prefaced with information about myself and followed by an information release clause. After the initial message was sent out and time was allowed for a response, I sent

several "reminder" emails to those who had yet to reply, and worked on cataloging and replying to messages as they came in. In total I sent out 489 email messages and got replies back, from May until August, from 171 Anglicans. While the response rate was less than I had hoped, around 35 percent, what was astounding to me was that of the thirty-eight Provinces and extra-provincial dioceses listed, I heard from twenty-seven of them, or over 70 percent.[\[13\]](#)

As Bishop Jones had warned me, and as I had known from previous experience, not all of the respondents could be helpful. Some bishops were out of the office, and so the only response I got from them was an automated one. Many of the retired bishops felt as though they were too out of touch, or had moved from where their charge had been, to offer any comments to my questions.

The reluctance of the retired bishops intrigued me much more than the automated responses. Many of these bishops had overseen the implementation of email and the Web into their dioceses, yet did not want to discuss what affect the Internet had on the Communion. Several commented that since they no longer lived in their old dioceses, they did not feel able to respond to what had gone on since they had left. And yet, the very fact that they have email, that they have a presence on the Web, speaks volumes. These bishops are still a part of their Church, part of the fabric of the Anglican Communion, whether they realize it or not. And some of them do, and with a little prodding on my part, were more than willing to discuss their use of the Web. Bishop Michael Hare Duke of the Scottish Episcopal Church, for example, keeps in touch with associates in the Episcopal Church in America, and uses email to get "fresh ideas" for his work with the Age Concern of Scotland.[\[14\]](#)

Again, as Bishop Jones predicted, the other results I did receive were biased, for technological reasons, towards Anglicans in the Northern hemisphere. There are reasons for this. Web users are most likely to be found in North America and Europe, where wealth, computer availability, and electricity are more readily had, rather than in Africa or South America. Thus, there is a slant towards an American view. Obviously, not everyone, everywhere, has access to the Web, and yet, despite the "slant," the information that I received was from around the globe and from nearly all of the Communion's Provinces.

#### .04. **USES OF THE WORLD WIDE WEB** [\(Return to Index\)](#)

But the level of response does not mean that there are not reasons to be concerned about the way the Web is distributed globally. The Communion faces a very real problem that not everywhere does have easy access to the Web. Computers and software are a major investment for dioceses to make, especially those already strapped for cash. African dioceses offer a clear example of the allure that the Web holds globally, despite the difficulties involved in achieving it. In Burundi, the Diocese of Matana is limited to twenty minutes of Internet use a day, and pays \$600 US a year for it. The Diocese of Eastern Zambia also faces prohibitions on their use of the Web because of the high cost involved. The Diocese of Kigali in Rwanda has to contend with the fact that the whole country has only two phone lines. Likewise, the Diocese of Zululand serves several parishes that have neither phone nor electricity. And even when dioceses have email installed, the cost can still be too much for it to be affective. Additionally, just because the diocese or churches have the Web, does not mean that many people in the surrounding community do.[\[15\]](#)

But those dioceses that do not have full access to the Web want it. They have all had a taste of what the Web can offer because of email. And this is seen as enough for now, because it cuts down on costs related to letter writing and speeds up communication. Dioceses may not have their own WebPages, but that does not mean that larger parish churches do not.[\[16\]](#) There is a sharing of resources, and thus, as strengthening of bonds, which go a long way in further the work of the Communion.

Despite the disparity, however, there are more similarities than there are differences within the different parts of the Communion when it comes to the Internet. Everyone sees the Web as a way to "reach out" to groups that may not feel a part of the Church already. Youth are one example. As Canon Paul Willoughby, of the Church of Ireland, said, "young people . . . who may have thought the Church to be stuffy or old fashioned have responded well to the Church being involved with and using technology to spread and share the word of God." The Diocese of West Tennessee has a similar



strategy to reaching out to the next generation. The Web can also be used to evangelize entirely new groups of potential Anglicans. In the Diocese of Central Florida, the Web has facilitated a Hispanic Ministry outreach program.[\[17\]](#)

Some of the results I received to the survey were surprising. Perhaps the best example of this came from Bishop Derek Damant of South Africa. Without his response, I would never have known how email was used in the church struggle against Apartheid. No one would have. In the literature dealing with this subject, the use of email never appears.[\[18\]](#) As he told me:

Although opposed to Apartheid many Anglicans (including Chief Butalezi) were vehemently critical of the Archbishop [Desmond Tutu], especially in regard to his call for sanctions. The media were constantly sniping at him so it was very necessary for his colleagues to have accurate transcripts of his statements, which we were able to download and defend him to our own people – he was frequently deliberately misquoted. Also when government action was threatened against him we were able to issue messages of solidarity. The use of our passwords in communicating made the net more secure than open telephone lines which were tapped. This was also true of contact with other bishops who were on line.[\[19\]](#)

His is only one story. It was amazing to hear how the Web was being used by churches around the world, and the many different uses Anglicans were finding for it. First and foremost, the Web has vastly increased communications within dioceses. Bishop Jackson Gilliam said that the Web was having “a profound effect [on his diocese], to the extent that some diocesan meetings are being held on the Net.” The hope that most dioceses have is that more and more inter-staff communication and meetings will be held in cyberspace. The Web is a way for agendas to be organized and made known in advance of meetings, and thus facilitate discussion once the meeting actually takes place.[\[20\]](#)

