

“Towards ‘a real reunion’?”

Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft 62



“Towards ‘a real reunion?’”

Archbishop Aleksi Lehtonen’s efforts for closer
relations with the Church of England 1945-1951

Mika K T Pajunen

Luther-Agricola-Society
Helsinki 2008

Luther-Agricola-Seura
PL 33 (Aleksanterinkatu 7)
FIN-00014 Helsingin yliopisto
Finland

Distributed by:
Bookstore Tiedekirja
Kirkkokatu 14
FIN-00170 Helsinki
www.tiedekirja.fi

© Mika K T Pajunen & Luther-Agricola-Seura

ISBN 978-952-10-5143-2 (PDF)
ISSN 1236-9675

Cover photo:
Museovirasto KL 6.1.-87
Aleksi Lehtonen 1891- 1951.
Valok. Tenhovaara

Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy
Jyväskylä 2008

Abstract

This is an historical study of the relationship between the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland during the archiepiscopate of Aleksii Lehtonen between 1945 and 1951. I have studied the relations of the churches from three perspectives: *ecumenical*; *church politics*; and *political*. The period begins with the aftermath of the visit of the Rev. H.M. Waddams to Finland in December 1944, and ends with the death of Archbishop Lehtonen at Easter 1951.

The rhythm for the development of relations was set by the various visits between the churches. These highlight the development of relations from Waddams' pro-Soviet agenda at the beginning of the period to the diametrically opposed attitude of Church of England visitors after the beginning of the Cold War. Official Church of England visitors to Finland were met by the highest political leadership alongside church leaders. The Finnish Church sought to use good relations with the Church of England as a means of gaining support and understanding for church and nation against the perceived Soviet threat, especially during the Finnish "years of danger" from 1944 to 1948. The Church of England wished to help the Finnish Church, but remained cautious, feeling that this might cause more harm than good *vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union.

From the ecumenical perspective, the churches were drawn together by post-war Christian reconstruction and Lehtonen's efforts to continue the pre-war development towards reunion. Lehtonen was motivated by both evangelical catholic theology and his desire to promote the western contacts of both church and nation. Lehtonen's insistence that the 1930s negotiations be continued posed a challenge to the Church of England. The ecumenical policy of the Council on Foreign Relations under its chairman Bishop G.K.A. Bell and its general secretary Waddams concentrated on the Lutheran churches of Denmark, Norway and Iceland, who unlike Sweden

and Finland had as yet no official agreement with the Church of England. The Finnish case advocated by Lehtonen was left to mature, a phrase that indicated a perceived need to wait for the apostolic succession to percolate through the church. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Fisher, took a practical and reactive approach to relations with the Finnish Church.

Both churches had small numbers of enthusiastic people in favour of closer relations. In England, they were often motivated by a need to support Finland during troubled times, as evidenced by the establishment of a circle to pray for Finland in the spring of 1948. In Finland, Lehtonen advocated a high church liturgical revival, a project especially undertaken by his chaplain, the Rev. Toivo Harjunpää and the young high church clergy the Archbishop supported. This was opposed by conservative pietists, who saw it as an alien Anglo-Catholic influence on the Finnish Church. Popular understanding of Anglicanism was affected despite the endeavours of Lehtonen and those close to him by a conservative pietistic interpretation, which saw Anglicanism as both too catholic and too reformed.

Relations began to settle after the 1948 Lambeth Conference, which Lehtonen attended in preference to important ecumenical conferences the same year. The Lambeth Conference encouraged the approval of the 1930s negotiations' recommendations by the Anglican churches that had not yet considered them. Lehtonen seemed content with this. Meanwhile, ecumenical reconstruction, which had provided the churches with a channel for closer relations, drew to an end. Lehtonen continued to advocate better relations, but without his former vigour because of his declining health. When he died in 1951, there was no obvious candidate among the Finnish bishops to take on his pro-Anglican mantle.

Acknowledgements

I need first to thank my supervisor Professor Aila Lauha, who has encouraged me to complete this study ever since I sought her permission to write my Master's Thesis about this subject a decade ago. She replied that it was something I could continue with in my post-graduate studies. This I did, which she made possible by helping me to secure funding and finding me opportunities to work at the Church History department, which has been such a good place for me to work and study. So thank you Aila very much indeed.

Particular thanks are due to all my co-labourers in the post-graduate seminar – you made my journey so much easier not only through the occasional good suggestion and constructive criticism, but especially with your deep support and shared good humour in tackling whatever challenges came along. The same applies to a number of my older colleagues and teachers, who shared their wisdom in, and especially out of, the classrooms.

Besides the great general debt of gratitude to all of you in the academic community, there are, however, some whom I should thank in particular. I begin with the Ketolas: thank you, Hanna-Maija, for a thorough basic study on the Revd H.M. Waddams, for sharing your views (and material!) with me, and for taking the trouble to be such a diligent opponent. Thanks also to you, Mikko, for the work you did as an assistant in the Masters' seminar that I attended, and for asking me to be your assistant in the Masters' seminars you supervised. I learned more about academic writing there than anywhere else. Further thanks are due to Mr Juha Meriläinen and Mrs Jenni Krapu, with whom I have had the particular pleasure of sharing an interest in ecumenism and its applications in the 1940s. Thank you all for your help and friendship.

I must also thank my English friends, the Revd Michael Ainsworth and the Revd Jonathan Collis and their families for accommodation and help

in studying the English archives. I should also like to thank the staff in the various archives and libraries, who have assisted me to the best of their ability; the Very Revd John Arnold, the Revd Sydney Linton, and the families and friends of Aleksii Lehtonen (the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen, the Revd Risto Lehtonen and His Eminence Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea), Colin Dunlop (Mr Bede Dunlop and his family) and Georg Pimenoff (Mrs Agnes Pimenoff and her family) for invaluable insights gleaned both from interviews and from the provision of private sources, from which I have greatly benefited. Further thanks are due to Mr Konsta Helle for sharing his work on the 1930s negotiations, and to Mr Tero Tulkki for providing me with the 1940s high-church material.

In the final stage of my research, I had the pleasure of receiving reviews from Professor Hugh McLeod, who kindly accepted an invitation to be my opponent in the public examination, and the Revd Dr Jaakko Rusama. I am grateful for your suggestions, which have guided me in revision. I also want to thank the Luther-Agricola Society for publishing my book in their series and St Henry's Foundation for their financial support of its publication.

I must also thank all the institutions that have enabled my study: the Finnish Cultural Foundation, the Finnish Graduate School of Theology, and above all the Jenny and Antti Wihuri Foundation for their scholarships; and the Church Research Institute and the International Department of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland for their travel stipends. In addition to travel grants, the Church of Finland has been very generous in providing international and ecumenical opportunities and education, as have the parishes I have served: thanks to the Anglican Church in Finland and the Diocese in Europe for teaching me to think like an Anglican (and indeed to be one!) and for all the helpful connections that this has afforded me, and to the Evangelical Lutheran Parish of Salo-Uskela for their understanding, and giving me study leave to finalize my book, which proved impossible while I was serving the Anglicans in stipendiary ministry.

This leads me to the debt of gratitude I owe to my former boss and a very dear friend, the Revd Rupert Moreton, who has done his best in honing my English to make up for the time I spent as his curate, when I should have been involved in academic work. So thanks for your labours Rupert: it's up to you to decide whether we are even!

Finally, thanks to my beloved wife Liina for suffering with me throughout the process. As an artist you realise that at times we are all insufferable and can't help it, and still you are there. Thank you very much indeed; and I

apologize to all I have forgotten to mention, the rest of my friends and family, who with their characteristic down-to-earth no-nonsense attitude have made it all so much more bearable, and ensured that I never got too carried away with academic stuff.

Mika K T Pajunen
26 October 2008

Contents

ABSTRACT	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
I Introduction	11
1. Task and sources	15
2. Relations from Finnish Independence to the end of 1944	20
a. The Swedes draw the Finns into Anglo-Nordic co-operation	20
b. The negotiations	27
c. ‘Economic intercommunion’	36
d. The war separates the churches	42
e. A messenger of the Allied world order	52
II Re-establishing Relations: 1945	57
1. The first post-war report about the Finnish Church	57
a. Waddams advocates concerted propaganda	57
b. The report discussed at the Allied Control Commission	62
c. The report’s reception by the churches	69
2. Politics displaces theology as the churches consider invitations	71
a. The Church of England debates the sending of a delegation	71
b. The debuts and installations of the new Archbishops	81
3. Lehtonen’s theological programme in his <i>Encyclical Letter, 1945</i>	90
a. ‘Evangelical Catholicism’ affords a natural link with Anglicanism	90
b. Lehtonen seeks convergence on the understanding of ministry ..	95

c.	The ecumenical relations of the Finnish Church	99
d.	The revival of church life on high church principles	103
e.	Adaptation to the Cold War	106
f.	"A Message from the Church of Finland"?	108
4.	Lehtonen begins his programme for closer relations	111
a.	Harjunpää, an able assistant to Lehtonen's pro-Anglican work	111
b.	Lehtonen concerned to persuade the new CFR personnel to engage with the quest for reunion	119
c.	The Church of England responds with CRE aid	124
d.	Gulin prefers the practical to the dogmatic in Anglican relations	131
III	The quest for reconstruction and reunion 1946-1947	138
1.	Lehtonen seeks closer relations with the Church of England ...	138
a.	Lehtonen steers a course towards England	138
b.	Nordic reconciliation at the Bible Conference	145
c.	'The informal conference' achieves little	151
d.	Lehtonen's ecumenical goal	156
2.	The early Cold War paradigm shift	161
a.	The northern perspective by the Rev. A. Cotter	169
b.	Pimenoff's place in the changing political climate	172
c.	The advancing Cold War mentality divides the churches	178
3.	Christian reconstruction - spiritual and material	178
a.	Lehtonen supports the emerging Finnish high church movement	178
b.	A young Church of Finland ambassador in Cambridge	186
c.	Samuel Lehtonen and the churchmanship of the Finnish visitors	189
d.	The significance of CRE aid in Finland	195
e.	The reality of Finnish popular perceptions and interest	201
4.	Bishop Hunter's introduction to Church of Finland relations	204
a.	The search for a successor to Headlam	204
b.	The first post-war Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference	211
c.	Hunter's visit connects the ecumenical and political	213
d.	The Archbishop's hospitality	228

e. Hunter's visit results in reorganising CRE work	234
f. A successor to Headlam?	240
IV The turning tide: 1948-1951	244
1. Church relations face growing difficulties	244
a. The saga of Gulin's car and his estrangement with Lehtonen ..	244
b. Student exchange offers a tool for Lehtonen's domestic policy .	249
c. A warning for the Finnish high church movement	256
d. A threat in the form of the Finnish-Soviet Treaty	264
e. Harjunpää in America	270
2. Lambeth 1948: a point of convergence and departure	275
a. Lehtonen's controversial decision to prioritise Lambeth to Amsterdam	275
b. The Nordic situation reviewed	280
c. The propaganda value of the Lambeth Conference	293
d. From theological rapprochement to political estrangement ..	297
3. "The soul of a truly virile nation" - Bishop Dunlop's Finnish experience	302
a. Debate about the Eucharist precedes Dunlop's visit	302
b. Dunlop surprised to find a free and independent Finland	307
c. Dunlop's introduction to the Finnish high church tradition ..	313
d. The CFR perspective	322
e. The inter-consecration of Bishops revisited	326
4. The end of the ecumenical reconstruction era	331
a. The last long-term student	331
b. The CRE ceases its work	338
c. Permanent peace-time links established and stabilized	343
d. Lehtonen's long good-bye	348
f. The humble remains of reconstruction work	355
5. Lehtonen's influence fades	358
a. Moss and the Apostolic Succession	366
b. The Church of England's policy towards the Nordic Churches	374
c. Last contacts with the Church of England	374
d. Archbishop Lehtonen's legacy	380

V	SUMMARY	384
	ABBREVIATIONS	
	SOURCES AND LITERATURE	
	INDEX OF NAMES	

I Introduction

1. Task and sources

The study of church relations is a complicated field. Anyone undertaking it needs to be familiar with the faith and order, life and work, and, indeed, the ethos of the churches in question. It is important to understand the different theological and political strands in the churches if one is genuinely to understand how they function within them; the mechanisms of power and the culture of decision making in order to understand how the official relations were conducted; to become familiar with the central figures who created and maintained contacts; to study the anxieties of the wider world beyond the churches, which affected them. Above all, one needs to learn to see the churches as they saw each other in order to understand what these relations meant to them.

This is the approach I have taken to my study of the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland during the archiepiscopate of Aleksii Lehtonen between 1945 and 1951. The method of the study is historical and alongside an analysis of the key factors affecting the relations of the two churches, the results are presented in narrative form. I begin with the basic task of reconstructing the process of communication between the churches: who was involved, how, and by what means; what decisions the churches took, if any, and by which processes; how the churches saw each other and what bearing it had on their relations. To facilitate this, I have studied the relations from three perspectives: *the ecumenical; church politics* and *political*.

From the *ecumenical* perspective, I study how ecumenical theological ideas were applied to the relations between the churches and what the motives of ecumenical intercourse were. This includes a study of the underly-

ing theology of the churches in general and individual church leaders in particular, and how that theology affected ecumenical praxis.

In the field of *church politics*, I study how ecumenical relations influenced the life of the individual churches. Particular attention is paid to those who were active in nurturing relations: how, if at all, did their ecumenical contacts influence the life of their churches; and how were their actions perceived by the wider circle of theologians and church people? By studying how ecumenical relations were received and their application in the life of the churches I analyse perceptions of Anglicanism in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland and of Finnish Lutheranism in the Church of England.

The *political* field forms the wider landscape in which the churches operated at the time. I study how the course of international and domestic politics affected church relations: did the churches conform to national policy, and if they did, how did they contribute and how were their actions perceived by the state, the other churches and the general public? These questions are especially important as the years in question belong to the critical period of the onset of the Cold War, which shaped the churches' approach to both world politics and ecumenical relations for almost five decades.

Furthermore, I have for the most part restricted the timeframe of the study to the archbishopate of Aleksii Lehtonen in order to study closer how the personality of a particular church leader affected the policy of the Finnish Church and its relations with the Church of England. This is also why I have analysed Lehtonen's theology in detail, with particular reference to Anglican relations in his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*, in chapter II:3.

Besides the Archbishop, there was a small group of active ecumenists who were advocates of Anglican relations. By studying their actions and theology, I try to shed light on the more general attitudes in Finland towards Anglicanism. This is applied, because of their relative insignificance, in a considerably more limited way to the so called 'friends of Finland' in the Church of England.

Strictly speaking, my study begins before Lehtonen's archbishopate. In chapter I:2 in my introductory section, I discuss the relations from Finnish Independence until the visit of the Rev. H.M. Waddams to Finland in December 1945. This is the point reached by the previous study of Anglo-Finnish church relations. I have thus distinguished between the actual visit, which is addressed in the Introduction, and the report produced by Wad-

dams, which I study in chapter II:1, and whose influence could not have been ignored by my study.

The decision to begin the study at the start of 1945 is also supported by the fact that Bishop Lehtonen of Tampere was already required to take some responsibility for the foreign relations of the Finnish Church during the illness and especially following the death of Archbishop Erkki Kaila towards the end of 1944, whereas Lehtonen's death at Easter in 1951 affords the most natural end for the study.

In order to answer the questions presented I have studied various archive sources, for the most part in Finland and England. It has proved quite easy to restrict the main sources to the collections of Alekski Lehtonen and Eelis Gulin in the Finnish National Archives (Kansallisarkisto) in Helsinki, and the Archives of the Church of England Council of Foreign Relations (CFR) together with the papers of Bell, Fisher, Douglas and Headlam at the Lambeth Palace Library in London. Besides these archives, collections and papers the above mentioned institutions hold additional material that has been of great value to me. For example, I have studied the Church of England Church Assembly's printed minutes at the Lambeth Palace Library, and benefited greatly from their collections.

In the field of state relations, I have studied the British Foreign Office (FO) and the Ministry of Information (INF) files and documents held by the Public Record Office (PRO) at Kew. Underlining the discrepancy between the two churches and nations, I have been unable to find comparable material in Finnish official sources, whether in state or church archives. The Finnish Foreign Ministry, for example, appeared not to be systematically interested in church relations, which were left to the politicians and diplomats in question as they arose.

Similarly, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland did not really debate Anglican relations in any official capacity during the period; they were left to the Archbishop and those he entrusted with them. This makes the archives of Alekski Lehtonen all the more important as they include, for example, the collection of papers concerning the foreign aid the Finnish Church received at the time (Kirkon lahjavarain toimikunta).

Besides these central sources I have studied various archives of private persons and organisations with a connection to church relations. Especially important sources have been the archives and papers of the Church of England bishops who visited Finland, for example the Bishop Hunter Papers in the Sheffield Archives. I am greatly indebted to the families of Archbishop

Lehtonen, Bishop Colin Dunlop and Director Georg Pimenoff for allowing me to use parts of their private collections related to my study. The same applies to all those who gave me interviews on the subject including the above mentioned families and His Eminence Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea and the Very Revd John Arnold, whose views have helped me to relate the picture constructed by archive sources to the bigger picture of their lives.

A particular challenge was to learn more about Georg Pimenoff, who died in 1955. Besides interviewing his widow Mrs Agnes Pimenoff, I have studied the papers of the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) at the Bible Society Archives (BSA) at Cambridge University Library (CUL) and the material of the Finnish Security Police, partly at the National Archives in Helsinki (EK-VALPO), but also in part still held by their own collection (SUPO). The most geographically distant sources I have used are those held by the National Lutheran Council collection (NLC) in the Archives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (AELCA) in Chicago, which helped me to relate Church of England reconstruction aid and relations to the wider Lutheran world.

In order to gauge public opinion in both churches, I have scanned the respective volumes of the Finnish church newspapers *Kotimaa*, *Herättäjä* and *Församlingsbladet*, and have also reviewed the Church of England newspapers *The Church Times* and *The Record* (later *The Church of England Newspaper*), partly with the aid of indexes. I have also attempted to get acquainted with the thinking of the respective church leaders in both churches, but especially in Finland, by reading their writings from the period, together with later recollections and memoirs.

A thorough study of primary sources has been especially important as there appears to have been little previous study in the field. The ecumenical and international relations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland have been studied by a succession of respected Finnish scholars. Professor Aila Lauha has covered the area from 1917 to 1925 in her two volumes *Suomen kirkon ulkomaansuhteet ja ekumeeninen osallistuminen 1917-1922* and *Suomen kirkon kansainväliset suhteet 1923-1925*. Before this, Professor Eino Murtorinne has studied the relations of the Finnish Church with Germany with reference to wider church relations from the 1930s to 1944 in his studies *Risti hakaristin varjossa* and *Veljeyttä viimeiseen saakka*. The most recent work in this series is Dr. Jaakko Ripatti's study of Finnish Church foreign relations in the years 1944 to 1946, *Suomen kirkon ulkomaansuhteet ja*

kansainvälinen politiikka 1944-1946, which I aim to supplement, as Ripatti does not use British archives in his study.

There has also recently appeared some other interesting Finnish studies that have been of great help to me. These include the unpublished Licentiate theses of Mrs Pirjo Kantala and Mrs Jenni Krapu. Kantala has continued the study of the ecumenical relations of the Finnish Church under the title: *Suomen evankelis-luterilaisen kirkon harjoittaman ekumeenisen toiminnan järjestäminen ja painopisteet toisen maailmansodan jälkeen 1945-1953*, and Krapu has studied Bishop Eelis Gulin as an ecumenist in her study *Ekumeenikko E.G. Gulin 1893-1975*. In the same field, Dr. Jaakko Rusama has written the history of the Finnish Ecumenical Council, *Kohti ykseyttä. Suomen Ekumeenisen Neuvoston synty ja toiminta 1917-1997*, which in part covers the same themes as my study, but from the point of view of an ecumenical organisation.

British study of church relations has been thin. Apart from the general histories of the Church of England and the ecumenical movement, little has been published about its ecumenical policy in general. An exception is the work of Dr. Dianne Kirby, who has studied the Church of England involvement in the Cold War, although with almost no reference to Finland. This means that I have heavily resorted to what I have been able to find, namely the excellent biographies of the various church leaders. These include Ronald Jasper's impressive studies of Bishops Headlam and Bell: *Arthur Cayley Headlam: The Life and Letters of a Bishop* and *George Bell. Bishop of Chichester*; and Edward Carpenter's *Archbishop Fisher – His Life and Times*.

The foundations of the study of Anglo-Nordic church relations were laid by Professor Lars Österlin in his work *Svenska kyrkan i profil: ur engelskt och nordiskt perspektiv*, whose English translation *Churches of Northern Europe in Profile - A Thousand Years of Anglo-Nordic Relations* I have used in my study. However, this study is very general because of the long period it covers.

Thus, the only previous studies of the relations between the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland are some articles and unpublished theses. I am greatly indebted to Mrs Hanna-Maija Ketola's articles about the Rev. H.M. Waddams' visit to Finland in December 1944 "*Oikeiden*" *asenteiden opettajana – The Rev. Herbert M. Waddams Ruotsissa ja Suomessa syystalvella 1944*, published in English under the title *Teaching 'Correct' Attitudes: an Anglican Emissary to Sweden and Finland in 1944*. I have also published some articles about the subject, having written my

master's thesis about it, and have referred to the articles, but following Finnish tradition, not to my thesis. I have, however, used Mr. Konsta Helle's excellent unpublished thesis *'That they all may be one': The Church of England and the ŒEcumenical Discussions with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland 1933-1934* for the Honour School of Modern History, Oxford, and express the hope here that it will one day be published as an article.

In general, I have used studies and articles in English if at all possible. This has long been a particular challenge in the case of Finnish history, still more so in Finnish church history. However, there has been something of a revival of general Finnish history in recent years, and I have referred to works of both Finnish and international scholars. In the field of church history, I have sought to refer to Nordic publications either in English or in the Scandinavian languages for the benefit of international readers.

A further challenge in my study has been the translation of various phenomena and terms from Finnish to English. The terms used by Finnish revival movements, for example, present especial difficulty in translation. The same applies to some Lutheran theological concepts. There is no study, for example, of evangelical catholicism in English. I have therefore had to resort to Professor Sven-Erik Brodd's study in Swedish on the subject. I have also endeavoured to translate quotations in Finnish into English, seeking to preserve the original tone while rendering them comprehensible. In this respect, I should record my thanks to my friend the Revd Rupert Moreton, who has shared my anxiety and helped me with my English throughout the process. Sometimes this has succeeded, sometimes perhaps not; any mistakes remaining are mine.

2. Relations from Finnish Independence to the end of 1944

a. The Swedes draw the Finns into Anglo-Nordic co-operation

Following the independence of Finland in 1917, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland was drawn into the developing ecumenical co-operation between the Church of England and the Nordic Lutheran churches. Ecu-

menical rapprochement with the Anglicans was led by the Church of Sweden. Anglicans and Swedish Lutherans had become acquainted with each other on both sides of the Atlantic. Through these contacts, the Church of England had come to appreciate the Church of Sweden for its long tradition as an historic national church with an historic ministry.¹

How Anglican appreciation of the Church of Sweden related to the other Nordic Lutheran churches was more problematic. Key to such an appreciation was the divergent Anglican and Lutheran understandings of the terms 'apostolic succession' and 'historic episcopate'.

In contrast to contemporary ecumenical agreements, in which the apostolic succession is understood broadly as "the continuity of the apostolic life and the mission of the whole Church"², in early twentieth century parlance, while it was acknowledged that the apostolic succession had different and wider meanings, its basic meaning was often simply the unbroken succession of bishops beginning from the apostles through the laying-on-of-hands from one bishop to another over the centuries.³ This arose from the way the Tractarians and the Anglo-Catholic movement, which dominated the conversation about apostolic succession in the Church of England, spoke about the historic episcopate almost as if it were a technical term. Thus, the historic episcopate and the apostolic succession had become almost identical terms, signifying the unbroken (or apostolic) succession of bishops, especially with reference to Anglican ecumenical relations with other Christians. This meant that while in theory the Anglican understanding of the apostolic succession broadly included other aspects alongside the historic episcopate, in practice the unbroken succession of bishops was given utmost importance as the final prerequisite for Church unity.⁴

The crux with the Nordic Lutheran churches, with the exception of the Swedish Church, was that the Anglicans did not consider them to have a valid apostolic succession, as the line of consecrating bishops had been broken, presbyters (pastors) having ordained at one time or another. This was embarrassing for the Swedes: the Nordic churches had always shared full communion, and no conditions were set in regard to succession in their relations. Indeed, the Nordic churches without the outward sign of unbroken

¹ Bell 1948a, 51-52; Österlin 1995, 211-244; Pajunen 2006, 147.

² The Porvoo Common Statement 1992, IV, C, 46.

³ Waddams 1968, 22-23; Avis 2000, 19-23.

⁴ Bell 1948a, 17-22; Avis 2000, 19-23.

succession of bishops still understood themselves, in their way, as churches in the apostolic succession, because they claimed inward succession of apostolic faith and teaching. There was a sense among Swedish church leaders that something needed to be done to overcome the difficulty in order to bring all the Nordic churches to the same level of relations with the Church of England.⁵

A particularly influential advocate of this cause was the Archbishop of Uppsala, Nathan Söderblom, a great leader of the early ecumenical movement. He reserved a prominent role for the Nordic churches in his evangelical catholic programme for Christian unity. The concept as such was not his invention, but he used it in an imaginative way, dividing the Church Catholic into three main branches: Roman Catholic, Orthodox Catholic and Evangelical Catholic, led by four centres, Rome, Constantinople, Canterbury and Uppsala. An integral part of Söderblom's programme was to unite northern European Lutherans around the common episcopal office, and to pass the Swedish succession to them if at all possible.⁶

This type of evangelical catholicism remained critical of the Roman Catholic insistence on authority and uniformity, but found some affinity with the liberal catholic tradition in Anglicanism; the romanising strands of Anglo-Catholicism, however, fell out of its scope.⁷ However, evangelical catholicism, like Nordic Lutheranism as a whole, appears to have been little known or understood in the Church of England in general.⁸

Furthermore, the evangelical catholic motivation for closer church relations was especially Söderblom's, rather than Finnish or even Nordic. The Finnish understanding of church relations was guided by a political reality and theological tradition that differed from those in either Sweden or England. The general outlook and the political situation of the Finnish Church during the first decades of the twentieth century were not particularly favourable for wide ecumenical co-operation. The Archbishop of Turku and Finland, Gustaf Johansson, was against the ecumenical movement in general and anything in connection with Nathan Söderblom in particular. As long as he was in charge of ecumenical and foreign relations, there was

⁵ *Österlin* 1995, 245-258, 265; *Busch Nielsen* 2002, 182-184; *Pajunen* 2006, 147.

⁶ *Lauha* 1993a, 29-30; *Lauha* 1993b, 46; *Brodd* 1993, 103-106; *Österlin* 1995, 246-252.

⁷ *Brodd* 1982, 169-181; *Brodd* 1993, 107-108.

⁸ *Hebert* 1965, 118-119; *Österlin* 1995, 256, 260-265; *Helle* 2007, 9-10.

no possibility of official talks between the churches. This meant that the contacts were pursued unofficially through the ecumenical movement, in which some Finnish theologians took part as private individuals.⁹ These included Bishop Jaakko Gummerus and the Rev. Dr. Aleksi Lehtonen (b. 1891), who despite his young age was already something of a specialist with regard to the Church of England. Both were initially interested in pan-protestant alliance ecumenism, but were later influenced by Söderblom's evangelical catholic ideas.¹⁰

The Archbishop was not the only obstacle to closer relations: the Finnish general public was deeply suspicious of the Roman Catholic Church, with its perceived expansionist politics in the Nordic area after the first world war. All attempts by the Church of England to develop friendly relations in the quest for unity with Rome – the Malines Conversations, for example – were thus subject to hostile scrutiny in Finland. In particular, the Anglo-Catholic party was criticised for its neglect of reformation tradition and its romanising tendency.¹¹ The geographical and ideological distance between the churches ensured that the extreme views dominated public debate about and conception of Anglicanism in Finland, which did its image no favours.

Even the otherwise supportive Lehtonen was critical of what he saw as the exclusively Anglo-Catholic insistence on the apostolic succession as a prerequisite for Church unity.¹² Lehtonen, who had visited England and studied the Church of England, published his impressions in a series of articles in the Finnish theological review *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* in 1923-1925. Although the series came out at a time of much suspicion, Lehtonen supported the developing of closer relations with the Church of England after the Swedish example. He considered the other Nordic Lutherans as closest to the Church of Finland, followed by the German protestants, and then the English protestants, by which he in fact meant the Church of England.¹³

⁹ Lauha 1990, 66-70, 98-100, 202-207, 220-221; Lauha 1993a, 226-228, 234-241, 250-251-258, 284-295; Lauha 1993b, 46-55; Rusama 1999, 29-32, 69-71.

¹⁰ Lauha 1990, 143, 152-154, 379-380.

¹¹ Lauha 1993a, 188-200; Lauha 1993b, 52, From Malines to ARCIC 1997; *Hastings* 1998, 208-212.

¹² Lauha 1993a, 191-192.

¹³ Lehtonen 1923a, 217-218.

The closer relations Lehtonen referred to meant the agreement the Church of Sweden and the Church of England had achieved whereby it was possible for members of one church to receive Holy Communion in the other, priests to be invited to preach, and bishops to take part in episcopal consecrations. Significantly, the Anglican report recommending this avoided the term 'intercommunion', which was generally used at the time. The recommendations were accepted by the 1920 Lambeth Conference, and in a letter from the Swedish bishops in 1922, although the matter was not brought to the Convocations of the Church of England. The recommendations were, however, immediately put into practice in Anglo-Swedish relations, even though the matter remained judicially incomplete.¹⁴

In Finland, Lehtonen proved capable of making subtle distinctions in his approach to both Anglicanism and Anglican-Lutheran relations. He was fascinated by the Anglican emphasis on *successio apostolica* as the foundation of the unity of the Church, although this was alien to his own tradition. While regretting the break in succession, he could not accept it as *conditio sine qua non* for Church unity.¹⁵

He also saw something good in all the traditional Church of England parties, and especially notable was his attitude towards the Anglo-Catholics. While he was very opposed to the extreme right wing of the Anglo-Catholic party, Lehtonen was quick to give credit to the liberal catholic party led by Bishops Charles Gore and William Temple.¹⁶ Lehtonen balanced his own tradition and the anti-ecumenical demands of the time on the one hand, and his obvious sympathy towards Anglicanism informed by first hand experience and Söderblom's influence on the other.

The need for this balancing act evaporated with the change in the ecclesiastical political situation. The Roman Catholic Church did not gain a strong footing in the Nordic area, but other problems, namely the vicinity of the Soviet Union and the threat it was perceived to pose to Christian nations on its borders, did not disappear. The civil war in Finland between the Reds, who had unsuccessfully supported the Russian Revolution, and the victorious Whites, who had seen themselves as a western outpost against the barbarian east, ensured that international relations in inter-war Finland were evaluated from this political perspective. The national Lutheran Church

¹⁴ Jasper 1960, 253; Hill 1993, 53-54; Helle 2007, 9-10.

¹⁵ Lehtonen 1923a, 221-223.

¹⁶ Lehtonen 1923b, 275-280.

was anxious to do all in its capacity to help the young republic gain powerful western European friends. Good relations with the Church of England fell easily into this category, and Finnish church leaders were encouraged to create and maintain them when independence was achieved.¹⁷

The first formal contacts between the Churches of England and Finland, besides occasional encounters at ecumenical meetings, were made in 1927, when Bishop Arthur Cayley Headlam of Gloucester visited Finland. Headlam had had links with the Nordic region since the beginning of the century, and was friendly with both Archbishop Söderblom and Professor Yngve Brilioth, Söderblom's son in law, who taught church history at the Swedish language university Åbo (Turku) Akademi in Finland. When Headlam decided to visit Denmark and Sweden, Brilioth arranged for him to visit Finland as well. It must be said that Brilioth's account of the Finnish Church was far from positive, suggesting that it was "lacking [in] both scholarship and beauty of worship".¹⁸

This, however, did not bother Headlam, who took another view of the Finnish Church. He met Archbishop Johansson, but considered his anti-ecumenical views as belonging to a generation already passing away. He also met other church leaders like Bishops Jaakko Gummerus and Erkki Kaila, and Dr. Lehtonen, who he discovered wanted closer ties with the Church of England.¹⁹ Again, the principal problem was the breach in the apostolic succession that had occurred in Finland in 1884, when all three Lutheran bishops had died suddenly in quick succession. As Finland was then an autonomous Grand Duchy under Russian rule, it was politically impossible to obtain a foreign bishop for consecrations, although it was scarcely deemed necessary to try.²⁰

This posed no problem for Headlam, who reasoned that the succession could be reinstated by allowing an Anglican bishop to take part in episcopal consecrations. Headlam found the Finns open to this in principle, but it was clear that it would be impossible as long as Johansson was Archbishop. As an interim measure, the Finns suggested that a proposal might be brought to the Finnish Church Assembly session in 1928 that if the Church

¹⁷ *Ripatti* 1990, 35-37; *Lauha* 1993a, 31-36; *Lauha* 1993b, 49-52.

¹⁸ *Jasper* 1960, 252-254; *Österlin* 1995, 255; *Rusama* 1999, 103-104; *Helle* 2007, 11.

¹⁹ *Jasper* 1960, 25; *Ripatti* 1990, 35-36; *Rusama* 1999, 103-104.

²⁰ *Gummerus* 1930, 399-402; *Jasper* 1960, 254; *Lauha* 1993a, 30; *Österlin* 1995, 249-259; *Pajunen* 2006, 147, 157.

of England asked for negotiations, the Archbishop of Finland should appoint a commission to consider them.²¹

It is debatable whether Headlam had correctly identified a Finnish openness to negotiations and willingness to propose this during Johansson's time. Nevertheless, he returned to England satisfied with the results of his journey, reporting to the Archbishop of Canterbury that the prospects of closer ties with the churches of Finland and Denmark, which he had also visited, were bright. Furthermore, he thought that the next Lambeth Conference in 1930 might take an initiative to create a joint commission with the Church of Finland to discuss closer relations.²²

Söderblom, who had supported the inclusion of the Finns in the Anglo-Nordic community, was happy with the unexpectedly positive outcome. Although he was unable to attend the Lambeth Conference in 1930, to which the Church of Sweden had been invited to send a representative, he sent the Bishop of Lund, Edward Rodhe, with a suggestion that the Finnish Church should be high on the agenda. Rodhe took part in the sub-committee responsible for relations with episcopal churches and made a strong contribution. He wanted Sweden's privileged position to be extended to all the Nordic churches, explaining the Nordic position that they were all established and historic churches.²³

The apostolic succession presented the only problem. Rodhe supported the incorporation of the other Nordic churches into the same succession as the Swedes and the Anglicans, but explained the sensitivities which related to the question. For the Danes, Norwegians and Icelandics, the breach in the succession was part of their reformation tradition. This, however, did not imply that they were not apostolic. They had always had bishops and were able to show ministerial succession in the succession of office.²⁴

Finland was different. Finland had a long history alongside the Swedish Church with the same episcopal tradition and the breach of succession had been accidental and unprovoked. Rodhe therefore considered it best to reinstate the apostolic succession first in Finland, where this would face little resistance. They should simply wait for the departure of Johansson before proceeding with Finland and only then with the other Nordic churches.

²¹ *Jasper* 1960, 254.

²² *Jasper* 1960, 254.

²³ *Jasper* 1960, 254; *Österlin* 1995, 255.

²⁴ *Österlin* 1995, 257-258.

Bishops Headlam and G.K.A. Bell of Chichester, who was a rising star among Church of England ecumenists, agreed, and the proposal was supported by the sub-committee. The Anglican side thus initiated negotiations at the 1930 Lambeth Conference, when the Archbishop of Canterbury was asked to appoint a commission to examine relations with the Church of Finland.²⁵

They did not need to wait for long. Johansson died on the very day that the sub-committee met. He was succeeded by the Most Rev. Lauri Ingman, who took a positive view of the negotiations, which began in 1933.²⁶

b. The negotiations

Before the negotiations began, Bishop Gummerus visited England for a month in the spring of 1932, lecturing on the Finnish Church, its revival movements and Finnish contacts with the Church of England. Gummerus met the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo Gordon Lang, and reported on their conversations to Archbishop Ingman. Lang had, for example, suggested that the Estonian and Latvian Lutheran Churches might be included in the discussions, although this was rejected by Ingman for the sake of simplicity.²⁷

Gummerus reported his impressions to the Finnish public through newspaper articles. He emphasized the importance of addressing questions of faith in dialogue between the churches, and considered external forms and order as secondary issues. Gummerus had developed an appreciation of high church Anglicanism, some of whose features he considered close to Lutheranism, whereas he considered low church Anglicanism as being closer to reformed Christianity. What disappointed him was that Anglicans were not especially familiar with Martin Luther, and were suspicious of the reformers, even though the reformers' theology clearly reflected the substance of early Christianity. According to Gummerus, both sides had much to learn from each other.²⁸

²⁵ *Jasper* 1960, 255; *Hill* 1993, 55; *Österlin* 1995, 258; *Rusama* 1999, 104-105.

²⁶ *Ripatti* 1990, 36-37; *Österlin* 1995, 258-259; *Rusama* 1999, 104-105.

²⁷ *Mäkeläinen* 1972, 35-36; *Repo* 2006, 313; *Helle* 2007, 15.

²⁸ *Mäkeläinen* 1972, 35-36.

The Rev. C.B. Moss, a conservative Anglo-Catholic scholar from St Boniface's College, Warminster, visited Sweden, Finland and the Baltic States at this time. Moss wrote a highly critical report of his findings to Headlam and Lang, who in the main disregarded it. Instead, they engaged in an extensive correspondence with Ingman and Lehtonen in preparation for the negotiations. Moss' criticism may have resulted in Lehtonen visiting England the following summer, where he met him and another Anglo-Catholic leader, Bishop J.B. Seaton of Wakefield, and stayed at the College of the Resurrection, Mirfield.²⁹

The actual negotiations took place in two stages: first at Lambeth Palace on 5 and 6 October 1933, and second at Brändö (Kulosaari) near Helsinki on 17 and 18 July 1934. Archbishop Lang appointed Headlam to lead the Church of England delegation, which included the bishops of Gloucester (chairman), Fulham (the Rt. Rev. B.S. Barty, who was in charge of the Anglican chaplaincies in northern Europe) and Wakefield (the Rt. Rev. Dr. J.B. Seaton), the Dean of Chichester (the Very Rev. A.S. Duncan-Jones), the Dean of Exeter (the Very Rev. Dr. W.R. Matthews), the Rev. Dr. Charles Raven (Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge), the Rev. Philip Usher (Headlam's domestic chaplain) and the Rev. C.B. Moss.³⁰

The Finnish delegation to Lambeth was appointed by Archbishop Ingman. As the number of ecumenically minded churchmen was limited, he nominated a delegation of only three: Bishop Gummerus, the Rev. Dr. U. Paunu and the Rev. Dr. Aleksi Lehtonen, Gummerus acting as chairman and Lehtonen as secretary. Gummerus and Lehtonen were obvious choices because of their knowledge of the Church of England; Paunu had been active in the Finnish Ecumenical Council and later became the director of the Finnish Missionary Society.³¹ Lehtonen was now Professor of Pastoral Theology at Helsinki University, having previously been the assistant to the professor for more than ten years.

The negotiations' starting point was the Lambeth Quadrilateral, which was then the basis for all Anglican attempts at unity. Headlam had been instrumental at the 1920 Lambeth Conference in producing an 'Appeal to all Christian People', which in fact was an adaptation of the Quadrilateral. In its original form, the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral was presented as

²⁹ *Helle* 2007, 13-15.

³⁰ Negotiations 1935, 2; *Jasper* 1960, 255; *Helle* 2007, 15-16.

³¹ *Helle* 2007, 15.

the starting point, ‘a basis upon which approach may be made’ for ‘Home Reunion’, whereas Headlam regarded the four points of the Quadrilateral as in themselves affording a sufficient basis for reunion. Headlam’s view, while dominating the inter-war ecumenical discussions of the Church of England, was not completely without controversy.³²

The published minutes of the negotiations quoted the basis in full:

It was agreed that the discussion should proceed along the lines of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and the restatement of them by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. These two pronouncements were as follows: —

1888

- (a) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as “containing all things necessary to salvation,” and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
- (b) The Apostles’ Creed, as the Baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.
- (c) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself –Baptism and the Supper of the Lord –ministered with unfailing use of Christ’s words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by him.
- (d) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church.

1920

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God’s revelation of himself to men, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles’ as the Baptismal confession of belief:

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ.

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the Commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.³³

It was soon clear that the discussion would focus especially on the fourth point of the Quadrilateral, namely ‘the Historic Episcopate’.³⁴

In regard to the first three points, Headlam acknowledged that there was no fundamental difference between the two churches concerning the doc-

³² *Jasper* 1960, 140-155.

³³ Negotiations 1935, 8-9.

³⁴ *Jasper* 1960, 255.

trines of Scripture and tradition, but that there was some discussion about the sacraments. The critical points relating to the Finnish Holy Communion had substantially been discussed in correspondence before the meeting. While Baptism did not raise any real debate, confirmation did. Sacramental confirmation was especially important for Moss, who explained that Anglicans had assured the Orthodox and the Old Catholics that they agreed with them about it. However, Headlam countered that while confirmation was very highly valued "it was not put forward in the Lambeth Quadrilateral as an essential condition of reunion."³⁵ This made discussion about confirmation secondary for Anglicans, although it also featured in the Finnish questions, which responded to the Anglican invitation to the negotiations.³⁶

Lehtonen had anticipated that the negotiations might easily degenerate into Anglicans asking awkward questions of the Finns, who would have to answer them to the best of their ability. He therefore ensured that the Finns also had some questions. Having studied the Church of England discussions with the Roman Catholics and the Old Catholics, he suggested that the Finns might ask about justification, the place of the word and the preaching of the Gospel as Church constituting factors, and the revision of the 39 Articles. Furthermore, he wanted to know why the Church of England officially refused to allow its members to communicate at Swedish Lutheran altars, even though there had been mutual participation in episcopal consecrations; what was meant by the statement that they were unable to find that the Eastern Orthodox Church taught anything contrary to Scripture; and what position the Church of England intended to take towards doctrines and liturgies of churches which condemned the most fundamental principles of the Reformation as heretical.³⁷

In the event, the Finns did not ask the last three polemical questions outright. They were replaced by questions about religious education, confirmation preparation and missionary work, which addressed more practical challenges.³⁸ Apart from confirmation, which in the Finnish Church was presbyteral, with thorough preparation compared with the less catechetical emphasis of the Church of England's episcopal confirmation, there was an old rivalry in the mission fields of South West Africa, which the Finns had

³⁵ Negotiations 1935, 26-28; *Mäkeläinen* 1972, 36-37; *Helle* 2007, 16-20.