Obviously then, email has become a great asset for dioceses, as it allows for “the ability to communicate quickly and efficiently.” Bishop Ronald Haines says that his diocese now does most of its correspondence by email, rather than traditional post, or even fax machines. According to Bishop John Neill, his diocese uses email “a great deal. In fact, postage has probably dropped by 25% in the past year” because of it. Email is a great way to proceed with “informal, directed communication,” according to Henry Reents.[\[21\]](#) It has helped bring parishes within dioceses closer together as well. In the Diocese of Quebec, seventy-five percent of the congregations use email in order to communicate with one another. In the Diocese of Southeast Florida, that figure is nearly fifty percent.[\[22\]](#) Email gives those regions of the Communion that are isolated an opportunity to stay in touch with their fellow Anglicans, because even in areas where access to the Web is limited, one email account can be the source for information from around the world.[\[23\]](#) Such usage will only increase in the years to come.

WebPages are also used to disseminate a variety of information: From directions, to service times, to general parish and diocesan news. They also serve an electoral function. Dioceses use them to keep the laity informed about bishop and priest candidates. They also are places where the minutes of synod and diocesan meetings can be posted and thus quickly be made available to the lay Anglican public.[\[24\]](#)

For these very reasons, many within the Communion view the Web as a force that brings everyone in a parish or diocese closer together. There is a “freedom of contact” which older forms of communication often stifled, according to Canon Paul Willoughby. As one respondent noted, “email and the internet has **greatly increased** the interaction between people and our diocese. The communication and information flow is incredible.” [\[25\]](#) And unlike a diocesan magazine or newspaper, a “diocesan website can be refreshed as often . . . as one chooses.” Many dioceses advise their members to check the websites first, because the other “traditional” forms of getting information to members are “out of date as soon as [they] are published.”[\[26\]](#)

Many dioceses have found that use of the Web also means more people in their pews on Sunday. Bishop John Richard Lewis says that an “increasing number [of people] make [their first] contact” with the Church by using the Web. Email and websites give people who might not normally make an

inquiry about a church a more anonymous option than using either the phone or conventional mail. Bishop Ronald Haines believes that a “substantial” number of people use the Web to find churches that are close to them, as well as to ask questions of the diocese. In the Diocese of Atlanta, the Web is even challenging traditional newspaper ads for referral rates. But the best example of innovative use of the Web belongs to the Diocese of Virginia, where information about a new church was advertised on a website, whose address was then placed on the side of the vicar’s car.[\[27\]](#)

Not everyone agrees with this use of the Web, or has found it to work as well for them. In fact, many Anglicans feel the Web does not bring people into the Church at all. It only seems to be an affective way to reach those who are already members.[\[28\]](#) Others have seen a very slow implementation of the Web in their dioceses, and thus very small “return” in new members. WebPages, like advertisements in newspapers, do not in and of themselves, provide readers with a “compelling reason” to visit any church. They are there to be glanced at, and only “occasionally used.” The detractors also feel that there is still a great deal of mistrust of the electronic medium that must be overcome as well, both within the Church and in the wider world. As such, much of the Web’s use is seen as haphazard, and a doubling of efforts already being made. At the same time, this group also holds out the hope that as more people “log on,” the numbers that visit their sites and their churches will increase as well.[\[29\]](#)

The Web then, has had a tremendous affect on the local aspects of the Communion. It gives tremendous outreach and informative power to parish and diocesan staffs. But we must also remember that in addition to being a medium for local use, the Web also carries with it global potential for Anglicans. Many in the Church view the Internet as the latest in a long line of ministry tools. Not surprisingly then, because of the resources available on it, the Web is changing the face of Anglicanism. It is a place for new friends to be made (or old friendships to be maintained), ideas to be shared, worship aids to be made widely available, and the bonds of communion to be tested and strengthened.[\[30\]](#)

The Web allows bishops and dioceses to keep in touch with others around the globe. Bishop Keith Whitmore, for example, uses the Web to facilitate a relationship between his diocese in Wisconsin with their companion diocese of Old Catholic Christians in Germany. Bishop Robert G. Tharp uses email to keep in touch with people he met at a conference on the Balkans. Likewise, Bishop Geoffrey Rowell has utilized email in his work as co-chair of the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox International Forum.[\[31\]](#)

So, bishops, clergy, and laity use email and the Web to keep in touch with other parts of the Communion and Christendom. Nearly all the respondents to my survey answered that they did so on nearly a daily basis. The ability to instantaneously correspond with their fellow Anglicans around the world on an individual basis is considered an enormous asset. It is also a way for them to keep up with news from across the globe. How they do this goes beyond merely checking websites and sending email. Discussion lists are prolific on the web, as are services that send subscribers news on issues facing the Communion, such as church growth and pastoral leadership.[\[32\]](#)

Being more accessible to one another, of course, also means being more accessible to the general public. While essential for out reach, such availability also has some drawbacks. One of them is that email opens up overworked diocesan staffs to another avenue for “junk mail.” Such junk email comes in many forms according to respondents: From unsolicited messages from varying groups and institutions (some related to the Church, some not), to people who want to come and visit a particular church when they are on vacation, to those doing genealogical research. As Bishop C. Wallis Ohl noted, “instant communication is not always a benefit.”[\[33\]](#)

Yet, despite the problems, the Web is here to stay. The Communion survey showed me that even though the amount of use varies for technological reasons, the fact of the matter is that the Web is being used all over the world. Its use, and uses, will only increase as availability and expertise grow. Retired Bishop Charlie McNutt believes that the Web “has affected the way all of us interact.” And, as Bishop Edwin Leidel said, “[it is] hard to conceive of being [a] diocese without [the] web and email.”[\[34\]](#)

Of course, asserting that a fundamental change has taken place is easy. Showing just how the

Communion has changed is another matter entirely. The Communion survey, however, illuminated to me the extent to which the Web has a transformative nature. If, as Michael Warner argues, printing helped create the public sphere, then I will be among the first to argue that the Internet has merged the public and private spheres into something new. Information is passed on much faster, in large part because production of WebPages is cheap and easy. Due to the speed involved in the production of WebPages, there is a lack of editorial restraint, as there normally is in traditional forms of publication. The Web is causing a breakdown in the uniformity print media has historically insured, and at times, in the words of Bishop Catherine Waynick, is little better than "a forum for bombast and demagoguery" because people can "speak" and "listen" without having to think.<sup>[35]</sup> Instant access requires people to be more discerning, and think about the source of the information they are reading. To date, such maturity seems to be lacking. Perhaps it will come to us as the novelty of the Web wares off.

#### 05. THE EFFECT OF THE WEB ON THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION([Return to Index](#))

While the new sphere idea is intriguing, we must still ask if the Web has affected the way people around the globe view the Anglican Communion? The answer is yes. For dioceses, the Web is a great benefit because it facilitates more interaction between members. This is true of dioceses that cover large geographic areas, such as in Europe, where Anglicans are scattered, as well as within "monster" single dioceses.<sup>[36]</sup> As Mary Parsons of the Diocese of Alaska noted:

I think the WebPage has helped our image in that Alaska is always thought of as being technologically disadvantaged. In actuality, because we are separated by great distances within our own state, as well as with the "Lower 48" Alaskans are always looking for the fastest ways to communicate. The web page and email has greatly improved communication between our members. Snail mail, which could take up to 5 days to get from Fairbanks to Point Hope or to Juneau or New York City can now happen in as short a time space as one minute.<sup>[37]</sup>

And according to Mary George:

Our diocese [Diocese of West Texas] is spread over 69,000 square miles of south central Texas (it really is a big state). We're geographically larger than most states east of the Mississippi. To come to meetings at the diocesan office, some of our priests have to drive four or five hours. So, we love email and the web.<sup>[38]</sup>

The Web is a way for the laity in large and small geographic dioceses to feel a part of what is going on. For this purpose, WebPages are indispensable for diocesan work in the twenty-first century.<sup>[39]</sup>

Because the Web brings people, dioceses, and provinces together, it is affecting how people view the Communion. The Web allows people who might not otherwise meet to get to know one another. It helps to "form community" by giving people an opportunity to talk and discuss issues, and to help in times of need.<sup>[40]</sup> However, the Web is not a cure all, nor does it always deliver everything that the user hopes it will. Not everyone is satisfied with it as a medium. According to David Griffin said, "while delivering some great results it [the Web] does not deliver its hyped access to the world, even a small corner of the world. One has to be realistic about what it will achieve."<sup>[41]</sup>

The Web, then, is something of a mixed bag. Some see it as a means by which the Communion can be brought closer together, while others view it as a means by which the Communion is being torn further apart and polarized. The issues of polarization are not new; the Web is just the latest (and fastest) means to facilitate their discussion. As Bishop James Tengatenga noted, "[the Web] certainly has increased communication and as such has brought it [the Communion] closer. This does not mean closeness in thought or agreement but simply proximity and access. I do not think that it has polarized it but only brought into the public the polarities."<sup>[42]</sup>

This public openness, this discourse, is exactly how the Web promotes community. Dioceses separated by miles of land and sea can be as in much contact as if they lay across the street from one another.<sup>[43]</sup> As Cameron Venables, the Youth Coordinator for the Popondota Diocese of Papua New Guinea said:

[We have] better communications with friends in Australia and New Zealand. Partnership between parishes and companion relationship between dioceses greatly assisted through email communications. We have at least six overseas missions per year and arrangements have been easier to make (and cheaper) because of email contact. Communications with other diocese and donor organizations within PNG have also improved because of email.[\[44\]](#)

Another similarity can be found in the interaction between Canadian and Alaskan dioceses, which are much closer to one another geographically, and thus in a better position to help one another in times of need, than their respective counterparts within their own countries. The Web has been used in a similar way within the Province of Central Africa.[\[45\]](#)