³⁶ Negotiations 1935, 9-10.

³⁷ *Helle* 2007, 16-17.

³⁸ Negotiations 1935, 9-10; *Helle* 2007, 16-17.

tried to address before.³⁹ It was decided to address the Finnish questions as they arose in the course of discussion.⁴⁰

Most of the discussions were concerned with ministry. Dr. Paunu, assisted by Gummerus and probably Lehtonen, had prepared a statement about the Finnish position. Paunu began with the Lutheran Confessions, especially the Augsburg Confession. He further pointed out, based on the latest British and continental theological research, that there was no single system of church order laid down by the apostles. There was no doubt concerning the apostolic ministry *per se*, but there had been no uniform threefold ministry during the first Christian centuries. Lutherans, while appreciating the history of the Church, were therefore flexible in organising ministry to the needs of the time.⁴¹

This was especially necessary in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, which had come into being as a separate entity from the Church of Sweden for political reasons in 1809, with the subsequent loss of succession in 1884. Paunu explained the significance of that loss in terms similar to those Gummerus had already used in his report to the Lambeth Conference in 1930 and Lehtonen in his book 'The Church of Finland' in 1927.⁴² He stated:

In view of the above-mentioned facts it is permissible to say that the apostolic succession in Finland was broken by accident. Many may have regretted the interruption of the apostolic succession as early as in 1884, and still more later on – since our church with the apostolic succession has lost a valuable inherited historic bond of union with the Catholic Christian church, both in the past and in the present. But in spite of it nobody in Finland considered the consecration of Archbishop Renvall less valid, performed as it was by Professor Granfelt, who had been ordained to be a priest but not to be a bishop, than if the Archbishop had been consecrated by a foreign bishop within the apostolic succession. In any case the presbyteral succession has been left, although the episcopal succession has formally been broken.⁴³

The Finnish Church was clear in its teaching: apostolic succession was a valuable bond of union, but not a prerequisite for a valid apostolic ministry.

³⁹ *Mäkeläinen* 1972, 37-38; *Lauha* 1993, 199-200; *Kemppainen* 1998, 166-177.

⁴⁰ Negotiations 1935, 9.

⁴¹ Negotiations 1935, 35-37.

⁴² Negotiations 1935, 37-38; *Helle* 2007, 21.

⁴³ Negotiations 1935, 38-39.

Paunu now explained the Finnish practice and church law on ministry. Finnish church law did not recognise the threefold ministry and both church law and the liturgy for consecrating bishops were ambiguous about whether the episcopate was a separate order or not. Supporting the view of episcopacy as a separate order was the fact that a bishop was consecrated only once and later only installed if he changed diocese. In regard to the third order of ministry, the Finnish Church, like the Church of Sweden, had no deacons, but a newly ordained clergyman could not have a permanent cure of souls before serving two years as an assistant priest and passing an examination before the bishop and chapter.⁴⁴

What is likely to have raised more Anglican suspicion was that Finnish church law allowed presbyteral ordination if the diocesan bishop were unavailable. Although seldom used, this practice came into being in the church law of 1870, replacing a law allowing only episcopal ordination. This had been supported by the Professor of Practical Theology and later Bishop of Porvoo, F.L. Schauman, who had been influential among subsequent generations of theologians, resulting in the matter gaining a fixed form in the statutes of church law. In general, there had been little discussion and study concerning the nature of the episcopate and its relation to ministry. Paunu concluded that they were "disposed to hear and learn what churchmen and theologians in other churches think on this important matter."⁴⁵

Paunu's paper sparked a lively discussion, which revealed the disagreement of the Anglican delegates on the question. Anglican views ranged from Professor Raven's full approval of Paunu's statement, which later disturbed Archbishop Lang, to Moss' complete refusal to accept the validity of Finnish orders. The median view was expressed by Headlam, who considered the Finnish ministry not invalid, but irregular. The discussion indicated how the negotiations would later be received: Raven represented a liberal, and Moss an Anglo-Catholic, point of view, while Headlam gave voice to an ecumenical *via media*. The matter was left open, and both sides left seemingly happy with the results of the first meeting.⁴⁶

There were, however, pressures that might influence the outcome of the negotiations, which were felt before the negotiations continued in Finland in July 1934. Just before the meeting, Headlam and Lang agreed that the

⁴⁴ Negotiations 1935, 39-41.

⁴⁵ Negotiations 1935, 40-41.

⁴⁶ *Helle* 2007, 17, 21.

Finnish openness to presbyteral ordinations was an effective bar to an agreement similar to that which the Lambeth Conference had reached with the Church of Sweden. Lehtonen must have feared this would happen, as he wrote to Ingman that this ecumenical obstacle should be removed, while remaining critical of the Anglican demands.⁴⁷ He knew the Church of England well enough to be both critical and appreciative of it.

When the negotiations resumed in Brändö, there had been major changes to the delegations. Most notably, Gummerus had died in November 1933, and had been replaced by Lehtonen, who was consecrated Bishop of Tampere and subsequently became the leader of the Finnish delegation. Apart from Lehtonen, the delegation now consisted of the Bishop of Porvoo (the Rt. Rev. Max von Bonsdorff), the Dean of Oulu (the Very Rev. J. Mannermaa), the Rev. Dr. Matti Tarkkanen (the director of the Finnish Missionary Society) and Dr. Eelis Gideon Gulin (the Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Helsinki University). The Church of England delegation did not include Matthews or Seaton. They were replaced by the Archdeacon of Auckland, Canon A.E.J. Rawlinson, whom Lang had asked to participate to represent the Anglo-Catholic position.⁴⁸

The previous sensitivities resurfaced. Points relating to the Anglican reservations about the Finnish ministry continued to be debated, while the Finns sought to avoid possibly awkward detailed debate concerning their questions, such as the present understanding of the 39 Articles in the Church of England. In regard to the ministry, the Anglicans emphasized episcopal ordination, but that there was no strict theory of this practice. They did not condemn the spiritual efficacy of non-episcopal ministries, but it was their special task to bring non-episcopal churches and those with broken succession into a fully regularised episcopacy for the sake of reunion. The Finns maintained their earlier position, stressing the value they placed on the episcopate, while stating that inviting a foreign bishop to take part in their episcopal consecrations would be seen as nothing more than a sign of unity.⁴⁹

Against this background the outcome of the negotiations is somewhat surprising. While both sides retained their positions, they reached a far-reaching unanimous agreement:

⁴⁷ *Helle* 2007, 22.

⁴⁸ *Helle* 2007, 22-23.

⁴⁹ *Helle* 2007, 24-25.

To their GRACES THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND THE ARCHBISHOP OF TURKU (Abo)

WE, the commission appointed by you to consider the relations of the Church of England and the Church of Finland with one another, report as follows:

We have considered with great care the agreements and differences in the doctrine and customs of the two Churches, and have to report that on the most fundamental points of doctrine there is agreement. Such relations between the two Churches as we recommend do not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion or of all sacramental or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but imply that each believes the other to hold the most fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. We are of opinion that both Churches hold the most fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

We recommend therefore:

1. That if the Archbishop of Turku (Abo) shall invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a bishop to take part in the consecration of a bishop in the Church of Finland, he shall commission a bishop for such a purpose; and in the same way, if the Archbishop of Canterbury shall ask the Archbishop of Turku (Abo) to appoint a bishop to take part in the consecration of a bishop in the Church of England, he shall commission a bishop for such a purpose.
2. The Anglican delegation recommends the admission of communicants of the Church of Finland to communion in the Church of England, and takes note of the fact that the Church of Finland is already accustomed to admit to Communion at its altars communicants not belonging to the Lutheran confession.
3. That if at the time of the Lambeth Conference or at any other time there shall be a conference between bishops of the Anglican Communion and bishops of other Churches in communion with it, bishops of the Church of Finland shall be asked to attend it, and that the Church of Finland shall invite Anglican bishops to similar conferences if they are held in the future.⁵⁰

In effect, these recommendations gave a similar status to the Church of Finland as the Church of England applied to the Church of Sweden.⁵¹

The original draft of the report contained a sentence that they had reached an agreement "on all fundamental points of doctrine", but this had to be changed to the formulation that they had reached an agreement "on the most fundamental points of doctrine" in order to satisfy Moss, who had in mind the differences concerning confirmation, before he agreed to sign it. Moss was still not completely satisfied with the report, but decided to sign it, feeling that disunity would endanger further negotiations and

⁵⁰ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

⁵¹ *Helle* 2007, 26.

that the Finns needed all possible moral support in the face of the Soviet threat.⁵²

In the accompanying letter to Lang, Headlam explained more about how the negotiations had proceeded. Touching on the first question they had addressed, Headlam reported that the Finnish Lutheran Church's emphasis on justification by faith was much stronger than it was among Anglicans. In spite of a difference in outlook and temperament, they had reached the necessary theological consensus on the point. Against the criticism there had been of Finnish confirmation, Headlam had advocated the view that there was no need for uniformity on the point.⁵³

In regard to ministry, Headlam's letter presented a decidedly Anglican interpretation of the negotiations. Where the breach of succession was concerned, he wrote that "it gradually became clear that the members of the conference were prepared to recommend that, as occasion occurred, any irregularity there was should be corrected, and that Bishops from Sweden and England should be invited to take part in consecrations."⁵⁴ Headlam implied that the process had already started with the consecration of Bishop Lehtonen who had had a Swedish Lutheran co-consecrator.⁵⁵ This was all the more important, as the Finns nowhere emphasized Lehtonen's consecration as initiating a reinstatement of the apostolic succession, and certainly did not see their ministry as irregular.⁵⁶

Headlam was no less relaxed about the Finnish position on the question of presbyteral ordinations, which he explained was enshrined in church law, which in turn was part of state law, "and to deal with it would be more difficult than for the Church of England to pass the new Prayer Book."⁵⁷ However, he was sure that "all the Finnish delegates were prepared to undertake to eliminate as far as possible Presbyterian ordination, but they could not bind their Church."⁵⁸

Headlam recognised that as long as presbyteral ordinations were possible, it would be difficult to arrange "the full and formal intercommunion

⁵² *Jasper* 1960, 257.

⁵³ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

⁵⁴ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

⁵⁵ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

⁵⁶ *Repo* 2006, 314-315; *Helle* 2007, 24-25.

⁵⁷ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

⁵⁸ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

which we both desire".⁵⁹ Nevertheless, he believed the Church of Finland was ready at least unofficially to follow the wishes of the Church of England on all controversial points.

An interesting detail was Headlam's proposal that the Church of Finland should appoint a bishop to preside over their missions in South-West Africa, in order to facilitate relations with the (Anglican) Church of South Africa.⁶⁰ This was his reading of the final section of the negotiations, which addressed somewhat superficially the Finnish question about relations between the missions and the need for a "united church of the people of that country", advocated by Dr. Tarkkanen.⁶¹ A Finnish question with an implicit complaint had become an English demand.

Headlam concluded:

In the first place, as regards the general agreement in Christian doctrine, I believe that it is an understatement rather than an overstatement. The essential thing is that all the delegates of both Churches recommend that gradually the ministry should be unified by each taking part in the other's consecration; that we grant the members of the Church of Finland the right to communicate in the Church of England: and we recognise the possibility of members of the Church of England communicating in Finland without making any recommendation; and that we look forward in the future to mutual conference between the Church of England and other Churches in communion with it. It was felt on both sides that it would not be desirable that we should advance too rapidly. There are elements in both Churches which are suspicious; but we think that the quite definite step which is taken, which will result in the regularisation of the Orders of the Church of Finland, means a real step in advance for Christian unity.⁶²

According to Headlam, the regularisation of Finnish orders was the most important point of the possible agreement.

c. 'Economic intercommunion'

The reception of the report was not without its problems. Headlam wanted the matter addressed promptly by the Convocations, but faced resistance following the publication of the report. He suspected that the Society for

⁵⁹ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

⁶⁰ Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

⁶¹ Negotiations 1935, 56-57.

⁶² Joint Report with Introduction 1934.

Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) intentionally delayed publication before it was approved by their committee. The report was published without the minutes of the two conferences only on 22 December 1934, which meant that it was much too late to be considered by the Convocations in January 1935. The reception of the report in the church press promised further trouble. *The Guardian* and *The Record* gave it a friendly review, but the Anglo-Catholic *Church Times* was distinctly hostile. Critical letters from Anglo-Catholic leaders followed, although the report was defended by Moss, who tried to explain the Finnish view of episcopacy against the suspicion of his own party.⁶³

In January 1935, the York Convocations approved the report without difficulty. The Archbishop of York, the Most Rev. William Temple, strongly supported it in his opening speech. The report was presented by the Bishop of Wakefield, who moved for its acceptance in the Upper House and the recommendations were unanimously accepted. The same happened in the Lower House, where it was presented by Rawlinson and was also accepted unanimously, with only three persons making any remarks.⁶⁴

It all changed in Canterbury, where the Anglo-Catholic opposition was considerably stronger. Headlam presented the report to the Upper House on January 23 and moved for its acceptance. In a long speech, he described the Finnish Church and summarized the work of the commission. Headlam addressed both the theological and the political aspects of the agreement. He emphasised that the Finns occupied an important position as “outposts of Christian civilisation in that part of the world and had to guard a thousand miles of forest frontier against Russia.”⁶⁵ However, there was no time for a debate on the matter that day, and it was postponed until the following day.⁶⁶

Meanwhile, the Dean of Chichester presented the report to the Lower House in similar theological and political terms as Headlam had. There was strong Anglo-Catholic resistance. Being divided over the issue, the Lower House decided to appoint a committee to seek further information and report back in June.⁶⁷

⁶³ *Jasper* 1960, 258; *Helle* 2007, 26-28.

⁶⁴ *Jasper* 1960, 258; *Helle* 2007, 29.

⁶⁵ Quoted through *Helle* 2007, 29.

⁶⁶ *Jasper* 1960, 258; *Helle* 2007, 29

⁶⁷ *Jasper* 1960, 258; *Helle* 2007, 30-32.

When the debate continued in the Upper House, Bishop Bell seconded Headlam's motion on the grounds that it would be entirely in line with the Lambeth Conferences' decisions, and that a similar practice prevailed already with the Church of Sweden. The bishops of the Church of England should thus be allowed to help the Finns to restore their broken succession. This was overwhelmingly the argument for intercommunion employed by all the report's proponents, whereas the Finns emphasised throughout the negotiations that they understood an invitation to a foreign bishop to participate in Finnish consecrations as a sign of unity, not as the restoration of the succession. *De facto* restoration was for the majority of the Finns but a by-product of intercommunion with the Church of England.⁶⁸

A lively discussion followed, revealing that the bishops struggled to differentiate between the levels of ecclesial relations. The absence of the minutes of the report was unhelpful. Lang suggested that the matter be referred to a committee and he undertook to appoint a joint committee for both Houses. This annoyed and disappointed Headlam, who blamed religious intolerance and the involvement of the religious press before the commission had a chance to expound and defend its proposals.⁶⁹

The report was well received in Finland: Lehtonen reported to Headlam that all the bishops were in favour of it. Lehtonen also reported that they had hoped to invite an Anglican bishop to take part in the consecration of the new Bishop of Viipuri on Ascension Day, but understood that it might now be impossible. Archbishop Ingman had died and had been succeeded by Bishop Kaila, causing the vacancy in Viipuri. Ruing a missed opportunity, Headlam wondered if the Bishop of Wakefield might be sent, as the York Convocations had already approved the recommendations. However, the Archbishop of York was anxious not to provoke disunity within the Church of England.⁷⁰

The minutes of the conference were published before March, when the Joint Committee met to discuss them. Headlam was appointed chairman, and the committee included the leaders of the Anglo-Catholic opposition, Dr. Darwell Stone, Dr. W.J. Sparrow Simpson and the Rev. C.E. Douglas. Headlam held to his view that the Finnish theory of the ministry was irregular but not invalid. The meetings were stormy, and Headlam confessed

⁶⁸ *Repo* 2006, 314-315; *Helle* 2007, 29-35.

⁶⁹ *Jasper* 1960, 258; *Helle* 2007, 29-30.

⁷⁰ *Jasper* 1960, 259.

to Lang that the committee was about the most unpleasant over which he had ever had to preside.⁷¹

Agreement proved impossible, and they were compelled to produce two reports. The majority report commended the approach to the Church of Finland and hoped for complete intercommunion based on a “common episcopal ministry” in due course. In the meantime, given the present status of the Finnish Church, it recommended the approval of joint consecrations and the admission of Finnish communicants to Church of England altars. The minority report, signed by the three opposing Anglo-Catholic leaders, identified six problems in the Finnish ministry in relation to the Church of England’s teaching and its ecumenical relations with other episcopal churches, and expressed the view that there was no guarantee that the Finns would refrain from presbyteral ordinations after any agreement.⁷²

Headlam vigorously attacked the minority’s objections when he presented the report to the Upper House in June. The Church of England, he said, was in no position to complain about Finnish church law after what had happened with their own Prayer Book revision. He produced a document that had been circulated by Douglas, which argued that the Finnish Church was essentially presbyterian. He had given the document to Lehtonen, who completely refuted it, as Douglas had made mistakes on almost every point of Finnish church law. Headlam observed that while the Lutheran view on ministry was clear and distinct, the Church of England entertained very different views on it. If the motion were rejected, the Church of England would be unable to enter into negotiations or grant a more regular succession to any other church.⁷³

The theological and political arguments came together forcefully in both Houses. Headlam reminded the Upper House that Viipuri was only ninety miles from Leningrad, “the great menace of Bolshevism”, which made closer ties for the Finns with the English essential. Duncan-Jones used the same argument in the Lower House. For him the intercommunion of the Churches of England and Finland would “form a common Christian front against the forces of secularism and atheism and godlessness” and the “outpost of the Christian Church” against atheism.⁷⁴ Theology and politics went

⁷¹ *Jasper* 1960, 258-260; *Helle* 2007, 32-33.

⁷² *Jasper* 1960, 260; *Helle* 2007, 33-34.

⁷³ *Jasper* 1960, 260-261; *Helle* 2007, 34-35.

⁷⁴ Quoted through *Helle* 2007, 34-35.

hand in hand at the Convocations: it is hard to define which was the more forceful argument.

The Upper House accepted the majority report and its recommendations without amendments.⁷⁵ The resolution of the Upper House read thus:

Having learnt from the Archbishop of Turku (Åbo) that he has authority, after consultation with the Conference of Bishops of the Church of Finland and with the agreement of its Church Assembly, to seek closer relations with the Church of England in response to the Archbishop of Canterbury's invitation (conveyed in pursuance of Resolution 38 of the Lambeth Conference, 1930), this House welcomes the approaches thus made, and expresses the hope that in due course complete inter-communion, based on a common episcopal ministry, may be achieved.

Further, and as a means towards such a complete unity, this House, noting that the Episcopal Ordination of Presbyters is the regular practice of the Church of Finland, and assuming that the Bishops of the Church will take steps to put the practice of the Church of Finland beyond doubt, approve the following recommendations:

That if the Archbishop of Canterbury be invited by the Archbishop of Turku (Åbo) to appoint a Bishop to take part in the consecration of a Bishop in the Church of Finland, he may commission a Bishop for such a purpose; and in the same way, if the Archbishop of Canterbury shall invite the Archbishop of Turku (Åbo) to take part in the consecration of a Bishop in the Church of England, it is hoped that he would be willing to commission a Bishop for such a purpose.

That members of the Church of Finland may be admitted to communion in the Church of England, provided that they are at that time admissible to communion in their own Church.⁷⁶

This departed from the original recommendations in not mentioning that the Church of Finland was already accustomed to admit Anglicans to Holy Communion, and not recommending mutual invitations to episcopal conferences such as the Lambeth Conference.

The Lower House, however, decided to restrict the recommendations further. They accepted the majority report up to the phrase 'beyond doubt' at the end of the preamble, but amended it from there as follows:

⁷⁵ Convocation of Canterbury. Resolution on Relations with the Church of Finland. June 6, 1935; *Jasper* 1960, 261.

⁷⁶ Convocation of Canterbury. Resolution on Relations with the Church of Finland. June 6, 1935.

-- is of opinion:

That if the Archbishop of Turku (Åbo) shall invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Bishop to take part in the consecration of a Bishop in the Church of Finland, he may commission a Bishop for such a purpose.

That members of the Church of Finland may be admitted to communion in the Church of England in accordance with the terms of Resolution 2(a) on the Unity of the Church communicated by the Upper House to this House on 4th June, 1931.⁷⁷

Thus, the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocations had established a policy for the Church of England whereby ‘economic intercommunion’ with the Church of Finland meant merely that the Church of England should be ready to send a bishop, when invited, to take part in Finnish consecrations as a means of achieving complete unity – the restoration of the succession – and that communicant members of the Church of Finland should be dealt with as any other baptized communicant members of other Christian churches.⁷⁸ This was nothing short of a one-way reintroduction of historic episcopate, after which the Church of England hoped to continue to ‘complete intercommunion’.

Lang informed Kaila of the decision of the Convocations in October 1935. Kaila’s reply the following spring constituted the Finnish decision, which in effect approved the recommendations made in the negotiations.⁷⁹ It is doubtful if the Finns fully appreciated the decision’s lack of clarity, but, with a note of criticism of its handling by the Convocations, they nonetheless welcomed it.

In his letter, Kaila restated the Finnish position on the historic episcopate. He endorsed the reply of the Swedish bishops in 1923, and emphasized that the historic episcopate was not a *conditio sine qua non* for a valid ministry. Similarly, invitations to foreign bishops to participate in Finnish consecrations were not understood as intending the restoration of the broken outward succession, but as a sign of unity. They were happy to welcome

⁷⁷ Convocation of Canterbury. Resolution on Relations with the Church of Finland. June 6, 1935.

⁷⁸ Convocation of Canterbury: Upper House. Resolutions on Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference 1930. January 18, 1933.

⁷⁹ *Ripatti* 1990, 37; *Helle* 2007, 35. *Ripatti* refers to ”ehtoollisyhteys” in referring to ‘economic intercommunion’. This over-simplification misses the point as the Finnish term can be translated as anything from ‘full communion’ to ‘eucharistic hospitality’.

Anglican bishops on the understanding that reciprocity will follow as "a fresh opportunity to promote the unity of the Universal Church."⁸⁰

Kaila rejoiced that Finnish Lutherans might now communicate in the Church of England, and explained that this would be reciprocated for Anglicans in Finland. In regard to Finnish church law's countenancing of presbyteral ordinations, he confirmed the position the Finns had taken at the negotiations, and stated that nothing prevented "the suggested arrangements, if it be understood that we do not therewith imply any definite theory about episcopal ordination."⁸¹ The Archbishop of Finland wished to accept the recommendations on his own terms, not on those imposed by the Canterbury Convocations.

Lang understood this and confided to Headlam that he desired to be cordial, but that he could not simply ignore Kaila's "somewhat unsatisfactory words about the Ministry."⁸² In his reply to Kaila, Lang was indeed cordial, but acknowledged that there might be a greater difference than mere emphasis in the understanding of ministry. Lang explained briefly that he was bound by his own tradition, but was confident that in due course there would be no fundamental difference between their churches on the issue.⁸³ This was the last word on the matter, and cordial relations with 'economic intercommunion', whatever it might mean in practice, were established.

d. The war separates the churches

Whatever the significance of the 'economic intercommunion' that had been achieved, Headlam and Lehtonen exploited it in supporting friendly relations between the churches. This began as soon as the negotiations were concluded. The Finnish delegates reported positively about the Church of England and the outcome of the negotiations before the matter was dis-

⁸⁰ Letter from the Archbishop of Turku to the Archbishop of Canterbury. March 9, 1936; *Repo* 2006, 317-318.

⁸¹ Letter from the Archbishop of Turku to the Archbishop of Canterbury. March 9, 1936; *Repo* 2006, 318.

⁸² Quoted through *Helle* 2007, 35.

⁸³ Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishop of Turku. April 30, 1936; *Helle* 2007, 35; *Repo* 2006, 318-319.

cussed in the Convocations. Lehtonen was most enthusiastic, but his colleagues were at least cautiously positive.⁸⁴

For example, when Professor E.G. Gulin, who had participated in the negotiations in Finland, reviewed Headlam's *Christian Theology* in a Finnish theological review he rejoiced that the relations between the Churches of England and Finland had been strengthened by the establishment of intercommunion. This was not strictly true: 'economic intercommunion' fell short of the Finnish concept Gulin used (*ehtoollisyhteys*), which could mean anything from 'full communion' between the churches to 'eucharistic hospitality'.⁸⁵

As there was but one Finnish concept to signify all these relations, it is unsurprising that mutual admission of communicants caused the Finns to believe the status of the relationship meant more than it actually did. The terminological problem, taken with a traditional lack of interest in ecclesiology, meant that for most Finns, regardless of their theological sophistication, 'eucharistic hospitality' and 'full communion' meant exactly the same, and it was thus mistakenly thought that the latter had been achieved.

The churches aimed to increase knowledge about each other through visits as well as publications. During the negotiations the Church of England offered a stipend for a young Finnish theologian to study church life in England for about a year. The Finns welcomed this, sending the Rev. Edgar Glückert (whose surname later became Ernamo) to study in Cambridge in 1935. Glückert's visit was, however, of limited influence, as he later drifted away from ecumenical circles and ultimately resigned from the priesthood.⁸⁶

The Finns hoped to offer a similar opportunity to a Church of England student. In spite of the linguistic challenge of such a venture, the Finnish Ecumenical Council applied for funding from the Finnish Ministry of Education in April 1936 after Glückert had returned. Funding was granted and the invitation sent.⁸⁷ In England the matter was addressed by the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), which had been established in 1933 to survey and promote relations with non Anglican/Episcopalian churches outside the British Isles. Its first chairman was Headlam, who was

⁸⁴ *Krapu* 2007, 74-75.

⁸⁵ *Pajunen* 2006, 148; *Krapu* 2007, 75.

⁸⁶ *Rusama* 1999, 108.

⁸⁷ *Rusama* 1999, 108.

assisted by the Rev. J.A. Douglas, the honorary general secretary, and the Rev. C.B. Moss and the Rev. Philip Usher as honorary assistant secretaries.⁸⁸

It was, however, much harder to find an English student because of the linguistic challenge. The man chosen was the Vice-Principal of Clifton Theological College in Bristol, the Rev. T.E.N. Pennell, who had visited Germany several times and spoke German and French. Pennell visited Finland for three months in the summer of 1937. He enjoyed his stay, reporting his findings positively to the CFR, one of whose tasks was to gather such information to promote relations with the churches covered by its mandate. Pennell also wrote extensively about his positive experiences in Finland in both English and Finnish magazines.⁸⁹

Interestingly for future development, Pennell was not the only candidate for the visit. The Bishop of Southwark, the Rt. Rev. Richard Godfrey Parsons, considered putting forward the Rev. H.M. Waddams. He had discussed the matter with Waddams' Superior Missioner, who was in charge of him during his curacy at the Corpus Christi Mission, Camberwell.⁹⁰ The Bishop described Waddams as:

-- an able young man from King's College, Cambridge, and Cuddesdon, who was with us last summer at out Conference at Larvik with the Scandinavians and proved most useful. He had previously paid visits to the Swedish Church. He is a definite Anglo-Catholic, with broad sympathies. I think he might make a very good use of three months in Finland.⁹¹

In the event, the bishop concluded that Waddams could not be taken away from his curacy for such a long period. He therefore decided not to recommend Waddams, hoping he would not later discover the opportunity he had missed.⁹² It took a further seven years before Waddams was sent to Finland.

Meanwhile, the promising development in relations between the churches was thwarted by the threat of war. The political connections afforded by

⁸⁸ *Jasper* 1960, 286.

⁸⁹ LP CFR LR file 31/1 Church of Finland invitation; Principal of Clifton Theological College to Douglas 15.3.1937; Pennell to Douglas 30.9.1937 with the Report: Finland, July-September 1937; *Rusama* 1999, 108-109.

⁹⁰ LP CFR LR file 31/3 Bishop of Southwark to Douglas 17.3.1937.

⁹¹ LP CFR LR file 31/3 Bishop of Southwark to Douglas 17.3.1937.

⁹² LP CFR LR file 31/3 Bishop of Southwark to Douglas 8.7.1936 (sic. - the correct year 1937).

church relations were especially valued in Finland. The establishment of friendly relations with the Church of England was seen by Lehtonen as both bolstering Finland against the Soviet Union and creating a front against what he saw as the neo-paganism spreading from Germany. The German Confessing Church concluded that the new relations with the Church of England represented a defeat for the official German Church. This conclusion was shared by the German embassy in Helsinki, which wanted to counter English influence in Finland, and arranged a visit by the German Foreign Bishop Theodor Heckel to Finland in the summer of 1936.⁹³

A further indication of the importance of church relations came when the President of Finland appointed Headlam a Knight Commander, first class, of the Order of the White Rose of Finland in October 1938.⁹⁴ However, at the same time the traditionally strong German influence in various quarters of Finnish society remained and indeed strengthened towards the end of the decade.⁹⁵ Meanwhile the Church of England continued its dialogue with the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Estonia and Latvia, resulting in a similar arrangement as had been made with the Finnish Church. As these Baltic countries bordered the Soviet Union, these negotiations were also not without political significance.⁹⁶

Fears concerning the precarious geopolitical position of Finland, which Headlam and Duncan-Jones had strongly emphasized at the Convocations, were realised on 30 November 1939 when the Soviet Union invaded Finland and the Winter War began. The basis for the Soviet invasion had been laid down on 23 August, when the Nazi-Soviet pact, with secret clauses dividing Europe between the two dictators, was signed. This caused disillusionment among Finns towards Germany, even on the right. They felt abandoned.⁹⁷

Although foreign governments, churches and individuals around the western world condemned the Soviet aggression, initial prospects did not bode well for Finland, whose forces were outnumbered by the invader. The Soviet Union attempted to establish a puppet government, and claimed that

⁹³ *Ripatti* 1990, 37, 41-42.

⁹⁴ *Jasper* 1960, 261.

⁹⁵ *Nevakivi* 2006, 33.

⁹⁶ *Jasper* 1960, 262-265; *Helle* 2008.

⁹⁷ *Hentilä* 1999, 177-181; *Jutikkala* 2003, 435-436; *Kirby* 2006, 205-210; *Nevakivi* 2006, 34; *Singleton* 2006, 122-123.

the Finns had started the war. This led to the Soviet Union's expulsion from the League of Nations. The aggression, however, served to unite the Finnish nation in the face of a common enemy. The former Reds, previously embittered by their defeat in the Civil War twenty years before, now joined ranks with the former Whites. The Soviet Union's invasion thus undermined the cause of revolution.⁹⁸

The Church of Finland became one of the cornerstones of Finnish patriotism, and the struggle acquired a religious fervour. Church leaders sought to gain as much foreign support and sympathy for their church and nation as they could. Kaila sent an appeal for material and spiritual help for the Finnish people and the church in their fight for the Christian faith and western civilisation in December 1939. Lehtonen pleaded for help from Sweden and spoke on English, Estonian and German radio programmes that were transmitted abroad.⁹⁹

In England, Headlam devoted himself to enlisting sympathy and support for Finland. Archbishop Lang and Headlam prepared a statement, which the Archbishop delivered at the House of Lords on 17 January 1940, urging that the members of the League of Nations should provide material assistance to Finland. Furthermore, the CFR organised a Service of Intercessions for Finland in St Paul's Cathedral on 1 February. The service consisted of intercessions, an address by Lang, hymns, the blessing and the Finnish national anthem, concluding with a collection for the Finland Fund.¹⁰⁰

Lang began his address by reading a message from Archbishop Kaila and Bishop Lehtonen, "men who are my friends and have been my honoured guests." He later referred to their words that Finland was fighting not only for its freedom and independence, but for its religion. Lang stressed that Finland knew "only too well that the Soviet Government is based upon the denial of God and that, whatever small concessions may have been grudgingly made, it has consistently oppressed those who by their worship profess

⁹⁸ *Hentilä* 1999, 181-183, 188-190; *Jutikkala* 2003, 438-443; *Kirby* 2006, 197-199, 208-213; *Nevakivi* 2006, 34; *Singleton* 2006, 124-126.

⁹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 25 The Appeal of the Finnish Primate to the Christian Churches of the World 10.12.1939; *Heikkilä* 1988, 123-124; *Ripatti* 1990, 44-45; *Jutikkala* 2003, 437-442.

¹⁰⁰ LPL CFR LR file 25 Douglas to the clergy of the Diocese of Southwark, St. Paul's Cathedral. Service of Intercessions for Finland. Thursday, February 1st, 1940; *Heikkilä* 1988, 123-124.

their faith in Him.”¹⁰¹ Lang appealed to the British Government to hasten its aid to Finland.¹⁰²

The service was broadcast by the BBC, and was heard by Lehtonen, who immediately sent his heartfelt thanks by telegram.¹⁰³ He later wrote to Canon Douglas of the CFR, again expressing his gratitude for the service, and suggesting that a British delegation of churchmen might visit Finland, as a delegation of British Labour Movement leaders had just done. Lehtonen expressed the hope that the end of atheistic bolshevism was near, bringing deliverance to Russia, and asked for British assistance in achieving this.¹⁰⁴

Characteristically, Headlam, who was seventy-five, immediately declared his readiness to fly to Finland. Lang approved, and the Ministry of Information Religious Division was ready to meet the Bishop's expenses. However, the visit never happened as Lehtonen had to ask for its postponement. This was probably because of the Finnish losses at the frontier and the uncertainty they caused.¹⁰⁵

After Finland made peace in Moscow on 12 March 1940, the Finnish church leaders tried in vain to revive the idea by inviting a delegation to inspect the war damage. The international situation had already changed, making the involvement of any British church leader in criticism of the Soviet Union undesirable. In any case, once the Winter War was over Finland was no longer at the centre of international attention and British interest turned increasingly to her own struggle.¹⁰⁶

The churches' attitude and position reflected those of the governments. When the Winter War started, Finland had received much sympathy from the British government. The First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill, on discovering that the Finns were able to defend themselves and were not easily overcome by the Soviet invader, had spoken in a broadcast in support of the Finns, who, he said, were fighting against the Red Army

¹⁰¹ LPL CFR LR file 25 Service of Intercessions for Finland – St. Paul's Cathedral, February 1st, 1940. The Archbishop of Canterbury's Address.

¹⁰² LPL CFR LR file 25 Service of Intercessions for Finland – St. Paul's Cathedral, February 1st, 1940. The Archbishop of Canterbury's Address.

¹⁰³ LPL CFR LR file 25 Lehtonen to Lang telegram 1.2.1940.

¹⁰⁴ LPL CFR LR file 25 Lehtonen to Douglas 5.2.1940.

¹⁰⁵ LPL CFR LR file 25 Douglas to Martin 26.2.1940; *Jasper* 1960, 261; *Heikkilä* 1988, 124-125.

¹⁰⁶ *Heikkilä* 1988, 125-126.

and communism, which was rotting the soul of a nation. These fine words, however, could not conceal the limited assistance actually received, despite the promises of military aid made by the British and French governments if Finland continued its struggle against a superior enemy. However stubborn Finland's defence, continued resistance proved impossible. Western promises were unrealistic and probably without basis, and thus offered little relief. In order to reach Finland western forces would have had to cross Norway and Sweden, neither of whom would permit transit, as to do so would risk a German attack upon them. Ultimately, large-scale aid was neither sought nor sent.¹⁰⁷

The peace of Moscow was bitter. Finland had to secede one tenth of its area along its eastern border and its southern islands, including most of Karelia, and lease the Hanko peninsula for use as a Soviet military base. The people of these areas, amounting to 11% of the whole population, had to be evacuated to other parts of Finland. Stalin had taken by force what he could not gain by bullying. Yet Finland retained its independence and democratic government. Bitter war and bitter peace served to reinforce German sympathy in Finland, and Germany was seen as the only realistic option if the Soviet Union was to be resisted.¹⁰⁸

Following the German seizure of Denmark and Norway and the Soviet capture of the Baltic States, Finland was left sandwiched between the two dictatorships, with neutral Sweden the only channel to the world outside. As German military pressure grew in the Nordic area, Finland consented, with Sweden, to allow German troops to transit to occupied Norway in September 1940. This obtained for Finland an important reinforcement in armaments from Germany. Meanwhile, Soviet free transit through the mainland of Finland to the military base in Hanko continued. The inner circle of the Finnish leadership, made increasingly anxious by continuous Soviet demands and threats, began to look to Germany, which was victorious elsewhere in Europe, for protection.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ *Hentilä* 1999, 182-187; *Jutikkala* 2003, 442-443; *Kirby* 2006, 211-214; *Nevakivi* 2006, 34-36; *Singleton* 2006, 124-126.

¹⁰⁸ *Hentilä* 1999, 191-196; *Jutikkala* 2003, 443-444; *Kirby* 2006, 214-222; *Nevakivi* 2006, 34-36; *Singleton* 2006, 127-129.

¹⁰⁹ *Hentilä* 1999, 194-196; *Jutikkala* 2003, 446-448; *Kirby* 2006, 216-222; *Nevakivi* 2006, 34-36; *Singleton* 2006, 127-130.

At the same time, however, the public attitude towards Great Britain remained positive. The British volunteers in the Winter War, amounting to some three hundred men, remained free and unharmed. At the outbreak of the new war, the last were allowed to leave for neutral Sweden on Field Marshall C.G.E. Mannerheim's personal orders. The Finns were also able to listen to the BBC's Finnish broadcasts.¹¹⁰ Something of the strangeness of the situation is recorded in the memoirs of the British Military Attaché in Helsinki at the time, Colonel J.H. Magill. Magill recalls his friendly and open relations with Mannerheim and conversations with German and Soviet officers in Finland during the 'interim peace'. According to Magill, only a small minority of Finns supported Germany and were happy about British military defeats. He was free to come and go as he wished, and even to observe the movements of German troops in Lapland.¹¹¹

On the international level, however, the situation was getting increasingly serious. When Germany invaded the Soviet Union, Finland could not avoid being drawn into the conflict. Finland joined the offensive as a 'co-belligerent' of Germany as the Finns saw it. Unlike the other nations on the German side, Finland never signed the axis-pact and shunned German overtures in this respect at all cost. However, Finland and Great Britain were now in opposing camps.¹¹²

For many Finns, the Winter War was a classic example of a just war, and nothing changed when Finland re-entered the war in 1941. The war has been called 'the Continuation War' in Finnish, implying that it represented an attempt to rectify the wrongs suffered in the Winter War and the Moscow peace. It was seen primarily as a defence of home, faith and nation, and as the only alternative to becoming a battleground overrun by the German and Soviet armies.¹¹³

However, when the Finnish and German offensive advanced eastward and the former frontier was crossed, Mannerheim repeated his famous pledge of February 1918 that he would not sheathe his sword until East Karelia was free. This revival of Civil War White phraseology provoked some criticism, especially from Finnish Labour leaders. This criticism was

¹¹⁰ *Nevakivi* 2006, 36-37.

¹¹¹ *Magill* 1981, 71-83.

¹¹² *Hentilä* 1999, 197-199; *Jutikkala* 2003, 447-448; *Kirby* 2006, 221-222; *Nevakivi* 2006, 37; *Singleton* 2006, 129-131.

¹¹³ *Murtorinne* 1995, 233-239, 273; *Jutikkala* 2003, 448-450.

to some extent justified, as the military advance in 1941 provided the impetus for the Greater Finland ideology advocated by such bodies as the Academic Karelia Society (AKS), and its application in the occupied areas of East Karelia.¹¹⁴

However, Mannerheim refused to allow the Finnish troops to assist in the assault on Leningrad, and the German troops that besieged the city came not from Finland but from the Baltic area. Nor did he attempt to sever completely the vital Murmansk railway line. On the contrary, the Finns stayed in the positions established in the winter of 1941 until 1944.¹¹⁵ This was a delicate balancing act, which was undoubtedly intended to keep all options open with the Allies when the time came.

The British declaration of war on Finland on Finnish Independence Day, 6 December 1941, came as a shock to many in Finland, although the political leadership must have expected it. The British Government had made it clear that they did not consider the Finnish invasion of Soviet territory as an event apart from the great European war but as an integral part of it. However, the Finnish leaders were greatly perplexed that an ardent anti-Bolshevik like Churchill could declare war on a nation whose struggle he had less than two years earlier praised.¹¹⁶

The declaration of war and the prayers of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the Red Army the previous summer angered Finnish church leaders, who were surprised to find that their sister church in England took an entirely different view of the war. They could not understand what had changed during the last two years, as they were still fighting the same enemy. The autumn and winter of 1941 was thus the low ebb for British sympathies in Finland. The general view was that the British, who had prayed for Finland at the outbreak of the Winter War, had betrayed Finland. This gave plenty of scope to German propagandists.¹¹⁷ The British Ministry of Information tried to appease Finnish opinion and asked Headlam to write to Kaila. This he did, attempting to explain the British alliance with the Soviet Union,

¹¹⁴ *Jutikkala* 2003, 450; *Kirby* 2006, 199-202, 222-227; *Nevakivi* 2006, 38-39.

¹¹⁵ *Jutikkala* 2003, 450-451; *Singleton* 2006, 130-131.

¹¹⁶ *Nevakivi* 2006, 39-40.

¹¹⁷ *Murtorinne* 1975, 92-100; *Heikkilä* 1988, 128; *Ripatti* 1990, 51-52; *Murtorinne* 1995, 239; *Nevakivi* 2006, 40; *Pajunen* 2006, 148.

but apparently without success. The letter merely formalised the break in church relations.¹¹⁸

The Finns reacted to the lost friendship with regret, pessimism and a bitter humour which was possible given the lack of concrete hostilities.¹¹⁹ Cantor (*lukkari*) Jumppanen, a character in a novel by the popular Finnish wartime writer Armas J. Pulla, suggested that even God must have been confused by the Archbishop of Canterbury's prayers changing side so rapidly.¹²⁰

Despite the shattering of the popular image of the Church of England in Finland, there still remained some contacts between the churches. The Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London, the Rev. Toivo Harjunpää, maintained good relations with the Church of England and British authorities throughout the war. He was approached by the Ministry of Information in the spring of 1941, seeking assistance in directing news items for publication in *Kotimaa*, the main Finnish church newspaper as a means of countering German church propaganda in Finland.¹²¹ It is likely that Harjunpää aided the Ministry: he was allowed to continue his work and once a month to visit Finnish seamen interned on the Isle of Man throughout the war.