And what of the technology gap? Because of its location within the United States, the Web has had the greatest affect on the Episcopal Church and how it sees the rest of the Communion. Bishop Catherine Waynick believes that the Web has helped make “people more aware of the differences, [as] there has long been a fond notion . . . that Anglicanism is monolithic.” The Web makes this an impossible notion to hold. According to Bishop Allen L. Bartlett, “the internet has sharpened my awareness of the disparate character of the Anglican Communion and the diversity of responses to events such as ordination questions. The internet forces the Anglican Communion to take more seriously the international consequences of controversial actions.”[\[46\]](#)

Perhaps more should be said about the “polarization” that seems to accompany the closeness brought on by the Web. Sending an email is so easy, that some fear that as it becomes the common form of communication “what we say to each other will not necessarily bring us closer together and may even push us further apart!” The Episcopal Church is not always viewed as a shining example to the rest of the Communion. Bishops in Africa and Asia have looked aghast, as the American church has grown increasingly liberal on issues such as female ordination, theology, and homosexual unions. They have used the Web to stay in contact with conservative forces within the Episcopal Church, to try and confine and rollback what they view as apostate innovations.[\[47\]](#) As such, according to Bishop Gordon Scruton:

I clearly see it [the Web] as having much more negative than positive impact, since the cultural differences are enormous and there is great conversation. I have found e-mail to be quite a violent medium, with occasional moments of grace. It has also excluded many from open conversation. A useful tool, which, like atomic energy, can be useful in some contexts, but destructive in others.[\[48\]](#)

Though many agree with Bishop Scruton, many more think the Web is a much more neutral factor on the course of debates within the Church. The factions and the polarization have always been there, the argument goes, only the medium has changed. It seems to “only enhance those [views] people currently hold.” As Clark Grew commented, “human beings rarely need any help to split into factions. It’s part of our sinfulness.”[\[49\]](#) And it may even be a means by which the Communion is brought closer together. I found that the Web is a place for people to be made aware. The more news and views represented, the better, because it is then easier to forge a middle ground.[\[50\]](#)

## .06. CONCLUSION [\(Return to Index\)](#)

Whatever position they take on polarization, the Web does not seem to have changed many peoples’ perceptions of the Communion. The Web is something that has to be dealt with, and helps the Communion to discuss things openly that in past years may have been covered up or brushed over.[\[51\]](#) Overall, respondents to my survey viewed the Web has been a great gift to the Communion. Obviously, it has increased communication. It is a place where Anglicans from all over the world can meet and be at home with one another. According to Bishop Richard Chang, “it has helped to provide a broader vision to the Church.” One Scottish bishop agreed, saying “[the Web] may in the long term help us to understand one another therefore differences will not come as such a shock when we meet together.”[\[52\]](#)



The World Wide Web has done all of these things. The hope of many of my respondents is that it will promote greater respect for all the members of the Communion. It is a focal point that draws people in, and erases distances. What is important is that there is a communication process involved. Ultimately, it is not the Web that forms the Communion, but rather, the relationships that people forge by using it that causes community within the Communion to exist.[53]

The most important thing that came from the Communion study is the understanding that the use of the Internet, the World Wide Web, and email have been a great boon for the dioceses that have been able to use them. They are places where information is traded, and new converts are made. But the Web has done something else as well. WebPages have become rallying points for groups, from dioceses to interest organizations, which make up the Anglican Communion. It might even be possible to argue that the Anglican Communion exists both physically and virtually now, and that it is increasingly an "imagined community" in both realms, whose members view both as they wish they were.

The Communion study lead to some new discoveries about research on the Web as well. Historians must be careful when dealing with Websites. They cannot expect to find the archival holdings of a given church (or other institution) online. Many parishes will include a brief history, though more often than not, it is of the "bricks and mortar" variety, detailing construction of old and new buildings. And because the Web is, in many ways, a visual medium, historians must also be careful not to judge a congregation solely on the pictures it has posted. Such a site tells you what the parish is like now, not how "old" or "important" it is or was. In the Anglican Communion study, I had to continually remind myself that the diocese did not equal the parish. In other words, just because a certain diocese may provide links to groups, does not mean that the membership in the parishes support all of those institutions, and vice versa.

The use of the Web and email in research extends beyond religious history of course. These tools can be utilized by anyone seeking to better understand an institution or even a person. I recently concluded a survey of the Presidential Library System in the United States based almost exclusively on information compiled from the Web, responses to email, and interviews set-up because of email correspondence.[54] Such is the nature of the Web; historians can conduct vast amounts of solid primary research without leaving their home or office. This is our future as a profession.

And what of the future of the Anglican Communion? Like historians, I think it is obvious that the Web and email are going to be indispensable tools for the Church in the twenty-first century. They are not going to go away, and rather than being afraid of them, the Church must come to embrace the Internet. And it seems, if my survey and the Pew Study are any indication, it is. Now is the time for the historian to do so as well. There is much information on the Web just waiting to be tapped and much more, undoubtedly, will come on line in the years to come. So, just as the Church is coming to master this technology to further its goals, so to must historians. In this way, the profession will continue to be master of its own domain, and be able to offer insights on to the past of others.

## .07. NOTES [\(Return to Index\)](#)

[1] *Indianapolis Star*, 21 December 2000; ABC News, 27 December 2000.