This was noted by the Germans, who protested about Harjunpää's liaison with enemy churchmen to the Finnish Foreign Minister, who explained that Harjunpää was a private person, who had no authorization from the Finnish Church.¹²² No doubt the Germans were right to be suspicious. The fact that Harjunpää's congregation had greatly diminished because of the war allowed him to divert his time and energy to other tasks. He used the opportunity to establish and maintain good relations with Church of England leaders including the Bishop of London, the Most Rev. Geoffrey Fisher.¹²³

Another channel for contacts between the churches was afforded by neutral Sweden, which became a centre of the ecumenical movement during the war. Exchange of information and renewal of contacts was especially assisted by the visit of Bishop George Bell of Chichester to Sweden in May

¹¹⁸ *Heikkilä* 1988, 128-129.

¹¹⁹ *Nevakivi* 2006, 40-41.

¹²⁰ *Pulla* 1992, 454.

¹²¹ *Heikkilä* 1988, 127.

¹²² *Murtorinne* 1975, 132-134.

¹²³ *Pajunen* 2004, 108-109.

1942. Bell met many Swedish and some Finnish church leaders, beginning with the Archbishop of Uppsala, the Most Rev. Erling Eidem, who tried to explain the Finnish position to him. After the meeting, Eidem sent Lehtonen Bell's greetings and informed him of what he had heard from Bell about Harjunpää and how well he was being treated in England.¹²⁴

Bell also met Mrs. Helmi Gulin, Professor Eelis Gulin's wife, and Bishop Max von Bonsdorff, who were visiting Sweden at the same time. Von Bonsdorff needed some convincing before he agreed to meet an enemy representative. The Finns complained to Bell about the consternation caused by the Archbishop of Canterbury's intercessions for the Red Army. Bell was very conciliatory and promised to inform the Archbishop about the Soviet desecration and destruction of churches in Karelia, which he had already learned about from the Swedes, who had visited there.¹²⁵

Bell also met the Swedish Professor Ragnar Bring who had returned from Finland and who largely underlined what the Finns had told him already. Bring emphasized that the Finns trusted Stalin as little as the British trusted Hitler, and that the British notion that all would be well as long as Germany was defeated was unrealistic. He joined Finnish critics in stating that the Church of England bid farewell to ecumenism as long as it resorted to the kind of nationalism shown in the Archbishop of Canterbury's pro-Soviet statements.¹²⁶

Although these meetings were purely informative, there were some signs of reconciliation. The value of these ecumenical contacts was generally recognised only at the end of the war, although President Risto Ryti had privately advised the Church of Finland as early as 1941 to retain as many of its contacts as possible.¹²⁷ These contacts were to prove very valuable when the Soviet Union agreed a truce with Finland in September 1944.

e. A messenger of the Allied world order

The terms of the interim peace with the Soviet Union reached on 19 September 1944 were harsh. Finland had again to cede even larger areas of

¹²⁴ *Murtorinne* 1975, 132-133.

¹²⁵ *Murtorinne* 1975, 133.

¹²⁶ *Murtorinne* 1975, 133.

¹²⁷ *Murtorinne* 1975, 63-64; *Ripatti* 1990, 54.

Karelia and Petsamo, stretching to the Arctic Sea, lease the area of Porkkala, which was within artillery range of Helsinki, and resettle the evacuees from these areas. They needed to fight the Germans out of northern Finland, yet reduce the army to peacetime levels within two and half months, and pay heavy reparations to the Soviet Union. What the Soviet understood as 'fascist organisations', including the national guard and the Lotta Svärd service organisation for women, had to be closed down and so-called war criminals brought to trial. The independence and democratic government of Finland was jeopardised by the installation in Helsinki of the Allied Control Commission, which was largely Soviet in its make up with a small British contingent, as the highest power in the country.¹²⁸

Public sentiment was still low in December 1944, when an officer of the British Ministry of Information and priest of the Church of England, the Rev. H.M. Waddams, visited Finland for a fortnight. Waddams' dual role was somewhat obscure and he wanted to keep it that way. Sweden, not Finland, was his primary destination. There, he was to investigate the state of religious propaganda, gather information on the ecclesiastical situation in northern Europe, and seek to influence Swedish attitudes towards the Soviet Union. When the opportunity presented itself, he also visited Finland, assisted by Swedish church leaders.¹²⁹

Waddams wrote from Sweden to Lehtonen and Gulin, whom he had met at the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference in 1936, to inform them that he was coming to Finland and hoped to meet them.¹³⁰ These conferences had been organised since 1929, usually every other year, although not in the war, and drew together British Anglican and Nordic Lutheran theologians to discuss matters of mutual interest in an informal way.¹³¹ Waddams explained that, along with his duties for the Ministry of Information, the purpose of his visit was the tentative re-establishment of relations between the Churches of England and Finland.¹³²

Waddams flew to Finland from Stockholm on 15 December, returning on 28 December. He spent most of the time in Helsinki meeting Finnish

¹²⁸ *Nevakivi* 1999, 222-230; *Jutikkala* 2003, 455-459; *Kirby* 2006, 231-231; *Visuri* 2006, 49-53; *Singleton* 2006, 133-136.

¹²⁹ *Ketola* 2004, 75-83, 91-92; *Pajunen* 2006, 149.

¹³⁰ *Ketola* 2004, 91.

¹³¹ *Bring* 1965, 184-187; *Österlin* 1995, 261-263.

¹³² *Ketola* 2004, 91-92; *Pajunen* 2006, 149.

churchmen, politicians and diplomats. Immediately on his arrival he was met by Gulin, who took him to a meeting with influential Helsinki clergymen. Waddams described his position in the Ministry of Information, saying that he was visiting Finland to inform them of the views of British church circles and to re-establish links between the Church of England and Finland. The Finns then asked questions about the Soviet Union and justified their hostility towards it. Waddams in turn explained that Great Britain was genuinely seeking to understand the Soviet Union, and that it was in Finland's own interests to do the same, and to become a bridge between east and west. This line was repeated in almost all of Waddams' conversations with Finns during his stay.¹³³

The problem was that having been in the Archbishop of York's delegation to the Soviet Union in 1943, Waddams' view of the Soviet Union was considerably more positive than that of any of the people he met. He faced a difficult challenge to cultivate understanding of, sympathy for, and trust in the Soviet Union among Nordic people, yet this was one of his tasks. Waddams told the Finns that he had himself seen how well the churches fared in the Soviet Union.¹³⁴ Not surprisingly, the Finns, who had seen churches burned and desecrated in Karelia, were unimpressed.

Biding their time, the Finns tried to accommodate Waddams and his views. He was taken from one meeting to another to advocate his cause. Besides private meetings with Professor Gulin, Bishops von Bonsdorff and Lehtonen, Bishop Alexander from the Finnish Orthodox Church, the Secretary of the Finnish Ecumenical Council, the Rev. Verner J. Aurola, the Director of the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) in Finland, Georg Pimenoff, and the rector of the Church of Sweden Parish of Olaus Petri in Helsinki, the Rev. S.J.F. Palmgren, Waddams attended a coffee reception held in his honour by the Minister of Education, Uno Takki.¹³⁵

The Finns Waddams met more or less confirmed the prejudices he had acquired in Sweden concerning what he saw as their inability to understand the brave new world of the Allies. Pimenoff, however, although he was an Orthodox Finn of Karelian ancestry, was considerably more sympathetic towards the Soviet Union. Indeed, he and Palmgren reinforced Waddams'

¹³³ *Ketola* 2004, 92-100.

¹³⁴ *Ketola* 1997, 223, 233-242; *Ketola* 2004, 80, 92-101.

¹³⁵ *Ripatti* 1990, 85-87; *Ketola* 1997, 234-240; *Rusama* 1999, 127-128; *Ketola* 2004, 92-98.

negative views of the Finns in general.¹³⁶ In Pimenoff's case, this was understandable: he had been imprisoned during the war for transmitting information on the Finnish treatment of Soviet prisoners of war to the United States of America's embassy in Helsinki.¹³⁷

There was, however, a limit to Finnish willingness to accommodate Waddams' views. Bishop Lehtonen, for example, insisted that the same rules must apply to the Finns as to the British, and reminded Waddams of the statement of the Archbishop of York following his 1943 visit to the Soviet Union that it was still officially an anti-religious state, and the statement of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords in 1939 that in a life-and-death struggle one had to accept whatever aid was offered. Waddams countered that the Continuation War had not been a separate struggle, but rather part of a larger war.¹³⁸

Waddams' stay in Tampere as Lehtonen's guest seems, however, to have been the most enjoyable part of his visit. Waddams found Lehtonen more broadminded than his compatriots, and considered his interest in the Church of England genuine and meriting support. Lehtonen gave Waddams two telegrams to dispatch: a reply to the Archbishop of York's condolences on the death of the Kaila and another to congratulate the new Archbishop of Canterbury on his appointment following the recent death of Temple.¹³⁹ Lehtonen and Waddams also discussed plans to send Finnish students of theology to study in England. This idea probably originated from

¹³⁶ The Interview of Mrs Agnes Pimenoff 8.5.2000; *Ketola* 2004, 88-90, 97-98; *Pajunen* 2004, 107. *Ketola* lists Pimenoff among the contacts Waddams made with foreign residents in Helsinki and describes him as being of Russian extraction. This is not correct. Pimenoff was, by his own account, a Finnish-speaking Finn, born in Tavastland in Central-Western Finland, despite his Russian family name. See for instance LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 9.

¹³⁷ CUL BSA/D3/1/6 Pimenoff to Temple Recd 18.10.1944, Translation of Sentence, Extract from General Purposes Sub-Committee Minutes – 24.10.1944; The Interview of Mrs Agnes Pimenoff 8.5.2000.

¹³⁸ *Ketola* 1997, 236-237; *Ketola* 2004, 92-98; *Pajunen* 2006, 149.

¹³⁹ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 11; *Ripatti* 1990, 86-87; *Ketola* 1997, 236-237; *Ketola* 2004, 95-96. Following *Ripatti*, *Ketola* portrays Lehtonen as consciously congratulating the newly appointed Fisher. This was not in fact the case, as Lehtonen sent general congratulations in advance of the forthcoming nomination. Churchill nominated Bishop Fisher of London to Canterbury only on 2 January 1945. See *Carpenter* 1991, 131.

Lehtonen, who explained that the students should belong to the younger generation, because the older had already been affected by the pietistic anti-ecumenical atmosphere of pre-war Finnish student circles.¹⁴⁰

However, Waddams did not view everyone he met as positively as Lehtonen. For example, Waddams was suspicious of Gulin's positive attitude towards him and the British in general. He admitted that Gulin had always had some contacts with the Church of England, but considered that he might have been influenced by the Greater Finland ideology that had prevailed at Helsinki University during the war. Waddams made sharp observations about the people he met, whom he found generally unattractive. However, he was a diplomat, and the Finns he met remained largely ignorant of his true feelings, taking his visit as a token of rekindled friendship.¹⁴¹ Perhaps they saw what they wanted.

¹⁴⁰ *Pajunen* 2004, 108-109; *Pajunen* 2006, 150.

¹⁴¹ *Ketola* 2004, 92-101; *Pajunen* 2004, 107-108; *Pajunen* 2006, 149.

II Re-establishing Relations: 1945

1. The first post-war report about the Finnish Church

a. Waddams advocates concerted propaganda

The Rev. H.M. Waddams' visit to Finland in December 1944 was not an isolated event in the relations between the Churches of England and Finland, but marked the beginning of a new era in which he was to play an important role. Having returned home, he delivered a very detailed report of the visit to his employer, the Ministry of Information. The report contained a detailed account of his trip with sharply executed portraits of characters he had met, remarks about the general conditions and opinions in Finland and suggestions how the Ministry of Information should relate to the Finns.¹

According to Waddams, Finnish opinion had become more optimistic, or at least less pessimistic, during the months following the truce. The Finns had not really found anything to complain about concerning Soviet behaviour in Finland, and were more or less reluctantly concluding that perhaps "the Russians may not want to occupy the whole of Finland after all". Nevertheless, he thought that many of them secretly hoped to find some evidence to support their view that "the Russians are barbarians who only want to compass the downfall of poor little Finland."² Waddams had caught the sombre mood of the Finns at the time, but did not see any reason for it. For him there was no reason to doubt the good will of the Soviet Union.

Even if Waddams had seen his task as cultivating an understanding of the Soviet Union among the Finns his report made it quite clear that the

¹ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland"; *Ketola* 2004, 75-76, 99-101; *Pajunen* 2006, 149-150.

² LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 1.

same method of understanding was not applied to his own dealings with the Finns:

On the whole I was not very favourably impressed by the Finns. They seem to have a narrow outlook, and few of them seem to be capable of seeing any of the larger issues at stake in the political events in Europe. Finland is the centre of their world, and there is a strong nationalist spirit which affects all their views. Friendliness with other nations consequently appears to be tinged in their case with a self-interest which diminishes the real value of such friendship.³

Whatever prejudices Waddams might earlier have held against the Finns, the visit had more than confirmed them.

The roots of Waddams' inability to appreciate the Finnish point of view lay in his fundamentally different interpretation of the war, intensified by his imperialistic attitude towards what he considered the lesser European nations. This was what he suggested:

So far as possible Finland should not be encouraged to think itself more important than it really is. One of the ill results of the first Winter War was that Finland saw herself as the champion of Western Democracy against the Bolshevik hordes, and the publicity given to that war in the world press resulted in a dangerous swelling of Finland's head, which was already rather too big for its hat. So long therefore as control is exercised over visitors to Finland in future, those Church dignitaries should be dissuaded from going, who regard as their main task the over enthusiastic exaggeration of the virtues of those small nations who live on the borders of the Soviet Union.⁴

Even if Waddams was correct in his estimation that the Finns had indeed considered themselves "as the champion[s] of Western Democracy against the Bolshevik hordes", this had been the general view in Christendom during the Winter War: the prayers offered for Finland at St Paul's at its outbreak would otherwise have made very little sense.⁵

Waddams' reference to church dignitaries who regarded "as their main task the over enthusiastic exaggeration of the virtues of those small nations who live on the borders of the Soviet Union" certainly applied to the Chairman of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), Bishop A.C. Headlam of Gloucester.⁶ Waddams must have considered Head-

³ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 1; *Ketola* 2004, 75.

⁴ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 2.

⁵ *Heikkilä* 1988, 123-124.

⁶ *Jasper* 1960, 261, 265-266.

lam as ignorant as the Finns given his long-standing failure to understand the depravity of Nazi Germany while retaining the notion of the Soviet Union as a godless state fighting against all religion. Having this kind of CFR Chairman had indeed become a burden to the Church of England especially at the beginning of the war.⁷ Thus Waddams' suggestion had an internal ecclesiastical political flavour.

However, dissuading the wrong kind of British visitors was not the only suggestion Waddams made. Throughout his visit, Waddams had tried "to enlighten Church leaders about Russia and about British opinion vis à vis Russia" and "tried to persuade them that the best thing the Finnish Church could do would be to throw their weight of its morale influence into the scales on the side of reconstruction in Finland and the creation of a new spirit of understanding and confidence between nations, especially with Russia."⁸ The way to proceed was to circulate British propaganda in Finnish in an attempt to influence Finnish Church opinion. Waddams wanted "to broaden the outlook of Finnish people and in this way to give them a more balanced view of the place of Finland in international affairs."⁹

Waddams regarded the church as a particularly important propaganda channel because of its dominant position in Finnish society. According to Waddams, "in large parts of Finland the Church has a strong hold on the people, whose religion is of a pietistic character, and is inclined to be associated with nationalism." As the church was probably "the only independent organisation -- in touch with the bulk of the people, -- an influence exerted on the clergy might have far-reaching results." This, Waddams planned, could also counteract "the tendency to give religious tinge to anti-Russian prejudice."¹⁰ Thus the British Ministry of Information could do well to try to use good church relations as a means to influence Finnish opinion.

In practice, Waddams suggested the implementation of a huge propaganda operation. He wanted "*The Spiritual Issues of the War*" to be issued weekly in Finnish and distributed to all clergymen throughout the country, whose members are about 1,500."¹¹ Furthermore books like *Christian Counter Attack* and *The British Churches in Wartime* should be translated

⁷ Jasper 1960, 290-301; Hastings 1998, 321-329, 338-345.

⁸ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 2.

⁹ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 2; Ketola 2004, 75-76, 99-100.

¹⁰ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 2.

¹¹ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 2.

into Finnish and sold or distributed. Waddams recorded that the British political representative in Helsinki, Mr. Francis Shepherd, had agreed with these suggestions in their conversation.¹²

On a more modest scale Waddams had already made arrangements for the circulation of *The Spiritual Issues of the War*, *The Church Times* and *The Guardian* through the Secretary of the Finnish Ecumenical Council, the Rev. Verner J. Aurola, who had promised to distribute them to those who could read English.¹³ The number of copies, 25, did not suggest that there were many important church people who could. This meant that the nurturing of relations with the Church of England was bound to concern only a very small group of church leaders with sufficient knowledge of English.

In the sphere of broadcasting, Waddams recommended that the emphasis should be on the activities of the Church in the Allied lands and the consolidation of relations between the Church of England and the Russian Orthodox Church.¹⁴ Such broadcasts should serve to provide the Finns with the desired model for the nurturing of ecumenical relations, while also assisting them to develop a more realistic understanding of their insignificant place in the world.

For translation, printing and circulation Waddams recommended Mr. Georg Pimenoff of the British and Foreign Bible Society, who he believed was able to arrange the cheapest printing in Finland. He recommended Pimenoff be trusted to do the translations entirely on his own. Waddams trusted that Pimenoff would "probably do the job very well" and the whole project would also relieve the burden of the Press Department.¹⁵ Perhaps one reason why Waddams was so confident in Pimenoff's ability was that they shared a very similar view of Finnish society and the Finnish churches - and especially their shortcomings.¹⁶

The scope of all these efforts was clearly defined in the "Recommendations" section at the end of the report. The aim of the propaganda was to reduce "the parochialism of the Finnish outlook." This was to be done by providing "as much news as possible -- of the events in the rest of the world, and as little attention as possible given to Finnish affairs directly. The gen-

¹² LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 2, 17.

¹³ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 17.

¹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 17.

¹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 17.

¹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 7-9; *Ketola* 2004, 97-98.

eral purpose should be to help Finland realise her true place and importance in relation to world developments.”¹⁷ This Waddams clearly considered insignificant.

However, one thing counted in the Finns’ favour: their opinion was guided more by their ignorance than their wickedness. Waddams stressed that “the majority of the Finns are very badly informed about occurrences during the war” and therefore they needed to be alerted to the true situation in the world through the provision of news which for most people elsewhere would have been “rather stale”.¹⁸ The Finns were as ignorant of the evils of Nazi Germany as they were of the goodness of the Soviet Union:

With regard to the Soviet Union two facts should be borne in mind. The first is that there is widespread ignorance in Finland about all changes in Russia since the Revolution, owing to the deliberate policy between the wars of cutting as many connections with Russia as possible. The second is that whatever may be their professions on the subject, many Finns cannot help secretly desiring a break between Britain and Russia. Everything possible should be done therefore to stress the reality and abiding nature of the British-Russian Alliance, and every opportunity taken to enlighten the Finns as to Russian opinion and progress.

I think there is still a need in Finland that the true nature of Nazi Germany should be exposed. For a number of years the Germans behaved very well in Finland, and in addition a strict press censorship prevented the Finns from learning the true facts about what was happening in the occupied countries. There is an improvement now, and the Germans have been extremely foolish in their behaviour in North Finland during the fighting. Yet I feel that it will take some time before the real facts sink into the consciousness of the ordinary Finn living in the countryside.¹⁹

It is notable that even if Waddams had no sympathy for what he considered Finnish ignorance of religious development in the Soviet Union, he was able to see how the Finns were largely ignorant of “the true nature of Nazi Germany”. Whatever he thought the majority of Finns were, he certainly did not consider them Nazis.

The one exception to the rule of Finnish ignorance was the Swedish-speaking circles, who he considered fared somewhat better, as they were able to read newspapers from Sweden throughout the war.²⁰ In addition to the traditionally close links between the Finnish-Swedish and the Swedes,

¹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum “Finland”, 16.

¹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum “Finland”, 16-17; *Ketola* 2004, 99.

¹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum “Finland”, 16-17.

²⁰ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum “Finland”, 16.

it is likely that Waddams' longstanding sympathy towards Sweden coloured his view of the Finnish-Swedish in his assessment of the Finnish situation. The general tone of the report was sombre. The report criticised almost all things Finnish from people to the food at the hotel, which Waddams found "rather trying, largely owing to the lack of sweet things."²¹

It seems that Waddams' negative attitude towards the Finns was based on at least two factors: the political situation of Great Britain; and the personal experiences of Herbert Waddams. First, on a political level the Finnish war against the Soviet Union had been on an unavoidable collision course with Allied war-time policy. The Soviet Union was still a major ally of Britain, fighting its way to the heart of Germany, and no mercy was to be shown to the enemies of the Allies.

Second, Waddams felt a deep personal sympathy for the Soviet Union and the Russian people, strengthened by his moving experience of visiting Moscow as a member of the Archbishop of York's delegation in 1943. Furthermore, the war was still far from over and if Britain's war against Finland had been to a great extent theoretical, the real war was still very much raging in most parts of Europe. For all that the Finns were fighting off the Germans from Lapland, the war still posed a threat to British people both at home and abroad.²² It is likely that Christmas spent alone in 'an enemy country' with very little company he appreciated, hardened Waddams' views, and made him more hostile than he might have wished in normal circumstances.

b. The report discussed at the Allied Control Commission

Waddams' position in the Ministry of Information ensured that his views and suggestions were received at the Foreign Office and later to some extent by the Church of England as well.²³ The first results of his visit and the report were somewhat surprising. His views were introduced into discussions between the heads of the Allied Control Commission in Finland on 5 February 1945. Mr Francis Shepherd had read his report and informed

²¹ LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 16; *Ketola* 1997, 240; *Ketola* 2004, 98-99.

²² *Nevakivi* 1999, 217-220; *Manninen* 2006, 42-45; *Nevakivi* 2006, 40-41.

²³ *Ketola* 2004, 99-101; *Pajunen* 2006, 149-150.

Colonel-General Andrei Zhdanov about it.²⁴ So Waddams' impressions and suggestions reached the highest Allied political powers in Finland almost immediately.

The meeting was arranged at Colonel-General Zhdanov's request and it consisted of discussion on the various topics relating to life in Finland and the fulfilment of the armistice terms, and the screening of British and Soviet propaganda films. The conversations happened through interpreters, both sides providing their own, and some other Soviet representatives of the Control Commission were present. It was quite evident to Shepherd that most of the Soviets were somewhat bored, as only he and Zhdanov were talking. The occasion was scarcely rendered more enjoyable by the English films, which were mostly incomprehensible to the audience, partly because of language, partly because of the haphazard order in which the Soviet projectionist showed them.²⁵

Shepherd found the discussions themselves hard work, as "it was very difficult to get the Colonel-General to offer any definite opinions and it was necessary for me to attempt to formulate them for him and then get his views for or against."²⁶ In his formulations, he followed the line of Waddams' report: the conversation dealt with issues such as "pro-German feelings in Finland", "influence of Church in Finland" and "ignorance about Russian affairs".²⁷

The discussion began with "pro-German feelings". Shepherd and Zhdanov "agreed about the slowness of the Finns in any kind of action, their absorption in themselves and their ignorance of affairs outside their own country." Shepherd found Zhdanov inclined to think that there "was a definite core of fascist influence in Finland, but thought that fascism was now at such a low ebb that this core no longer had real importance."²⁸ This was hardly surprising, as the Soviet understanding of 'fascism' included right wing ideas of all shades. The President of Finland at the time, Marshal Mannerheim, was a former General of the Imperial Russian Army with very little sympathy for either Stalin or Hitler.²⁹

²⁴ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945; *Pajunen* 2006, 150.

²⁵ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

²⁶ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

²⁷ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

²⁸ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

²⁹ *Jussila*, 1999, 108; *Hentilä* 1999, 199, 203, 208-211; *Palmer* 2006, 259, 308-309, 354, 365; *Kirby* 2006, 161, 201, 228, 230-231.

Nor were all Finland's cultural ties with Germany especially 'fascist', as Shepherd tried to explain to Zhdanov. According to Shepherd there was "a fairly widespread tendency, especially in certain classes, towards friendly feelings for Germany, as apart from Hitler Germany, for cultural reasons and because Germany had been the natural support for the traditional Finnish anti-Russian attitude."³⁰ No doubt these classes included a large portion of the Finnish clergy, who were tied over centuries to German Lutheran theology and church life.

The army and Finnish militarism was another matter on which the two did not agree. Initially, Zhdanov considered that "there was in fact a good deal of militarism in Finland rather on the German model", whereas Shepherd explained it in terms of a cultural evolution from Finland having been a battleground between Sweden and Russia for so many centuries. Zhdanov thought there was something in this explanation.³¹ Common history was an awkward matter: for all that Zhdanov was a representative of the Soviet Union he was the political successor of a Tsarist Russia whose Finnish legacy was not entirely positive.

However, both representatives agreed that there was a much more important way in which the Finns differed from the Germans:

We agreed that the Finns had no conception of the darker side of Germany or of the atrocities which had been committed under the Hitler régime both before and during the war, and that the Finns could reasonably be accused of being deliberately blind to these matters. We also agreed that it was remarkable how little notice appeared to be taken by the Finns of the unreasonable devastation committed by the Germans in Rovaniemi and the north of Finland generally. I said that I considered it of great importance to do all that we could to enlighten the Finns on this subject and told him of the plans that the press attaché was working out for the dissemination of British books, films and propaganda generally. It was, however, going to be very difficult to bring Finns to any realisation as to the kind of people with whom they had been collaborating during the war.³²

Shepherd's analysis of Finnish culture and its links with Germany was definitely of the type most of the Finns would have agreed upon. The remark that "the Finns had no conception of the darker side of Germany" and Shepherd's resolve to shed some light on the matter by means of British propaganda, closely echoed the suggestions of Waddams' report.

³⁰ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

³¹ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

³² PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

It is thus no surprise that Waddams' visit was soon introduced into the conversation:

In the course of the conversation, I said that it had been brought to my notice from more than one source that although the Finns alleged that they knew Russia and the Russians very well, they were in fact very ignorant on the subject. I had been struck by the report of Mr. Waddams, the British clergyman who recently visited Finland and who had been with the Archbishop of York's mission to Moscow some time before. The Finnish clergy were completely ignorant of the progress in church matters in Russia since the Revolution and had been surprised and pleased to hear from Mr. Waddams what was going on. The Colonel-General rather surprised me by replying to this that he knew very little about church matters in Finland, though he understood that the Finns were, in the main, Protestant. I said that the influence of the Church in Finland was considerable and should not be under-estimated. I hoped that Mr. Waddams had been able to introduce a rather better atmosphere among them and I understood that the new Archbishop was a sensible and intelligent man. The Colonel-General interrupted to say that he had not seen a report of the Archbishop having made any exhortation to the clergy or people, to which I replied that although that was, so far as I knew, the case, the influence of the clergy was in the main in the villages where the individual pastors had great influence. I hoped that our press attaché would be able to bring some enlightenment in this direction.³³

Zhdanov was not greatly interested in Finnish church matters, as long as they created no public disturbance or otherwise obstructed the Soviet agenda. Indeed, the Colonel-General is likely to have been as 'ignorant of the progress in church matters in Russia since the Revolution' as the Finnish clergy. Religious education was hardly on the curriculum of Soviet military personnel, even if Shepherd described him as "curiously unimpressive for a man of his powerful position" having anyhow "something of the unworldliness and even of the spiritual force of a high dignitary of the Catholic Church about him, in spite of his mediocre appearance."³⁴ Perhaps Shepherd perceived Soviet communism as akin to a religion.

What Zhdanov was really interested in was the state of the Finnish mood, about which Shepherd was very positive. According to Shepherd, the Finns had expected all kind of horrors in the months immediately after the armistice, but subsequently the tension had eased. The Finns were surprised to have "seen that the Control Commission had behaved correctly and that the Russian attitude was in general friendly":

³³ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

³⁴ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

I thought that the tension was progressively diminishing and that there was a universal desire to live on friendly terms with Soviet Russia. The difficulty was that the majority of Finns were so far only convinced of this with their heads and not yet with their hearts. That, in view of their history, would probably take a considerable time to achieve, but they had good memories of the earlier days of the Grand Duchy and I thought it would come in time. Here, also, the Colonel General agreed and said that on his arrival he had the impression that the Finns thought he had come with a regiment of tanks in one pocket and a squadron of aeroplanes in the other.³⁵

Again, Shepherd's reply echoed Waddams' observations with one notable exception: Shepherd emphasized the desire of Finns to live in peace, but displayed none of Waddams' notion of their secretly desiring a split between the Soviet Union and its Western Allies.

It is hard to say what Shepherd really thought, but the view he wanted to present to Zhdanov was reassuring: the Finns were becoming convinced of the Soviets' benevolence towards them and beginning to behave accordingly. This line was clearly taken in order to promote peaceful development in Finland, if possible. At the same time, Shepherd wanted the leaders of the Control Commission to make some public appearances together in order to counter the German propaganda "that the friendship and collaboration between Russia, Great Britain and the United States would not last."³⁶ Shepherd did not turn a completely blind eye to Finland's underlying problems, but simply wanted to keep them out of the conversation with Zhdanov. He may have been closer than Waddams to the eventual Cold War mentality, in which a break between the Western and Eastern Allies would be reality.

Another interesting feature of Shepherd's presentation was his reference to Finland's history as a more or less autonomous Grand Duchy within the Russian Empire. It is hardly surprising that Zhdanov refrained from commenting on it. It was much easier for a British diplomat to see continuity from Imperial Russian power politics to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union than it was for his Soviet colleague. It was, after all, a central element of Soviet ideology to oppose the imperial claims of one nation over another. It seems that the international or supranational claim of Soviet communism was never really properly understood or accepted by the British Foreign Office. Even official Foreign Office documents habitually referred to 'Russians' when they actually meant 'Soviet'. The fact that the Soviet Union consisted of many nationalities apart from the Russians had no importance. All were

³⁵ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

³⁶ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

labelled 'Russian' and thus, for the Foreign Office, the Imperial Russian tradition continued. The freedom of small nations like Finland and the Baltic States on the Russian border was bound to be of secondary interest in the world of the great imperial powers.

From the churches' point of view the most important feature of the conversation between Shepherd and Zhdanov was that Shepherd had taken Waddams' suggestions seriously and seemed resolved to follow them. The Finns were to be enlightened by British propaganda about the true nature of Nazi Germany, to which the Soviets made no objection. However, the British in general, and Shepherd in particular, viewed the Church in Finland as much more important than did Zhdanov, whom Shepherd tried to convince of its influence. By doing this he only emphasized the importance and strength of the very elements of Finnish society least likely to conform to the Soviet way of life.

Whether this approach succeeded is another matter, as the Foreign Office minutes of the discussion of the report underlined:

Mr. Shepherd laid great stress on the need for British propaganda and it is useful to have confirmation that Col-General Zhdanov favours our activities in this direction. But somewhat naturally, the Col-General was not nearly so responsive about religious matters, and in fact appears to have been most bored by Mr. Shepherd's praise of Mr. Waddams.³⁷

Apart from Shepherd, who seems to have entertained a personal interest in the church and religion, diplomats and politicians on both sides appeared disinterested in religion if it neither posed an immediate threat nor offered any gain.

The conversation dealt with other matters that concerned the immediate future of Finland. One of these was the state of Finnish democracy, which must have been of particular interest, as Finland was preparing for the first post-war general election:

I added that considering their history and the short time which they had had to create a working democracy, they had, on the whole, made a good and promising start. Colonel-General Zhdanov agreed to all these points and indicated that he also was of opinion that the Finns were making progress towards democracy and would continue to do so.³⁸

³⁷ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945. Minutes.

³⁸ PRO FO 371/47369 Shepherd to Eden 6.2.1945.

The main point, left unsaid, was that the Western and Eastern Allies had a somewhat different understanding of the word 'democracy'. For all that Colonel-General Zhdanov had promised not to interfere in Finnish internal affairs, he wanted if possible to steer them. The political party of his choice was thus the Finnish People's Democratic League (SKDL), which served as an umbrella for the Finnish extreme left, the Finnish Communist Party (SKP) being more an elite organisation. Indeed, it was Zhdanov's hope that the SKP could become the decisive power in the SKDL.³⁹

The first real test for Finnish democracy after the war was the general election in March 1945, in which the SKDL promoted generally leftist, anti-war policies and campaigned with anti-Fascist slogans. The party gained, to its own surprise, a quarter of the seats of the Finnish Diet (the *Eduskunta*), increasing its representation to the same level as the Social Democratic Party and the centrist Agrarian Party. The outcome of the election was interpreted by the Allies as showing that Finland had independently chosen a new political direction away from its war-time policies. Indeed, Zhdanov viewed the result as a clear sign that Finland could be led by parliamentary means towards a People's Democratic system, emerging in the Soviet sphere of influence. This was based on the assumption that the SKDL's post-election co-operation agreement with the two big parties would enable it to implement its agenda in the *Eduskunta*.⁴⁰

This never happened, and Zhdanov was to be disappointed both by the co-operation between the big parties, and the inability of the SKP to implement a radical programme in Finland. The formation of the Government in 1945 already showed something of the strength of the anti-communist forces in Finland. The Government was led by Prime Minister J.K. Paasikivi and consisted of all the main parties, with the notable exception of his own right-wing Coalition Party. Additionally, there was a strong anti-communist element in charge of the SDP, which fought against all attempts to unify the left under the SKDL, and opposed the SKDL's attempt to seize the leadership of the Finnish Labour Unions.⁴¹ The battle for Finnish public opinion did not prove an easy task for the Soviet Union, and it took much more to build up friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance between the two countries, even if that had been the goal of a certain Ministry of Information official.

³⁹ *Nevakivi* 1999, 233.

⁴⁰ *Nevakivi* 1999, 234.

⁴¹ *Nevakivi* 1999, 233-236; *Kirby* 2006, 235-237.

c. The report's reception by the churches

If Waddams' report and views were received quickly in political circles, it took much longer in the church. This was natural, as the report was written for the use of the British Government, while ecclesiastical circles absorbed such ideas less effectively, depending less on individual reports, and more on individual interest. In this case especially, Waddams' views concerning Finland spread more through his personal contacts with Church of England people than through any official channel. Indeed, his report was officially received by the CFR only in late September 1945, following a complete change in CFR personnel.⁴²

Earlier, Waddams had passed to the the CFR articles about Finnish church life by Bishop Aleksi Lehtonen and Professor G.O. Rosenqvist, which had been translated from the Swedish Church's Year Book by the Rev. C.H. Jones, the Anglican Chaplain in Stockholm.⁴³ Jones made a point of keeping an eye on the development of church affairs in and around his chaplaincy, and continued to monitor the Finnish situation for the CFR throughout the period.⁴⁴

Waddams also gave his own summary of his visit to the Nordic countries to the CFR and its Anglo-Scandinavian-Baltic circle. The part concerning Finland was muted to say the least:

Finland

Programme during the fortnight. Messages from Lehtonen and Gulin.

General attitude to begin with. Russian behaviour very correct. Release of two generals from war criminals. General improvement in views of future. At first a good deal of concealment, but now cooperation with Russians much better. Am told that German influence still remains to some extent.

⁴² LPL CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 1; *Ketola* 2004, 100.

⁴³ LPL CFR LR file 25 Waddams to Douglas 6.2.1945 with attachments.

⁴⁴ ¹LPL Douglas papers vol.73 The Church of Finland (General View) by Archbishop Aleksi Lehtonen, Åbo. Sept.1944-Aug.1945; LPL CFR Documents C.C. 46. Professor Eelis Gulin now Bishop of Tammerfors. Extract from *Hufvudstadsbladet* 16th June 1945; LPL CFR LR file 25 Findlow to C.H. Jones 17.3.1947; LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 4. Swedish Church Life in Finland during 1946 by Professor G.O. Rosenqvist of Abo; LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 7. The Church of Finland. General Review 1946 by Archbishop Aleksi Lehtonen; LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 22 The Church of Finland.

Church conditions fairly all right so far as Lutherans concerned. Various evangelical revivals during the war. My knowledge insufficient to go into details with regard to life of the Church.⁴⁵

Such caution was understandable, as the circle included ecclesiastics on friendly terms with the Finnish Church together with, for example, the Nordic Seamen's Pastors and some of the Nordic and Baltic political representatives in London.⁴⁶ Thus the lack of knowledge claimed by Waddams afforded a pretext to avoid stating anything which was likely either to irritate his readers or to compromise Waddams' personal integrity.

Waddams' visit was received very differently in the Church of Finland, as the Finns remained wholly unaware of his report. Besides, according to Waddams, the Finns had a traditional ability to interpret foreign communications in ways which best suited them. A good example of this was provided by the Finnish language church newspaper *Kotimaa*, which reported the BBC radio message Waddams had sent to Finland on 15 February 1945. It is doubtful if *Kotimaa* did justice to it as it appeared bearing the headline "An Englishman has been greatly impressed by Finnish courage".⁴⁷ It is unlikely this was the real gist of Waddams' message.

Kotimaa mentioned only that Waddams had visited Finland in December; that he had been greatly impressed by Finnish courage; observed that both churches had lost their Archbishops; and reported Waddams' hope that Dr. Temple's books might be translated into Finnish, so that Finns might familiarise themselves with his thought.⁴⁸ This was the first and only report of the visit within Finland. Otherwise it was kept strictly out of the public eye, which may have reflected a deliberate attempt by Finnish church leaders not to draw any unnecessary attention to the foreign relations of the Finnish Church.⁴⁹ If that was the case, the attempt had certainly failed with regard to the Allied Control Commission.

⁴⁵ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Scandinavia - Notes for CFR and Anglo Scandinavian-Baltic Circle.

⁴⁶ LPL CFR LR file 113/2 Anglican Scandinavian-Baltic Circle. List of Addresses 3.7.1945.

⁴⁷ *Kmaa* 13/16.2.1945 Englantilainen saanut voimakkaan vaikutuksen suomalaisten rohkeudesta; *Pajunen* 2004, 108.

⁴⁸ *Kmaa* 13/16.2.1945 Englantilainen saanut voimakkaan vaikutuksen suomalaisten rohkeudesta.

⁴⁹ *Ripatti* 1990, 88; *Pajunen* 2006, 149-150.

Furthermore, Waddams had been adept at hiding his real emotions and the Finns he had met retained a positive picture of him and his visit, utterly ignorant of the effusion of ill-feeling in his report.⁵⁰ On his return to England Waddams found a letter from Bishop Lehtonen confirming that Lehtonen was anxious to re-establish friendly relations with the Church of England. Waddams' reply suggests that Lehtonen's overture was successful. Despite his spikey report, there is no reason to doubt the gratitude Waddams expressed to the Lehtonens for their hospitality in Tampere.⁵¹ After all, Lehtonen was among the very few accorded a relatively moderate judgement in the report; and there was no reason for Waddams the clerical diplomat to be impolite to him.

2. Politics displaces theology as the churches consider invitations

a. The Church of England debates the sending of a delegation

Following the premature death of William Temple on 26 October 1944, the Church of England faced the task of appointing a new Archbishop of Canterbury. Unlike the Finns, the English were unprepared; in Finland Archbishop Erkki Kaila had been seriously ill for quite some time. However, the respective processes shared some common features: notably, in both countries, the political establishment had a final say in the decision. In England the Archbishop of Canterbury was nominated by the Prime Minister, guided by his advisors.⁵² In Finland, the clergy having voted, the President of the Republic nominated any of the three candidates who had received the most votes.⁵³

In England, the Prime Minister made his nomination on 2 January 1945. The decision came as a surprise to many: Geoffrey Fisher of London, rather than George Bell of Chichester, was nominated. Bell was well known and active in ecumenical circles beyond the British Isles, a defender

⁵⁰ *Ripatti* 1990, 88; *Ketola* 1997, 242; *Ketola* 2004, 100-101.

⁵¹ KA AL 34 Waddams to Lehtonen 23.1.1945; *Ketola* 2004, 101.

⁵² *Carpenter* 1991, 130-131.

⁵³ *Lehtonen* 1945, 39-40.

of refugees and friend of the German Confessing Church, and an ardent opponent in the House of Lords of the obliteration bombing of Germany. It is widely considered that his opposition cost him the nomination of Mr. Churchill.⁵⁴ However, Fisher's appointment was not unpromising from the Church of Finland's perspective. As Bishop of London, Fisher had come to know and appreciate the Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London, the Rev. Toivo Harjunpää.⁵⁵

In the face of a general ignorance of Finnish affairs, Harjunpää made sure that the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations was kept well informed. On Saturday 20 January 1945 he informed the CFR about the forthcoming archiepiscopal election on 1 February in Finland and explained how the procedure of election and nomination worked. The probable candidates were: the Bishop of Tampere, Dr. Lehtonen; the Dean of Turku; the Bishop of Kuopio; and the Rural Dean of Helsinki.⁵⁶

Furthermore, Harjunpää asked if Canon Douglas, the General Secretary of CFR, might bring "before the Archbishop-Elect of Canterbury the possibility of the Church of England sending a delegation to the installation of the new Archbishop taking into consideration the especial relationships which exist between the Finnish Church and the Church of England and the agreement existing between the two churches."⁵⁷ Indeed, the agreement contained a specific recommendation to this effect, which had not yet been put into practice.

According to Harjunpää the archiepiscopal installation or consecration could not take place before the beginning of April at the earliest.⁵⁸ There was still time to prepare for the visit. Harjunpää had wasted little time, bringing his suggestion soon after he had heard of the forthcoming election. As communications with Finland were severely limited, his visit to the CFR was probably undertaken on his own initiative.

Harjunpää's promptness was matched by the CFR. Douglas passed the matter to Archbishop-Elect Fisher the following week. However, his initial

⁵⁴ *Carpenter* 1991, 129-131; *Hastings* 1998, 436-437.

⁵⁵ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Fisher to Douglas 15.12.1941.

⁵⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Douglas to Fisher 23.1.1945; LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Archbishopric of Finland, note by Assistant General Secretary 20th January 1945.

⁵⁷ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Archbishopric of Finland, note by Assistant General Secretary 20th January 1945.

⁵⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Archbishopric of Finland, note by Assistant General Secretary 20th January 1945.

view was less than positive as he saw problems with regard to the proposed delegation:

The difficulty of sending a delegation, apart from and over and above the cost of doing so, would be I imagine considerable. For a delegation would have almost of necessity to comprise or consist of a Bishop, e.g. the Bishop of Fulham, and I am somewhat doubtful as to whether the Foreign Office, even if it approved, would facilitate the sending one. In ordinary circumstances I should venture myself to think it desirable that our Archbishop should be represented as the Installation of the new Archbishop of Finland, but as things are I hesitate to express an opinion.