[2] James P. Wind and James W. Lewis's "Memory, Amnesia, and History" in Carl S. Dudley, Jackson W. Carroll, and James P. Wind, editors, *Carriers of Faith: Lessons from Congregational Studies* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 15-17, 25-27; James P. Wind, *Places of Worship: Exploring Their History* (Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History, 1990), 2, 60-62, 95, 104-106.

[3] The Anglican Communion, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/introduction.html>; Terry Mattingly, "Cracks in the Anglican Communion," <http://www1.gospelcom.net/tmattingly/col.07.16.97.html>.

[4] Bishop Michael Hare Duke, retired bishop of the Diocese of St. Andrew's, Scotland, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000.

[5] The Polis Center, "Polis Center," <http://www.polis.iupui.edu>.

[6] James H. Madison, *Eli Lilly: A Life, 1885-1977* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1989); Jason S. Lantzer, "Crisis on the Circle: Christ Church Cathedral Confronts the 1960s," *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 68 (November 1999), 468-492; Jason S. Lantzer, "Tradition, Transition, Turmoil, and Triumph: Indianapolis Episcopalians Confront the 1960s and 1970s," (MA Thesis: Indiana

University, 1999).

[7] Jason S. Lantzer, "Electronic Episcopalians?: The Results of the Episcopal Email Survey of 1999," *The Journal of the Association for History and Computing*, 2 (November 1999), <http://www.mcel.pacificu.edu/jahc/jahcII3/WORKSII3/worksII3.html>.

[8] Lantzer, "Electronic Episcopalians"; Lantzer, "Tradition, Transition, Turmoil, and Triumph." My thesis contains discussion of each of these subjects.

[9] Lantzer, "Electronic Episcopalians." Another good source for email addresses, and an example of how important it has become as a medium of communication, is in church or business directories.

[10] James B. Gardner and Peter S. LaPaglia, editors, *Public History: Essays From the Field* (Malabar, Florida: Krieger Publishing Company, 1999), 203-216; Lantzer, "Electronic Episcopalians."

[11] Prof. David Sumner, Ball State University, correspondence with author, 1 May 2000; Prof. David Bundy, Christian Theological Seminary, correspondence with author, 2 May 2000; Bishop Edward Jones, retired bishop of the Diocese of Indianapolis, correspondence with author, 1 May and 15 May 2000. Also see David E. Sumner, *The Episcopal Church's History, 1945-1985* (Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse Publishing, 1987).

[12] Louie Crew, "Louie Crew's Collection of Anglican Bishops' Email Addresses," <http://newark.rutgers.edu/~lcrew/ebishops.html>.

[13] I heard from respondents in the Anglican Church of Aotearoa, New Zealand, and Polynesia, the Anglican Church of Australia, the Anglican Church of Canada, the Anglican Church of Papua New Guinea, the Church in the Province of the West Indies, the Church of Bangladesh, the Church of Ceylon, the Church of England, the Church of Ireland, the Church of Nigeria, the United Church of Pakistan, the Church in the Province of Central Africa, the Church in the Province of South East Asia, the Church in the Province of Southern Africa, the Church in the Province of the Indian Ocean, Church of the Province of West Africa, the Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East, the Episcopal Church of Burundi, the Anglican Church in the Region of Central America, the Anglican Church of the Cone of South America, the Episcopal Church of Cuba, the Anglican Episcopal Church of Brazil, the Anglican Church of Mexico, the Anglican Episcopal Church of Rwanda, the Anglican Communion in Japan, the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Episcopal Church in the USA.

I did not hear from the Anglican Church of Kenya, the United Church of North India, the Church of the Province of Uganda, the Episcopal Church in the Philippines, the Episcopal Church of the Sudan, Extra-Provincial to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Portugal), Extra-Provincial to the USA (Puerto Rico), Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui, and the Province of the Anglican Episcopal Church of the Congo.

[14] Bishop Michael Hare Duke, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Charles McNutt, retired bishop of Central Pennsylvania, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop David Reed, retired bishop of Kentucky, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Jose A. Gonzalez, retired bishop of Cuba, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000.

[15] Bishop Kenneth Barham, Bishop of Cyanguu, Rwanda, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Debra Gill, assistant to the bishop, Diocese of the Arctic, Canada, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Pie Ntukamazina, Bishop of Matana, Burundi, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Todd A. McGregor, assistant to the bishop, Diocese of Antananarivo, Indiana Ocean, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Bishop Barnabas Dwijen Mondal, Bishop of Kushtia, Bangladesh, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Russell E. Jacobus, Bishop of Fond du Lac, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Sonja Hoekstra Foss, secretary, Diocese of Kigali, Rwanda, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Cathy Wright, secretary, Diocese of Zululand, Southern Africa, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Elijah Olasoji, secretary, Diocese of Ibadan, Nigeria, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Bishop James Tengatenga, Bishop of Southern Malawi, Central Africa, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Canon Chad Gandiya, Diocese of Botswana, Central Africa, correspondence with author, 3 June 2000.

[16] Bishop Thomas Brient, Diocese of Sunyani, West Africa, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Bishop Khotso Makhulu, Diocese of Botswana, Central Africa, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Canon Chad Gandiya, correspondence with author, 3 June 2000; Bishop Pie Ntukamazina, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop John Osmer, Diocese of Eastern Zambia, Central Africa, correspondence with author, 20 May 2000; Bishop Raymond Smith, Western Region of the Diocese of Brisbane, Australia, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000.

[17] Canon Paul Willoughby, Diocese of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross, Ireland, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Julie Denman, Director of Congregational Support, Diocese of West Tennessee, correspondence with author, 9 June 2000; Bishop William Folwell, retired bishop of Central Florida, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000.

[18] Bishop Derek Damant, retired bishop of George, Southern Africa, correspondence with author, 19 and 23 May 2000; Lyn S. Graybill, *Religion and Resistance Politics in South Africa* (Westport Connecticut: Praeger, 1995); Desmond Tutu, *No Future Without Forgiveness* (New York: Doubleday, 1999).

[19] Bishop Derek Damant, correspondence with author, 19 and 23 May 2000.

[20] Bishop Jackson Gilliam, assistant bishop of Hawaii and retired bishop of Montana, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Clark Grew, assistant to the Bishop of Ohio for information strategy, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Debra Gill, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Allen L. Bartlett, retired bishop of Pennsylvania, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop George Conner, Diocese of the Bay of Plenty, New Zealand, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Presiding Bishop Samuel Azariah, Pakistan, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; David Smart, webmaster of the Diocese of Eastern Tennessee, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Matthew Payne, lay canon for youth ministry and communications, Diocese of Fond du Luc, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Timothy K. Fujii, assistant to the Bishop of Tokyo, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Bishop Geoffrey Rowell, suffragan Bishop of Winchester-Basingstoke, England, correspondence with author, 3 June 2000; Bishop Rawle E. Douglin, Diocese of Trinidad and Tobago, West Indies, correspondence with author, 13 July 2000.

[21] Bishop John Neill, Diocese of Cashel and Ossory, Ireland, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Ronald Haines, Diocese of Washington, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Henry Reents, administrator of the Diocese of Idaho, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Michael Turnbull, Diocese of Durham, England, correspondence with author, 21 May 2000; Bishop Maurice Sinclair, Diocese of Northern Argentina, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Cary Patrick, director of communications, Diocese of Atlanta, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Rev. Alan Naylor, executive officer of the Diocese of Edmonton, Canada, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; C.A. Salstrom, accountant for the Diocese of Rupert's Land, Canada, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Jim Kelsey, Diocese of Northern Michigan, correspondence with author, 27 May 2000; Rev. Barry Greaves, chaplain to the arch bishop, Diocese of Brisbane, Australia, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop Henry Scriven, suffragan Bishop of Europe, England, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000.

[22] Bishop John Hannen, Diocese of Caledonia, Canada, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Bishop Richard Clarke, Diocese of Meath and Kildare, Ireland, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Michael Creighton, Diocese of Central Pennsylvania, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Bruce Stavert, Diocese of Quebec, Canada, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Sandra Bell, secretary to the bishop of Southeast Florida, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000.

[23] Bishop Pie Ntukamazina, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Francisco de Arazoza, communications officer for the Episcopal Church of Cuba, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Isidora Gallego, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Bishop Clive Handford, Diocese of Cyprus and the Gulf, Middle East, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000.

[24] Vincent Currie, Jr., administrator of the Diocese of the Central Gulf Coast, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Lorie Chortyk, communications director, Diocese of Vancouver, Canada, correspondence with author, 31 May 2000; Nell Toensmann, communications officer, Convocation of American Churches in Europe, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000.

[25] "Betty," assistant to the Bishop of Cariboo, Canada, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000 (emphasis in original); Bishop John-David Schofield, Diocese of San Joaquin, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Mary George, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Ann Castro, program resources, Diocese of Toronto, Canada, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Barbara Hume, secretary of the Diocese of New Castle, New South Wales, Australia, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Archdeacon Stuart Edwards, Diocese of Christchurch, New Zealand, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; David Smart, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Robert Rowley, Diocese of Northwest Pennsylvania, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop John Gladwin, Diocese of Guildford, England, correspondence with author, 26 May 2000; Bishop Michael Scott-Joynt, Diocese of Winchester, England, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Guy Snell, communications officer, Diocese of Algama, Canada, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Julie Denman, correspondence with author, 9 June 2000.

[26] Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Cary Patrick, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Timothy K. Fujii, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Robert A. Franken, coordinator of the bishop's office, Diocese of Colorado, correspondence with author, 26 May 2000; Lorie Chortyk, correspondence with author, 31 May 2000; Bishop Penelope Jamerson, Diocese of Bunedin, New Zealand, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Rev. Barry Greaves, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop F. Neff Powell, Diocese of Southwestern Virginia, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Rev. Scott Albergate, communication's officer, Diocese of Fort Worth, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Julie Denman, correspondence with author, 9 June 2000; Julianne Jones, diocese office, Diocese of Bath and Wells, England, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Nell Toensmann, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000.