If you should decide that it is desirable and the bureau of the Council could be of any help we should of course be eager for your instructions.⁵⁹

Douglas' caution is evident, and was natural: Fisher was still very new to his archiepiscopal office in general, and in particular had very little international ecumenical experience. Undoubtedly Douglas did not wish to appear to advise Fisher on what he should do as Archbishop.

Douglas' concerns, however, were practical; he had no political or theological reservations on the matter. The war complicated matters and the travel arrangements of the Church of England were completely dependent on the facilities of the Foreign Office. In any case, it seems that the practical problems were quite enough for the Archbishop-elect to reject the proposal.⁶⁰

The matter came up again at the CFR meeting on Thursday 8 February, when Douglas informed those present about the hesitancy of both the Archbishop-elect of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York concerning sending such a delegation. A lengthy discussion ensued, during which there was considerable support for sending the delegation. It was therefore decided that the Chairman of the CFR, Bishop Headlam, should write to Fisher and ask him to reconsider.⁶¹

Despite the strong support at the meeting, there was much subsequent hesitation among the participants. Waddams was unhappy: he thought the decision "was taken in a hurried manner without giving the members pres-

⁵⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Douglas to Fisher 23.1.1945.

⁶⁰ LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945, Headlam to Fisher 12.2.1945, Douglas to Fisher 13.2.1945, Fisher to Douglas 15.2.1945.

⁶¹ LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945, Headlam to Fisher 12.2.1945, Douglas to Fisher 13.2.1945.

ent the chance of considering the implications of such a resolution."⁶² At the meeting Headlam had asked for Waddams' opinion on the matter. At the time, he spoke in favour of the delegation, yet did not feel it right to make a positive recommendation to Fisher as he had already rejected the idea and had not asked the CFR's advice. According to Waddams, "the question ought to have been reconsidered by the Council at leisure."⁶³ Waddams did not want the CFR to be proactive on matters without a clear mandate from the Archbishop, whose Council the CFR in fact was. In this respect, his view on the role of the CFR was more limited than that of some of its older members.

Furthermore, Waddams did not completely agree with the point made at the meeting that "it was not the business of the Council to worry over practical or political difficulties, but merely to advise what was religiously desirable."⁶⁴ However, he understood that Fisher had rejected the proposal precisely on practical grounds and thus the decision had been "made for reasons which are outside the sphere with which the Council has to deal."⁶⁵ In effect this meant that according to their stated self-understanding it was not in the remit of the CFR to take the decision anyway.

Ever the bureaucrat, Waddams understood that if the matter were referred back to the Continental Churches Committee, the idea would almost certainly be dropped. He therefore merely asked Headlam "to consider whether you could stress in your letter to the Archbishop that the Council's request to you to write to him on this subject was decided purely by religious motives, and that the Council did not take into consideration any questions of a practical or political nature."⁶⁶ The decision to recommend the sending of a delegation might be carried, but the recommendation was unlikely to be accepted.

At no point did Waddams elaborate as to what the practical or political difficulties of the proposed visit might be. He had spoken in favour of sending a bishop at the meeting, but lamented that there had not been a "chance of considering the implications of such a resolution."⁶⁷ Evidently,

⁶² LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945.

⁶³ LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945.

⁶⁴ LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945.

⁶⁵ LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945.

⁶⁶ LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945.

⁶⁷ LPL CFR LR 28/1 Waddams to Headlam 9.2.1945.

Waddams' hesitation resulted from his conclusion that sending a bishop to Finland would do more harm by reinforcing in the Finns a sense of their importance than it would do good in ecumenical relations. Even Waddams found it difficult to follow the strategy of neglecting Finland recommended by his report.

However, Waddams was not alone in having an acutely political mind. Another contrarian with regard to Finland was the Dean of Chichester, the Very Rev. A.S. Duncan-Jones.⁶⁸ On the day of the CFR meeting, there was also a Church Assembly debate on the Commission on Aid to Christian Churches in Europe, an opportunity which Duncan-Jones did not miss. He strongly espoused the view that the Church of England should take a full part in the reconstruction of Europe and in doing so "it should be careful to guard its own special responsibilities."⁶⁹ Amongst those responsibilities were relations with the Church of Finland.

Duncan-Jones wanted the Assembly to be "very careful in any action -- to dissociate themselves from any political influence, and in war time that was not very easy." He was concerned about "the lack of information of the ordinary Churchman about the conditions of the Churches in Europe" and wanted the Commission to address the matter. He considered that there lurked a great danger, "a danger which became much more acute in time of war -- that the Church might be used as an instrument of national policy." Against this danger, he wanted the churches "to revive amongst their people and get out into the world an Ecumenical sense of the Church - a Church which was not an instrument of national policy, but which set out to uphold and maintain in perfect freedom the Gospel of Jesus Christ."⁷⁰ This statement reflects Duncan-Jones' critical attitude towards the Church of England's opportunist political tendency to follow the lead of national politics, an attitude for which he was well known.⁷¹

Duncan-Jones' plea to the Church of England to allocate grants to the churches for which it had special responsibility reveals his attitude:

There were Churches for which the Church of England had since the last war, by the mercy of God, been able to undertake a special responsibility of fraternity. It was remarkable that the Church of England seemed to be the only Church which had

⁶⁸ *Carpenter* 1956, 96-101.

⁶⁹ CA 1945, 131.

⁷⁰ CA 1945, 132-133.

⁷¹ *Carpenter* 1956, 98-102.

been able to establish relations of a more or less intimate kind with other Churches on the continent of Europe. Those relations were very little understood by ordinary Churchmen. It had entered into very close relations with the Old Catholic Church, which would now be in a very difficult position, as a considerable section of it was in Germany. It had entered into different and less close relations with the Churches of Finland, Estonia and Latvia, and those Churches were certainly looking to it to help them to get as much religious freedom as possible. If Convocation solemnly asserted and defined certain relations with other Churches and then forgot all about them, it was not good for Convocation or for the Church of England, and it was worst of all for any attempt to have an Ecumenical movement.⁷²

Duncan-Jones used every opportunity to remind the Assembly about those churches, among them the Finnish Church, who would perhaps otherwise have been forgotten. It seems he sought to act as the conscience of the Assembly in ecumenical affairs.

The following day the theme continued, when the Assembly debated the Report of the CFR, signed by Bishop Headlam in December 1944. Although the report dealt mainly with the visit of an official delegation from the Episcopal Church of America, Headlam and Duncan-Jones emphasized their support for the suffering churches with whom the Church of England had entered into friendly relations.⁷³ In his introduction Headlam explicitly mentioned Latvia and Estonia, with whom "he had had many pleasant relations" and whose "Churches were very closely associated with the Church of England, and they looked forward to complete union with them in future."⁷⁴ In the late 1930s the Latvian and Estonian Churches had signed agreements with the Church of England similar to that earlier signed by the Church of England with the Church of Finland.⁷⁵

During the war, they had suffered terribly from both German and Soviet aggression. Headlam presented the Assembly with gruesome statistics of Baltic people who had either disappeared or who had fled as refugees to Sweden. With justification he suggested that "those who cared for the good name of Russia should represent to that country what a slur it cast upon her to attempt to destroy those peoples and Churches", but caused embarrassment in the face of the prevailing political correctness.⁷⁶ It is unlikely to have helped the reception of his message among the other members of

⁷² CA 1945, 133.

⁷³ C.A. 767; CA 1945, 143-146.

⁷⁴ CA 1945, 144.

⁷⁵ *Jasper* 1960, 262-265.

⁷⁶ CA 1945, 144.

the Assembly. From the Finnish point of view, the Estonian and Latvian Churches shared the same status with the Finnish Church in their relations with the Church of England; the Finns had merely been more fortunate in avoiding Soviet occupation.

Headlam was shortly followed by Duncan-Jones, who again reminded the Assembly of the importance of gathering accurate information about churches all over the world, and the need to disseminate this to the church at large:

Ignorance about such matters was very natural. They were not mentioned in the ordinary Press, or, if they were, they were completely misrepresented, no doubt through ignorance; and there were Churches for whom the Church of England had a very special responsibility. Many of those Churches, and especially those which had been under the harrow, were looking to the Church of England for spiritual comfort and for spiritual comradeship. The Assembly ought to feel that it was its business to support that comradeship in every way possible. They should simply as Christians, as Lord Quickswood so well said, do everything they could to make them feel that, whatever might happen owing to the separations of war, their Christian community remained.

He thought, for example, of what recently happened in Finland. The archbishop there, a fine old man, had died, and his place had probably been taken by another representative of the bishops. They were hoping that it was a bishop whom many in this country knew well. That country had had a very "raw deal" since 1939, and that Church had had much to suffer. It would be a very great thing if something could be done at the time of the new archbishop's enthronement or in some other way to make it clear how much the Church of England sympathised with him and how much their prayers went out to him in view of the enormously difficult task in front of him. He felt that the Assembly and the Church at large would feel a much greater concern for many of those things if more information could be put before Assembly.⁷⁷

Duncan-Jones linked a general appeal to help the churches with whom the Church of England had friendly relations with a particular appeal to do something at the new Finnish archbishop's enthronement: a skilful way to raise general awareness of the Finnish situation among the members of the Assembly. The Bishop "whom many in this country knew well" was no doubt Lehtonen, who nonetheless was largely unknown outside the somewhat restricted ecumenical circles.

The supply of information about foreign churches among ordinary church people was certainly deficient. However, the information Headlam

⁷⁷ CA 1945, 145-146.

and Duncan-Jones had gained and wished to disseminate did not coincide with the view of Waddams and the Ministry of Information. It is more than likely that both Headlam and Duncan-Jones were among those Church of England dignitaries whom Waddams had recommended should be dissuaded from visiting Finland.

It is thus no surprise that Headlam's letter to Fisher contained none of Waddams' suggestions. Headlam was polite but resolute. The Council had discussed the matter and was conscious of the Archbishop's hesitation, but wished to press upon the Archbishop the desirability of the Church of England being represented. Headlam's account of the meeting presented a unified view:

The Bishop of Fulham felt very strongly on the matter. He was supported by the Dean of Chichester and by Mr. Waddams, who had recently been in Finland. It was felt that some token of friendship to them after all the troubles their Church had gone through and some sign of our sympathy was very desirable.

As far as we can judge the Foreign Office are not likely now to make any objection. The Council therefore wish very strongly to urge upon your Grace the desirability of such a representation taking place.

I may add that the Bishop of Fulham is ready to go if bidden.⁷⁸

There was no hesitation. Headlam was all in favour of sending the delegation and Waddams' views had not made the slightest difference to him.

Any wavering was left to others, such as Headlam's old colleague at the CFR, General Secretary Douglas, who also presented his particular view of the decision to Fisher:

At the Council meeting last week the Dean of Chichester was very anxious to press that in spite of your Grace's letter, of which letter I communicated the gist, the Bishop of Gloucester should put up to your Grace the project of sending an English Bishop to Helsinki (sic.) for the Installation of the new Archbishop. The Bishop of Gloucester himself was anxious that he should be empowered to do so, and the Bishop of Fulham who was present expressed his readiness to go.

Myself I deprecated the matter being put further before your Grace but thought that there would be no harm in the Council doing so.

Douglas thus presented himself as a mere spectator at a meeting at which the rebellious old boys, the Dean of Chichester, and the Bishops of Gloucester-

⁷⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Headlam to Fisher 12.2.1945.

ter and Fulham, were emboldened to ask the Archbishop to reconsider his decision.

However, there were developments following the Assembly's meeting: Douglas received further information from Harjunpää concerning the candidates.⁷⁹ This changed the situation a little, as only one among the three candidates with most votes was not already a bishop. Douglas thought that there would not have been "great point, except on the political side, in an English bishop attending" if either of the bishops were chosen. On the other hand were the Dean of Turku elected "then there would be considerable point in as much as under our agreement of 1931 (sic.) with the Church of Finland an English bishop ought if possible to be present in order to take part in the Consecration and so to pass on Anglican Orders for the Church of Finland."⁸⁰

It says a lot about the Church of England's approach to Christian unity that the General Secretary of the CFR viewed the agreement between the churches on 'mutual' episcopal consecrations exclusively as a means to restore the apostolic succession to the Finnish Church. This was undoubtedly a common interpretation of the meaning of the agreement in the Church of England; in Finland it was never acknowledged as such. In Finland, re-introduction of the historic episcopate was generally viewed as an accident, as opposed to the intention, of the agreement.

Regarding the practical and political difficulties, Douglas had "not consulted anyone at the Foreign Office formally" but gathered "that as things are developing there would be little risk of offending the U.S.S.R. by an Anglican bishop visiting Finland and that therefore there is more likelihood of the Foreign Office viewing such a visit favourably and expediting the transport facilities."⁸¹ Suddenly, the matter seemed very much easier as the political and practical obstacles evaporated.

However, there were signs of Douglas' age becoming a factor. On the positive side, he was an able diplomat capable of presenting the case in the way he wanted it to develop. On the negative side, his solecisms suggest that his memory was beginning to fail him. He thought, for example, that the installation was to take place in Helsinki, not in Turku, the centre of the

⁷⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Harjunpää to Douglas 8.2.1945, Douglas to Fisher 13.2.1945.

⁸⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Douglas to Fisher 13.2.1945.

⁸¹ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Douglas to Fisher 13.2.1945.

Archdiocese and the ancient capital of Finland; and he confused years and agreements, referring erroneously to 1931, the year of the Bonn Agreement with the Old Catholics. In a post where avoiding irritating foreign church leaders was of the essence this was simply not good enough.

If Douglas were beginning to be too old for his post, Archbishop Fisher's situation was completely different. He faced an interesting challenge in deciding how to proceed with a proposal he had already once rejected, but which kept coming back to him, through the efforts of those with more ecumenical experience than he had. Fisher's reply to Douglas was a masterpiece of ecclesiastical administration: he neither revised his earlier decision nor forbade the Bishop of Fulham from going to Finland:

My dear Douglas,

Archbishopric of Finland.

I think I must stick to my former letter that I am not prepared to send a special delegation for the Installation of the new Archbishop. On the other hand, Finland is in the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Fulham. If he would like to go I would willingly ask him to go as representing the C. of E. and I am writing to him to this effect. It is very suitable that he should visit this part of his Diocese and add to it this special function. But if he finds it inconvenient to go I do not think anything more can be done.

Yours sincerely,
Geoffrey Cantuar⁸²

This was the end of the matter: it fell to the Bishop of Fulham to decide whether the Church of England should be represented at the installation of the new Archbishop in Finland. The debate in the CFR and the Church Assembly revealed a great difference of approach between the older generation of the CFR and Waddams in relating to the Church of Finland. On this occasion, the old guard, having much sympathy for the Finnish Church and with many ways to affect ecclesiastical decision making, had got their way; but their influence was rapidly waning.

⁸² LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Fisher to Douglas 15.2.1945.

b. The debuts and installations of the new Archbishops

Harjunpää was able to inform Douglas about the outcome of the Finnish election at the time of the debate about sending a delegation in early February. The three candidates with most votes were Bishop Lehtonen of Tampere, Bishop Salomies of Mikkeli and the Dean of Turku. Harjunpää had heard the result through friends who had listened to Finnish radio and also from Waddams. The reports conflicted concerning the actual number of votes, but Harjunpää was confident that if this was the correct order of the candidates Bishop Lehtonen would be appointed by the President within a matter of days. Since there was as yet no postal or telegraph communication between the countries Harjunpää was unable to confirm the news and discover whether there would be any special ceremony of enthronement: although there was no special canon requiring such a ceremony in Finnish Church Law, that did not mean it would not take place.⁸³

In the event, the nomination of the new Archbishop took somewhat longer than Harjunpää had anticipated. President Mannerheim delayed it until Wednesday 14 March 1945; the nominee was indeed Bishop Aleksi Lehtonen of Tampere. He was to be translated to his new duties on 1 April and to be installed on 10 June, by which time he was to publish an encyclical, according to Finnish custom.⁸⁴

Of the three candidates, Lehtonen was without doubt the best known internationally. The Archbishop of Uppsala, the Most Rev. Dr. Erling Eidem, had written to his friend Bishop Bell of Chichester as early as January that he believed Lehtonen would receive the most votes, and expressing his hope that Lehtonen, who had been “gravely ill a few years ago”, had “conquered the illness”.⁸⁵ In his reply, Bell hoped Lehtonen would be elected.⁸⁶ Bell was actually writing two days after Lehtonen had won the election, but had not been nominated.

Fisher had received Lehtonen’s congratulations on behalf of the Finnish bishops in January, but it took some time for him to respond. Waddams explained to Lehtonen that he thought it likely Fisher wanted to wait un-

⁸³ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Harjunpää to Douglas 8.2.1945.

⁸⁴ *Kmaa* 21/16.3.1945 Arkkikiispaksi nimitetty piispa Aleksi Lehtonen.

⁸⁵ LPL Bell papers vol.87 Eidem to Bell 13.1.1945.

⁸⁶ LPL Bell papers vol.87 Bell to Eidem 16.3.1945.

til the official ceremonies were concluded.⁸⁷ In this he was proved right; Fisher's reply came towards the end of March 1945 in grand style:

Thankfully remembering the close friendship which in the province of God has for many years existed between our Churches, I announce to you that in succession to our beloved Archbishop William, whose death has been so deeply lamented throughout Christendom, I have become Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan. Having been duly and canonically elected to the Archbishopric and my election thereto having been duly confirmed according to the constitution of the Realm of England by His Majesty King George VI, I took office in February 2.1945 [sic.] and am now awaiting the symbolic ceremony of enthronement in the historic Chair of St. Augustine, which if God so will is to take place on Thursday April nineteenth.

I trust that the happy and brotherly bonds which have existed between our predecessors, may be continued and be strengthened between ourselves and that the fellowship in Christ our Lord and Saviour which binds our Churches together may be ever increased in mutual understanding and service and may be used by God to His Glory, to the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ here in earth and to the true peace and well being of all the families of mankind.

Asking your prayers for myself and for the Church to the primatial throne of which I have been called and praying that God will bless richly yourself, your brother clergy and the people of the Church of Finland,

I am,
Your Grace's devoted brother in Christ,
GEOFFREY
Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all
England and Metropolitan.⁸⁸

It was fortunate indeed that Lehtonen was familiar with Church of England people and culture. It is likely that most of Lehtonen's Finnish colleagues would have been persuaded by Fisher's style that he came from the high church party of the Church of England, which was most certainly not the case. No Church of England party could have claimed Fisher as theirs.⁸⁹ Signals about churchmanship did not translate from one church to the other very well, which easily resulted in misunderstandings and false assumptions in their relations.

Leaving aside the grand words, it is likely that Lehtonen was pleased to read Fisher's assurance that he wished to continue and strengthen "the

⁸⁷ KA AL 34 Waddams to Lehtonen 23.1.1945.

⁸⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Fisher to Lehtonen 26.3.1945.

⁸⁹ *Carpenter* 1991, 14.

happy and brotherly bonds which have existed between our predecessors".⁹⁰ He was surely no less pleased to find himself introduced to the British public by *The Church Times*, which reported his nomination.⁹¹

The article began with an explanation of the mechanism of the election process, and introduced Lehtonen's clerical and academic career under the title "Professor and Liturgiologist." The anonymous author considered that Lehtonen's high qualifications made him well suited for the Primate's office. Particular weight was given to his liturgiological work: "The new Archbishop is a noted liturgiologist, and has done much to awaken a deeper appreciation of liturgical worship among both Finnish clergy and laity."⁹² Evidently, the *Church Times* considered this one of Lehtonen's chief merits.

The last paragraph of the article was entitled "A Friend of England". Lehtonen was introduced as a well-known and frequent visitor to England, who had "furthered a reliable and sympathetic knowledge about Great Britain, its Christian tradition and especially about the Church of England" in his own country through his lectures and writings. Lehtonen's ecumenical achievements included both playing "a leading part in reunion movements" like the Edinburgh Conference of 1937, at which he had acted as one of the chairmen, and especially in the negotiations between the Church of England and the Church of Finland, in which "the new Archbishop [had] played a leading part."⁹³

On the whole, the short article portrayed the new Archbishop in a very positive light, as a learned liturgiologist and able ecumenist, who had a deep and sympathetic knowledge of Great Britain in general and the Church of England in particular. This was surely how Lehtonen would have wanted himself described in England and was probably written by one of his old English friends: Dean Duncan-Jones or the Rev. C.B. Moss, perhaps.

Good news followed on good news. Waddams continued very much on the same lines in his own introduction of Lehtonen in the Religious Division's magazine *The Spiritual Issues of the War*:

Archbishop Lehtonen has played an active part in the Ecumenical Movement, and has strong ties with Britain and particularly with English Churchmen. His English friends, and many English Christians who do not know him personally, will

⁹⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Fisher to Lehtonen 26.3.1945.

⁹¹ CT 23.3.1945 The Lutheran Primate of Finland.

⁹² CT 23.3.1945 The Lutheran Primate of Finland.

⁹³ CT 23.3.1945 The Lutheran Primate of Finland.

learn with great interest of his appointment to the highest Church office in Finland. The new Archbishop has a very wide knowledge of the English language and of the English theological writing. He played an important part on the Finnish side in achieving an agreement with representatives of the Church of England during the negotiations to establish closer relations between the Churches of England and Finland. Under his leadership it may be expected that the Church of Finland will play its full part in those affairs of common interest to all Christians throughout the world.⁹⁴

Waddams was pleased that it was Lehtonen who had been elected. Whatever his reservations regarding the sending of a delegation, he was anxious to give Britain a favourable introduction to Lehtonen.

Naturally, Archbishop Lehtonen was very pleased when Waddams' article reached him. He wrote to his friend the Rev. Professor Eelis Gulin, expressing his view that relations with the West had recovered excellently and reasoned that it was indeed Waddams, who had written those "overtly friendly lines".⁹⁵ Lehtonen retained happy memories of Waddams' visit and never knew what a critical report of his Finnish experience he had written.⁹⁶

In spite of his rejoicing, Lehtonen forbade Gulin from alerting the Finnish newspapers to the articles. He preferred to nurture relations with the western churches quietly. Lehtonen was anxious as much as possible to avoid public awareness of relations with the western churches, fearing that it might prove counter-productive by causing problems with the Finnish communists or Soviet observers.⁹⁷ Gulin followed Lehtonen's orders: the matter received no publicity in Finland.

Spring advanced and the Archbishops were enthroned. The Church of England invited representatives from the Nordic Lutheran Churches, but the immediate post-war period in Europe did not favour the sending of delegations. The Lutheran Churches of Denmark, Finland and Sweden were represented at the Enthronement by their Seamen's Pastors in London, while Bishop Arne Fjellbu represented the Norwegian Church.⁹⁸ This reflected the fact that of all the Nordic Churches and nations the Norwegians

⁹⁴ *The Spiritual Issues of the War* 281/29.3.1945 New Finnish Archbishop.

⁹⁵ KA EG 11 Lehtonen to Gulin 25.4.1945.

⁹⁶ *Ripatti* 1990, 88; *Ketola* 2004, 101.

⁹⁷ KA EG 11 Lehtonen to Gulin 25.4.1945; *Ripatti* 1990, 88.

⁹⁸ LPL Douglas papers vol.76. 36a Enthronement of Dr. G. Fisher as Archbishop of Canterbury on 19th April 1945. Council on Foreign Relations Party of Foreign Clergy and Others; *Kmaa* 28/17.4.1945 Canterbury arkkipiispan virkaanastujaiset; *Fsb* 16/19.4.1945 Eidem och Lehtonen inbjudna till England.

had at the time perhaps the closest relations with Great Britain in general and the Church of England in particular. The King of Norway had spent the war in London as a refugee and there was a strong political alliance between the countries.⁹⁹ In practice this meant more to the public than the closer theological relations the Church of England enjoyed with the Swedish and Finnish Churches.

Still, Finnish Seamen's Pastor Harjunpää made his mark. Fisher wrote later to Lehtonen thanking him for Harjunpää's participation and the message he had conveyed from Lehtonen at the enthronement:

May I say that during the war I have had many opportunities of meeting him and have greatly valued his friendship? I am glad that it was through his hands that your kind message reached me. I thank you for it sincerely.

I trust that the Bishop of Fulham will be present at your Enthronement to represent the Church of England. He will take the assurance of our prayers and sympathy. May God's blessing rest richly upon us to forward the fellowship of our two Churches which has been firmly established by our consultations in past years and of their witness to the world of the faith of Christ.¹⁰⁰

It is safe to assume that Lehtonen's greeting had contained a reference to the previous consultations between the churches, which Fisher acknowledged while confirming that the Bishop of Fulham was to take part in Lehtonen's installation. The esteem in which Harjunpää was held by the new Archbishop is notable. It is no exaggeration to suggest that his service as Seamen's Pastor in London had been exceptional in his careful nurturing of ecumenical relations.

In Finland the election of the new Archbishop of Canterbury received extensive if not entirely flawless coverage in the church newspapers. For example, the Finnish language newspapers initially used the German spelling of Fisher, taking their cue from the Finnish Office of Information (STT).¹⁰¹ This apparently insignificant detail reflects the reality of Finnish society's stronger ties with Germany and Central Europe than with Anglo-American culture.

However, at least Finnish church circles were interested in news about the Church of England, which was more than could be said of the Church

⁹⁹ Österlin 1995, 278.

¹⁰⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Fisher to Lehtonen 1.6.1945.

¹⁰¹ *Kmaa* 2/9.1.1945 Canterburyn arkkipiispaksi tohtori Fischer; *Fsb* 2/11.1.1945 Nu ärkebiskop av Canterbury; *Hjä* 2/12.1.1945 Canterburyn arkkipiispaksi tohtori Fischer.

of England newspapers, which evinced little interest in Finnish affairs, whether political or ecclesiastical, after the war. *The Church Times* showed some interest in European issues, whereas *The Record* (later *The Church of England Newspaper*) showed almost none.¹⁰² This vividly illustrates the difference between the average members of both churches: the Finns were somewhat ignorant but interested; the English were simply ignorant about what was going on in the other church.

The installation of Lehtonen as the forty-eighth Bishop of Turku and eighth Archbishop of Turku and Finland took place on 10 June 1945 in, for Finland, exceptionally festive style.¹⁰³ The foreign visitors, Archbishop Erling Eidem of Uppsala, Bishop Staunton Batty of Fulham representing the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Anglican Chaplain in Stockholm the Rev. C.H. Jones acting as Bishop's Chaplain, arrived from Stockholm by boat on Friday 8 June. On Saturday, they visited Turku Cathedral and the nearby Archbishop's house. The installation took place on Sunday after which Batty and Jones continued to Helsinki.¹⁰⁴

The installation took the form of a Service of the Word. It began with a service of prayer and thanksgiving for the end of the war and the liberation of Denmark and Norway. This was led by Archbishop Lehtonen, who also preached. After the sermon the assisting Bishops and clergy proceeded to the chancel and the service continued with intercessions, led by Archbishop Lehtonen, joined by Archbishop Eidem and Bishop Batty in Swedish and English. The service concluded with the installation of Archbishop Lehtonen with the Apostolic blessing.¹⁰⁵ The foreign visitors had a prominent role in the service, which served to reinforce what was already well known: that the new Archbishop had a good eye for symbol and celebration.

Along with all the Finnish bishops and many clergy, the Installation was attended by the highest representatives of the Finnish secular establishment. President Mannerheim, Prime Minister J.K. Paasikivi and other representatives of the Government and the army were present, and the installation was broadcast live on Finnish Radio. At the end of the service both the President

¹⁰² *CT* 1945-1951; *Record* 1945-1951.

¹⁰³ *Ripatti* 1990, 130-132.

¹⁰⁴ *Kmaa* 40/5.6.1945 Esirukousjumalanpalvelus arkkipiispan virkaanastumisen johdosta ensi sunnuntaina Turussa; 42/12.6.1945 Piispa Batty saarnannut Helsingissä.

¹⁰⁵ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Kirkko luomaan rakkauden mieltä!

and the Prime Minister gave their personal congratulations, before continuing to lunch with other dignitaries at the Archbishop's house, where they gave further speeches to the new Archbishop.¹⁰⁶ The installation was thus an ecclesiastical, but also a national, event of the highest importance.

This was underlined by the Finnish church newspapers, which published President Mannerheim's speech in full on their front pages. The gist of Mannerheim's speech was that this was a time when people were searching for consolation and strength from the fear of God and religion. However, the President continued that "the hard-pressed times have always been the times of grace as well".¹⁰⁷ The traditional link between the nation and the national Lutheran church was clear:

Bearing in mind these thoughts I wish you, the Primate of our Church, success in your responsible and high office, and strength to our Evangelical Lutheran Church to give to the sons and daughters of this nation that support, which they so dearly need in finding a right way through the storms of the age.

At the same time, I wish to express our gratitude towards the Churches of Great Britain and Sweden, who have honoured this occasion by sending their high representatives, and let us value this fleeting moment in their company.¹⁰⁸

President Mannerheim's speech echoed well Mr. Shepherd's account of the Finnish Church to Colonel-General Zhdanov. For both, the Finnish Church was a source of strength, support and unity for the Finnish people. And perhaps Mannerheim's erroneous reference to 'the Church of Great Britain' was a symptom of more than mere ignorance; the President may have been trying to accord a greater political importance to Bishop Batty's visit than it actually had.

The same themes continued in the other speeches. The Prime Minister emphasized the increasing value of spiritual work, which meant that the church had an important role in the life of the nation. Archbishop Eidem in his turn spoke of the ties which connected the people of Sweden and Finland, and which were closer than ever before, while Bishop Batty underlined the importance of the relations between the churches.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Kirkko luomaan rakkauden mieltä!; *SK* 25/23.6.1945 'Ensimmäinen vertaistensa joukossa'.

¹⁰⁷ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Ahtaat ajat ovat aina myös armon aikoja.

¹⁰⁸ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Ahtaat ajat ovat aina myös armon aikoja.

¹⁰⁹ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Kirkko luomaan rakkauden mieltä!

It is noteworthy that all the dignitaries emphasized the need for unity. However, it was Batty who was most emphatic, encouraging the churches to learn from the great political movements, which had drawn their strength from their unity. They should learn from the enthusiasm of the Nazis and Bolsheviks for their cause. The great future tasks of reconstruction could only be met if the churches and Christians found a way to each other.¹¹⁰ Christianity was competing with rival ideologies. This view foreshadowed the transition from war to Cold War; Bishop Batty was alone in explicitly mentioning Nazism and Bolshevism. No Finn would have risked such a statement, lest it be interpreted as a provocation by the Allied Control Commission led by the Soviet representatives.

Batty's visit and participation at the installation was well received in Finland. For example, the traditionally ecumenically reserved *Herättäjä* rejoiced that it was Batty who had represented the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Installation. "The inconvenience of travelling and advanced age did not hinder this friendly churchman in travelling to our distant country."¹¹¹ His message was appreciated and his presence probably conveyed to the Finns the sense that they had not been forgotten by the international community.

Following the installation Batty and Jones continued their journey to visit the local Anglican chaplaincy in Helsinki.¹¹² This was not the first visit for either of them. Jones knew the place especially well, having been the Anglican Chaplain in Helsinki before the war.¹¹³ They were thus familiar and eagerly anticipated visitors to the chaplaincy, which had been cut off from its clergy during the war. The core of the chaplaincy was made up of elderly ladies who had fled from St Petersburg during the Russian Revolution, established their church, made their home, and latterly endured war-time privations in Helsinki. There were some new faces, however, including the British Political Representative to the Allied Control Commission, Mr. Shepherd.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Kirkko luomaan rakkauden mieltä!

¹¹¹ *Hjä* 24/15.6.1945 Arkkipiispa Aleksi Lehtosen virkaanastumisjumalanpalvelus pidettiin viime sunnuntaina Turun tuomiokirkossa.

¹¹² *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Piispa Batty saarnannut Helsingissä.

¹¹³ *Fsb* 25/28.6.1945 Engelskt kyrkoherdeämbete åter i Helsingfors?

¹¹⁴ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Piispa Batty saarnannut Helsingissä.

If this small Anglican chaplaincy was largely unknown to the Finnish public, it would get its share of media interest during the Bishop's visit. *Kotimaa* reported the service Batty and Jones conducted on Monday and noted that the lessons were read by Mr. Shepherd along with 'a high-ranking Naval Officer'.¹¹⁵ *Kotimaa*'s 'high-ranking Naval Officer' was Commodore R.M. Howie, who led the British element in the Allied Control Commission. Apart from Howie, the British contingent included Captain P.D. Kelly and Colonel J.H. Magill, who knew the Finnish people and language well.¹¹⁶ Magill was exceptional as for most British expatriates in Finland Swedish – if any – was the only local language spoken. It was thus natural that their social links were usually directed towards Swedish-speaking circles in Helsinki.

Not surprisingly, only the Swedish language *Församlingsbladet* was able later to report the substance of Bishop Batty's negotiations concerning the reorganisation of the chaplaincy, revealing that the question of sending a new Anglican Chaplain to Helsinki had been discussed.¹¹⁷ In February Harjunpää had already tried to approach Batty through Douglas to recommend the Rev. A. Cotter, who had lived in Finland and spoke Finnish, Swedish and Russian.¹¹⁸ Whether Douglas had passed Harjunpää's suggestion on to Batty is unknown; but Batty did not mention Cotter during his visit.

Batty left Finland convinced of the good will and appreciation his visit had gained, as he recalled later the same year to Waddams:

The enthronement of Lehtonen went off very well and at a luncheon afterwards both the Archbishop and the President spoke very warmly in appreciation of my visit. I met all the Finnish Bishops and very many of the clergy. The Finnish church is evidently very Pro-British and very anxious to deepen our relations with it.¹¹⁹

The reference to Finnish Church being 'evidently very Pro-British' is likely to have stemmed from Archbishop Lehtonen's personal influence and the general appreciation given to Batty during his visit. Finnish society in general viewed Great Britain positively at the time and wanted to strengthen ties with it. It is likely that this appreciation was motivated more by the po-

¹¹⁵ *Kmaa* 42/12.6.1945 Piispa Batty saarnanut Helsingissä.

¹¹⁶ *Magill* 1981, 108-109; *Seppinen*, 2008, 22.

¹¹⁷ *Fsb* 25/28.6.1945 Engelskt kyrkoherdeämbete åter i Helsingfors?

¹¹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Harjunpää to Douglas 8.2.1945.

¹¹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Batty to Waddams 1.11.1945.

litical situation than theological interest. The former concerned everyone, the latter only a small group of ecumenically minded churchmen.

3. Lehtonen's theological programme in his Encyclical Letter, 1945

a. 'Evangelical Catholicism' affords a natural link with Anglicanism

According to Finnish custom, Archbishop Lehtonen issued an encyclical book for his diocese on the eve of his installation. This provided Lehtonen an opportunity to present an overview of his theology to the general public. The book was somewhat unimaginatively entitled *Paimenkirje 1945 (Encyclical Letter, 1945)*. There were no subtitles, but the material was well structured and coherent addressing the following themes: *introduction and predecessors*¹²⁰, *the present time of crisis*¹²¹, *the need for unity in Christendom*¹²², *Church order*¹²³, *the development of Church order in Lutheranism*¹²⁴, *the need for a dynamic ecclesiology in the Finnish Church*¹²⁵, *the ecumenical and international relations of the Finnish Church*¹²⁶, *the tasks of the Church universal*¹²⁷, *the Finnish Folk Church*¹²⁸, *the clergy*¹²⁹, *the laity*¹³⁰, *church administration*¹³¹, *Lehtonen's affection for his native region of South-West Finland*¹³² and *conclusion*¹³³. These themes revealed much about Lehtonen's interests and concerns: he had, for his time, an unusually strong interest in ecclesiology,

¹²⁰ *Lehtonen 1945*, 5-12.

¹²¹ *Lehtonen 1945*, 12-23.

¹²² *Lehtonen 1945*, 23-37.

¹²³ *Lehtonen 1945*, 37-41.

¹²⁴ *Lehtonen 1945*, 41-46.

¹²⁵ *Lehtonen 1945*, 46-58.

¹²⁶ *Lehtonen 1945*, 58-64.

¹²⁷ *Lehtonen 1945*, 64-73.

¹²⁸ *Lehtonen 1945*, 73-78.

¹²⁹ *Lehtonen 1945*, 78-89.

¹³⁰ *Lehtonen 1945*, 89-97.

¹³¹ *Lehtonen 1945*, 97-100.

¹³² *Lehtonen 1945*, 100-104.

¹³³ *Lehtonen 1945*, 104-105.

which made him something of a high churchman among his brother bishops. Furthermore, Lehtonen's ecclesiology was influenced by the evangelical catholic theology of the interwar years, which gave him a special empathy for Anglican theology in particular and ecumenism in general.

The evangelical catholic influence in Lehtonen's theology was partly due to the many colleagues and older friends he had met through the ecumenical movement. The most prominent of these was the great former Archbishop of Uppsala, Nathan Söderblom, whose legacy influenced all the Nordic ecumenists at the time.¹³⁴ Besides Söderblom, Lehtonen was influenced by the Swedish Young Church Movement. Lehtonen was also much interested in the theology of the more explicit proponents of evangelical catholicity, among them the German Professor Friedrich Heiler, about whom he had written as early as 1925, on the Lutheran side, and the Bishop of Derby, A.E. John Rawlinson, with whom he had become acquainted during the negotiations between the churches, on the Anglican side.¹³⁵

However, there was something home-grown, and particularly South Western Finnish, in Lehtonen's high church Lutheranism. Lehtonen dedicated the first pages to his beloved Archdiocese of Turku, which, he considered, bore "a particularly binding weight of holy traditions".¹³⁶ His reverence for tradition and continuity was no less marked when he described those of his predecessors he could personally remember and their particular gifts:

Now they are gone. We, having received the shepherd's staff after our teachers, for the time between the labour of our predecessors and successors, feel gratitude for the precious inheritance handed to us. But the Church of Christ is one, in paradise and on earth. I believe that the blessing of departed friends, who have been called to peace, is with us, whose ministry falls in this time of trouble. There is a long succession behind us.¹³⁷

Lehtonen continued by quoting one of the Finnish Lutheran All Saints' and All Souls' tide hymns emphasizing the unity of the Church militant with the Church triumphant.¹³⁸ For Lehtonen death was no obstacle to the unity of the Church.

¹³⁴ *Nokkala* 1951, 125; *Ryman* 2005a, 51-52; *Ryman* 2005b, 63-64.

¹³⁵ *Lehtonen* 1922; *Nokkala* 1951, 122-128; *Brodd* 1982, 169-181, 326-327; *Ryman* 2005a, 52-54.

¹³⁶ *Lehtonen* 1945, 5.

¹³⁷ *Lehtonen* 1945, 11-12.

¹³⁸ *Lehtonen* 1945, 12.

Archbishop Lehtonen's tone, while identifiably Finnish Lutheran, closely mirrored the mainstream Anglican theology of the time.¹³⁹ This resulted from the similar ethos of ecumenically minded liberal catholic Anglican and evangelical catholic Lutheran circles during the inter-war years. That similarity notwithstanding, the Anglican side was never entirely comfortable with the attribute 'evangelical'. For them, the term referred particularly to pietistic motivated churchmanship, whereas in Nordic and Continental theology the term signified in the main belonging to the Protestant tradition. Thus liberal and evangelical catholicism can be seen as analogous terms born in different cultures.¹⁴⁰

Lehtonen's debt to evangelical catholicism is explicit in his description of recent theological development in the section *the need for unity in Christendom*. He was happy that theology was returning to the classical confession of Christ and considered that this was due to a rising "historical-ecclesial" interest throughout Christendom:

There is a new awareness of the rich inheritance of the Church. Following a time of subjectivism, there is a longing for objectivism, as well as tradition and authority. In many countries, this longing has given birth to an evangelical-high-church movement (although in our country only on the Swedish-speaking side). The word "high church" has a negative echo in common consciousness. Usually, it is understood to include the kind of thinking which stresses the external power and "benefits" of the church and the clergy. The ecclesial movement to which I refer is however completely different in essence. This is illustrated by a comparison of its aims with the earlier "high church" movement in Finland, which was a product of a train of thought according to which everything necessary in the priestly ministry was done if the letter of Canon Law were met. -- [Against this] The high-church movements in Christendom today usually place a high emphasis on the confessing of Christ (see for example the first chapter of HEILER's book *Im Ringen um die Kirche*). 'High church' in this context signifies high thoughts, not of oneself, but of the vocation of the Church. Usually, this includes the noble ideals of a serving Church and a clergy sacrificially coming close to people of all classes, but particularly those poor neighbours, who live in the utmost misery and destitution oppressed by hard social conditions. These thoughts have created many inspiring and noble priestly characters in modern church history both at home and in the mission fields. They have also, and this is what I especially mean to say, greatly contributed to the new, joyful personal confession of Christ around Christendom. In these circles the liturgy is not about aesthetic atmosphere or fancy rhetoric. On the contrary, it is about a serious

¹³⁹ Love's Redeeming Work 2003, 369-376.

¹⁴⁰ *Brodd* 1982, 169-181.

confession of the basic truths of the faith and is often austere in form (following the western model).¹⁴¹

For Lehtonen, evangelical catholicism meant the Church's sacrificial service in the world arising from a personal and full confession of Christ. This can be seen as a point of convergence between the catholic principle of *Imitatio Christi* and the evangelical demand for personal conversion and insistence on a growth in holiness. As such it came close to traditional Anglican piety with its strong emphasis on sanctification, holiness and worship. In a Finnish Lutheran context, this feature of the Archbishop's theology was often viewed with suspicion.¹⁴²

Lehtonen's reference to the "many inspiring and noble priestly characters" of a high church tradition working with the poor is most likely to have been inspired by Christian Socialism and the Anglo-Catholic slum priests of the Church of England.¹⁴³ Lehtonen had become acquainted with English urban social challenges at the World Student Christian Federation's meeting in Liverpool in 1912, about which he reminisced elsewhere in the book.¹⁴⁴

In his view, the churches should unite in a common endeavour to organise foreign missions, witness at home and tackle social challenges. In Finland, emphasis on ecumenism and a social Gospel was viewed as somewhat radical, especially by the pietists, who were especially unsettled by the defence of the value of social work in the saving of individual souls.¹⁴⁵ On the other hand, this emphasis on social responsibility was calculated to gain the support of the younger, so-called *Brothers in Arms* clergy, who had learned from the war the value of such endeavours and could no longer return to the old world of separation between the clergy and the ordinary working man.¹⁴⁶

Similarly, Lehtonen's distinction between the sacrificial and serving high church ideal and the romantic love of ritual or the fascination with "the beauty of holiness" may have derived from a cultural protestant influence, but was especially important, bearing in mind that a large proportion of

¹⁴¹ Lehtonen 1945, 28-30.

¹⁴² Gulin 1952, 59; Love's Redeeming Work 2003, 369-376.

¹⁴³ Lehtonen 1945, 69-70; Nokkala 1951, 131-132; Hastings 1998, 82, 174-175; Love's Redeeming Work 2003, 370.

¹⁴⁴ Lehtonen 1945, 69-70.

¹⁴⁵ Lehtonen 1945, 64-73.

¹⁴⁶ Ahola 2001, 485-486; Seppo 2001, 214-215.

the people of his diocese and the Church of Finland were strict pietists for whom the distinction between inner faith (good) and the external form of religion (bad or secondary) was of grave importance.

Indeed, Lehtonen's outlook, while not anti-catholic, was at least anti-Roman, and to some extent it was informed by his cultural protestant heritage. This was most often seen in his suspicion of the Roman Catholic Church and in a hint of a cultural protestant superiority complex concerning scientific progress and ethics.¹⁴⁷ In this as in so many other ways he followed in the footsteps of leading ecumenists and church leaders of the previous generation such as Archbishop Nathan Söderblom and the great liberal catholic Bishop Charles Gore, who had embraced the word 'catholic' while remaining suspicious of Rome.¹⁴⁸ Like them, Lehtonen did not reject catholicism as the antithesis of evangelicalism – probably the most common stance adopted by his fellow Finnish Lutherans. However, that stance had to be taken into consideration. This was perhaps the reason why the *Encyclical Letter, 1945* appears as the first truly public occasion on which Lehtonen expressed his support for high church ideals.¹⁴⁹

Nevertheless, Lehtonen was not really a party man and tried to avoid controversies of churchmanship for the sake of the unity of his diocese.¹⁵⁰ This is demonstrated by his conciliatory description of the traditional Finnish Lutheran pietistic revival movements, which were to some extent the Finnish Lutheran equivalent of Anglican party divisions.¹⁵¹ Similarly, Church of England party labels could not easily be applied to him, as his churchmanship bore points of convergence with all the parties: he shared the Anglo-Catholic concern for the freedom of the Church; agreed with the liberal churchmen on the vital importance of free academic study; and emphasized with the evangelicals the place of Christian mission and revival both at home and abroad. Among his own, Lehtonen was a high churchman; in Church of England terms he would have been a mainstream Anglican.

¹⁴⁷ *Lehtonen* 1945, 20.

¹⁴⁸ *Brodd* 1982, 132-134, 138-146; *Hastings* 1998, 82-83.

¹⁴⁹ *Nokkala* 1951, 130.

¹⁵⁰ The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000; *Aurola* 1951, 94-95.

¹⁵¹ *Lehtonen* 1945, 48-54.

b. Lehtonen seeks convergence on the understanding of ministry

As the inter-war Anglican-Lutheran dialogues had demonstrated, the key issue in relations between the two traditions remained the ministry of the Church.¹⁵² Archbishop Lehtonen devoted much space to this topic in his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*. In his section on *the Church order*, Lehtonen rejoiced that as theology in general was increasingly returning to a positive confession of the divine revelation, so protestant Christendom had begun to return to a traditional understanding of church order. This stemmed from the amazing discovery that the churches whose leadership was based on historical tradition had survived best under hostile conditions.¹⁵³

However, Lehtonen framed his understanding of apostolicity in general and the apostolic succession in particular in a typically Nordic Lutheran way, which presented something of a challenge to most contemporary Anglican theologians:

Only a superficial mind, misled by deceptive phrases, might imagine that this only means something approaching a magical notion that the so-called apostolic succession implies that the external laying on of hands, passing from the Apostles to their successors and from them to successive generations of bishops, could through a mechanical, external act pass mystical powers to the one consecrated (a vulgar catholic notion). On the contrary, the fact that the episcopal ministry has been passed from one generation to another by the historical, episcopal consecration means above all that the whole Church, yesterday as today, is behind this ministry of leadership. In other words, the ministry of bishop can be given to a person only by the Church, the Church of Christ, which is behind it both throughout the Christian centuries leading from the early Church to the Church today. No one can declare himself a bishop, nor can the state give or take away episcopal or any other ministry. They come from the Lord of the Church through His Church. Only thus will the person appointed be *rite vocatus*. The authorization for the episcopal ministry does not come from the state or any other secular authority, but the authorization comes from God and His word. The state does not dictate what the bishops and priests of the Church should proclaim; they must proclaim the word of God purely and in unadulterated form, paying no attention to the popular whim. The Church must give Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and God what belongs to Him, but what belongs to Caesar is ordered by God and His holy word - not Caesar.

-- The authorization for the ministry comes from God and his Church. This was the stand taken by the Bishops of the Church of Norway in the recent violent conflict. Even when discharged they let everyone know: we still have our authorization, which we have received from the Church of God, and we are bound to it, unless

¹⁵² Österlin 1995, 256-260.

¹⁵³ Lehtonen 1945, 36-38.

the Church itself let us leave. The parishes also upheld this principle, that only those who had been *rite vocati* were real bishops.¹⁵⁴

Lehtonen's use of the Norwegian Church's struggle as an example of the defence of the historic episcopate was the more remarkable for the fact that the Norwegian Lutheran Church did not enjoy formal apostolic succession in the Anglican understanding, although it had always been episcopally ordered. He proposed a wider perspective of the historic episcopate than was common in the Anglican theology of his day.¹⁵⁵ Not only did his vigorous criticism of the mechanical understanding of the apostolic succession arise simply from a protestant denial of what was seen as anti-evangelical; it also paved the way for a positive understanding of the broad historic episcopate among his more protestant readers.

Nevertheless, Lehtonen was careful to continue that an appreciation of traditional Church order "should not lead to interpretations foreign to Evangelical confession", even if he did not want to reject the formal signs altogether, as indeed some other Lutherans had done. For Lehtonen "the external forms, tested through the Church's history, are a gift, not just something exchanged overnight, or the matters of mere temporary arrangements or titles."¹⁵⁶ He was thus strongly against an over simple or superficial understanding of the apostolicity of the Church. On the one hand, apostolicity was much more than the mere mechanical passing of the apostolic succession according to the traditional 'pipeline' theory; on the other, it was something so central to the Church's historical self-understanding that it could not be changed overnight.

While affirming the centrality of Christ in a truly traditional Lutheran way, Lehtonen condemned spiritualism, separating as it did soul from body, the spiritual from the material, form from essence, as a false interpretation of the Reformation tradition:

The Church has no refuge in things external. Were the precious historical tradition of the Church to tumble down, the Church of Christ, sustained by word and sacraments, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, would remain. The foundation of the Church is Christ, who holds it together. Yet at the same time we appreciate the valuable temporal orders God has given us. I repeat: form and essence, spirit and its temporal appearance are not against each other. Let us not slide into one-sided spiritualism. The soul has a body. And so the forms of our confes-

¹⁵⁴ *Lehtonen* 1945, 38-39.

¹⁵⁵ *Norris* 1999, 343-344; *Tjørhum* 2002, 168-169.

¹⁵⁶ *Lehtonen* 1945, 40; *Tjørhum* 2002, 168-169.

sions; the poetic verse of our spiritual hymns; the richly decorated mementoes of our old churches; the high uplifting vaults of Turku Cathedral, for centuries sanctified by hymns of prayer and thanksgiving, are all dear to us. The same applies to the traditional order of our church. It is indeed especially valuable, because through it we are clearly bound to past Christian generations in the north, who prayed and fought, were joyful and gave thanks and laid the Christian foundation for the future of generations yet unborn.¹⁵⁷

Lehtonen's interpretation was informed by an urgent desire for the synthesis of evangelical faith and catholic order, because he supported the unity and richness of tradition against protestant reductionism. In this, as well as in his criticism of an institutional understanding of the Church, he very much trod the path of Söderblom.¹⁵⁸ It is noteworthy that when Lehtonen was less careful to defend high church ideals against the more obvious low church criticism concerning 'love of the externals', his love of tradition and ritual became clearly visible.

In another section, in which he discussed the role of *the clergy*, Lehtonen, while warning his readers of the fact that the word 'Church' had been too often understood to mean only the clergy, followed the traditional Lutheran line according to which the ordained ministry was one of the constituting elements of the Church, the others being the word and sacraments.¹⁵⁹ During the 1930s negotiations with the Church of England one of the questions of the Finnish delegation concerned the constitutive elements of the Church. They had asked about the place of the word for Anglicans as a Church-constituting element, since the Lutheran divines placed most emphasis on it.¹⁶⁰ In Lehtonen's *Encyclical Letter, 1945*, the word of God was certainly the first element, but the sacraments and ministry followed and were equally ordained by God.¹⁶¹ The ordained ministry was essential for the Church and Lehtonen placed a strong emphasis on it, albeit in a very Lutheran way, stressing the importance of the word of God.

To make his point Lehtonen emphasized another kind of succession, a *succession homi-letica*, from the time God spoke to the first human in paradise. He quoted the Finnish Lutheran liturgy of ordination to the priesthood, which he understood as emphasizing the same truly Lutheran under-

¹⁵⁷ Lehtonen 1945, 40-41.

¹⁵⁸ Brodd 1982, 134; Hytönen 1997, 36.

¹⁵⁹ Lehtonen 1945, 78-79.

¹⁶⁰ Negotiations 1933-1934, 9.

¹⁶¹ Lehtonen 1945, 79.

standing of ministry as the ministry of the word of God and preaching.¹⁶² However, Lehtonen's view was much more sacramental than was perhaps the case for most Finnish Lutherans at the time:

There is a grace which comes through the ministry. Prayer is heard. The charismas are given for the forthcoming tasks on the journey.

The Lord has given authorization by the solemn mediation of his Church. He, the Great High Priest, has placed the task in our hands through grace. *Vocatio interna* and *vocatio externa* come to us from God. We, who are ordained to the sacred ministry, belong to ourselves no more. "So Jesus said to them again, "Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost - !" (John 20.21-23) The Lord Himself is at work in the ordination to the priesthood as in Baptism and the Eucharist, where He Himself baptizes and consecrates through a human hand (Luther). The living Christ calls, ordains to, and installs in the sacred pastoral ministry.¹⁶³

In his approach to ministry as in many other matters, Lehtonen was inclined to follow the old high church interpretation of the Lutheran Reformation against the more recent continental tendency to confuse the particular ministry of the Church with the priesthood of all believers. While he kept the latter in high regard, he did not confuse it with the former.¹⁶⁴

There is, however, another remarkably Lutheran feature of Lehtonen's understanding of ministry, which is revealed in his more or less synonymous use of the Finnish terms ministry or priesthood (*pappisvirka*) and magisterium (*opetusvirka*).¹⁶⁵ This probably stemmed from the traditional Lutheran doctrine of the fundamental unity of the ministry, which held that there was but one ministry ordained by Christ (*iure divino*), adapted in the Church's history to the threefold form, which was the fruit of human reason (*iure humano*). Thus the distinction between the ministry of a bishop and that of a priest was practical or functional rather than divinely ordained, which was another challenge for much of Anglican theology.¹⁶⁶

Nevertheless, Lehtonen's theology of ministry converged significantly with the Anglican understanding, but this originated mainly from the common roots of the western tradition and the lessons of the ecumenical movement. It was not based on concessions or a betrayal of the Lutheran tradi-

¹⁶² *Lehtonen* 1945, 79-81.

¹⁶³ *Lehtonen* 1945, 79-80.

¹⁶⁴ *Lehtonen* 1945, 89-91.

¹⁶⁵ *Lehtonen* 1945, 78-79.

¹⁶⁶ *Norris* 1999, 335-337; *Gritsch* 2002, 37, 103-104.

tion, but on a readiness to evaluate and reassess its meaning in the light of reason and tradition. He lived in an *ecclesia semper reformanda* and preferred a dynamic to a static ecclesiology.¹⁶⁷ This is another marked similarity with Anglican theology and its traditional emphasis on scripture, reason and tradition.

Furthermore, Lehtonen's understanding of ordained ministry came very close to the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral's position that "The Historic Episcopate" should be "locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."¹⁶⁸ Lehtonen was careful to stress that apostolic ministry and church order need not imply complete uniformity, but that there needed to be both an appreciation of and willingness to learn from the history of the Church. In Anglican-Lutheran relations, this meant that both sides had something to learn.

c. The ecumenical relations of the Finnish Church

Lehtonen was a strong advocate of *the ecumenical and international relations of the Finnish Church* and devoted a section to it in his book. This section followed his *need for a dynamic ecclesiology in the Finnish Church*, in which he had argued for peace both within and between the churches at the present time of crisis in Christendom. It is thus evident that he linked good ecumenical relations with the need for a united Christian front in the world. Indeed, Lehtonen responded to Finnish criticism of international ecumenical relations by explaining how important they had been during the war, when precisely those churches and churchmen with whom there had been personal ecumenical contacts had given the most humanitarian aid to Finland.¹⁶⁹ This was especially the case concerning the Nordic and American Lutherans and the Church of England.

Lehtonen urged the younger generation and especially the younger clergy to wake up to the importance of ecumenical relations. In his advocacy of ecumenism, he traced a long line of international contacts with the Finnish Church from the Finnish reformer Mikael Agricola onwards, and reminded

¹⁶⁷ *Nokkala* 1951, 130.

¹⁶⁸ Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1888.

¹⁶⁹ *Lehtonen* 1945, 58-59.

his readers that before he had been consecrated as Bishop of Turku, Johannes Gezelius the younger had studied the Bible in England for a long time, in spite of his father's advice to leave that 'heretical' country. It was said that every protestant clergyman should be able to express himself in at least one foreign language. In this respect standards had slipped.¹⁷⁰

Furthermore, Lehtonen cautioned his readers to adopt a degree of humility:

Let us also speak humbly of the fact that we are "the most Lutheran people in the world". It is indeed God's unspeakable goodness towards us that we have been allowed to drink abundantly from the deep springs of God's grace through Martin Luther. The essential mood of Lutheran Christianity, the feeling of our own unworthiness and God's grace as our only hope, has been deeply rooted in our Christian people. Lutheranism, with its liberating and positive spirit towards all noble secular work, has made its mark on the whole of our national civilisation and way of thinking. This is something about which we can rejoice, but any boasting about our Christianity being especially deep, must be rejected among our Christian brethren.¹⁷¹

This was an implicit criticism of the ultra-confessional, pietistic Lutheran line, which the Rev. Professor Osmo Tiililä of Helsinki University, for example, had promoted in Christian student circles.

Lehtonen considered that the benefits of having relations with other churches were twofold. First, the Finns received "new and often valuable stimuli and learning", but second, it was "often only then we really learn what is particularly precious in our midst. We become grateful for our Church of Finland, blessed with many graces. In this way, we are both inspired by the realisation of what our own calling is, and learn greater humility."¹⁷² Lehtonen's ecumenism was motivated by an openness to learn new things through dialogue with other churches. Throughout the book, many of the positive examples of what might be learned came from English Christianity and the Church of England.

Of all churches, however, Lehtonen considered the other Nordic Lutheran churches and particularly the Church of Sweden to be closest to the Finnish Church. They were united by a common history, protestant faith,

¹⁷⁰ *Lehtonen* 1945, 59-60.

¹⁷¹ *Lehtonen* 1945, 60.

¹⁷² *Lehtonen* 1945, 61.

more or less common church order and common goals.¹⁷³ However, in defining these close relations Lehtonen had no particular agenda to promote closer relations. This may have been the result of the already deep sense of unity among Nordic Lutherans, which led him to take these relations more or less for granted. If indeed there were problems between the Nordic Churches in the post-war world, they were more like family quarrels, which Lehtonen veiled, undoubtedly for the sake of unity.

It was Lehtonen's assessment that the Nordic Lutheran churches would share more common tasks in the future, because the centre of European Lutheranism was shifting towards them. The most pressing task for the Nordic Churches was the preservation of God's grace and gospel as the main point of the whole Christian faith.¹⁷⁴ By this, he clearly meant the Lutheran understanding and proclamation of justification by faith. Following evangelical catholic lines, he underlined that this was not the property of the Nordic churches, but was central to the Christian tradition which belonged to all churches:

Lutherans do not desire to make other Christians Lutherans. We only want to lead Christendom back to the spring of the greatest joy and power: to know God's incomprehensible love for sinners. This is the real gospel. Returning to it does not mean converting to Lutheranism but returning to primitive Christianity. Sadly St Paul's dogma of justification and grace suffered defeat as early as the second century. Moralism and legalism got the upper hand. Luther was graced to return to the primitive gospel of salvation and we received a wonderful inheritance. It has prevailed in our Nordic Churches, with varying degrees of clarity. It is the deepest undercurrent of our Nordic Lutheran folk Christianity. This treasure does not belong to a particular church but to the Church universal. It is the task of the Nordic Churches to share it with other Christian denominations, faithfully emphasizing it. The reformation has not nearly been concluded in this respect.¹⁷⁵

While quintessentially Lutheran in his demand for the centrality of justification by faith, Lehtonen's insistence on primitive Christianity and tradition, evangelical and catholic, in many ways resembled traditional Anglican theology, which drew from the Bible and the Fathers. The common denominator was the example of the primitive church and an understanding that the scope of ecumenism was drawing from and rediscovering the common

¹⁷³ *Lehtonen* 1945, 61-64. Lehtonen constantly referred to *four* Nordic Churches, omitting Iceland. Iceland had seceded from Denmark on 17 June 1944.

¹⁷⁴ *Lehtonen* 1945, 61-64.

¹⁷⁵ *Lehtonen* 1945, 63-64.

apostolic tradition, not promoting the uniform belonging to a particular church or denomination. For Lehtonen, the apex of the apostolic tradition was faithfulness to the gospel of salvation according to traditional Lutheran lines. This did not require conversion to Lutheranism, but the reformation of the whole church catholic on the evangelical principle of justification by faith. Keeping this on the ecumenical agenda was the special task of the Nordic Lutheran Churches.

In his consideration of the role of the Nordic Churches, Lehtonen followed closely Nathan Söderblom's thoughts and endeavours.¹⁷⁶ It is easy to see that the Nordic approach was his favoured position in world Lutheranism. It was Lehtonen's analysis that the development of church order had begun to go wrong in Germany even at the Reformation, when the bishops had not converted to an evangelical confession and Luther had had to relocate the external oversight of the Church to the secular government. The measure, intended to be temporary, had quickly become established and theologically justified. This was unlike Sweden, of which Finland was then part, where there was a milder development of oversight.¹⁷⁷ For Lehtonen, the liberty of the Church remained an essential feature of the Church's life. This linked naturally with the Finnish situation, in which the possibility of a communist coup or at least a hardening of the church's position in society had to be taken into consideration.

It is striking that Lehtonen never referred to the official negotiations between the Finnish Church and the Church of England in his book, the more so as the book otherwise gave such a positive view of England. The only possible reference was very implicit in nature and little can be made of it: in relation to other churches, Lehtonen argued that since the Church of Finland had never belonged to those protestant churches that were continually producing new confessions, it had gained a certain respect and position among even "the old catholic churches".¹⁷⁸ By this he clearly did not mean the continental Old Catholic Churches, but the churches with a catholic tradition like the Church of England.

The use of the word 'catholic' was remarkable, as Lehtonen usually avoided it in Finnish. When describing the evangelical catholic movement, for example, Lehtonen tended to replace 'catholic' with 'high church' in

¹⁷⁶ *Lauha* 1993, 43-55.

¹⁷⁷ *Lehtonen* 1945, 41-42.

¹⁷⁸ *Lehtonen* 1945, 30-31.

Finnish. This was a product of the old Finnish anti-catholicism, which meant that the word ‘catholic’ was almost exclusively reserved to signify either the Roman Catholics or the orthodox, who were officially called the Greek Catholics. Similarly, Lehtonen often used the word ‘protestant’ to mean ‘non-Roman and non-orthodox’.

The question, however, remains: why were the official relations with the Church of England missing from Lehtonen’s account? The only answer that comes to mind is that Lehtonen did not want to draw too much attention to this issue at the time. The same political caution resulted in the omission of a discussion of relations with western churches such as the American Lutherans and the traditional relations with the German Lutheran Churches. Yet Lehtonen remained unable or unwilling to conceal his Anglophile tendencies. Furthermore, he discussed matters clearly linked with Lutheran-Anglican relations, even if the relations themselves were not explicitly mentioned. Compared with the central and western European churches, Nordic church relations offered a safe channel to support and continue the western realignment of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland.

d. The revival of church life on high church principles

Besides foreign relations, Archbishop Lehtonen’s ecclesiology was intensely focused on Finnish church life. He argued for a dynamic ecclesiology, in which all the Finnish Lutheran revival movements, a range of new working methods and organisations would make their own contribution for the benefit of all.¹⁷⁹ Lehtonen’s comprehensive approach was very similar to the middle-of-the-road Anglican insistence on unity and tolerance.

According to Lehtonen’s dynamic ecclesiology, the Church and Christianity should resemble “a flowing river, living, reaching towards its goal, in order that the sacred vocation of the Church should ever better be realised, and that the Church on earth should increasingly serve as the outer court of the Church triumphant.”¹⁸⁰ Thus, he studied the history of the Finnish Church, placing particular emphasis on the Finnish Lutheran revival movements, which he considered to be of great value. Indeed, Lehtonen considered some other Lutheran Churches to be like ecclesial departments, “high

¹⁷⁹ Lehtonen 1945, 46-54.

¹⁸⁰ Lehtonen 1945, 46.

and dry', without any warmth of revival", while some had developed an "openness to the world' that was clearly worldly". Against this background, Lehtonen saw Finnish Christianity as the heir of Lutheran evangelicalism or pietism.¹⁸¹

However, Lehtonen's view of pietism was unusual. He had been influenced by the Hannula Revival in his youth and to an even greater extent by his older friend Baron Paul Nicolay of Monrepos, who may best be described as an ecumenical evangelical revivalist.¹⁸² From this perspective, Lehtonen could view pietism in a very favourable light, while emphasizing its distinction from English puritanism:

Nevertheless, the word 'pietism' is misleading, particularly when you introduce Finnish Christianity to a foreigner. Pietism is understood in leading protestant countries as an introverted, narrow-minded, anti-cultural movement. Often it is also understood to signify a Christian faith with a rigorous emphasis on law and repentance. In this light, the word 'pietism' inadequately describes our lively Finnish Lutheran peasant Christianity. In any case, the study of church history reveals that our current revival movements are possessed of a wonderfully deep evangelicalism. They wish only to glorify Christ, live in Him alone and see Him as the only hope.¹⁸³

Lehtonen's emphasis on the positive features of Finnish pietism served at least two different goals. First, it assured pietistic circles of his goodwill and his understanding of them. Second, it helped give a positive overall picture of Finnish Christianity for possible foreign readers. What Lehtonen did not mention was that Finnish pietism was indeed influenced by English puritanism through English devotional literature, which was being read in Finland from as early as the 17th Century.¹⁸⁴

Nevertheless, Lehtonen acknowledged the challenges posed by a strong pietistic tradition. He suggested that in practice many Finnish Christians thought that their Christian history began only with the Reformation or perhaps, better still, with the Great Pietistic Folk Revival. He wanted the younger clergy especially to gain new and living insights from the earlier phases of Christian history in Finland. He considered that the medieval Finnish Church might have some much needed encouragement to offer at present, namely the pursuit of "unity with the rest of Christendom, par-

¹⁸¹ *Lehtonen* 1945, 47-48.

¹⁸² *Winter* 1951, 20; *Pirjola* 1951, 37-38; *Gulin* 1951, 44-46.

¹⁸³ *Lehtonen* 1945, 48.

¹⁸⁴ *Laine* 2000, 394-403.

ticipation in the common tasks of the Church universal and obtaining language skills and contacts with other Christian centres!¹⁸⁵ The Archbishop's writing placed great emphasis on the catholicity of the Church in both time and place.

This emphasis was reinforced by his own experience:

On a late summer day in 1938, I was standing in Durham Cathedral. It is one of the architectural pearls of northern England's middle Middle Age, situated on a romantic lofty hill by which there is a river just like our [river] Aura here in Turku. The chancel echoed with the clear silver voices of the boys chanting the liturgical responses of Evening Prayer. Behind the altar was the tomb of St Cuthbert. We went to the Cathedral Museum, where there were artefacts from as early as perhaps 300, and a bishop's cross from the 7th century. Close to this memorable place were Lindisfarne and Jarrow. I stood amazed. When Bishop Henry came to Finland, this country had already as venerable a Christian history as we have now –.

What should we conclude? The more dearly should we hold on to our historical memories! Though we have less of them than, for instance, other Nordic countries, the more should they talk to us. This is a special task for the people and youth of the parishes of south-western Finland. "In nomine Domini". Arise, south-western Finland, *Fennia stricte sic dicta*.¹⁸⁶ Arise to defend the holiest values of our history, to strengthen the Christian frontline in Finland today! In this you are obliged by your history.¹⁸⁷

This reference to English church history and its link with Finland through St Henry, the English patron saint of Finland, supports the conclusion that Lehtonen pondered some kind of high church revival, drawing from Finnish sources. This was in essence rather similar to the catholic revivals in the Churches of England and Sweden. In promoting this, he especially encouraged the younger clergy to have wide contacts with the world beyond Finland, and appealed to the youth and people of the parishes of south-western Finland, for whom the old ecclesiastical traditions were part of their life through their medieval history.

Lehtonen had an enduring interest in the education and spiritual formation of theological students. As early as 1924 he had made a study trip to English theological colleges, which he held in high regard.¹⁸⁸ According to Lehtonen there was a pressing need for a spiritual formation of future clergy

¹⁸⁵ Lehtonen 1945, 42-44.

¹⁸⁶ "Fennia stricte sic dicta." - The Latin name of South-West Finland, the area called "Finland Proper" in Finnish and Swedish.

¹⁸⁷ Lehtonen 1945, 44-45.

¹⁸⁸ Lehtonen 1926; Lauha 1993a, 197.

which would complement the academic training. He cited the Church of England's theological colleges, arguing that there was a need for similar institutions in the Lutheran Church.¹⁸⁹ Theological education was one of the key areas in which Lehtonen desired to follow the Church of England's example. This was understandable as it had a great strategic importance in the shaping of the future clergy.

Lehtonen's deep love of liturgy and the tradition of the Church is evident throughout the book. He particularly emphasized the old liturgical customs, kept especially in western Finland, and expressed his hope that some of them might be revived in other parts of Finland.¹⁹⁰ Archbishop Lehtonen's high churchmanship undoubtedly owed more to the traditional ecclesiastical piety of south-western Finland than to the rest of the Finnish Church.¹⁹¹ No wonder, then, that Lehtonen gave south-western Finland a special place in his plans for a more evangelical catholic church life following the English example.

e. Adaptation to the Cold War

The reality of the post-war world especially informs Lehtonen's theology in his approach to defending the liberty of the Church. This is evident in *the present time of crisis*. Unlike in medieval theology, where this meant the issue of the rights and liberties of the Church in a Christian state, Lehtonen's canvas presented the 20th century's churches' struggle to survive under hostile states. This perspective gave him scope to criticise all totalitarian systems.

Unsurprisingly, the political situation at the publication of the *Encyclical Letter, 1945* led to the criticism being especially directed at Nazi Germany. This was nothing new, as Lehtonen had publicly criticised the Nazis and their church and race politics as early as 1937.¹⁹² Whereas in 1937 Lehtonen was able openly to express similar criticism against the Soviet Union, in 1945 omitting any explicit reference to 'The Great Eastern Neighbour' was prudent.¹⁹³ There is no reason to think Lehtonen had changed his views

¹⁸⁹ *Lehtonen* 1945, 27-28.

¹⁹⁰ *Lehtonen* 1945, 30.

¹⁹¹ *Nokkala* 1951, 120-122.

¹⁹² *Lehtonen* 1937, 61-65.

¹⁹³ *Lehtonen* 1937, 65-66; *Lehtonen* 1945.

on Soviet communism, which he, along with the majority of the Finnish establishment, had considered the worst enemy of Finnish state and church alike.

According to Lehtonen, there was scarcely any difference in righteousness between the European nations, but the difference lay between the states. Government was able to choose between “the traditional God-fearing Christian approach” or a “conscious rejection of Christianity” and “apostasy”. There was a great gap between the God-rejecting states and those states whose intention was to “protect and promote the fear of God, keep the best Christian traditions of the nation inherited from the fathers, uphold the Christian upbringing of youth and the Christian morals of the whole nation.”¹⁹⁴ While clearly referring to Nazi Germany and omitting any reference to the Soviet Union, Lehtonen’s timing, in the summer of 1945, meant that his words could hardly be taken not to refer to communism.

In relation to the Finnish situation, Lehtonen considered that a national, parochially based church with its historic church order and range of working methods corresponded best with “the Saviour’s universal Great Commission to make disciples of all nations by continuously reflecting the Christian ideal for the nation”. He assessed the external ties between the Finnish state and the Lutheran Church as being quite weak. The connection was based rather on the Lutheran Church’s position as a national church, representing the 96% of the Finnish people who belonged to it. Thus any attempt completely to sever ties between the national Church and the state would not arise from actual need, but from an ideology hostile to Christian faith.¹⁹⁵

However, Lehtonen recognised that different situations demanded different measures:

In a country like the United States of America, where there is an enormous diversity in the church sphere, that [separation of the state and church] is almost a necessity. In England many representative churchmen - although a small minority - have demanded this separation, in order that the church might gain more freedom, and that the 1928 incident, when Parliament rejected the Prayer Book approved by the convocations, might never happen again.¹⁹⁶

For Lehtonen, the 1928 Prayer Book controversy served as a warning of the dangers of state intrusion in purely ecclesiastical matters. The similarities

¹⁹⁴ *Lehtonen* 1945, 19.

¹⁹⁵ *Lehtonen* 1945, 73-75.

¹⁹⁶ *Lehtonen* 1945, 75.

between the Church of England and the Finnish Church were obvious, since Finnish Church Law was approved by the Finnish *Eduskunta*. This must have concerned Lehtonen, as the Finnish People's Democratic Party (SKDL) had gained a quarter of the seats in the general election of March 1945, and any further strengthening of their support might threaten the position not only of the national Lutheran Church, but of all public religion in Finland.¹⁹⁷ The time was such that even the national Church had to be ready to adapt to its demands.

Eventually, and with great caution, Lehtonen did present a subtle criticism of communism at home and abroad. He highlighted the novel situation that there was for the first time "a phenomenon of a common atheism and culture, and a civilization that has completely departed from religion."¹⁹⁸ There was nowhere where this applied more than the irreligious Soviet ideological system, with its call for world revolution.

Nevertheless, Lehtonen expressed some understanding of the causes of atheism, seeing it as a symptom of frustration with naïve religious concepts:

This [atheism] may have turned against naïve religious convictions, against the individual's experience of cancerous religion, but which has nothing to do with true Christian faith. Protestant Christianity demands full day light. It fights against all superstition. It demands a pure quest for truth. It desires only to build on facts. Or perhaps an atheist has not encountered in his vicinity any fully convicted Christian person, but only conventionality, a mere Christian caricature.¹⁹⁹

Lehtonen believed in the power of example and was positively evangelical in his attitude towards it, but he never offered religious conversion as a cheap solution for the world's political problems. He was too well-versed in *Realpolitik* to do so.

f. "A Message from the Church of Finland"?

In Finland, Lehtonen's ideas became widely known first through the book, published by one of the main publishers, WSOY, and second through newspaper reviews. The book was discussed in an editorial of *Kotimaa*, where it

¹⁹⁷ *Hentilä* 1999, 234.

¹⁹⁸ *Lehtonen* 1945, 19.

¹⁹⁹ *Lehtonen* 1945, 20.

was well, if partially, received. Concerning ecumenical relations, the editor chose to emphasize the strong biblical basis of the Archbishop's view that conservative Lutherans were correct in insisting that the unity of the Church consisted primarily in unity in faith.²⁰⁰ What the editor neglected was the positive opportunities ecumenical relations offered to the Finns.

Various reviews followed. The most thorough was published in *Herättäjää* by the Rev. Jaakko Haavio, who essentially abridged the entire book. What was common to all the reviews was their uncritical appreciation. They were enthusiastic, but did not discern the distinctively evangelical catholic character of the Archbishop's writing, or if they did, they chose not to comment.²⁰¹

This is likely to have reflected the popular reception of the Archbishop's message among his clergy and people. They could sense something of the Archbishop's personal enthusiasm for the evangelical catholic programme both at home and abroad, but neither fully understood it nor accepted it. Ecumenical matters interested them insofar as they offered the benefits of good relations with the western world and the possibility of humanitarian aid. A deeper theological ecumenism, presenting opportunities for real interaction between the churches, was not of interest unless it brought in practical changes to everyday life and worship, while any notion of the Archbishop's high churchmanship was kept well out of the public debate until the end of his life.

Archbishop Lehtonen, however, had wider plans: he wanted to publish the book in England. Lehtonen suggested this to Waddams in July 1945. As a preamble to his proposition Lehtonen wondered about the possibility of getting some English theological literature to Finland, which it seems Waddams promised to arrange. As the Finns had been unable to follow English theology during the war, he struggled to suggest titles of books that he wanted. So Lehtonen asked if Waddams could suggest a list of books or send him the books he thought suitable.²⁰²

Perhaps Lehtonen understood that this was Waddams' role as an officer of the Ministry of Information, and wanted to present his book as a possibility for reciprocal learning:

²⁰⁰ *Kmaa* 42/12.61945 Arkkipiispan paimenkirje (Ed.).

²⁰¹ *Kmaa* 46/26.6.1945 "Kaikkien maiden kristinuskovaiset, yhtykää!"; *Hjä* 27/6.7.1945 Arkkipiispan paimenkirje; *Fsb* 26/12.7.1945 Ärkebiskopens herdabrev.

²⁰² LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Waddams 20.7.1945.

I would also be very grateful if some of our books could be published in England. I myself have published my new "Encyclical Letter, 1945" (106 printed pages), that will also be published in Sweden before long. I deal in it chiefly with the present situation and the necessity of a united Christian front in the world. I plead for deepened theology and historical episcopacy and ministry in the light of the experiences of the last years, etc. Could e.g. S.P.C.K. publish it in England? The book could be printed in Finland, where we do not suffer any lack of paper. In this way our common endeavours for a better knowledge of our Churches could be fulfilled. The title could perhaps be: "A Message from the Church of Finland", or something like that.²⁰³

Lehtonen's idea of informing an English audience about the Finnish Church was certainly novel. Until this point, there had been no suggestion of reciprocal information. Lehtonen's description of the purpose of the book should have made it theologically appealing to mainstream Church of England people, and his plans for publishing and printing were detailed. The idea was thus left for Waddams to consider.

Waddams replied that the idea was interesting and considered it excellent if it happen through the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.). He also wondered about the practicalities of such a venture and promised to mention the matter to the S.P.C.K. Secretary.²⁰⁴ While Waddams clearly avoided making any commitment, he seemed genuinely interested in the idea, even if it conflicted with the policy he had laid down earlier in his report.

For his part, Lehtonen remained completely unaware of Waddams' possible misgivings. He had thanked Waddams for his sympathetic presentation of him in *The Spiritual Issues of the War*, which he believed had meant much to the Church of Finland, and assured him that they would never forget Waddams' visit, which he described as "the first harbinger of reborn Christian friendship".²⁰⁵ So he left the matter of publishing to Waddams, of whose willingness to act on his behalf he had no guarantee other than Waddams' hope to "be able to make some contribution towards the good relations between our two Churches."²⁰⁶ Whether they agreed what this meant was left open.

²⁰³ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Waddams 20.7.1945.

²⁰⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Waddams to Lehtonen 21.9.1945.

²⁰⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Waddams 20.7.1945.

²⁰⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28 Waddams to Lehtonen 21.9.1945.

4. Lehtonen begins his programme for closer relations

a. Harjunpää, an able assistant to Lehtonen's pro-Anglican work

Apart from writing his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*, Archbishop Lehtonen prepared for his new office by obtaining a suitable archiepiscopal staff. Some time in late May 1945 he wrote to the Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London, the Rev. Toivo Harjunpää, and offered him the position as his Chaplain. This was an innovation for the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland: it had not been the practice of Lehtonen's predecessors to call their secretaries chaplains in the English way. However, this was what Lehtonen had in mind, as 'Chaplain' was the term he and Harjunpää used of the position in English.²⁰⁷

After careful thought, prayer and consultation with his wife and intimate friends, Harjunpää decided to accept the offer, which he understood as a great honour and a sign of appreciation for the work he had done in England. Harjunpää's reply reveals the extent of his acclimatization to English culture. Perhaps for security reasons, as there still existed a formal state of war between the countries, he wrote in near perfect English:

I cannot deny it, my Lord Archbishop, that there is much in your proposal which appeals to me, and it has in fact had a great and altogether wholesome psychological - or should I say pastoral effect on me. I begin to gain more confidence that with God's help and with your fatherly advice and encouragement I might still be able to make my own humble contribution to the Church at home, which I love so deeply. And should it be so that I can best serve the Church by coming home, I must take it as God's gracious will; and besides, ought not a priest feel himself under the obligation of canonical obedience in relation to his bishop.

Your personality, Most Reverend Father, has always had an inspiring effect upon me, and I can assure that nothing could be dearer to me than to work as your chaplain in so close a contact with you. I also feel this, if anything would enable me to carry into effect some of my cherished religious-ecclesiastical ideals and visions, which, I think, you would share with me.²⁰⁸

Harjunpää's excellent English, indicating as it did the sort of things he had learned from the Church of England, was a sign of the extent to which his time in England had influenced him: his language was extraordinarily high church for a Finnish Lutheran cleric in the 1940s. Whenever he could,

²⁰⁷ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945.

²⁰⁸ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945.

Harjunpää chose the more catholic terms. He constantly referred to himself as 'priest', when most Finnish Lutheran clergy would have chosen 'pastor' as a more suitable description of their ministry. Harjunpää also addressed Lehtonen as 'Most Reverend Father in God', 'Lord Archbishop', 'My dear Archbishop' and 'Most Reverend Father'.²⁰⁹ Even if this was common for Anglican clergy, it would have unsettled most of Archbishop Lehtonen's episcopal colleagues in Finland. In this respect Archbishop Lehtonen seems exceptional, for he indeed shared his Chaplain's "cherished religious-ecclesiastical ideals and visions", which included a 'higher' understanding of the Church and its ministry than was then common in the Finnish Church.

Ideals and visions aside, Harjunpää was grateful that his future position would enable him "to retain and foster further contacts with the friends and representatives of the Anglican and other foreign churches, which thing I personally value greatly."²¹⁰ He had made many friends during his years in England. Harjunpää already knew something of the Chaplain's duties, as some of his friends had served in such a position:

I meet fairly often Canon Don, D.D., now the Sub-Dean of Westminster Abbey, who was the chaplain of the late Archbishop Temple. He is the chairman of theological study group, the member of which I am. I know also the present chaplains of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and best of all the Rev. Syngé, who was Dr. Fisher's chaplain, when he was the Bishop of London. Syngé - now the vicar of a West-London Church - and I are very dear friends. I have therefore had good opportunities to become more closely acquainted with the chaplain duties in the Anglican Church.²¹¹

Harjunpää's friends were distinguished churchmen. Canon Alan Don was a Scotsman from Dundee, liturgically moderate and open to ecumenism, whereas the Rev. F.C. Syngé was a devout and liberal evangelical churchman and a New Testament scholar.²¹² Again, what might have been seen as strikingly high church in Finnish Lutheranism was generally mainstream in English Anglicanism.

Besides the Church of England men, Harjunpää had also made friends with the Rev. John R. Temple, D.D., a Methodist minister, who was one

²⁰⁹ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945. *Ripatti* 1990 describes the tone of Harjunpää's letter as solemn. While that may partly be true, it misses Harjunpää's closeness with and affection towards Lehtonen.

²¹⁰ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945.

²¹¹ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945.

²¹² *Carpenter* 1991, 115, 131, 246-249.

of the driving forces of the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS). Harjunpää thought it worth mentioning to Lehtonen, as the Archbishop had indicated that the Chaplain's position might be connected either with the Finnish Bible Society in Turku or with a diocesan chaplaincy.²¹³ It appears that Harjunpää was more interested in the Bible Society than he was in an ill-defined diocesan position, which might have involved anything and everything. Eventually, the latter was closer to what he got, as the Bible Society work was never incorporated into the Chaplain's office.

Harjunpää's general tone ensured that the listing of his friends did not appear merely as a casual dropping of famous names in order to impress; on the contrary, his letter was replete with humility and an awareness of his limitations.²¹⁴ In any case, Harjunpää never listed all of his "intimate friends" in the Church of England, even though some of them served in high positions. One of them was certainly Canon Douglas of the CFR with whom Harjunpää conversed before making his decision and who tried to arrange an audience with Archbishop Fisher for Harjunpää:

Finland – On Saturday Pastor Harjunpää saw me and we had a long talk about things. He tells me in confidence he has been approached by Archbishop Lehtonen about becoming his Chaplain and also the Director of the Finnish Bible Society.

Harjunpää has been a tower of strength while he has been in England (seven years) in church relations and taking into consideration the Agreement existing between the Church of England and the Church of Finland would his Grace be able to spare a few minutes to see Harjunpää and to give him his views on the question of accepting such an appointment. I think, if there is no interference from Russia, that such a link at this juncture would be of immense importance.²¹⁵

It must have been exceptional for a foreign clergyman to seek career advice from the Archbishop of Canterbury, but Harjunpää can hardly be seen as an ordinary Seaman's Pastor. This was confirmed by the fact that the audience was granted.²¹⁶

Douglas treated Harjunpää as if he were a member of the Anglican clergy. Their correspondence reveals a close affinity; it seems, indeed, that

²¹³ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945.

²¹⁴ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945.

²¹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Finland 1945. Note to the Archb. s.d.

²¹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Douglas July 1945.

they were family friends.²¹⁷ Before leaving for Finland, Harjunpää thanked Douglas for all his help and great kindness, and wrote that he would miss him as "a dear and trusted friend and a wise counsellor very greatly indeed. Your help and advice has enabled me to survive through all hardships, and look forward to a time when the cordial relations between the Church of England and the Church of Finland will grow even stronger."²¹⁸ Harjunpää rejoiced that his new post would give him "a very good opportunity to foster further these relations which are so dear to me personally."²¹⁹

Besides mentioning the good relations between the churches, there was something Harjunpää wanted, namely "to pay a short farewell visit to his Grace" the Archbishop of Canterbury before his departure. Harjunpää had already met Fisher, and was very grateful to Douglas, who had organised the meeting.²²⁰ In the event, Harjunpää got both his meeting with the Archbishop and a farewell party, organised by the Church of England. On both occasions, he was told that the Church of England wanted to welcome a successor for Harjunpää as soon as possible, as Harjunpää later emphasized to the readers of *Kotimaa*.²²¹

Evidently, Harjunpää knew how to use his good contacts with Church of England dignitaries; his personal relations were based on more than mere ecumenical politeness. On his departure, Douglas wrote to him:

My very dear Friend,

That you are called home, does not surprise me. Who could better serve your dear Church and Nation? You have made such a world of friends here in London and know and understand us so well. Myself from our first meeting five years ago I was drawn to you and I foresaw that you would work your best to create and strengthen that solidarity of our Churches - never mind their formal reunion - which is my heart's desire. As time went on and the dark shadows came, I learnt to know your loving loyal heart and more and more I came to love you as a very dear friend. I shall miss you very greatly but I shall rejoice to be sure that over there in your beloved

²¹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Farewell letter in Return of Pastor T.Harjunpää to Finland July 1945, Douglas to Harjunpää 7.7.1945.