[27] Bishop John Richard Lewis, Diocese of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, England, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Ronald Haines, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Rev. Tony Somerveil, assistant to the Bishop of Paraguay, South America, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Richard Chang, Diocese of Hawaii, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Julianne Jones, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Jubal Pereira Neves, Diocese of Southwestern Brazil, Brazil, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Isidora Gallego, editor of the Anglican newspaper and clerk/secretary for Anglican schools, Diocese of Belize, West Indies, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Chong Tze Kong, assistant to the Archbishop of South East Asia, correspondence with author, 29 May 2000; Bishop Sumio Takatsu, retired bishop of Sao Paulo, Brazil, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Russell E. Jacobus, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Cary Patrick, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; David Smart, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Rev. Alan Naylor, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Matthew Payne, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Henry Scriven, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Patrick Getlein, communications officer, Diocese of Virginia, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Rev. Scott Albergate, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Bishop Geoffrey Rowell, correspondence with author, 3 June 2000; Nell Toensmann, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000; Bishop Gordon Scruton, Diocese of Western Massachusetts, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000; Bishop Robert G. Tharp, assistant bishop of Atlanta and retired bishop of East Tennessee, correspondence with author, 5 June 2000; Julie Denman, correspondence with author, 9 June 2000.

[28] Bishop Jackson Gilliam, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; David Griffin, assistant to the bishop of Kootenay, Canada, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Cameron Venables, youth coordinator of Diocese of Popondota, Paupa New Guinea, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Vincent Currie, Jr., correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Henry Reents, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Kenneth Fernando, Diocese of Colombo, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Maggy Clarke, secretary to the bishop, Diocese of Grahamstown, Southern Africa, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Richard Clarke, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Michael Creighton, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Rev. Alan Naylor, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Sarah Barnett, content editor and film reviewer for Diocese of Sydney, Australia, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Guy Snell, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Bishop Murray Mills, Diocese of Waiapu, New Zealand, correspondence with author, 7 June 2000.

[29] Bishop Bill Ind, Diocese of Truro, England, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Clark Grew, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; David Griffin, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop David Farrer, Diocese of Wangaratta, Australia, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Henry Reents, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Peter Beckworth, Diocese of Springfield, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Rev. Brian Roundtree, rector Church of the Advent and St. John's Anglican Church, Diocese of Keewatin, Canada, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop John-David Schofield, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Bishop Edwin Leidel, Diocese of Eastern Michigan, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Mary George, communications officer, Diocese of West Texas, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop Russell E. Jacobus, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000;



Bishop Keith Whitmore, Diocese of Eau Claire, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Canon William F. Honaman, Japan, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Bishop Humphrey Taylor, suffragan bishop of the Diocese of Selby (York), England, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Geoffrey Rowell, correspondence with author, 3 June 2000; Steve Biggar, business manager of the Diocese of Bunbury, Australia, correspondence with author, 16 June 2000.

[30] "Betty," correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop Maurice Sinclair, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000.

[31] Bishop Keith Whitmore, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Robert G. Tharp, correspondence with author, 5 June 2000; Bishop Geoffrey Rowell, correspondence with author, 3 June 2000.

[32] Bishop Jackson Gilliam, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Bill Ind, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop John Richard Lewis, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; David Griffin, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Debra Gill, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop John Neill, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Richard Chang, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Julianne Jones, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop David Farrer, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; "Betty," correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Vincent Currie, Jr., correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Peter Beckworth, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop John-David Schofield, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Bishop Edwin Leidel, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Bishop Jubal Pereira Neves, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Julio C. Marton, communications officer Diocese of Mexico City, Mexico, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Todd A. McGregor, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Ann Castro, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop John Osmer, correspondence with author, 20 May 2000; Bishop Michael Turnbull, correspondence with author, 21 May 2000; Chong Tze Kong, correspondence with author, 29 May 2000; Bishop Barnabas Dwijen Mondal, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Barbara Hume, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Sumio Takatsu, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Allen L. Bartlett, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Richard Clarke, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Michael Creighton, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Carol Miers, secretary to the bishop of Waikato, New Zealand, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Charlie McNutt, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Michael Hare Duke, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Archdeacon Stuart Edwards, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Presiding Bishop Samuel Azariah, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; David Smart, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Rev. Alan Naylor, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Robert Rowley, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Matthew Payne, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Cathy Wright, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Elijah Olosoji, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Rev. Barry Greaves, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop Richard Henderson, Diocese of Tuam, Ireland, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop Barry Jenks, Diocese of British Columbia, Canada, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Guy Snell, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Rev. Scott Albergate, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Helen Bishara, personal assistant to the bishop of Egypt, Middle East, correspondence with author, 5 June 2000; Bishop Rawle E. Douglin, correspondence with author, 13 July 2000; Sandra Bell, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Julie Denman, correspondence with author, 9 June 2000.

[33] Bishop John Richard Lewis, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Julianne Jones, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop David Farrer, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; "Betty," correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Richard Clarke, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Rev. Alan Naylor, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Sandra Bell, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Bishop C. Wallis Ohl, Diocese of Northwest Texas, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Bishop Gordon Scruton, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000.

Such contact, for dioceses with large enough staffs, however, is not viewed in quite the same way. See Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000.