²¹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Farewell letter in Return of Pastor T.Harjunpää to Finland July 1945.

²¹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Farewell letter in Return of Pastor T.Harjunpää to Finland July 1945.

²²⁰ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Farewell letter in Return of Pastor T.Harjunpää to Finland July 1945.

²²¹ *Kmaa* 59/10.8.1945 Englannin kirkon suhde Suomeen koko sodan ajan läheinen.

Finland you will be doing a greater work than you can do here. That at my age I shall be able to visit you in Helsinki is unlikely but if God give me that happiness, I know that you will welcome me.

When you see him give my humble greeting to Archbishop Lehtonen and tell him how in these dark days I have hoped and prayed and worked for Finland and that my dearest wish is to know that the shadows are lifted from your Church and Nation.²²²

Douglas' letter not only indicated his deep affection for Harjunpää, but revealed his worries concerning the Church of Finland, the Finnish state and its situation in the world. While acknowledging the importance of the link Harjunpää could provide with the Finnish, he had already expressed to Archbishop Fisher his fears concerning the Soviet attitude towards any deepening of the Church of England's relations with the Finnish Church.²²³ Clearly, Douglas did not foresee a bright future for Finland.

Where ecumenism was concerned, it is clear that the 'formal reunion' of the two churches was the final goal of the CFR under Douglas' and Bishop Headlam's leadership. Archbishop Lehtonen was aware of this: Douglas had written to him that he had been working in the best interests of Finland during the dark days of the war. There is little doubt that the shadows to which Douglas referred in his letter to Harjunpää were cast by the growing political influence of the Soviet Union.

Harjunpää's departure constituted something of a problem for the Finnish Seamen's Church. Just as the Archbishop's offer reached Harjunpää, he also received a letter from the Rev. Daniel Orädd, Director of the Finnish Seamen's Mission Society, inviting him and his family to spend a two month holiday in Finland at the Society's expense. Lehtonen advised Harjunpää not to inform Orädd about his proposal, which suggestion he followed.²²⁴

Eventually, Orädd learned about Harjunpää's new post from a newspaper. The Society was most unhappy with the way the Archbishop had handled the situation. They were faced with the urgent need to appoint a new Pastor for London, while Harjunpää was unable to see in his successor. On his return to Finland, Harjunpää gave the board of the Society an account of his work in London during the war years, for which he received

²²² LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Douglas to Harjunpää 7.7.1945.

²²³ LPL CFR LR file 28 Finland 1945. Note to the Archb. s.d.

²²⁴ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945.

great thanks and appreciation. The board also decided to appoint a new Pastor as soon as possible.²²⁵

Harjunpää arrived in Finland at the beginning of August 1945 to assume his duties as Archbishop's Chaplain.²²⁶ He was widely interviewed by the Finnish church newspapers.²²⁷ His return made the front page of the main church newspaper *Kotimaa*.²²⁸ The focus of these interviews was naturally the Finnish Seamen's Mission, but Harjunpää also shared many of his experiences of English church life, and emphasized the close relations with the Church of England throughout the war, which had enabled him to continue his work and to contribute articles about Finland to various English newspapers. According to *Kotimaa*, Harjunpää's work had greatly assisted the cause of his church.²²⁹

At a time when there was a psychological need for good news in Finland Harjunpää's return received much positive interest, presenting him with an opportunity to give Finnish readers a positive introduction to Anglicanism. Harjunpää's second interview in *Herättäjä* concentrated on the ecclesiastical situation in England. *Herättäjä* thought this to be of particular interest, since there was a general ignorance of such matters in Finland, which nonetheless had enjoyed great sympathy in English church circles in recent years in spite of the war.²³⁰ *Herättäjä's* views reflected a commonly held Finnish assumption based on the activities of a handful of faithful English friends, which had received an attention beyond their true significance in Finland.

Harjunpää explained the ecumenical context of the churches in England, but concentrated on the Church of England, which was a church with a high view of episcopacy. This meant that the Church of England would not enter into communion with a church that did not have the his-

²²⁵ KA AL 29 Harjunpää to Lehtonen 6.6.1945; *Kansanaho* 1983, 266-267; *Ripatti* 1990, 175.

²²⁶ *Kansanaho* 1983, 266; *Ripatti* 1990, 174-175.

²²⁷ *Kmaa* 59/10.8.1945 Englannin kirkon suhde Suomeen koko sodan ajan läheinen; *Hjä* 32/10.8.1945 Englannissa sai suomalaisen pappi sota-aika vapaasti toimia; *Hjä* 33/17.8.1945 Anglikaaninen kirkko ja voimakkaat vapaakirkot vaalivat Englannissa uskonnollista elämää; *Fsb* 29/23.8.1945 Vår sjömansmission i England fick verka fritt under krigsåren.

²²⁸ *Kmaa* 59/10.8.1945 Englannin kirkon suhde Suomeen koko sodan ajan läheinen.

²²⁹ *Kmaa* 59/10.8.1945 Englannin kirkon suhde Suomeen koko sodan ajan läheinen.

²³⁰ *Hjä* 33/17.8.1945 Anglikaaninen kirkko ja voimakkaat vapaakirkot vaalivat Englannissa uskonnollista elämää.

toric episcopate. However, Harjunpää continued, it was also a reformed church, whose “official confession”, the 39 Articles, had brought it close to the Finnish Church, as it had been greatly influenced by the Lutheran Augsburg Confession. It was therefore natural that the Church of England had endeavoured to create close relations with the Finnish Church.²³¹

Harjunpää’s picture was simplistic and a little disingenuous: the 39 Articles did not have as central role in Anglicanism as the Augsburg Confession did in Lutheranism; and the 39 Articles were influenced not only by Lutheran, but also Reformed, theology.²³² It may be that restricted space did not allow him to go sufficiently deeply into Anglicanism to do it justice. That being said, he was further restricted by his Finnish readers’ ignorance: there was very little to build on. They knew about the Augsburg Confession, but it is likely, for example, that a description of the development and position of the Book of Common Prayer in English church history would have been lost on them.

However, a simple introduction to the catholic and reformed heritage of the Anglican doctrinal tradition afforded Harjunpää the opportunity to continue with a description of his own experiences in the light of the agreement the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland had signed some ten years before:

During the war, I was able to experience myself the great value that the Anglicans give to the agreement which was achieved between our Churches before the war. This has enabled me to participate frequently in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar in this Church, where the value of the sacrament is understood more richly and deeply than in many other churches. The agreement has also made it possible for our pastors to be welcomed as guests in Anglican pulpits. What an extraordinary opportunity and challenge is thus opening for us to proclaim the message of sin and grace in the Anglican world, where with some exceptions this message does not shine with the same clarity as in our midst. The Anglicans also desire to have closer theological contacts with the [other] Nordic Churches and this I would consider highly desirable.²³³

²³¹ *Hjä* 33/17.8.1945 Anglikaaninen kirkko ja voimakkaat vapaakirkot vaalivat Englannissa uskonnollista elämää.

²³² The Porvoo Common Statement 1992, III:29; *Toon* 1999, 144-148; *Gady & Webber* 2001, 27-28.

²³³ *Hjä* 33/17.8.1945 Anglikaaninen kirkko ja voimakkaat vapaakirkot vaalivat Englannissa uskonnollista elämää.

Harjunpää's account reveals much of his understanding of the differences between Lutherans and Anglicans, and how he wished to present those differences to the Finnish public. He painted a traditional picture of Anglican-Lutheran relations, in which Anglicans placed a greater emphasis on the Eucharist, while Lutherans placed a greater emphasis on preaching the word. His Finnish readers could thus be proud of their great inheritance, and Harjunpää was able to introduce the idea that there was something they could give to 'the Anglican world' in the "closer theological contacts" he wished to encourage.

Harjunpää's broad ecumenical interest emerges in his attempt to explain the recent ecumenical developments between the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Free Churches in England. He drew comparisons between the English Free Churches and the revival movements in the Finnish Lutheran Church: for both, the laity had an important role, and both similarly nurtured individual piety. Harjunpää considered that religious life in England was in general more cheerful and practical than in Finland. New methods were adapted to quickly, and missionary work was generally and strongly supported, especially in the Free Churches. Of the Free Churches, Harjunpää considered the Methodists to be closest to Finnish Lutheranism.²³⁴ The picture Harjunpää painted of English church life was positive and extended beyond the Church of England. The interview suggests that Harjunpää had been infected with something of the enthusiasm of English religious life during the years he had spent in its midst.

All in all Harjunpää's return received much interest in Finland, affording him the opportunity to introduce English church life, with particular emphasis on the Church of England, to the Finnish public. It is likely, following plans made by Waddams eight months previously, that Harjunpää brought with him some English theological books and newspapers, which were delivered to approximately twenty active ecumenists by the Rev. Vernér J. Aurola, the Secretary of the Finnish Ecumenical Council.²³⁵ That there were only twenty recipients rawly exposes the lack of interested and sufficiently educated people in Finland who could actually read English religious or theological literature. There was great scope for education.

²³⁴ *Hjä* 33/17.8.1945 Anglikaaninen kirkko ja voimakkaat vapaakirkot vaalivat Englannissa uskonnollista elämää.

²³⁵ EA SYKTA SYT Hf.2. Mailing List 13.8.1945.

In Harjunpää, Lehtonen had an able advocate for Anglican relations both at home and abroad, something the Archbishop understood well. Soon after he had made the appointment he wrote to Waddams:

I have appointed the Rev. Harjunpää of London as my Chaplain and he will be arriving in Finland soon. Then we will do all that we are ever able to in order to promote our friendly relations with the Church of England. I am very glad to acquire so able a man as secretary.²³⁶

Lehtonen was certainly happy that Harjunpää shared his positive view of the Church of England and was already making plans to promote Anglican relations. This together with his good language skills and wide ecumenical contacts in England made Harjunpää's acceptance of his appointment a matter of great relief and joy to him.²³⁷

b. Lehtonen concerned to persuade the new CFR personnel to engage with the quest for reunion

From the beginning of his archiepiscopate, Lehtonen began to strengthen relations with the Church of England by contacting his old English friends. A considerable challenge was that they were indeed old, as his friendships had been made in the inter-war years. One of them was the Rt Rev. John Rawlinson, the Bishop of Derby, to whom Lehtonen had sent a message through Bishop Batty and to whom he later wrote at the end of July. On 8 August, Rawlinson replied that he shared "all your hopes for the future relations of the Churches of England & Finland, & much hope that further intercourse & friendship may be possible in the not too distant future."²³⁸ This undoubtedly reflected the content of Lehtonen's message and letter.

Lehtonen further invited his English friends to visit him, if they could. His invitation was reciprocated by Rawlinson, who expressed the hope that Lehtonen would visit him were he ever able to come to England. However, Rawlinson appreciated the seriousness of the Finnish situation:

²³⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Waddams 20.7.1945.

²³⁷ *Ripatti* 1990, 174-175.

²³⁸ KA AL 35 Rawlinson to Lehtonen 8.8.1945.

I send my deepest sympathy with you & your people in all the tragedy & suffering which has befallen Finland. Let us hope & pray that the future may be brighter.²³⁹

Rawlinson belonged to a group of friendly English ecclesiastics who did not share Waddams' positive views on living as next door neighbours of the Soviet Union.

Concerning other old friends, Lehtonen had informed Rawlinson that he had been succeeded in Tampere by Professor Eelis Gulin. Rawlinson was happy to learn this and asked Lehtonen to deliver his "warm message of Christian Love, sympathy + prayer for God's blessing upon his coming Episcopate" to Gulin. Rawlinson also wrote of having recently met Harjunpää, whom he had liked very much.²⁴⁰ It is no exaggeration to suggest that these three, Lehtonen, Gulin and Harjunpää, were the best known Finnish churchmen in the Church of England. Lehtonen and Gulin had many friends of long-standing, while Harjunpää had made a good name for himself during his years in London.

Apart from Rawlinson, Lehtonen also informed Waddams that Gulin would be consecrated and installed as Bishop of Tampere on 2 September 1945. This he did in a letter in which he also presented the appointment of Harjunpää and publication of his *Encyclical Letter, 1945* in England as steps to deepen relations.²⁴¹ For all that Waddams' answer arrived only towards the end of September, it was nonetheless both friendly and promising. Waddams apologized for not having replied earlier, citing family difficulties and the fact that he had been appointed and had started his work as the new General Secretary of the CFR, following the retirement of Canon Douglas.²⁴²

This was the first news the Finns had of a complete change in CFR personnel: the Chairman, Bishop Headlam, had also retired and had been replaced by Bishop George Bell of Chichester. The council had been very much the creation of its first Chairman and Secretary, who had used its machinery to further reunion negotiations of particular interest to them, and change now seemed likely.²⁴³

²³⁹ KA AL 35 Rawlinson to Lehtonen 8.8.1945.

²⁴⁰ KA AL 35 Rawlinson to Lehtonen 8.8.1945.

²⁴¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Waddams 20.7.1945.

²⁴² LPL CFR LR file 28 Waddams to Lehtonen 21.9.1945.

²⁴³ *Jasper* 1960, 305-306; *Jasper* 1967, 345.

Although Waddams hoped to “be able to make some contribution towards the good relations between our two Churches”, the new situation required attention, and the news created a stir in Finland.²⁴⁴ Lehtonen asked Harjunpää to write to Waddams; he wrote to the incoming and retiring Chairmen himself. All three letters were dated the same day, 28 September 1945, indicating that Waddams’ letter had received the highest priority.²⁴⁵

The central section of Lehtonen’s letter to both Bell and Headlam bore word for word the same text:

A great part of that programme, which aims at a closer union of our Churches, has been fulfilled during the recent years. The historical episcopacy is now a rule in our Church. Only the bishops ordain. There has no longer been any departure from this principle in Finland. The Bishop of Fulham - as you know - has been lately taking part in my benediction, which act concluded the service of my installation as the Archbishop of Finland. Swedish bishops have taken part in almost every consecration here. I hope that the same successful development will continue. I also hope that my son, who soon will be ordained priest, could come next year to England with the help of scholarship. Perhaps I too will be able to return the friendly visits of the English bishops before long. I hope that my pastoral letter could be issued in English, being printed over here and published in Great Britain under the name “A Message from the Church of Finland”, or something like that.

Great common tasks are waiting and must be solved by our Churches. In my opinion time is now particularly suitable for the Church of England and the Northern Lutheran Churches to join together.²⁴⁶

This sums up well Lehtonen’s programme for closer relations with the Church of England when he was installed as Archbishop of Finland. He wanted to take up the relations from the point they had reached before the war, and sought to demonstrate that the Finnish Church had followed the guidelines of the preamble of the 1935 Canterbury Convocations’ resolution. The re-introduction of the historic episcopate had been effected; and a commitment to refraining from the non-episcopal ordinations allowed by Finnish Church Law had been made. Besides the small practical steps, which Lehtonen himself wanted to make, he considered that the time was

²⁴⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Waddams to Lehtonen 21.9.1945.

²⁴⁵ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 28.9.1945; LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Lehtonen to Bell 28.9.1945; LPL MS.2641 Lehtonen to Headlam 28.9.1945; *Pajunen* 2004, 112; *Pajunen* 2006, 154.

²⁴⁶ LPL MS.2641 Lehtonen to Headlam 28.9.1945; LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Lehtonen to Bell 28.9.1945.

“particularly suitable” for the reunion of the Church of England and the Nordic Lutheran Churches.

However, Lehtonen did not elaborate on why he thought this. There are some hints in his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*, in which he wrote of the need for a united Christian front, suggesting that his agenda was in part political. However, it was also theological: he believed theology was returning to the classical full confession of Christ and its common Christian roots. What he always omitted to say, however – and this was especially important in the Finnish case – was that he himself had been appointed as Archbishop and had thus the necessary power to decide on the ecumenical relations of his church. Had any other candidate been elected he would hardly have had Lehtonen’s energy for and commitment to closer relations with the Church of England. In this respect, his personal influence was immense.

The importance of Lehtonen’s personal contacts also emerges in his letters to the CFR Chairmen. In Bell’s case, Lehtonen congratulated him on his appointment and reminisced about their previous acquaintance:

Although we have not met often I have felt, nevertheless, great sympathy and spiritual kinship with you. Nobody in my opinion could be more suitable than you to build up closer relations between our Churches. I remember you well from the year 1924, when you introduced me in Canterbury to the Most Reverend Davidson, the late Archbishop of Canterbury.²⁴⁷

In 1924, Bell had been Archbishop Davidson’s Chaplain when Lehtonen visited England to study the English approach to training future clergy in theological colleges.²⁴⁸ Meanwhile, Bell had become an important ecumenical figure himself and Lehtonen reminded him that they had met before. For his part, he promised that the Finns would do their “best for the further development of friendship” between the churches, and hoped that Bell would visit Finland soon. His house would be open and the Finnish churches waiting for Bell.²⁴⁹ Lehtonen wished to establish the same friendly personal relations with Bell that he had enjoyed with Headlam.

Writing to his old friend Headlam, Lehtonen was both grateful and more forthcoming:

²⁴⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Lehtonen to Bell 28.9.1945.

²⁴⁸ *Lauha* 1993, 197.

²⁴⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Lehtonen to Bell 28.9.1945.

Now that you are retiring from the Chairmanship of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, I take the opportunity to thank you for the valuable and longstanding friendship and interest that you have so kindly shown towards the Church of Finland. I still recall vividly our visit to Archbishop Johansson in 1927 at Turku. I am now living in the same house and working for a real friendship and reunion sincerely. Your photograph in my study is to me a daily reminder of you. I owe you very much of inspiring views.²⁵⁰

There was a certain irony, which will not have gone unnoticed by Headlam, in Lehtonen's words. Old Archbishop Johansson had been a powerful and long-standing opponent of ecumenism in Finland, who had obstructed relations to the end.²⁵¹ Now, Lehtonen lived in the same house, but his approach was diametrically the opposite. If the old man had known that one of his successors "was working for a real friendship and reunion sincerely", he would surely have been horrified.

If Harjunpää failed to scale quite the heights of his Archbishop's tone, he nevertheless had a friendly correspondence with Waddams concerning the practicalities of reunion. Harjunpää conveyed Lehtonen's thanks to Waddams for regularly sending him *The Church Times* and his heartfelt congratulations on his appointment. Harjunpää wrote that Lehtonen considered Waddams "well qualified for this important post." He concurred with the Archbishop and expressed his happiness that their posts made it possible for them to keep in touch.²⁵² Harjunpää enjoyed his new job and shared with Waddams some plans he had for the future:

I like my new post very much. It will, I think, give also opportunities to put into practise [*sic*] here something of that inheritance which you Anglicans have given me, and about which I think with special gratitude.²⁵³

Harjunpää appeared a willing agent for Waddams' plans to educate the Finns. He even asked if Waddams could send them "every now and again some suitable pamphlets and literature that we can follow events in the Anglican Communion", and promised to send him a report about the Finnish Church later.²⁵⁴ This must have been welcome news to Waddams.

²⁵⁰ LPL MS.2641 Lehtonen to Headlam 28.9.1945.

²⁵¹ *Österlin* 1995, 246-247, 255-258.

²⁵² LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 28.9.1945.

²⁵³ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 28.9.1945.

²⁵⁴ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 28.9.1945.

Waddams' reply to Harjunpää was prompt, kind and personal, even if it did not match Harjunpää's openness and cordiality. Waddams was grateful for the kindness and good wishes of the Finns and promised to try to send some pamphlets and literature in the future. However, the times did not make this easy, so he asked Harjunpää to write to him if he saw something interesting in *The Church Times*.²⁵⁵

From the start, the working relationship between Waddams and Harjunpää was effective and friendly. They had known each other earlier, shared similar interests, and there was a sense of personal friendship between the two. However, there was at least one notable difference between them. Whereas Harjunpää was very much committed to bringing the two churches closer together, Waddams hoped "that we shall be able to make some contribution of value to Christendom by our work for Christ's kingdom."²⁵⁶ Unlike Harjunpää and Lehtonen, Waddams did not always concentrate on the relations between the two churches, but more often referred to the tasks of the Church universal. This suggests, his kindness in practical matters notwithstanding, that the Finnish Church still belonged very much to the periphery of the interests of the Church of England as he saw them. Waddams' view appears to have been more generally held, for it seems that the Chairmen of the CFR never replied to the kind and enthusiastic letter of Archbishop Lehtonen.

c. The Church of England responds with CRE aid

The practical steps suggested by Archbishop Lehtonen proved to be much easier to take than were discussions concerning the ultimate goal of closer union between the churches. The Church of England was better equipped to offer practical ecumenical aid than it was to engage in deep theological discussion concerning reunion. Indeed, the CFR had not been created for this purpose but simply with the object of surveying and promoting friendly relations with foreign churches. Under Douglas and Headlam, such efforts towards reunion as were made were the fruit of their personal interest, not based on any mandate given to them by the Church of England.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁵ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Waddams to Harjunpää 8.10.1945.

²⁵⁶ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Waddams to Harjunpää 8.10.1945.

²⁵⁷ *Jasper* 1967, 345.

It remained to be seen whether Waddams and Bell would show a similar interest in reunion.

However, the war and the pressing needs of the suffering people of Europe and beyond had created much goodwill towards the cause of Christian aid in England. This had led to the creation of an organisation called Christian Reconstruction in Europe (CRE), which drew together all the main Christian bodies in the United Kingdom. Preparations for this had started as early as 1943. From the outset, it was clear that the CRE was not intended to compete with official secular reconstruction agencies, such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), but specifically to concern itself with spiritual reconstruction and with the rebuilding of Christian church life.²⁵⁸ In post-war Europe, this inevitably had political, as well as purely religious, consequences.

Because of its ecumenical and co-operative nature, the structure of the CRE was quite complicated. Organisationally, the CRE was the British Reconstruction Committee working under the auspices of the British Council of Churches and in co-operation with the World Council of Churches' (WCC - 'in the process of formation') Department of Reconstruction and inter-Church aid in Geneva. The intention was that the Reconstruction Committees in the receiving countries should assess the needs of the churches in their countries and pass their findings on to the WCC Reconstruction Department, while in the donor countries the Reconstruction Committees presented the needs of the receiving countries to their churches and to the Christian public in order to raise funds for relief aid. The WCC Department of Reconstruction acted as a consultative body for both the donor and receiving countries, passing information and seeking to avoid overlapping.²⁵⁹

In Great Britain the CRE set a target of one million pounds to be raised for the needs of Europe. Of this sum the Church of England promised to collect one quarter, and to establish its own Church Assembly Commission on Christian Reconstruction in Europe (CAC CRE) to supervise the money collected and allocated.²⁶⁰

The system allowed individual donors to earmark their money for certain churches or causes, general donations from the Church of England

²⁵⁸ *Jasper* 1967, 288.

²⁵⁹ C.A.765A, 4-5; CA 1945, 134; *Jasper* 1967, 288-289.

²⁶⁰ C.A.765A, 6-7; CA 1945, 134-135.

being under the auspices of the CAC CRE. In the case of a special project or when a sum was allocated for a particular project and was accepted by the Reconstruction Committee of a donor country, there was no need to discuss the matter through Geneva, and direct communication between the donors and the receiving church was encouraged.²⁶¹ What this meant in practice, however, was that 'denominational money' given by one church to another was seen as 'ecumenically neutral' or 'inter-denominational' because of the international and ecumenical nature of the machinery used for its distribution. It is not surprising, then, that this seriously complicated the development of the organisation and the aid it offered.

The matter became even more confusing following the revision of the structures of the CRE in the autumn of 1945, when all members of the CAC CRE became members of the General Committee of the CRE. Furthermore four of them, Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester, the Rev. A.J. Macdonald, the Rev. R.R. Williams and Miss Eleanor Iredale, were appointed by the General Committee to serve on the executive of the CRE.²⁶² This certainly makes it difficult to discern whether these individuals represented the interests of the Church of England or the CRE or indeed both. What it does confirm is that Church of England interests were especially well represented at all levels of the work of the CRE.

The Finnish church newspapers followed the news concerning international ecumenical relief aid to the best of their ability. Although the first reports of CRE aid in *Herättäjä* in January 1945 were critical, such criticism was isolated and soon overcome. Until the summer of 1945 the newspapers reported mainly on the plans for the reconstruction of Germany and the Allied countries.²⁶³

This changed with the arrival of Harjunpää, who suggested that there might be some Church of England aid for Finland as well:

– The Church of England has a strong interest in foreign Churches. Although hundreds of their own [parish] churches have been destroyed during the war, they are ready to extend a helping hand to Finland. And they are prepared to offer material

²⁶¹ C.A.765A, 4-5; CA 1945, 134-135.

²⁶² C.A. 788, 2.

²⁶³ *Fsb* 45-46/21.12.1944 Engelska kyrkomän önska söka kontakt med tyska kyrkor så fart ske kan; *Hjä* 2/12.1.1945 Euroopan kirkollinen jälleenrakentaminen; *Kmaa* 23.3.1945 Lohduttavia sanoja ja tekoja; *Fsb* 20/17.5.1945 Stora kyrkliga krav i Europa; *Hjä* 26/29.6.1945 Tien ohesta tempomia.

aid as well. Especially since the initiation of Finnish-Anglican co-operation relief action has revived considerably.²⁶⁴

It is clear that any news of a possibility of material reconstruction aid was going to raise interest in war-ravaged Finland.

Harjunpää informed his compatriots that the English churches had collected a substantial amount of money to aid the European churches and Finland would not be forgotten when the aid was delivered. Indeed, “a visit by a significant English clergyman to negotiate this matter in the near future” was expected.²⁶⁵ The “significant English clergyman” was the Rev. Dr. J. Hutchison Cockburn, who was neither English nor Anglican, but a former Moderator of the Church of Scotland, who worked as the Director of the WCC Reconstruction Department in Geneva. The misapprehension of Cockburn’s nationality and church affiliation pointed to a general difficulty the Finnish language church newspapers in particular had in understanding the British religious situation. Not all significant British ecclesiastical visitors were English bishops, even if they were distinguished church leaders.²⁶⁶

Cockburn visited Finland in October and November 1945 to assess the level of reconstruction aid needed especially in Lapland, which had been to a large extent destroyed by the retreating Germans. Cockburn urged the Finns to establish their own ecumenical reconstruction committee to co-operate with the international reconstruction bodies.²⁶⁷ This was necessary if international ecumenical aid was to be received and distributed in Finland.

Even before Cockburn’s visit, *Kotimaa* was able to inform its readers of the CRE’s grant to Finland. *Kotimaa* might have got its information from the May issue of the British Ministry of Information magazine *The Spiritual Issues of the War*, which reported on the plans for reconstruction in Europe. According to this report, the Lutheran Church of Finland was to get a residential training centre for parish lay workers, theological scholarships and help for evacuated and orphaned children.²⁶⁸ These were part of the larger

²⁶⁴ *Kmaa* 59/10.8.1945 Englannin kirkon suhde Suomeen koko sodan ajan läheinen.

²⁶⁵ *Hjä* 32/10.8.1945 Englannissa sai suomalainen pappi sota-aika vapaasti toimia.

²⁶⁶ *Hjä* 44/2.11.1945 Maailman kirkkoja kohtasi sodassa suunnaton hävitys; *Ripatti* 1990, 177-182. *Ripatti* repeats the mistake of the Finnish newspapers and introduces Cockburn as English.

²⁶⁷ *Ripatti* 1990, 177-182.

²⁶⁸ *Kmaa* 69/14.9.1945 Englannin kirkko auttaa Suomea; LPL D115·W2S6 *The Spiritual Issues of the War* No.228. 17.5.1945 Church Reconstruction Europe.

WCC reconstruction department plans, which were not dealt with by the CRE alone, but to a great extent by the American Lutherans. The CRE share was quite modest. This was not something evident from *Kotimaa's* reporting.

According to *Kotimaa*, the CRE had granted £4000 to the Evangelical Lutheran Church and £1000 to 'the Catholic Church', by which it meant the Orthodox Church. Equally misleading was the headline accompanying the report: "The Church of England helps Finland". The actual text of the story did not refer to the Church of England, but to the CRE.²⁶⁹ In spite of the ecumenical nature of the aid, *Kotimaa* probably understood any help coming from Britain as coming from the Church of England. By chance it was not far from the truth on this occasion.

However, it all seemed very vague. When the news was published, Archbishop Lehtonen had yet to receive confirmation of the proposed CRE grant.²⁷⁰ He was only informed of the grant by Waddams towards the end of September, when Waddams wrote having arranged also to send a collection of books including copies of the most important works published during the war.²⁷¹

Perhaps as a result of the advance notice by the newspapers, it did not take long for Archbishop Lehtonen and his chaplain to decide what they wanted to do with the money. On 15 November 1945, Harjunpää wrote to Waddams, asking him to inform Mr. Allen, the Director of the CRE, that the Archbishop wished to propose that £500 of the total would be set aside by the CRE "to be used for various needs in the future." The rest of the sum was to be paid to the Finnish Missionary Society's bank account in London. This would enable the Society to pay the travel expenses of its missionaries returning from and going out to the Missions. Missionaries in the field had been cut off from Finland since the beginning of the war, and it would otherwise have been impossible to bear the costs of their travel. The Society had already paid the Archbishop £3500 in Finnish Marks to be used for reconstruction work in Finland, for which Harjunpää enclosed a receipt with his letter.²⁷²

²⁶⁹ *Kmaa* 69/14.9.1945 Englannin kirkko auttaa Suomea.

²⁷⁰ *Kmaa* 69/14.9.1945 Englannin kirkko auttaa Suomea.

²⁷¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Waddams to Lehtonen 27.9.1945.

²⁷² LPL CFR LR file 28 Harjunpää to Waddams 15.11.1945.

Harjunpää made no false assumptions concerning British wealth. This was natural, as he had lived through the war in London, and knew of the shortages in Britain from personal experience. Harjunpää assured Waddams that he would make this clear to others:

This practical gesture of true friendship has impressed us greatly, as we know how enormous sums are needed for reconstruction in your own country; and I for my part have made it quite clear to our people. We appreciate this gift very greatly indeed.²⁷³

The Finnish public knew little of the realities of the post-war situation in the United Kingdom, and Harjunpää did his best to educate them.

However, Harjunpää was wrong in one respect. He wrote to Waddams that the aid came from the British Council of Churches, which was not the case.²⁷⁴ The money came exclusively from the Church of England, which had collected it from its people and earmarked it through the CAC CRE to be used by the CRE for reconstruction aid in Finland.²⁷⁵ The complexity of the system confused the actual donor and misled even Harjunpää, who was the Finn best qualified to understand it.

Waddams replied quickly to Harjunpää that he had passed his letter to Mr. Allen of the CRE and gave his address for future use. Waddams had also been in touch with the secretary of the SPCK regarding the publication of Lehtonen's *Encyclical Letter, 1945* in England. Waddams reported that the secretary had responded quite favourably, saying that they would "always be interested to publish English translations of any important utterance or work emanating from the Church of Finland, provided that it seemed to be of general interest to English readers". However, he thought it would be difficult to get books printed in Finland to England. What was needed was a more concrete and precise proposal, about which Waddams asked Harjunpää to give his considered opinion.²⁷⁶ Harjunpää's response either never arrived or the matter was otherwise delayed before being forgotten.

It was Waddams' second suggestion which prompted more immediate action:

²⁷³ LPL CFR LR file 28 Harjunpää to Waddams 15.11.1945.

²⁷⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Harjunpää to Waddams 15.11.1945.

²⁷⁵ C.A. 788, 3.

²⁷⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Waddams to Harjunpää 24.11.1945; LPL CFR LR file 28 Davey to Waddams 22.11.1945.

At the Students Committee of this Council recently we decided that we should ask whether the Finnish Church had a student available soon who would be suitable for sending to this country for study in one of our theological colleges or other institutions. Probably it would be best to have a young pastor or Kandidater, but here again I would like you if you would discuss it with the Archbishop and let me know what you think. I am sure it would be very valuable if we could get this sort of interchange going.²⁷⁷

It is difficult to say whether this suggestion was made with a particular candidate in mind, but it can at the least be said that Archbishop Lehtonen's eldest son Samuel met Waddams' requirements. Lehtonen had already informed Waddams about his son's wish to come to England, and Waddams had promised to help in any way he could. Perhaps this was the first step.

Archbishop Lehtonen's own activity in getting his son Samuel a place at an English theological college was soon revealed. The principal of Westcott House, Cambridge, the Rev. William Greer, wrote to him only three days after Waddams, saying that he had learned that Lehtonen wanted his son to spend some time in one of the English Theological Colleges, preferably in Cambridge. This he had heard from his friends Robert Mackie of the World Student Christian Movement and Dr. Temple of the British and Foreign Bible Societies, both of whom had recently visited Finland and met the Archbishop.²⁷⁸ Archbishop Lehtonen had used every opportunity to get his son to England.

In normal circumstances, Greer would have been delighted to welcome the Archbishop's son to Westcott, but the College was presently full of men coming back from the army. In spite of this, he offered Samuel a place from the beginning of the Michaelmas term of 1946, and enquired about his interests. Concerning financial aid, he advised Lehtonen to write to Waddams and to the CRE, with an assessment of how much they could pay themselves. Greer's letter concluded with his assumption that Samuel spoke and understood English at least to some extent, and with the promise that they would try to answer his letter soon.²⁷⁹ Everything suggests that there was a mutual interest in getting the Archbishop's son to study in Cambridge.

²⁷⁷ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Waddams to Harjunpää 24.11.1945.

²⁷⁸ KA AL 35 Greer to Lehtonen 27.11.1945; *Kmaa* 77/12.10.1945 Lähentymistä Raamattuun Euroopan ylioppilaspireissä; *Kmaa* 86/13.11.1945 Euroopan ja Amerikan raamatuseurat yhteistoimintaan.

²⁷⁹ KA AL 35 Greer to Lehtonen 27.11.1945.

From a Finnish perspective, the immediate outcome of Archbishop Lehtonen's attempt to achieve closer relations with the Church of England was thus the promise of material help through the CRE. The Church of England seemed content to assist the Finnish Church in its post-war spiritual reconstruction through the offering of material help, theological literature and by supporting the sending of a Finnish student to study in England; the corresponding proposal to publish Lehtonen's *Encyclical Letter, 1945* in England proved much more difficult to achieve. There was little interest in anything beyond the reconstruction work then starting all over Europe, a probable result of the fact that the CRE constituted the best machinery for the Church of England to relate to foreign churches.

d. Gulin prefers the practical to the dogmatic in Anglican relations

Along with Lehtonen and Harjunpää, Eelis Gulin was the only other Finnish churchman who had any significant contacts with Church of England people, but he always had a somewhat ambivalent relationship with Anglicanism. Gulin was less interested in Faith and Order matters, but was instead a supporter of Life and Work ecumenism. The official ecumenical dialogue with the Anglicans was thus of little interest to him, in spite of the fact that he had participated in the second round of the 1930s negotiations; nor was he interested in Anglican theology, which he had dismissed in the mid-1930s as alien, unclear and old-fashioned.²⁸⁰

Furthermore, Gulin considered that the Anglican insistence on the apostolic succession as a guarantee of the authenticity of the apostolic tradition was alien to Protestantism. This attitude is exemplified in his book *Elämän rikkaus Jumalan seurakunnassa* (*The richness of life in the Church of God*), written for publication had he been elected Bishop of Oulu in 1943. Gulin had not been elected and thought that he would never be a bishop, so he had published the book in 1944.²⁸¹

However, the book showed that Gulin differed from many of his evangelical contemporaries in his understanding and appreciation of the apostolic succession as a gift and precious tradition. According to Gulin, the apostolic succession, understood as a gift, "represents vividly in visible form

²⁸⁰ Krapu 2007, 71-76.

²⁸¹ Krapu 2007, 126-128.

the invisible fact that our Church wants to retain and has retained a living link with the early Church of Jerusalem and our Lord Jesus of Nazareth."²⁸² This definition came close to the Augustine-derived catholic teaching of the Sacraments being outward and visible signs of an inward and invisible grace, which was the basis of traditional Anglican theology.²⁸³ Gulin went so far as to compare the nature of the gift in the apostolic succession to that in baptism, stating that they should not be seen as external signs guaranteeing God's favour and the gift of the Holy Spirit, but as precious gifts which represented the grace of God and through which thanks was given to God for his faithfulness and mercy through the ages.²⁸⁴

Where he departed from Anglican theology, however, was in his view of the efficacy and importance of such a sign. Gulin regarded the sign of apostolic succession as neither effectual nor necessary for the unity of the Church universal. In this respect Gulin also differed from his friend Lehtonen, who, while rejecting efficacy, understood the Anglican insistence on the historic episcopate as a basis for the visible unity of the Church, although he demanded a broader understanding of it, not based exclusively on the formal sign of apostolic succession. In spite of their shared openness to ecumenism, the two differed greatly in their view of the Anglican way of doing theology and ecumenism in particular.

Indeed, Lehtonen had noted Gulin's disinterest in Anglicanism in 1931, when Gulin had returned from the first Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference, at which he had been the only Finnish participant.²⁸⁵ This underscores the peculiarity of Gulin's position as one of the few leading ecumenists in Finland; his lack of interest in Anglicanism in particular was of much less importance than his general interest in the ecumenical movement and his ability to converse with foreign church leaders. So Gulin, without ever being a great proponent of Anglican-Lutheran relations, was tied to ecumenical encounter with Anglicans whether he was interested in it or not, and was thus relatively well known to Church of England ecumenists before he became the Bishop of Tampere in the summer of 1945.

The process of Gulin's election and consecration reveals something of how the CFR monitored the situation in Finland. The first news of Gulin's

²⁸² *Gulin* 1947, 87-88.

²⁸³ *Crockett* 1999, 311.

²⁸⁴ *Gulin* 1947, 103.

²⁸⁵ *Krapu* 2007, 70-71.

nomination came from the Anglican Chaplain in Stockholm, the Rev. C.H. Jones, who followed news about Finland in Swedish and Finnish-Swedish newspapers.²⁸⁶ His contribution was later supplemented by English churchmen, whose correspondence with their Finnish friends kept them up to date with Finnish affairs.²⁸⁷ CFR information on Finland thus consisted of both public news and individual assessments.

The situation in 1945, when the Finnish Church wanted to strengthen all its contacts with the West, meant that Gulin also had good reason to keep in touch with his English friends and acquaintances. Such contact was for the good of the church and the nation. Even before he was a bishop, he had written to Waddams suggesting the promotion of correspondence between the clergy of both churches, and saying he had a good Finnish candidate in mind. Waddams considered the idea excellent and suggested that Gulin contact the CFR.²⁸⁸ It seems that the idea was never put into practice, though it serves as a good illustration of Gulin's personality. It was typical for Gulin to engage in a friendly manner with other Christians, regardless of their denomination or origin, in a spirit of practical Christian service and in order to promote goodwill and understanding between people. His ecumenism was based on the evangelical concept of unity of faith between individual believers; belonging to a church simply opened avenues to engage with other Christians.²⁸⁹

Something of Gulin's naïve enthusiasm for the common Christian cause was expressed in his letter to Bishop Bell, whose help he asked in organising safe passage home for a German-Jewish Christian called Arthur Siebel:

My dear Lord,

it is a joy for me to write to you after the horrible war has ended. Greater still is my gratitude towards God for the fact that *Una Sancta* has prevailed and that we have a new opportunity to serve our fellow men by the Gospel.

²⁸⁶ LPL Douglas papers vol.73 *The Church of Finland (General View)* by Archbishop Aleksii Lehtonen, Åbo, Sept.1944-Aug.1945; LPL CFR Documents C.C. 46. Professor Elis Gulin now Bishop of Tammerfors. Extract from *Hufvudstadsbladet* 16th June 1945.

²⁸⁷ LPL CFR Documents C.C. 46. Professor Elis Gulin now Bishop of Tammerfors. Extract from *Hufvudstadsbladet* 16th June 1945; LPL CFR Documents C.C. 50. Extract from a letter from Pastor Toivo Harjunpaa to the Rev. Dr. C.B. Moss, dated Sept. 7 [1945], Tyrva, Finland.

²⁸⁸ KA EG 27 Waddams to Gulin 30.5.1945.

²⁸⁹ *Krapu* 2007, 128.

Now I write to you on behalf of a friend of mine, a German antinazi refugee, who has been here since 1938 after having been in Hitler's prison in Germany several times. He is a Christian "atombomb", a man of unusual energy for the sake of Christ. Now he wishes to go back to his home, the Siegerland in Westphalen, which is ruled now by Your British countrymen. Are you so extremely kind, that you would do something for his sake? He has made a detailed plan for a Christian rebuilding of his home land.²⁹⁰

Interestingly, Gulin nowhere mentioned that Siebel had been a Jew who had found refuge in Finland before the war, but referred to him only as "a German antinazi refugee". This suggests that Siebel's Jewish ancestry was of no particular interest to Gulin, as it had no bearing in Finnish society. Indeed, the British Legation in Helsinki reported at the time that there was "no anti-semitism in Finland, despite the country's close connections with Nazi-Germany during the war of 1941-1944"²⁹¹, which is confirmed by later studies showing that anti-Semitism was a marginal feature in Finnish society.²⁹²

Gulin received Bell's answer shortly. His reply was written in similarly friendly style; he addressed Gulin as "My dear Bishop and Friend":

I was overjoyed to get your letter of the 29th August. May I say how often my thoughts go back to our meeting in Holland, and our talks there. May we have opportunities in the near future for strengthening our fellowship and expressing the reality of the Una Sancta.²⁹³

Bell's reference to Holland concerned an international ecumenical meeting held in Apeldoorn from 8 to 9 January 1940, at which Gulin had attempted to secure western help for Finland in its Winter War against the Soviet Union. Gulin had not been very successful. In particular, his suggestion that the west had forgotten the special case of Finland and the nature of the dictatorship in Russia in its urge to oppose Germany was not well received.²⁹⁴

However, there was no trace of sarcasm or irony in Bell's answer. On the contrary, he acknowledged the difficulty of getting entry for anyone to Germany, but promised to do what he could to help and offered to make

²⁹⁰ LPL Bell papers vol.87 Gulin to Bell 29.8.1945.

²⁹¹ PRO FO371/65929 The Social Structures of Finland 12.10.1945.

²⁹² *Lauha* 2005, 28; *Hanski* 2006, 410-413.

²⁹³ KA EG 23 Bell to Gulin 19.9.1945.

²⁹⁴ *Ripatti* 1990, 45-46; *Krapu* 2007, 99-102.

enquiries to see if Siebel might first be got to Sweden.²⁹⁵ It took some time to resolve the matter, as Siebels were able to return to Germany only in November 1948. Throughout, Gulin ensured that the matter was not forgotten by his Swedish and English friends.²⁹⁶ Gulin could be resolute when it was necessary for the welfare of an individual.

That Gulin was now a bishop was likely only to increase the Church of England's interest in him, and in Waddams' case, especially so. On his visit in Finland, Waddams had not been greatly impressed by Gulin. However, he was quick to congratulate Gulin before he had himself been elected to the CFR. Gulin's reply to Waddams was jovial and honest. He thought that Waddams would probably understand how much he trembled before his new duties, but admitted all the same that the "new work interests me more deeply than I can say."²⁹⁷ Gulin was also happy that Waddams had begun preparations for the first Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference to be held since the end of the war.²⁹⁸ Perhaps the difficulties of the period and the resulting need to develop contacts abroad helped him to appreciate the value of such meetings more.

Bishop Gulin continued as the chairman of the Finnish Ecumenical Council and arguably enjoyed an extensive influence in the Finnish church and in society. Unsurprisingly, the CRE Literature Committee became interested in him and Gulin was approached by its chairman, Hugh Martin. Martin informed Gulin that having consulted the WCC Reconstruction Department they had decided to give him a year's subscription to *The International Review of Missions*, *The Christian Newsletter* and *The Expository Times*.²⁹⁹ Martin described these as pretty standard 'British religious periodicals', which were sent as a gift from the CRE. He hoped that Gulin would "accept the journals as a token of Christian fellowship" and that they would "be found helpful in your work".³⁰⁰ The publications were well chosen for Gulin, who must have found them a welcome gift.

However, Martin's previous work for the Ministry of Information had not been in vain. His first letter informed Gulin that he would be sent a pleas-

²⁹⁵ KA EG 23 Bell to Gulin 19.9.1945.

²⁹⁶ *Krapu* 2007, 151.

²⁹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 117/1 Gulin to Waddams 25.7.1945.

²⁹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 117/1 Gulin to Waddams 25.7.1945.

²⁹⁹ KA EG 25 Martin to Gulin 12.9.1945.

³⁰⁰ KA EG 25 Martin to Gulin 12.9.1945.

ing and useful gift as a token of Christian fellowship; his second letter, sent a month later, informed him that something quite different was being sent:

My Committee feel that you may be glad to have for distribution some copies of a booklet describing the life of the British Churches during the war. We have had many requests from the Continent for something of this kind. By the kindness of the British Ministry of Information copies of a booklet written by myself on this subject are being delivered to you.³⁰¹

As Martin himself was the author of the booklet, and as it had been produced for the Ministry of Information, the book can only have been *The British Churches in War-time*, whose distribution in Finland Waddams had suggested in his report to the Ministry.

Martin added that if Gulin needed them, he could be sent more copies. From January 1946, Gulin would also receive *Theology*, which was added to the papers the CRE sent him.³⁰² It seems that Gulin was happy with the arrangement and did ask for more booklets. Martin wrote to him again at the beginning of December that more books were on their way, this time for clergy, and Gulin should organise their circulation in the way he saw best. Martin concluded that if there was any other way his committee could help the Finns, they would be happy to do their best.³⁰³ In effect, Gulin had become an important part of Waddams' plan to educate the Finns through British propaganda. Whether he ever realized this is doubtful, though it must be acknowledged that Waddams' plan in no way contradicted Gulin's own interest in promoting friendly relations among Christian people and nations.

Apart from official relations, Gulin had some personal contacts with English churchmen like the Bishop of Derby and the Dean of Chichester, A.S. Duncan-Jones. These contacts resumed after the war, abetted by the fact that Gulin was an enthusiastic correspondent, and represented a revival of political embeddedness in church relations. In his correspondence with Gulin, Duncan-Jones made it very clear that Waddams' approach of tolerance of and understanding for the Soviet Union was not universal in the Church of England. Having received Gulin's greetings through Bell, Duncan-Jones wrote to him congratulating him on his consecration and made known his political views in no uncertain terms:

³⁰¹ KA EG 25 Martin to Gulin 19.10.1945.

³⁰² KA EG 25 Martin to Gulin 19.10.1945.

³⁰³ KA EG 25 Martin to Gulin 5.12.1945.

I am delighted to hear that you are to succeed our good friend Lehtonen as Bishop of Tampere. My wife and I have thought so much and so often of you and your wife during these dreadful years. We have always endeavoured to put the Finnish point of view when that has been obscured and misrepresented by the Press, as has too often been the case.--

We cannot help being anxious about the future of Finland, though the outlook there seems brighter than it does anywhere else in Eastern Europe. The Russian domination is a terrible thing and a menace to us all. But perhaps even more terrible is the fear or blindness which prevents so many people in England and France from recognising the true facts, or even trying to find them out.

One thing is certain, that in view of the terrible forces of evil and godlessness which are abroad in the world, there is even greater necessity than there has ever been in the past for the cultivation of the closest possible unity between all parts of Christ's Church, and unswerving maintenance of the faith in the salvation which comes from Him alone.³⁰⁴

Duncan-Jones was the first English churchman openly to express the new concerns of the Cold War regarding the Finnish and wider European future in his correspondence with the Finns. He certainly did not harbour much hope of peaceful co-operation with the Soviet Union; on the contrary, he saw it as a threat. His views coincided with the prevailing opinion in Finnish church circles, and surely, to a great extent, with Gulin's.³⁰⁵ Whatever his willingness to circulate British propaganda among Finnish clergy, there is no reason to suppose Gulin shared Waddams' political views. He was glad to help, and to show some Christian charity to all who came to him.

³⁰⁴ KA EG 23 Duncan-Jones to Gulin 13.9.1945.

³⁰⁵ *Lauba* 1999, 67-68.

III The quest for reconstruction and reunion 1946-1947

1. Lehtonen seeks closer relations with the Church of England

a. Lehtonen steers a course towards England

The year 1946 did not begin positively for the CRE: the distribution of funds promised proved to be a troublesome task. The agreed payment of £3500 to the Finnish Missionary Society's account in London had still not been made. Lehtonen sent a telegram to the CRE enquiring about the delay in late February 1946. He received a prompt reply from Miss Eleanor Iredale, who had succeeded Mr Allen as General Secretary of the CRE. Iredale took the task immediately in hand and informed Lehtonen that she had already taken steps to pay the sum to the Finnish Missionary Society, the remaining £500 being held by the CRE until the Finnish Church wanted to spend it.¹ Iredale struck the Finns as a positive and energetic General Secretary from the beginning.

It was clear that Iredale had a mind of her own, and was not afraid of using her initiative:

May I make a suggestion? I am most anxious that at least some part, and if possible a considerable part, of the gifts which are made by Sister Churches such as our own, should be used to strengthen the relations between the Churches of our country and the Churches of Europe. The kind of thing I have in mind is the facilitating of visits by the most outstandingly gifted members of the Church of either country to one another, with a view to enabling such visitors to get that knowledge of each other's

¹ KA AL 42 Iredale to Lehtonen 21.2.1946.

problems, interests and concerns that would give them the respect for one another's experience on which friendship is based.

This whole question is one which may have to be considered a little later when things are easier, but I am sure we would be wise in planning for it as soon as possible and keeping at least a part of the funds that are raised and given to different countries in reserve for use in enabling visits to be exchanged between our two countries for anything from six weeks to two months, or even three months, if able people can be spared for so long.²

Iredale's suggestion was bound to please Lehtonen; it should be noted that the idea of using CRE funds to support and strengthen relations between the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland originated from the General Secretary of CRE and not from the Archbishop himself.

Iredale asked Lehtonen only to write something about how the funds had helped the Finns to meet their needs to "stimulate the interest of the Church of this country in the Churches of Finland, for whom we are all concerned at this difficult time."³ While sharing the generally gloomy assessment in England of the Finnish situation, Iredale's position as leader of an ecumenical body is exemplified by her use of the plural form when speaking about churches in both countries. This is an indication of the balance between bilateral Lutheran-Anglican and wider ecumenical co-operation the CRE and its officials were bound to by the nature of their work.

Iredale's suggestion for using CRE funds for ecclesiastical exchanges could hardly have arrived at a better time for Lehtonen, who was preparing for a trip to England in May 1946. He must have informed Iredale of this in his telegram, as she already knew of his impending visit and looked forward to meeting him.⁴ It seems that the two were in immediate agreement about how the limited CRE reconstruction funds might be used in Finland. The beginning of Iredale's chairmanship must thus have energized Lehtonen to seek ever closer relations with the Church of England in particular and British Christianity in general. His forthcoming visit would provide a perfect opportunity to do just that.

Lehtonen's visit was organised by the British and Foreign Bible Societies and was associated with the formation of the United Bible Societies, which the Finnish Bible Society had been invited to join. The Bible Societ-

² KA AL 42 Iredale to Lehtonen 21.2.1946.

³ KA AL 42 Iredale to Lehtonen 21.2.1946.

⁴ KA AL 42 Iredale to Lehtonen 21.2.1945.

ies constituted another front on which Archbishop Lehtonen was working to increase contact with the British churches.⁵ Some attempts had been made to coordinate the efforts of the British and Foreign Bibles Society's (BFBS) Finnish branch and the Finnish Bible Society in 1934, but without success. The intention had been that the Finnish Church should take entire responsibility for the sale of the Scriptures in Finland. Surprisingly, this had been strongly advocated by the BFBS, who nevertheless wanted to ensure the independence of the Finnish Bible Society from the Finnish Home Mission Society. According to the BFBS, the Finnish Bible Society had gradually "lost all life and was content to maintain the quiet 'status quo', even allowing its control to pass into the hands of the Finnish Home Mission Society".⁶ Evidently, the BFBS had no real confidence in the Finnish Home Mission Society's handling of Bible distribution.

The situation had changed in the autumn of 1945, when Archbishop Lehtonen had invited the Secretary of the BFBS, the Rev. John R. Temple, to visit Finland on the 133rd anniversary of the Finnish Bible Society.⁷ Lehtonen and Temple had produced a plan for future Bible work in Finland, according to which the Finnish Bible Society should become completely independent from the (Finnish) Home Mission Society, form a Committee under which the work in Finland of the BFBS and its director Mr. Pimehoff should come, and enter into the fullest co-operation with other Bible Societies in encouraging the wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures within and without Finland. As part of the plan Lehtonen was to represent the Finnish Bible Society at the Conference of the Bible Societies in London in May 1946.⁸

While the united Bible work clearly coincided well with Lehtonen's ecumenical vision, there was more to his visit: it provided an opportunity for furthering relations with the Church of England. Thus, at the same time he hoped to organise a follow-up meeting of the 1930s discussions with the Church of England and wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury Geoffrey Fisher with this suggestion in March 1946.⁹

⁵ The interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000; *Ripatti* 1990, 236-237.

⁶ CUL BSA BFBS D8/8/1 Finland. 1931-1948. Record of Policy and Main Events.

⁷ *Ripatti* 1990, 236-237.

⁸ CUL BSA BFBS D8/8/1 Finland. 1931-1948. Record of Policy and Main Events.

⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 2.3.1946 copy.

Lehtonen began with various compliments. He had looked forward to coming to England for a long time, as he wanted to meet Fisher personally to thank him “for his kind interest in the Church of Finland, shown by the presence of the Bishop of Fulham as your representative at my installation to my present office, and by your valuable support to our Church in London during the last difficult years.”¹⁰ He also asked Fisher “to convey our thanks to all friends of the Church of Finland who in England have kept up friendly relations with us, so many of who are bishops and leading churchmen.”¹¹

In this way, Lehtonen sought to bond with Fisher, with a clear aim in mind:

I would be grateful, if perhaps an opportunity would be found during my stay in London for discussion concerning the next steps to be taken in our relations in accordance with the Resolution passed by the Convocation of Canterbury on June 6th, 1935 (The Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury, pages 378, 421; and the York Journal of Convocation January 1935, pages 40, 43, 81 and 86). As far as I can see, a notable progress has taken place during the last eleven years, but there still remain points for further consideration. I wonder whether there could be an opportunity for me of meeting some of the members of the Joint Committee on our mutual relations. These were Bishop Headlam, the Bishop of Derby and the Bishop of Fulham, the Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Matthews, the Dean of Chichester, Dr. Duncan-Jones, Professor Raven, and Dr. C.B. Moss. Of course, I would also like to meet the Rev. Waddams who so kindly visited me in Finland 1944. If you have no objection to my suggestion, I would later on send you further details.¹²

Lehtonen knew exactly what he wanted: a meeting that would take on the work of the negotiations of the 1930s. His specific reference to the resolutions of the Convocations of Canterbury and York reveal that he did not expect Fisher to know the actual state of relations, and wanted to get him on the right track from the start.

Fisher accepted the proposal and assigned Waddams to prepare for the meeting. Following his orders Waddams sent invitations to all whom Lehtonen had mentioned and who had taken part in the previous conferences, explaining that the meeting was to discuss the relations between the churches and asking them to make every effort to attend.¹³ The Church of England followed Lehtonen's initiative to the letter.

¹⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 2.3.1946 copy.

¹¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 2.3.1946 copy.

¹² LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 2.3.1946 copy.

¹³ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Archbishop Lehtonen. A draft invitation by Waddams s.d.1946.

There was more to Lehtonen's ecumenical endeavours. Two days after he had written to Archbishop Fisher, he wrote to Waddams regarding the next Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference, planned for Denmark in 1947.¹⁴ Waddams had participated at the last meeting, held in Durham in 1939, and had been preparing for this conference ever since his Nordic visit in 1944.¹⁵ The only Finnish participant at these conferences had thus far been Eelis Gulin, who had already expressed his enthusiasm for the conferences in general and Waddams' preparations in particular the previous summer.¹⁶ Now Lehtonen wanted to ensure that the timing of the conference would allow both him and Gulin to participate, and that Waddams was aware that they wanted to organise the next conference in Finland.¹⁷

Hosting this conference would have allowed Lehtonen to further the Anglo-Lutheran relations both at home and abroad and would have brought international attention to his church and nation. In the tense political situation of 1946, all relations with sympathetic western churches were bound to give a positive stimulus to Finnish morale and affirm the sense that their cause was not forgotten. Yet just at this time, the Finnish People's Democratic Press was voicing strong criticism of Finns and Norwegians who travelled to Sweden, suggesting their promotion of Nordic co-operation was a cover for both junkets and the creation of an ideological block against the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly, Lehtonen kept a low profile concerning the existing co-operation with even the other Nordic Churches, let alone the Church of England.¹⁸

Waddams, however, was delighted to learn of Lehtonen's trip, and looked forward to seeing him. He suggested that one person from the BFBS should be made responsible for Lehtonen's programme and offered his assistance in general and in making some engagements in England in particular.¹⁹ Aside from the forthcoming visit, Waddams supported Lehtonen's plans to get to the Anglo-Scandinavian Conference, although the practicalities were in the hands of the Danes, and offered further help in getting the Archbishop's

¹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Lehtonen to Waddams 4.3.1946.

¹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 117/1 Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference. Waddams 29.11.1944; *Bring* 1965, 187.

¹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 117/1 Gulin to Waddams 25.7.1945; *Bring* 1965, 186-187.

¹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Lehtonen to Waddams 4.3.1946.

¹⁸ *Ripatti* 1990, 213.

¹⁹ KA AL 35 Waddams to Lehtonen 11.3.1946; *Ripatti* 1990, 237.

son to study in Cambridge, a matter which Lehtonen had mentioned in his letter. Waddams concluded by sending his regards to both Lehtonen and his family.²⁰ His correspondence with Lehtonen was friendly and down-to-earth, the product of an easy working relationship that was not stiffened by the difference in age, position or nationality.

Another sign of the friendliness and warmth between the two was the way Waddams responded to Lehtonen's gift of the Swedish edition of his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*, which Lehtonen sent before leaving for England. He promised to read it "with the greatest interest" and write something about it for some English church newspapers, if he possibly found time.²¹ Even if his tone was friendly and familiar, it seems that the time was never found. Typically, Lehtonen's attempt to raise interest in England about his church was met with kind words and little action. However, in this case it was at least understandable. Finding the time to review a book in a foreign language was a tall order for a busy bureaucrat like Waddams.

As the news of Lehtonen's forthcoming visit to England spread his old friends and colleagues in the ecumenical field began to get in touch with him.²² Among them was Bishop George Bell, who wrote at the beginning of March saying how sorry they had been that Lehtonen had missed the World Council of Churches (WCC) meeting in Geneva. Bell hoped that Lehtonen would indeed make it to the meeting of the United Bible Societies, which was to be held in his own diocese, Chichester.²³

Bell's concern about Lehtonen's ability to travel abroad was valid. Lehtonen had indeed felt unable to attend the meeting in Geneva, since it coincided with the trumped-up trial of the 'war criminals' imposed by the Allied Control Commission in Finland. Based on retrospective legislation the trial was contrary to Nordic principles of justice, and caused great unease in Finland. Most of the war-time government concerned with foreign relations were convicted of initiating the war and delaying a peace treaty. Only the commander of the armed forces during the war, President Mannerheim, escaped charges and subsequently handed in his resignation on the conclusion of the trial in early March. This was followed by a presiden-

²⁰ KA AL 35 Waddams to Lehtonen 11.3.1946.

²¹ KA AL 35 Waddams to Lehtonen 11.4.1946.

²² KA AL 35 Bishop of Derby to Lehtonen 19.4.1946; KA AL 35 Rank and Gregory to Lehtonen 24.4.1946.

²³ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.307 Bell to Lehtonen 6.3.1946.

tial election by the Finnish Diet, which elected J.K Paasikivi with a large majority as the new president of Finland.²⁴

This critical time for the nation inevitably affected the Archbishop. The tension, however, eased during the spring. The correspondence between Lehtonen and Waddams shows that the Finnish situation was closely followed by the CFR. As early as April, Waddams expressed the hope "that things in Finland are getting back to normal again."²⁵ This was indeed the case and there was no further hindrance to Lehtonen making his long awaited journey to England. Lehtonen replied to Bell that he looked forward to having "an opportunity to discuss with you several actual matters, especially the further developments of the relations of our Churches."²⁶ Lehtonen had set his priorities, and the development of close relations with the Church of England was high on his list.

However, Lehtonen left one question unanswered in his reply, possibly wanting to discuss it with Bell in private once he was in England. Bell had included a document in his previous letter, which he had acquired through the CFR and found "rather baffling, in a way, to us" and asked if Lehtonen could provide him with any information concerning the situation.²⁷ It remains unknown what the document really was, but Bell's apologetic and non-committal style suggests that he was puzzled about and less than happy with the content of the document.

The document may well have been Pimenoff's 1945 report on Finland, written for the BFBS and probably sent to Waddams in January 1946.²⁸ In his report, Pimenoff continued the discourse of December 1944, with strong criticism of Finnish society and showing a similar sympathy for Soviet aspirations. Pimenoff's report contained disturbing suggestions of crimes committed by Finns against Russian prisoners-of-war, of anti-British feelings in Finland during the war, and of the Finnish Government's successful attempts "towards moulding the country's political life into such new forms of democracy, that these have so far been approved by both the West and

²⁴ Ripatti 1990, 205; Paasivirta 1992, 299-302; Nevakivi 1995, 162-169; Nevakivi 1999, 227-228, 235; Kirby 2006, 233-234.

²⁵ KA AL 35 Waddams to Lehtonen 11.4.1946.

²⁶ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.309 Lehtonen to Bell 18.4.1946.

²⁷ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.307 Bell to Lehtonen 6.3.1946.

²⁸ CUL BSA D3/1/6 Annual Report of the Helsingfors Debot of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the Year 1945. Finland; LPL CFR OC file 121 Pimenoff to Waddams 16.1.1946.

East despite their largely different interpretation of democracy.”²⁹ So the cause of Bell’s bafflement may have been anything from disgust to disbelief and concern for the state of Finnish democracy.

Leaving aside the particular allegations, it is likely in any case that Bell was baffled by Pimenoff’s pro-Soviet discourse. If so, it is an indication that Church of England politics had already changed considerably. What Wadams had considered as Allied policy just over a year earlier, had become an embarrassment for Bell, who now knew much more about the actual political and ecclesiastical situation in Eastern Europe under Soviet occupation: Pimenoff’s argument was already hopelessly out of date.

b. Nordic reconciliation at the Bible Conference

In April, Lehtonen received more information about his schedule in England. The Bible Conference part of his programme was handled by Temple, who sent him information about registration and the engagements he had made for him. The letter was accompanied by travel tickets for the Archbishop, his wife and Harjunpää, who travelled as Archbishop’s Chaplain. The austerity of post-war Britain was underlined by the fact that Temple asked the participants to give Bible House in London as their address in England, in order that he could obtain food vouchers for them. A limit of £10 could be brought to England, which, Temple said, would not be a problem, as all expenses of the guests would be met.³⁰ Everything suggests that the BFBS took good care of their foreign visitors.

As a personal friend, Temple was delighted to welcome Lehtonen and his wife to England. He had arranged some engagements for the Archbishop, and asked him to speak on some occasions and to chair one of the sessions at the conference.³¹ This was natural not only because of Lehtonen’s position as the Archbishop of Finland, but also because he had chaired several international ecumenical meetings before the war.³²

²⁹ CUL BSA D3/1/6 Annual Report of the Helsingfors Debot of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the Year 1945. Finland, 10.

³⁰ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachement BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946.

³¹ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachement BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946.

³² *Aurola* 1951, 91-92.

The Finnish delegation sailed for England from Turku on 23 April 1946. They journeyed first to Gothenburg and from there to London, where they arrived on 29 April.³³ As the journey alone took almost a week in one direction, it is hardly surprising that the Archbishop needed to prioritise his travels.

The official programme began the next day with the British Council of Churches' (BCC) Council meeting, to which Lehtonen was probably invited by Waddams.³⁴ The programme continued later the same evening with the Burge Lecture, given by Bishop Eivind Berggrav at King's College.³⁵ Like Lehtonen, Berggrav had come to London to attend the Bible Society conference, and this was their first chance to meet each other since before the war.³⁶

What made their meeting especially noteworthy was the tension there had been between the Finnish and Norwegian Churches since the war: Norway had been occupied by Nazi Germany, Finland's ally against the Soviet Union.³⁷ Even English ecumenists were aware of the tension: Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester had expressed his hope to Gulin already in November 1945 that the British might assist with a healing process.³⁸ This was no pious hope: both Lehtonen and Berggrav were known anglophiles and the conference allowed them to spend some time together on neutral soil.³⁹

The following day began with the BFBS's annual meeting, after which the foreign church leaders were welcomed by Archbishop Fisher; Lehtonen replied on behalf of the foreign guests.⁴⁰ Bishop Berggrav was among the main speakers, and Temple had asked Lehtonen and two other dignitaries

³³ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachement BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946; *Fsb* 16-17/18.4.1946 Ärkebiskopen till England.

³⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Archbishop Lehtonen's visit to England 1946; *Ripatti* 1990, 237.

³⁵ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachement BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946.

³⁶ *Ripatti* 1990, 237-239.

³⁷ *Ripatti* 1990, 215-222, 238-239.

³⁸ KA EG 23 Duncan-Jones to Gulin 17.11.1945.

³⁹ *Ripatti* 1990, 238-239.

⁴⁰ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachement BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946; *Fsb* 20/16.5.1946 Bibelsällskapskongressen i London.

to “say a few words” at the Treasurer’s Luncheon that followed.⁴¹ Temple had obviously made some effort to ensure that each distinguished guest had his fair share of publicity.

Some of this reached even the Finnish press, perhaps with the help of the Archbishop’s party. A section of a speech by Lehtonen, probably from his reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury, was later quoted in *Kotimaa*:

The Church of England has more than any other worked for the reunion of all Christians. We need the lead which Canterbury has provided, and wish that England still inspired those churches who have traditionally been close to the Church of England.⁴²

Clearly, Archbishop Lehtonen did not neglect bilateral relations with the Church of England even at an ecumenical Bible Conference.

Following the meeting of the BFBS, Lehtonen availed of the opportunity presented by break of a few days to attend to relations with the Church of England. Waddams had clearly organised a tight schedule for the following day, Thursday 2 May: Lehtonen lunched at the Nikean Club, which was in Waddams’ words “a semi-official hospitality agency in close connection with CFR”; had the follow-up meeting he had asked for at the CFR headquarters in Lollards Tower at Lambeth Palace; and dined with Archbishop Fisher at the Palace.⁴³

Perhaps because Bishop John Rawlinson of Derby had taken an interest in Lehtonen’s schedule, Waddams had arranged for Lehtonen to spend the weekend in the Bishop’s company.⁴⁴ Rawlinson, being unable to take part in the follow-up meeting in London, had written to Lehtonen before the visit apologizing for his absence and inviting him to spend a quiet weekend with him in Derby.⁴⁵ However tempting the invitation was, it is unlikely Lehtonen would have been able to accept it.⁴⁶ What little time he

⁴¹ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachement BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946.

⁴² *Kmaa* 38/24.5.1946 Me olemme löytäneet Raamatun uudestaan.

⁴³ LPL Bell papers vol.171 Waddams to Bell 2.1.1946; LPL CFR LR file 28 Archbishop Lehtonen’s visit to England 1946; *CT* 10.5.1946 Nikean Club. Reception for Archbishops.

⁴⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Archbishop Lehtonen’s visit to England 1946.

⁴⁵ KA AL 35 Bishop of Derby to Lehtonen on Good Friday 1946.

⁴⁶ L PL CFR LR file 28 Archbishop Lehtonen’s visit to England 1946; KA AL 35 Bishop of Derby to Lehtonen 25.5.1945.

had in England, had to be used prudently in the most profitable way for his church.

Instead, Lehtonen's party spent the weekend visiting the Finnish Seamen's Church in London and taking part in the Scandinavian Sunday Service at St Martin in the Fields, which all the Nordic visitors to the Bible Conference attended. The service was extraordinary in more ways than one. Along with the inevitable difficulty of accommodating more than one bishop and ecclesiastical tradition in one service there were also three sermons, preached by Bishop Berggrav, Archbishop Lehtonen and Dean Olle Nysted from Sweden.⁴⁷

The official programme continued on Monday, when the delegates of the Bible Society Conference met the General Committee members at Bible House. Temple had asked Lehtonen to deliver a speech about Bible work in Finland.⁴⁸ In his speech, Lehtonen outlined plans that included deeper cooperation with the BFBS and with various bodies doing Bible Work in Finland. He planned the establishment of a Central Council for Bible Work, consisting of representatives from the various Lutheran organisations and the Orthodox and the Free Churches under his chairmanship.⁴⁹ This serves both as a sign of Lehtonen's keen interest in Christian unity in practice, but, further, of his wish to centralize various ecumenical endeavours under his own supervision.

The speech itself was both inspiring and focused on action. According to Lehtonen, the Bible Society could "not be in these tumultuous days like a ship in anchorage in the quiet waters of home harbour. It must lift up its anchor and start for a new crusade."⁵⁰ These metaphors arose not only from the voyage they had made to the shores of England, but also from the fact that sailing had been Lehtonen's beloved hobby since his boyhood.⁵¹ Moreover, the metaphor of the crusade hinted at a common enemy: the atheistic unbelief propagated by the Soviets.

⁴⁷ KA SMLS C 20 Minutes 1945-1946, Fa 10 incoming mail, Lontoon Suomalainen Merimieslähetysseura; *Kansanaho* 1983, 268; *Fsb* 20/16.5.1946 Bibelsällskapskongressen i London.

⁴⁸ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachment BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946.

⁴⁹ KA AL 35 Speech by Abp Aleksi Lehtonen sd.

⁵⁰ KA AL 35 Speech by Abp Aleksi Lehtonen sd.

⁵¹ *Winter* 1951, 13-15.

Lehtonen spoke of the visit to England and meeting with many long-standing international friends affording happy memories from his days in the Student Christian Movement, which had offered the first ecumenical experience for many of those present. This sentiment did not, however, prevent him from reminding his audience that the Finns needed their “support both spiritual and material.”⁵² Although he was genuinely ecumenical, concern for the nation remained a constant theme in all his international contacts and those of his generation in the Church of Finland.

Lehtonen concluded with thanks for being welcomed as an honorary member of the BFBS. This was perhaps the reason why he had been asked to make the speech in the first place.⁵³ As befitted the occasion, there was no reference to relations with the Church of England. That was taken care of elsewhere.

On Monday afternoon, the participants were taken to the Elfinward conference centre at Haywards Heath in the Diocese of Chichester, where they stayed until Thursday. Temple had asked Berggrav to chair sessions on Tuesday and Lehtonen on Wednesday.⁵⁴ The first sessions on Monday and Tuesday dealt mostly with the war-time experiences of the delegates, many of whom like Bishops Berggrav and Lilje had been imprisoned.⁵⁵ Not surprisingly the Finnish representatives, including the Lehtonens, Harjunpää and Pimenoff, remained silent at this point. They were the only people from a country that had fought against the Allies but had retained the freedom of religion.

Lehtonen's only contribution was to suggest they sing Luther's hymn 'A safe stronghold our God is still' to express their gratitude to Dr. Temple, whose birthday it was. It seems that Lehtonen either did not realize, or did not care, that the hymn had been especially associated with German nationalism during the First World War and was thus perhaps not the most politically correct choice.⁵⁶ As the hymn was, no doubt, known to everyone, and as the suggestion was probably innocent, no-one seemed offended.

⁵² KA AL 35 Speech by Abp Aleksii Lehtonen sd.

⁵³ KA AL 35 Speech by Abp Aleksii Lehtonen sd.

⁵⁴ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachment BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946.

⁵⁵ Elfinward 1946, 5-12.

⁵⁶ Elfinward 1946, 12; *Gritsch* 2002, 212.

The incident, together with the meaningful silence of the Finnish participants, served to underline the fact that the Finnish church leaders felt no particular guilt concerning the war. The hymn had strong resonances in Finland as well, where it had been sung spontaneously in 1939 at Helsinki railway station when the Finnish diplomats left to negotiate in Moscow on the eve of the Winter War. Such patriotism had seemed appropriate in the face of the threat posed by the godless Soviet Union. Finland and Nazi Germany were considered by the Finns to have been in essence completely different. The only guilt the Finnish church leaders felt for the Second World War was the collective guilt of sinful humanity, which had brought the nations to war. They had no share in the guilt of Germany, and were made somewhat bitter by the fact that the rest of the world seemed not to appreciate their point of view.⁵⁷

However, these happy days in England afforded an opportunity for reconciliation between Lehtonen and Berggrav. The atmosphere of the meeting was exemplified when the Nordic delegates, led by Mrs. Lehtonen, sang the Norwegian national anthem to commemorate the day of Norwegian liberation, which was immediately followed by the Dutch national anthem to commemorate the liberation of the Netherlands exactly a year before.⁵⁸

The dominant personality at the meeting was Berggrav, who with great humour chaired many of the sessions, and also at several points appeared at the back of the plenary room with his Norwegian peasant pipe, as Pimenoff later recalled to the *Kotimaa* reporter.⁵⁹ One factor in the easing of tension was that both Lehtonen and Berggrav were confirmed anglophiles, and were greatly enjoying, having endured the privations of war, attending this international ecumenical meeting. Lehtonen was relieved that all had gone so well, and wrote to Gulin from England that it had been a first class conference.⁶⁰

The Lehtonens left England on Saturday 11 on the MS "Suecia" to Gothenburg, where they spent some days as guests of Bishop Carl Block, before continuing home to Turku.⁶¹ On his return, Lehtonen thanked Berggrav for

⁵⁷ *Lauha* 1999, 67-69.

⁵⁸ *Kmaa* 38/24.5.1946 Me olemme löytäneet Raamatun uudestaan.

⁵⁹ *Kmaa* 38/24.5.1946 Me olemme löytäneet Raamatun uudestaan; *Robertson* 1996, 19-23.

⁶⁰ *Ripatti* 1990, 237-239.

⁶¹ KA AL 35 Temple to Lehtonen 8.4.1946 with attachement BFBS to Lehtonen 25.3.1946; LPL CFR LR file 28 Archbishop Lehtonen's visit to England 1946; *Kmaa* 36/17.5.1946 Yhtyneet Raamattuseurat perustettu Lontoon raamattuneuvotteluissa; *Fsb* 21/23.5.1946 Ärkebiskopen Lehtonen om bibelkonferensen i London.

the convivial time they and their families had spent together, and sent him his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*.⁶² Whatever tension there had been between the two had evaporated. Lehtonen's visit to England had not only connected the Finnish Bible Society with international Bible work, but had also brought a considerable improvement in Finnish-Norwegian church relations.

c. 'The informal conference' achieves little

Archbishop Lehtonen's visit to the conference of Bible Societies received positive coverage in Finnish church newspapers. News began to reach Finland before his party had arrived home, and later Lehtonen, Harjunpää and Pimenoff were all interviewed. Even Pimenoff complimented Lehtonen's work as one of the chairmen.⁶³ However, not everything about Lehtonen's visit to England was brought to the public's attention. The follow-up meeting of the 1930s negotiations with the Church of England was kept quiet in both countries.⁶⁴ This may have been because of the informal nature of the conference, especially for the English, but for Lehtonen the main reason must have been his desire to avoid any attention that might have provoked political criticism from the Finnish extreme left and theological criticism from the Finnish pietists, who were traditionally suspicious of ecumenism.

The follow-up meeting took place at 3 p.m. on Thursday 2 May 1946, at the CFR office in Lollards Tower at Lambeth Palace, and was followed by dinner with Archbishop Fisher at Lambeth Palace at 7 p.m.⁶⁵ The tim-

⁶² KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Berggrav 1.7.1946; *Ripatti* 1990, 237-239.

⁶³ *Hjä* 19/10.5.1946 Maaïman raamattuseurat liittyvät yhteistoimintaan; *Fsb* 20/16.5.1946 Bibelsällskapskongressen i London; *Kmaa* 36/17.5.1946 Yhtyneet Raamattuseurat perustettu Lontoon raamattuneuvotteluissa; *Fsb* 21/23.5.1946 Ärkebiskopen Lehtonen om bibelkonferensen i London; *Kmaa* 38/24.5.1946 Me olemme löytäneet Raamatun uudestaan.

⁶⁴ *Pajunen* 2004, 112-114; *Pajunen* 2006, 154.

⁶⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Archbishop Lehtonen's visit to England 1946; LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference held at 3 p.m. on Thursday, 2nd May 1946, at Lollards Tower, Lambeth Palace Road, London, S.E. 1, between the following members of the Church of Finland and England who conferred in Helsingfors in July 1934 - the Rt. Rev. Dr. Alexsi (sic) Lehtonen, Archbishop of Finland, attended by his Chaplain the Rev. Toivio Harjunpää (sic), the Rt. Rev. Staunton Batty, Bishop of Fulham, the Very Rev. A.S. Duncan Jones, Dean of Chichester in the chair and the Rev. Dr. C.B. Moss, with the addition of the Very Rev. W.R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's and the Rev. Dr. A.J. Macdonald, 1. Abbreviated reference from now on LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946.

ing must have suited Lehtonen well, as it allowed him to take his general impressions of the meeting to Fisher immediately afterwards, even if the amount of time reserved did not promise an extensive meeting. The significance of the meeting was diminished by the fact that many of those invited could not come. The only English bishop present was Bishop Batty of Fulham.

It seems the agenda for the 'Informal Conference', as it was entitled in the minutes, was set by Archbishop Lehtonen, who was accompanied by Harjunpää; the Very Rev. A.S. Duncan Jones, Dean of Chichester, took the chair. The conference was divided into three sections with the themes: "Relations up to the present", "Next Steps" and "The Finnish Church & State To-Day".⁶⁶

The first section began with Harjunpää's recollection of Archbishop Kaila's response in 1936 to the Archbishop of Canterbury following the recommendations of the Joint Report of 1934, which was followed by Lehtonen's account of how the Finnish Church had implemented them. Five out of six Bishops enjoyed the apostolic succession according to the Anglican understanding, and "No practical or theoretical difficulties had been raised in its reintroduction and the new position had been generally and quietly accepted as in 1934 he [Lehtonen] had foreseen it would be."⁶⁷ It is worth mentioning that this was perhaps as much due to ignorance and indifference concerning the matter in Finland as anything else.

However for Archbishop Lehtonen this was an important point, as the English keeper of the minutes summarized his thoughts:

It was a wonderful door the Finnish Church had to fellowship through this step. As Evangelical Christians they ought to feel that they were of course free to be without a formal gift from God but they had the freedom to receive it. They were not compelled to take a negative position. They felt that in the present situation the non-Roman historical Churches who had kept their historical office, e.g. the Church of England, ought to draw closer to each other. It was now possible to see what it was when a Church had a tradition behind it. It was the Church which gave the office to a man not the State. He thought this must be clear to many countries after the sad experience of the last few years.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946.

⁶⁷ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 1.

⁶⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 2.

This well encapsulates the essence of Lehtonen's practical ecclesiology. Evangelical freedom did not stand as a bastion against tradition. On the contrary, the troubled times demanded unity and brought out the strength of tradition as its best.

The chairman welcomed the fulfilment of the hope, expressed in the 1934 report, that the broken succession be repaired, and enquired about the next steps that should be taken. Lehtonen thought that "on the Anglican side [these steps] would probably be found by Anglicans". He continued with an assurance that there could be no further non-episcopal ordinations in Finland. As a first practical step, the conference saw it as desirable that an Anglican bishop take part in Finnish consecrations. In presenting this recommendation, the conference followed the 1934 report by asking the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider favourably:

- (a) any invitation from the Church of Finland for an Anglican bishop to take part in the consecration of a new Finnish bishop and
- (b) the possibility of a reciprocal arrangement whereby an invitation might be extended to a Finnish bishop to take part in the consecration of an Anglican bishop.⁶⁹

Whereas the first point was anyway already more or less established, the second touched on an old problem. There had been an evasive response to the idea of Finnish bishops taking part in Anglican consecrations from the Canterbury Convocations; there had been a not altogether warm conversation on the ecclesiastical status of the Church of Finland; and the Convocations had left the matter undecided.⁷⁰ Having failed once, those involved in the discussions of the thirties were making one more attempt to resolve this outstanding problem.

Otherwise this section of the conference worked as a platform for Archbishop Lehtonen's efforts at reunion: with Harjunpää he presented several of their practical ideas. Among these were a request for assistance in securing a visa for the new Finnish seamen's pastor in London, the provision of accurate information about the Finnish Church to English churchgoers, the use of CRE sources to provide the Archbishop with a library of Anglican theology and the allocation by the CRE of £500 to be used at the

⁶⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 3.

⁷⁰ Convocation of Canterbury. Resolution on Relations with the Church of Finland. June 6, 1935; *Jasper* 1960, 257-261.

Archbishop's discretion to bring a handful of young Finnish students "of suitable calibre" to study the Church of England and its life.⁷¹ In practice the establishment of student visits would mean further concentration of all Anglican relations in the hands of the Archbishop.

The only initiative that seemed to originate from the Anglican side concerned the relations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland with other Anglican churches. This was an especially sensitive issue in the case of the Anglican Church of South Africa, who had from time to time come into conflict with the Finnish Missionary Society, who were working partly in the same area.⁷² The Anglicans were especially concerned by the apparent lack of episcopal oversight of the missions. Archbishop Lehtonen said that "the appointment of a Finnish bishop waited only the appearance of the right candidate."⁷³ This had first been proposed by Bishop Headlam in the 1930s, but it never materialised. Nevertheless, the conference decided that the next Lambeth Conference in 1948 should work for defined relations "between the Church of Finland and the Anglican Churches in South Africa, Japan and China": all places where the Finnish Church had its Missions.⁷⁴

In the last section, Lehtonen spoke about the Finnish Church and its relationship with the state of Finland, which, in spite of the greater freedom of the church, had much in common with English establishment. However, there were problems: the communists were seen as the worst threat. The minutes of the conference noted that "It was a matter of thanksgiving that the worst dangers of all had been settled and there was still freedom of thought at the cost of 500 000 of the population of four million being homeless."⁷⁵ The half million people Lehtonen referred to were mainly Finns, who had been evacuated from former Finnish territory following the annexation of Karelia by the Soviet Union. More positively, Lehtonen noted that President Paasikivi "was definitely a Christian" and "a friend of the Church".⁷⁶

⁷¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 3-6.

⁷² LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 5; *Kemppainen* 1998, 166-177; *Pajunen* 2004, 113.

⁷³ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 5.

⁷⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 5.

⁷⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 6.

⁷⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 6.

The conference concluded at 4.15.p.m. having lasted for one and a quarter hours. The low priority the Church of England gave to the conference was evidenced by the fact that while some formerly prominent figures from the Anglican side were unable to attend the meeting they were not replaced by contemporary churchmen of the same prominence: according to the minutes not even Waddams of the CFR was present, in spite of the fact that the conference was held in the CFR's premises. However, this was exactly what Lehtonen had asked for and nothing more.

Bishop John Rawlinson, who had been unable to attend the meeting, wrote to Lehtonen afterwards that he had "read with the greatest interest the minutes" and that he "greatly hope(d) that the resolutions passed may be put into effect."⁷⁷ However, this was where the problem lay. The conference was labelled from the beginning 'unofficial' by the Anglican side and there was no attempt to make it anything more. In order to succeed, the recommendations should have been brought to the Church Assembly for approval, but this was never attempted. Perhaps the memory of the previous attempt led the Church of England ecumenists to avoid public debate on the matter, but instead to leave it to the Archbishop of Canterbury's discretion.

Furthermore, the agenda, together with the tight schedule, suggest that the initiative for the conference came from Lehtonen alone. Almost all the ideas and issues discussed came from him and the Church of England side simply reacted to the issues as they were raised. This being the case, it is unsurprising that the conference failed to produce results of any enduring significance.

A prime example of this was Lehtonen's suggestion that some message from the Church of Finland could be published in England. This had clearly evolved from Lehtonen's idea of publishing his *Encyclical Letter, 1945* in England, but in the event the meeting concluded "that if some pamphlet describing the actual position of the Church of Finland could be prepared, especially with a review of its recent history (?by Pastor Harjunpaa) the representatives of the Church of England would try and circulate it as widely as possible in England."⁷⁸ This never happened; and Lehtonen failed to secure the publication of his book.

⁷⁷ KA AL 35 Rawlinson to Lehtonen 25.5.1946.

⁷⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28 Minutes of the Informal Conference 2.5.1946, 4-5.