[34] Rev. Jim Murphy, rector of the Church of the Nativity, Diocese of Southwestern Florida, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Bishop Charlie McNutt, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Edwin Leidel, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000.

[35] John Dye, computer programmer, correspondence with author, 22 July 2000; Sarah Barnett, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Matthew Payne, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Geoffrey Rowell, correspondence with author, 3 June 2000; Julie Denman, correspondence with author, 9 June 2000; Bishop Catherine Waynick, Diocese of Indianapolis, correspondence with author, 7 June 2000; Michael Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992).

[36] Nell Toensmann, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000.

[37] Mary Parsons, assistant to the bishop of Alaska, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000.

[38] Mary George, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000.

[39] Mary Parsons, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Penelope Jamerson, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop Catherine Waynick, correspondence with author, 7 June 2000.

[40] Bishop Pie Ntukamazina, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop David Farrer, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; "Betty," correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Mary Parsons, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop John Hannen, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Mary George, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Ann Castro, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop Michael Creighton, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop David Bowden, Diocese of Bendigo, Australia, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; David Smart, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Rev. Mark B. Cyr, cybersexton of Diocese of New York, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Rev. Scott Albergate, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000.

[41] Clark Grew, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Kenneth Fernando, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; David Griffin, correspondence with author, 16 May and 18 May 2000.



[42] Bishop Kenneth Barham, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Ronald Haines, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Bishop Edwin Leidel, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Julio C. Marton, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop Kenneth Fernando, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop Keith Whitmore, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Carol Miers, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Cary Patrick, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Humphrey Taylor, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Robert A. Franken, correspondence with author, 26 May 2000; Bishop James Tengatenga, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000.

[43] Todd A. McGregor, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Isidora Gallego, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000.

[44] Cameron Venables, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000.

[45] Mary Parsons, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Bernard Malango, Diocese of Northern Zambia, Central Africa, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000.

[46] Bishop Catherine Waynick, correspondence with author, 7 June 2000; Bishop Allen L. Bartlett, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Maggy Clarke, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000.

[47] Bishop Ronald Haines, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Julianne Jones, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Rev. Brian Roundtree, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Charlie McNutt, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Archdeacon Stuart Edwards, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Harold Daniel, suffragan bishop, Diocese of Jamaica, West Indies, correspondence with author, 26 May 2000.

[48] Bishop Gordon Scruton, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000.

[49] Bishop Bill Ind, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Clark Grew, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; David Griffin, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Debra Gill, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Vincent Currie, Jr., correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Henry Reents, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Peter Beckworth, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Rev. Brian Roundtree, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Michael Turnbull, correspondence with author, 21 May 2000; Barbara Hume, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Canon William F. Honaman, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Bishop Rodney Michel, Diocese of Long Island, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop George Conner, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Rev. Alan Naylor, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Bishop Clive Handford, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; Bishop David Murray, assistant bishop of Perth, Australia, correspondence with author, 25 May 2000; Rev. Barry Greaves, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop Robert G. Tharp, correspondence with author, 5 June 2000; Bishop Rawle E. Douglin, correspondence with author, 13 July 2000

[50] Bishop Richard Henderson, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop Barry Jenks, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Bishop William Folwell, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000; Guy Snell, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Canon Robert Butterworth, Diocese of Bloemfontein, Southern Africa, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Bishop Henry Scriven, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Patrick Getlein, correspondence with author, 2 June 2000; Nell Toensmann, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000.

[51] Bishop Ronald Haines, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Debra Gill, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Vincent Currie, Jr., correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Rev. Brian Roundtree, correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Todd A. McGregor, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Bishop Kenneth Fernando, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop Sumio Takatsu, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Maggy Clarke, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Russell E. Jacobus, correspondence with author, 22 May 2000; Bishop Richard Appleby, Diocese of Brisbane, Australia, correspondence with author, 1 June 2000.

[52] Bishop Richard Chang, correspondence with author, 15 May 2000; Anonymous Bishop, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000; "Betty," correspondence with author, 16 May 2000; Bishop Jubal Pereira Neves, correspondence with author, 17 May 2000; Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Bishop Robert Rowley, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Nell Toensmann, correspondence with author, 4 June 2000.

This Scottish bishop remains anonymous because he chose to reply to the survey by printing out the survey and mailing it to me. Without signing his name, nothing he wrote revealed where he was from, except that the email subject heading "Church of Scotland" remained on the print-out.

[53] Todd A. McGregor, correspondence with author, 18 May 2000; Canon Paul Willoughby, correspondence with author, 19 May 2000; Matthew Payne, correspondence with author, 23 May 2000; Sandra Bell, correspondence with author, 24 May 2000.

[54] Jason S. Lantzer, "The Public History of Presidential Libraries: How the Presidency is Presented to the People," Unpublished paper, 2000.

[Return to Index](#)

Jason Lantzer  
[jlantzer@hotmail.com](mailto:jlantzer@hotmail.com)

© The American Association for History and Computing All rights reserved.

[Home](#) [Current](#) [Articles](#) [Works](#) [P-Resources](#) [E-Resources](#) [E-Journals](#) [Notices](#)