The truth was that the Church of England in general was not especially interested in the Church of Finland or its concerns, reflected by the lack of news about Finland in its leading church newspapers. The only time Archbishop Lehtonen's visit reached the pages of *The Church Times* was when he, along with other distinguished foreign churchmen, attended the Nikean Club reception, and was reported as having "referred to the age-long ties between the Church of England and the Church of Finland, whose patron saint, Bishop Henry, was an Englishman."⁷⁹ Perhaps this was the most interesting aspect of the Finnish Church for the Anglo-Catholic *The Church Times*.

Another Church of England newspaper, *The Record*, was usually even less interested in Finnish affairs. However, its extensive coverage of the Bible Conference guaranteed the Finnish delegation some publicity along with the other foreign visitors.⁸⁰ It appears that the relative lack of interest had less to do with churchmanship than with the fact that Finland was peripheral to British interests.

However, the conference was only barely better reported in Finland, receiving no attention beyond the Archbishop and those close to him, which is likely to have been Lehtonen's intention from the beginning. Lehtonen kept the conference, along with Anglican relations in general, very much to himself, and had only himself to blame if his ecumenical endeavours with the Church of England were largely ignored by other Finnish church leaders and leading theologians. Eventually, Lehtonen had to find other ways to foster links with the Church of England, as there was clearly a limit to what could be achieved by the follow-up meeting. Thus, he attempted to awaken interest in the Church of Finland among Church of England leaders in general and Bishop George Bell in particular.

d. Lehtonen's ecumenical goal

On assessing the outcome of his visit to England, Archbishop Lehtonen must have concluded that the follow-up meeting was unlikely greatly to further his objective of closer relations between the churches. Another approach would have to be found. At the beginning of June 1946 Lehtonen wrote to Archbishop Fisher introducing another proposal:

⁷⁹ CT 10.5.1946 Nikean Club. Reception for Archbishops.

⁸⁰ *The Record* 10.5.1946 Last Year's Record Income. The Annual Report.

Having happily arrived in Finland, I want to thank you most cordially for the kindness you showed to me and my wife during our stay in England in May. It was a great privilege to meet you personally and to have an opportunity to discuss vital Church problems with you. Our Churches are in the fortunate position that the lines of a closer relationship have been established already before this time, when we have to bear responsibility. I find that the former agreements from the years 1935-1936 form a solid foundation, still more valuable at present, when there is so much chaos in the world.

I hope very much that we could move forward to even closer relations. In my opinion the past quarter of the century has been used in the Ecumenical circles mainly for creating good personal relations, which is enough, I feel. The present time, however, demands more practical measures. As to the Church of Finland, it would be of a great value, if a prominent Anglican churchman, like Dr. Bell, could visit our Church before the Lambeth Conference. A visit postponed to take place after this great gathering of the Anglican Bishops would come, I fear, too late as far as our relations with the Anglican Communion are concerned. This would be the more necessary, as Bishop Headlam, who best knew these problems, has recently retired. Dr. Bell again has good knowledge of the Church of Sweden with which we are closely affiliated historically and through common activities at the present time. His visit, lasting at least for four days, of which two would be spent as my guest in this town and the other two in Helsinki as the guest of our Church, would be very desirable. Such a visit would be a great encouragement to the Church of Finland.⁸¹

Lehtonen considered that the principal difference between the first set of discussions leading to the agreements of 1935-1936 and the follow-up meeting had been the absence of a leading figure from the Church of England. In the past, Lehtonen had been able to plan the future of relations with Headlam, but no one had taken his place. Lehtonen's suggestions had been heard, but imagination and leadership from the other side had been missing. It was time to try to find a new Headlam as an English patron of relations. Lehtonen considered Bishop Bell of Chichester as the best candidate for the role.

There was an obvious sense of urgency in Lehtonen's letter. He wanted to activate his new patron with a visit to Finland before the forthcoming Lambeth Conference in 1948, which he undoubtedly saw as an opportunity to strengthen the relations of his church with the whole Anglican Communion. This had already been addressed in the follow-up meeting in relation to foreign missions.

Perhaps Lehtonen considered that it would be easier for the Anglican side to address the question of intercommunion with the Church of Finland at the Lambeth Conference than at the Church of England Convoca-

⁸¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 4.6.1946.

tions or Church Assembly. This had in fact already happened in the case of the Church of Sweden: the 1920 Lambeth Conference had made similar recommendations, which were received without ever being presented to the respective synodical decision making body in the Church of England.⁸²

However, another reason for Lehtonen's urgency and his need of encouragement was either too obvious or too delicate to put in writing: the need was created by the perceived Soviet threat.

This was not the only way in which the letter underlined the sense of vulnerability and the need for foreign contacts. In expressing his gratitude for the scholarships the British Council of Churches had offered to the Church of Finland, Lehtonen wrote that "as a small nation we have to keep our windows open to the big world."⁸³ With this in mind, Lehtonen invited Fisher to spend his holidays in Finland, "if things are, as we hope, beginning to settle happily."⁸⁴ No opportunity to further relations between the churches, whether based on official agreements or personal friendships, was missed.

However, it is hard to define exactly what Lehtonen meant by "closer relations". There was no concrete suggestion concerning the nature of his ecumenical goal, in his letter to Fisher, in any of his previous correspondence during his archiepiscopate, or the discussions in London. What he wrote on the same day to Bell, another experienced ecumenist, is thus all the more significant:

Having now arrived home after a very refreshing journey to England, I and my wife clearly see our stay with you and Mrs. Bell was the very climax of those wonderful two weeks. We are so grateful for having met you both. For me personally our talk about common problems in the Ecumenical work and about closer relations with the Church of England and with the Churches of the Lutheran North was of a quite special value. Since that evening I have been very strongly aware of the need and of the importance of your visit to Finland. It seems to me that it ought not to be postponed after the next Lambeth Conference. From our point of view it would mean a great strengthening of our mutual relations if you could come before that conference, if possible, even for a short stay for a few days as my guest in this town and then visit Helsinki for a day or two. This visit would be even more needed now that Bishop Headlam, who knew our Church well, has recently retired. If we are to move forwards towards a real reunion, we ought to draw nearer to one another

⁸² Helle 2007, 9-10.

⁸³ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 4.6.1946.

⁸⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 4.6.1946.

where the threshold is lowest. In the case of Finland this is now so. Could you not come after having delivered your lectures in Uppsala?⁸⁵

Lehtonen had greatly enjoyed his time in England and especially with the Bells. In Bell he had found someone who was well informed, of a positive disposition, and imaginative enough to set high goals for ecumenism. For this reason, he dared to write that his desire was “to move forwards towards a real reunion”. This was about more than securing much appreciated reconstruction aid for his church and nation, and about more than mere practical co-operation. Lehtonen’s ecumenical goal was “a real reunion” between the Church of England and the Nordic Lutheran churches. In the case of the Finnish Church, the preamble of the Canterbury Convocations resolutions had expressed the hope “that in due course complete intercommunion, based on a common episcopal ministry, may be achieved.”⁸⁶

Lehtonen felt that there was less resistance in the Church of Finland towards any such scheme than in any of the Nordic Churches with the exception of the Church of Sweden, whose relations with the Church of England were essentially different. He still wanted to follow the plan laid down in the inter-war years according to which the Church of Finland would act as a forerunner and exemplar to the other Nordic Churches without the historic episcopate in its relations with the Church of England.⁸⁷ Furthermore, according to Finnish church law, the Archbishop was in charge of foreign ecumenical relations and could thus lead the way. All this persuaded Lehtonen that his church was indeed extraordinary well placed to conduct negotiations for full communion with the Church of England; the only challenge was to convince the English of the desirability of such negotiations.

Bell’s visit would indeed have been a major ecclesiastical event and provided an obvious source of wider attention for the Finnish Church and its concerns, at the same time gaining for Lehtonen a close ally who would guarantee unbroken communication with the ecumenical elite in Europe and beyond. This, however, was not to happen. Bell’s answer came at the end of June: it was polite, but firm: he could not fit in a visit to Finland. He had pressing tasks to attend to after the lectures and he had promised to visit Norway. His wife had received an invitation from Mrs. Berggrav, although

⁸⁵ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.310 Lehtonen to Bell 4.6.1946.

⁸⁶ Convocation of Canterbury. Resolution on Relations with the Church of Finland. June 6, 1935.

⁸⁷ *Österlin* 1995, 256-260; *Pajunen* 2003, 114.

the Bishop himself was ill at the time. Nevertheless, he wrote of being "personally thankful for the talk we had about our common problems, and ways and means of securing closer relations between the Northern Churches and the Church of England" and that he "fully appreciate[d] the point that it might well be a help that such a visit should take place before the Lambeth Conference of 1948."⁸⁸ However, this time personal friendship called him to Norway, where he had a sick friend awaiting his visit.

Bell clearly understood what was at stake and wanted to help Lehtonen and his cause where he felt he could. A sign of his interest is that Bell made a copy for himself of a print of Archbishop Kaila's letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1936, which Lehtonen had forgotten in Bell's study, before returning it to him.⁸⁹ No doubt Bell wanted to include it to the *Documents on Christian Unity* he was compiling.⁹⁰ However, the difference between Lehtonen's words about "real reunion" and Bell's more non-committal "securing closer relations" indicates that Bell did not share Lehtonen's passion and sense of urgency when it came to the position of the Church of Finland in the wider ecumenical field.

Bell's reply was a disappointment to Lehtonen, who asked Harjunpää to answer it. Harjunpää wrote to Bell and explained that Lehtonen, who was on holiday, had asked him to write. According to Harjunpää, Lehtonen had been very disappointed, but that he naturally understood how full Bell's schedule was. However, Lehtonen still hoped that Bell could visit Finland before the Lambeth Conference. "It would be of great importance for the further development of our mutual relations, as you well realize", added Harjunpää, suggesting that Bell could perhaps make a short visit to Finland the following year.⁹¹ That Lehtonen asked Harjunpää to answer Bell may be taken as a sign of Lehtonen's annoyance and desire to avoid any possible tension with foreign church leaders. No doubt he would have found time to answer had there been a positive response to his invitation.

Towards the end of the summer of 1946 Lehtonen had still to find a new English patron of relations. Now the former patron, Bishop Headlam,

⁸⁸ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.311 Bell to Lehtonen 26.6.1946.

⁸⁹ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.310 Lehtonen to Bell 4.6.1946; LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.312 copy of Arch Kaila of Finland to the Arch of Canterbury 10.3.1936.

⁹⁰ *Bell* 1948b.

⁹¹ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.317 Harjunpää to Bell 16.7.1946.

wrote to Lehtonen enclosing an article he had written, which he thought would be of interest to Lehtonen. The letter concluded with a wish:

I hope that in all the troubles of Europe your Church is still able to do its work in peace. I often think of you and your country. I am quite sure that the more the Christian Churches can get together, the better it will be for Europe. What is now needed is peace and freedom for Germany.⁹²

Headlam's short letter pressed all the right buttons. It showed concern for peace and Christian unity with a personal acknowledgement that the Church of Finland had its own portion of the present troubles. This was precisely the attitude Lehtonen was seeking from the present leaders of the Church of England. Bishop Headlam's time, however, was over. This was his last letter to Lehtonen; he died the following winter.⁹³ His hope for peace and freedom for Germany was shared by many both in England and the Nordic countries.

2. The early Cold War paradigm shift

a. The northern perspective by the Rev. A. Cotter

The international political transition from the Second World War to the Cold War and its influence on church relations is revealed by a British attempt to re-establish relations between the German and Nordic churches. The impetus for this attempt came from Dr. Hans Asmussen, the Chief of the Chancellery of the Evangelical Church in Germany, who wanted closer contacts with the sister Lutheran churches in northern Europe, and whose wish was supported by the British Controller General of the Religious Affairs Branch.⁹⁴

This led to the sending of the Rev. A. Cotter, an officer of the Religious Affairs Branch in Germany, for discussions with the Nordic church leaders to explore the possibility of such closer co-operation. The choice was well made: he already had an extensive knowledge of the Nordic countries and

⁹² KA AL 35 Headlam to Lehtonen 25.8.1946.

⁹³ *Jasper* 1960, 349-351.

⁹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.); *Pajunen* 2004, 115.

their culture, having taught English in Helsinki before 1920 and speaking fluent Finnish, Swedish and Russian.⁹⁵ Cotter visited the Nordic Lutheran Churches of Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland in August and September 1946 and reported back to his superiors in Germany. His information was in turn quickly passed to the CFR, which received the document on 11 October 1946.⁹⁶

Cotter went first to Copenhagen, where he was unable to meet the Bishop, but where he did meet some influential clergy. Among these was the Rev. Alfred Jörgensen, who seemed to be well informed about the situation in both Germany and the other Nordic countries. According to Jörgensen, the best way to establish links with Germany was through the Church of Sweden, given the level of hatred for the Germans in Denmark and Norway. Cotter recorded Jörgensen's view of the Nordic churches:

Dr. Jörgensen considered that the most important man to be contacted was Archbishop Eidem of Uppsala. He was very much interested in the whole matter of the part to be played by the German Church in the reconstruction of the country and of the part which the Swedish Church could take also, another country which he was glad to see that the British were not neglecting was Finland. He considered Archbishop Lehtonen as a very fine man who was not so "envious" as some of his countrymen were. He saw the only hope for Finland in its being brought into the Scandinavian orbit and facing west.⁹⁷

Thus Cotter's first Danish contact offered great encouragement for the re-establishment of closer relations between the German and Nordic churches. Jörgensen considered Lehtonen more broadminded and capable of seeing the broader picture than were most of the Finnish clergy, who, being for the most part unable to see beyond the immediate suffering around them were thus "envious" of what they considered the better fortune of their Nordic brothers and sisters.

Jörgensen also proposed that as "all the Churches entertained great respect for the Bishop of Chichester and admired his ecumenical relations", the Danes should send a representative "to enter into contact with the Ger-

⁹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.); LPL CFR LR file 28 Harjunpää to Douglas 8.2.1945.

⁹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.); *Pajunen* 2004, 115-116.

⁹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 2.

man Churchmen”, to accompany Bell who was leading a British ecumenical delegation to Germany.⁹⁸ He felt that this would be “a veritable breaking of the ice and would pave the way for further relations.”⁹⁹ Cotter saw the wisdom of this and brought it to the attention of the churchmen he subsequently met. The plan was supported by, among others, Dr. Paul Bredersen, the Dean of Copenhagen, whom Cotter met a few days later.¹⁰⁰

From Denmark Cotter continued to Norway, where he stayed for a few days. He was unable to meet the ailing Bishop Berggrav of Oslo. Instead, he was met by the Bishop’s Chaplain, the Rev. Henrik Hauge, who assured him that the Bishop had “the welfare of the German Church very much at heart”.¹⁰¹ Hauge supported visits and discussions as a means to break down Germany’s sense of isolation, and thought that “the Germans would be impressed by the fact that Scandinavians had joined with their British fellow Christians to show their interest in and desire to help the German Church in every possible way. The Scandinavians, as Lutherans, stood closer to the German Church.”¹⁰² Hauge evidently wished to set an example to the German Lutherans of Nordic Lutheran support for wider ecumenical co-operation.

However, the Nordic people had their own worries as well:

Pastor Hauge told me that the Scandinavians were very much exercised over Russia, particularly so in Northern Norway where the Norwegian frontier was again contiguous with that of Russia. Finland was coming more and more under Russian influence and had lost its only ice-free port. Its economy was ruined by Russian exactions, while Norway was rapidly building up again.¹⁰³

The Norwegians had realised that the onset of the Cold War had brought a new threat to their very borders. Before the Second World War, Norway

⁹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 1; *Jasper* 1967, 302.

⁹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 2.

¹⁰⁰ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 2.

¹⁰¹ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 3.

¹⁰² LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 2-3.

¹⁰³ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 3.

had been separated from the Soviet Union by Petsamo, a strip of Finnish territory. Now, however, Petsamo was occupied by the Soviet Union, with serious potential consequences for Norwegian security. Fear of the Soviet Union was a constant theme of Cotter's discussions with the Norwegians.

Cotter now continued to Sweden, where he was met in Stockholm by the Rev. C.H. Jones, the Anglican Chaplain in Stockholm, who arranged meetings with both Swedish clergy and local British diplomats including the British Minister and Military Attaché.¹⁰⁴ Everything suggests that Cotter was held in high esteem by both the churches and the embassy.

On 10 September, Cotter had an audience with Archbishop Erling Eidem of Uppsala, whom he had already met in London in 1935. The conversation dealt mainly with issues related to Germany, about which Eidem was well informed. However, the Archbishop was less enthusiastic about sending a joint delegation of British and Nordic clergy to Germany, fearing that it might be interpreted as suggesting that "the Scandinavian Churches were acting at the behest of England. That of course was not true, but it might be so interpreted."¹⁰⁵ He therefore suggested that the Nordic Churches send their own delegation after the British. This delegation should consist of one representative from each of the Lutheran Churches of Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. He had a clear view of the important places and people the delegation should visit, and promised to discuss this with the Bishop of Chichester, who was to be his guest during his forthcoming lecture series.¹⁰⁶

Before leaving for Finland, Cotter discussed the situation there with Jones, who felt that the future of Finland was very uncertain. Even if the presence of "the Russians" was discreet, their influence was silently making itself felt. Jones also brought up the situation of the Baltic states and churches, and also of Baltic refugees in Sweden.¹⁰⁷ As Anglican Chaplain in Stockholm, Jones was acutely aware of the developments throughout the Nordic and Baltic region. He was in constant touch with the personnel of

¹⁰⁴ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 5-8.

¹⁰⁵ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 7.

¹⁰⁶ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 7.

¹⁰⁷ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 7-8.

the British Embassy in Stockholm and his other parishioners from Sweden and Finland, which was then without a chaplain.

Cotter arrived in Turku on 12 September and was welcomed by Harjunpää, who took him first to lunch and then to meet the Archbishop. At lunch they met by chance two representatives of the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS), A. L. Haig, Secretary for Europe, who was in Finland to discuss international Bible work, and Pimenoff, the head of the BFBS office in Finland. The latter recalled having joined Cotter's classes when he had taught English in Helsinki. This, however, Cotter could not remember, even if his report betrayed a degree of nostalgia concerning familiar places and renewed friendships.¹⁰⁸

After lunch everyone went on to meet Archbishop Lehtonen, who received them, as Cotter recorded,

-- with great cordiality and with evident pleasure, pleasure at renewing an acquaintance with myself, because to my surprise he reminded me that 35 years ago, he and I were fellow passengers on the S.S. Arcturus from Helsingfors [Helsinki] to Hull in the month of December. He was going to some conference and I was going home for my winter holidays. The Archbishop recognised me the moment I came in and declared that I had not changed much during these years. I had not remembered this and it was a real pleasure to renew our acquaintanceship. The Archbishop welcomed me back to Finland and said that he hoped to see me Anglican Chaplain in Finland for he felt that I could do much for relations between the Church of Finland and the Church of England.¹⁰⁹

The compliment was not merely polite: Harjunpää had already asked the Rev. J.A. Douglas, then Secretary of the CFR, to ask the Bishop of Fulham to consider sending Cotter to Finland in February 1945.¹¹⁰

Lehtonen had no doubt been helped by Harjunpää's briefing to remember Cotter. Two days before the visit he had written to Bishop Gulin that the "English Professor Cotter, now an Anglican priest" was coming and that the Bishop's wife, Mrs. Helmi Gulin might know him.¹¹¹ Lehtonen's recol-

¹⁰⁸ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 8.

¹⁰⁹ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 8.

¹¹⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28 Harjunpää to Douglas 8.2.1945.

¹¹¹ KA EG Lehtonen to Gulin 10.9.1946.

lection of Cotter is the more important given that his health was in gradual decline after the war.¹¹²

After coffee, Lehtonen took Cotter into his garden for a private discussion about the German situation. Lehtonen's approach to helping the German Church affords an illustration of one of the basic dilemmas of the Finnish situation stemming from the interim peace with the Soviet Union in 1944, which was to endure throughout the Cold War. While it was "a Christian duty to assist the sister Church in Germany in its present difficulties", "Finland however was not officially at peace with Germany and the Russian had to be taken into consideration."¹¹³ Nevertheless, Lehtonen approved Eidem's suggestion that the Nordic Churches should send their own delegations after the British and hoped that the plan would progress and that relations would be re-established. Lehtonen proposed to send Bishop von Bonsdorff of Porvoo with the Nordic delegation, but he wanted to discuss the matter with his colleagues.¹¹⁴

As Lehtonen said, the Finnish political situation made it difficult to have relations of any kind with Germany: not only was there as yet no permanent peace treaty; the existing treaty more or less denied all interaction with Germany. Furthermore, sending Bishop von Bonsdorff would have been quite controversial. Although von Bonsdorff's many previous contacts with Germany did not make him a Nazi sympathizer, less sympathetic quarters might have interpreted his support for Germany during the war as a sign that he was.¹¹⁵ However, this appears not to have troubled the Archbishop, who probably considered the position von Bonsdorff had adopted as a means to survive the travails of the war by accepting any help against the Soviet enemy.

The meeting concluded with vespers in English in the Archbishop's private chapel. The following morning Pimenoff visited Cotter. The discussion turned to Russia and Finnish attitudes towards it. Pimenoff said that, in spite of his Russian name, he was a Finnish-speaking Finn born in Tavastland in Central-Western Finland. Pimenoff went on to say that he had "a great regard for and liking of the Russians" and that he "was greatly

¹¹² Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

¹¹³ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 8.

¹¹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 8.

¹¹⁵ *Ripatti* 1990, 115.

perturbed by Finnish relations with their powerful Eastern neighbour.” According to Pimenoff, “all the relations of the Finns with the Russians were dominated by their anti-Russian bias”, of which he provided many examples, repeating in large measure what he had said to Waddams little less than two years earlier.¹¹⁶

However, whereas Waddams had largely agreed with Pimenoff, Cotter simply summarised what he said without comment. Two factors, the first political, the second personal, explain this. During Waddams’ visit the Allied cause had still been high on the agenda, whereas during Cotter’s visit the Cold War was in its early stages and the need for Soviet sympathy in the western camp no longer existed.¹¹⁷ Perhaps a more compelling factor in Cotter’s cool approach to Pimenoff’s pro-Soviet talk was the fact that he knew Finland and the Finnish view of the Soviet Union from personal experience before the war. The origins of the Anglican Chaplaincy in Helsinki, Cotter’s parish while in Finland, had owed much to the influx of refugees from the St Petersburg Chaplaincy during the Russian Revolution. Cotter also spoke Russian, but it is likely his knowledge predated the Revolution, which he is unlikely to have welcomed.

Cotter left Finland on 14 September, returning first to Stockholm, where he met the Bishop, and then to Norway.¹¹⁸ On 17 September, he had a meeting in Oslo with Bishops Bell and Berggrav, accompanied by Hauge. He reported about his meetings with Archbishops Eidem and Lehtonen and informed them of the Danish, Swedish and Finnish reactions. Bell welcomed the proposal of a Danish representative meeting him in Berlin to break the first ice with the Germans.¹¹⁹

Berggrav’s response, however, revealed the political tension underlying the sending of a joint delegation of any kind. He opposed a visit to Germany by a Nordic delegation after the British, because that could awaken criticism:

¹¹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 9.

¹¹⁷ *Kirby* 1999, 100-106; *Varsori* 2004, 282-288, 294-296.

¹¹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 9.

¹¹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 9-10.

There were he said, political aspects to the question which had to be taken into consideration. The first was that the Norwegians and the Danes must work with the Allies and a delegation which included the Swedes might give rise to misinterpretations which were not intended. The second was that he did not think that the Swedes understood their political position. During the war they had been neutral, whereas the allies had conquered Germany and were now not only occupying it but governing it, opinion in their own countries had to be considered and no false step made at this juncture. He was sure that Archbishop Eidem would understand the position if it were laid before him and the Bishop of Chichester said he would discuss with the Swedish Archbishop when he saw him. Bishop Berggrav said that neither Norwegians nor Danes would have any difficulty in cooperating with the Finns if they were able to send someone. He felt it important that the allied Scandinavians first contact the Germans and then later have a joint Scandinavian delegation. They could not then be accused of acting on the behest of England or Sweden.¹²⁰

It was important for Berggrav to ensure that no one thought the Norwegians were following foreign orders. On the contrary, he wanted to emphasize the independence of Norway and Denmark as Allied nations, even at the expense of excluding the Swedes. It is thus notable that he did not have a problem with sending a Finnish representative. Berggrav may have calculated that the Finns were less likely than the Swedes to claim leadership over others. Be that as it may, his wish to punish the Swedes for their neutrality scuppered any thought of a common delegation. He was much more interested in another plan to send a Norwegian Lutheran religious affairs officer to Germany.¹²¹

However, Berggrav's attempt to create an Allied bloc inside the Nordic churches gained no support from the Norwegian and Danish clergy Cotter met on his way to Germany. In Denmark Jørgensen assured Cotter that "Archbishop Eidem had no idea of the Swedish Church's securing a position of leadership over the other Scandinavian Churches" and that "they were all on an equal footing".¹²² Ultimately, whether Berggrav's analysis was correct or not, it made it clear that sending a joint delegation was impossible, and the plan was soon forgotten. In the case of Finland it is doubtful whether Lehtonen ever consulted any of his episcopal colleagues about the matter.

¹²⁰ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 10.

¹²¹ LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 10.

¹²² LPL CFR LR file 113/1 Report on a visit to Scandinavian Church leaders by the Rev. A. Cotter of Religious Affairs Branch C.C.G. (B.E.), 11.

But Cotter's visit was not in vain. During his discussions with Nordic church leaders, he had found that they all wished to re-establish relations with the German churches and harboured no hatred against them even if some of their people did. All of them had great respect for the Bishop of Chichester; had a favourable view of the Church of England; and wanted closer ties with it. It was between the Nordic Churches that the problems lay, especially Berggrav's negative attitude towards the Swedish Church, which perhaps owed more to the particular Norwegian situation than anything else. Everywhere Cotter went Finland's situation was seen as grim. Even if there were no active hostilities or violations of basic western rights in general, the Allied Control Commission, with its strong Soviet component had made itself felt. There was a sense of uncertainty about the future, which did not give much scope for the Finnish Church to act in its relations with Germany. This, however, did not serve to alienate it from its Nordic sister churches, who wished it well but were unable to do much more.

b. Pimenoff's place in the changing political climate

As Cotter's visit had shown, Pimenoff enjoyed a somewhat tense relationship with most of his fellow Finns. During the war he had been imprisoned for delivering information about the treatment of Soviet prisoners-of-war to the US embassy in Helsinki, which embittered him towards the Finnish establishment.¹²³ That Pimenoff had been imprisoned during the war made him an object of suspicion for many ordinary Finns; for many church people he was beyond rehabilitation. Archbishop Lehtonen's private correspondence reveals a complaint made by a customer of the BFBS depot that Mr Pimenoff was an "awful communist".¹²⁴

However absurd the complaint about a Bible-selling communist, Pimenoff's Russian sympathies and his strong criticism of the Finnish wartime establishment made it the more understandable. Indeed, the fact that Pimenoff was asked by Waddams to deliver news from Finland and work on British religious propaganda in Finland, and that he managed to retain his job as a BFBS employee even after all the society's work had been handed over to the Finnish Bible Society raises questions about the nature of his

¹²³ The Interview of Mrs Agnes Pimenoff 8.5.2000.

¹²⁴ KA AL 29 Frey to Lehtonen 28.7.1945.

foreign relations. In the early Cold War world this caused people to wonder whether Pimenoff was a spy, a charge of which he had already been convicted during the war.¹²⁵ However, it was never as straightforward as this.

From the point of view of the BFBS, there was nothing suspicious about Pimenoff's service. He had been a faithful and able servant of the society in an extreme situation. It was largely down to the efforts of Pimenoff and his wife, Agnes, that the BFBS depot in Helsinki could work throughout the war even when Pimenoff was imprisoned and that its property was never confiscated, which was a standard procedure for the enemy property in war-time. It is thus unsurprising that the BFBS wanted to award him even after all its work was given over to the Finnish Bible Society in 1947. The agreement included a clause under which Pimenoff continued in his position as director under the Finnish Bible Society and received a salary from the BFBS.¹²⁶ This arrangement may have had something to do with Pimenoff's apparent distrust of other Finns, but it was nevertheless something upon which both societies agreed.

Much has already been said about Pimenoff's relation with Waddams. During his visit to Finland in December 1944, Waddams, then an officer of the British Ministry of Information, found Pimenoff an able, willing and politically suitable ally to handle Allied religious propaganda in Finland. Their relationship continued when Waddams left the Ministry and began to work for the CFR; Pimenoff's information was welcomed and appreciated by the CFR as it had been by the Ministry.¹²⁷ For Pimenoff, this was not much of a burden as he was anyway reporting about life in Finland for the BFBS.¹²⁸ He could use the same reports for both bodies.

However, Pimenoff was by no means the only source of information for the CFR: Jones, the Anglican Chaplain in Stockholm, continued to

¹²⁵ SUPO Pimenoff, Georg Georginpoika.

¹²⁶ CUL BSA BFBS D8/8/1 Finland 1931-1948 Record of policy and Main Events, Finland - Superintendent Mr. G. Pimenoff, Finland. History, 4-7, Finland - Administration, Finnish Bible Society, copy of Tyrrell to Lehtonen 3.12.1945; The Interview of Mrs Agnes Pimenoff 8.5.2000.

¹²⁷ LPL CFR OC file 121 Pimenoff to Waddams 16.1.1946; LPL CFR OC file 121 Waddams to Pimenoff 24.1.1946; LPL CFR OC file 121 Pimenoff to Waddams 19.1.1947; LPL CFR LR file 25 Year 1946 From Dr. Pimenoff; LPL CFR OC file 121 Year 1946 From Dr. Pimenoff copy.

¹²⁸ CUL BSA D3/1/6 Annual Report of the Helsingfors Depot of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the Year 1945. Finland.

monitor the Finnish situation; there were occasional reports from Anglican visitors to Finland; and information was sought from Church of Finland contacts like Harjunpää.¹²⁹ What distinguishes Pimenoff was his role under Waddams' plan of December 1944 in translating, publishing and distributing British religious propaganda in Finland. The summer of 1946 saw the publication of two Ministry of Information books, *Christian Counter-Attack* and *The British Churches in War Time*, in Finnish.¹³⁰

Although the books were advertised in *Herättäjä* and *Kotimaa*, there was no mention of their translator.¹³¹ *Christian Counter-Attack* made no mention of its publisher, containing only a note that it had originally been published by SCM, whereas *The British Churches in War Time* gave 'British Ministry of Information' as its publisher.¹³² The only trace of a Finnish translator came with the publication note in *Christian Counter-Attack*, which emphasized that the title had been first published in England in 1943, and that no changes had been made to the translation. This was to show, the note continued, that the information in the book, which would have faced censorship during the war in many European countries, was correct, as the Nürnberg trial had confirmed. The note concluded with the cautious remark that the section concerning Finland represented only the opinions of the four authors.¹³³

As the authors, including Waddams, who had originally asked Pimenoff to undertake the publication, were Ministry of Information employees, there is no reason to doubt that Pimenoff had indeed translated and published the books. After all, publishing was his profession, and he had been able to pursue it even through the hardship of war and imprisonment. Indeed, his wartime imprisonment gave Pimenoff good cause to omit his name from the publication of British propaganda after the war.

¹²⁹ LPL CFR LR file 25 Findlow to C.H. Jones 17.3.1947; LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 4. Swedish Church Life in Finland during 1946 by Professor G.O. Rosenqvist of Abo; LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 7. The Church of Finland. General Review 1946 by Archbishop Aleksii Lehtonen.

¹³⁰ *Christian Counter-Attack* 1943; *Martin* 1944; Brittien kirkkokunnat sodan aikana 1946; Kristikunnan vastarinta 1946.

¹³¹ *Hjä* 26/28.6.1946 "Brittien kirkkokunnat sodan aikana."; *Kmaa* 45/2.7.1946 Englannin kirkko, "Brittien kirkkokunnat sodan aikana".

¹³² Brittien kirkkokunnat sodan aikana 1946; Kristikunnan vastarinta 1946.

¹³³ Kristikunnan vastarinta, 1946.

Apart from the publishing of propaganda, there is no evidence that Pimenoff had any contact with any foreign Government after the Second World War. Having been convicted, however, he continued to be regarded with suspicion and was thus monitored by the Finnish Security Police (VALPO), who found nothing against him.¹³⁴ Pimenoff's continuous monitoring is the more notable because VALPO itself had undergone a complete change and was at the time largely in the hands of the Finnish Communists.¹³⁵ It is clear that while Pimenoff's political stance had been well suited to the Allied wartime mentality, with the onset of the Cold War he was regarded with a degree of suspicion by communists and conservatives alike. Although Pimenoff for the most part adhered to the line advocated by Waddams in December 1944, the world around him had undergone a paradigm shift, which served to isolate him, especially in Finland.

c. The advancing Cold War mentality divides the churches

The inevitable change from Allied war-time co-operation between east and west to Cold War confrontation had its impact on the work of the CFR, which presented its first report under the leadership of Bell and Waddams to the Church of England Church Assembly Summer Session in 1947. Apart from a short description of the work of the Council, the report presented a survey, entitled "Church Life in Europe and the Near East", prepared by Waddams.¹³⁶ The first part of the survey covered the general situation in Europe, while the second part was devoted to particular churches "in Scandinavia and [the] Baltic Republics". Waddams noted that "in the former the Churches of Sweden and Finland, and in the latter the Churches of Estonia and Latvia, have special connections with the Church of England".¹³⁷ In Waddams' understanding Finland belonged to Scandinavia rather than to the Baltic, an approach that was not universally accepted in British circles.

Regarding Finland, Waddams wrote:

¹³⁴ SUPO Pimenoff, Georg Georginpoika; KA EK-VALPO II 2278 Pimenoff's account on his work in Finland and abroad 30.12.1947.

¹³⁵ *Nevakivi* 1999, 236; *Kirby* 2006, 235-237.

¹³⁶ CA 1947, 215.

¹³⁷ Church Life in Europe and the Near East 1947.

Finland

Finland suffered more from the war than the rest of Scandinavia, and, finding itself on the side of the vanquished, has severe economic problems which affect the country as a whole. The Church is also affected by the transfer of population from the Karelian districts which were ceded to the Soviet Union in accordance with the peace terms, and contained some of the most important ecclesiastical institutions. In 1945 Archbishop Kaila of Åbo (Turku) was succeeded as Archbishop of Finland by Bishop Lehtonen of Tammerfors (Tampere), who is a friend of the Church of England and well known to many Anglicans. He is anxious to improve the relationship at present existing between the Church of England and the Church of Finland, and was a welcome visitor to this country in 1946.¹³⁸

Waddams' description of Finland was one with which many Finns would easily have concurred, and Lehtonen thanked him for his words after reading the survey.¹³⁹ From the political perspective it is notable that the report propounded what later became the traditional, if not universally accepted, interpretation of Finland floating like a log in a stream of international relations, as a result of finding "itself on the side of the vanquished" as Waddams put it. Perhaps with the onset of the Cold War, Waddams had revised his views.

Waddams' Soviet sympathies were more evident in his description of conditions in Latvia and Estonia. The report acknowledged the sufferings of Latvians and Estonians, mentioning deportations, deaths and the flood of refugees to the west, but said little of the Soviet aggression that were their cause. Waddams even ended on something of a positive note on religious freedom, concluding that "while it is probable that the Church members who remain in these two countries are now free to carry on their religious worship, they must be very short of pastors and their difficulties must be very great."¹⁴⁰ Waddams struggled to reconcile what he had learned about the Soviet attitude to religion during his 1943 visit with the undeniable, devastating reality of the Baltic Churches of which the CFR was already very much aware through the testimonies of Baltic refugees.

The same struggle was present in Bishop Bell's introduction of the survey to the Church Assembly, in which he underlined the importance both of relations with, and of the role of, the Russian Orthodox Church, while acknowledging the all-important difference of that church's situation from

¹³⁸ Church Life in Europe and the Near East 1947, 6.

¹³⁹ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Lehtonen to Waddams 4.8.1947.

¹⁴⁰ Church Life in Europe and the Near East 1947, 6.

that of the churches of the west. Having referred to some of the benefits the Russian Orthodox Church had accrued as a result of its patriotic help for the state during the war, Bell continued: "But in Russia they had different conceptions of the meaning of freedom from our conception, and the State was always at the door."¹⁴¹

The leadership of the CFR was struggling to come to terms with the transition from the war, when there had been great ecumenical opportunities in the Allied countries, to the harsh reality of the hardened agenda of the Cold War world. This had its bearing on relations with the Church of Finland, which was seen as a national church in an ex-enemy state, now firmly believed to be in the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union, even if this was not explicitly stated.¹⁴²

From an ecumenical point of view, the survey confirmed that the CFR had understood Lehtonen's message that he wished to improve relations with the Church of England, and Lehtonen himself was portrayed as "a friend of the Church of England and well known to many Anglicans".¹⁴³ However, there is little to suggest that Lehtonen's efforts were matched by the Church of England. Lehtonen was not awarded the Lambeth Cross, like Bishops Berggrav from Norway and Brilioth from Sweden, for rendering "exceptional services to the cause of Christian unity and specially to strengthen the relations between these Churches and the Anglican Communion".¹⁴⁴ As Lehtonen can hardly be accused of any lack of effort to strengthen relations with the Anglican Communion, the failure so to award him must have been personal and political.

Lehtonen's friendships with Church of England dignitaries were mainly with the pre-war ecumenical old guard. Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, for example, was, from a political point of view, a not especially useful friend. In his anxiety to find a successor for Headlam as a patron to advocate relations with the Church of Finland, Lehtonen failed to realise that in his old age Headlam had become quite unpopular: his dislike of the Soviet Union and his blindness concerning the true nature of Nazi Germany long after the eyes of many others had been opened had caused much embar-

¹⁴¹ CA 1947, 217.

¹⁴² CA 1947, 216.

¹⁴³ Church Life in Europe and the Near East 1947, 6.

¹⁴⁴ Church Life in Europe and the Near East 1947, 4.

rassment.¹⁴⁵ Reference to Headlam's virtues did not make Lehtonen's task any easier. On the contrary, it served as a reminder of the political reality of Finland as an ex-enemy state, whose ecclesiastics were doubtless more difficult to award, especially as there had been no resistance movement to which they might have belonged.

A third, and perhaps the most plausible, reason for not awarding the Lambeth Cross to Lehtonen is that at a time of increased general need for the CFR work, the particular ecumenical endeavours of the Church of Finland and its Archbishop were not viewed as sufficiently ecumenically important, resulting in his overtures being addressed on the practical level of reconstruction work through the CRE.

This is more or less confirmed by a comparison of the CFR report with the second report of the Church Assembly Commission on Christian Reconstruction in Europe (CAC CRE), which immediately followed it. The CAC CRE report took up where the CFR report left off, dealing with the theme of the Church of England's ecumenical relations, but from the perspective of reconstruction, in which Finland featured prominently through various CRE activities.¹⁴⁶ It was much easier for the Church of England to provide material and spiritual reconstruction aid than it was to continue the theological dialogue "towards a real reunion".

Interestingly, the CFR's non-committal line was in accordance with British Foreign policy on Finland. Finland, already traditionally on the periphery of British interests, was left after the war to cope alone with 'the great eastern neighbour'. As early as August 1944, the British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden had predicted that Finland would fall within the Soviet sphere of influence and that the British government should not seek to interfere with whatever the Soviet Union decided to do; he only expressed the hope that Finland would be left with some degree of cultural and commercial independence and parliamentary government.¹⁴⁷ It is not to downplay the independence of the Church of England and its Council on Foreign Relations to assume that its officials' perception of the world was influenced by the general British mindset, and was thus close to that of the British Government, on whose radar Finland barely registered.

¹⁴⁵ *Jasper* 1960, 290-301; *Hastings* 1998, 321-322.

¹⁴⁶ CA 1947, 219-221; C.A. 848 1947.

¹⁴⁷ *Upton* 2006, 63-64.

Indeed, the British involvement in the ratification of the Finnish peace treaty proved somewhat counter-productive for the Finns. On the eve of the armistice agreement in 1944, the British Government had wanted to finalize territorial issues and the level of reparations required from Finland before the signing of the formal peace treaty. This had suited the Soviet Union well. In practice this meant that Finland suffered hard armistice terms, with no benefits that might have resulted from a final peace treaty and no hope of getting those terms reviewed positively. The Finnish peace treaty was thus left officially open to be settled as part of a larger European settlement, but in practice there was no hope of reviewing the terms, a fact of which the Finnish Government remained completely ignorant. Meanwhile the highest authority in Finland was the Allied Control Commission.¹⁴⁸

As time passed and the Cold War intensified, the Finnish situation became increasingly uncertain. The Soviet threat, together with the fact that the ratification of the final peace treaty had been delayed, made it impossible, for example, for the Finns to apply for Marshall-aid. So the generally positive view the Finns had of Britain masked the reality, which was that there was little the British could or indeed would do for them.¹⁴⁹

The little there was to do in Finland was left to the British Minister in Helsinki, Mr. Shepherd, who defined the British policy in Finland thus:

- a) To supervise by means of the British element of the Control Commission the carrying out of the terms of armistice.
- b) To encourage, and as far as possible secure, the continued political and economical independence of Finland; and for this purpose to encourage relations with the West in general and discourage undue subordination to the U.S.S.R.
- c) To encourage Fenno-British trade with particular regard to United Kingdom imports of timber and timber products, and United Kingdom exports of manufactured and semi-manufactured goods.
- d) To reinstate friendly relations between the Finnish and British Governments and peoples by means of expanding cultural and business relations.¹⁵⁰

Good church relations not only assisted friendly cultural links, but served to discourage "undue subordination to the U.S.S.R" as well.

¹⁴⁸ *Evans* 2006, 92-94.

¹⁴⁹ *Evans* 2006, 100-102.

¹⁵⁰ PRO FO 473/1No.6 British Policy in Finland, 15 February 1947.

Nevertheless, the Finnish Church did not play any significant role in Shepherd's analysis. In his Ideological Report from Finland, he defined the three main bodies of opinion in Finland as: Communists; reactionary circles consisting of industrial conservatives; and the potentially powerful mass of Social Democrats. Alongside these main bodies of opinion Shepherd ranged "the army, the Church and the Agrarians: the first, so far as its officer class is concerned, pro-German but not Nazi; the second, autocratic and reactionary, and the third conservative and self-centred."¹⁵¹

So it is not surprising that it was considered that the church was best approached through its "Leading Personalities", of whom Archbishop Lehtonen was not only the most influential but the most anglophile as well. Lehtonen's friendly relations with the English Church were noted by the Foreign Office, which included him in its list of 184 Leading Personalities in Finland, 1947, with the rare description "very anglophile". Apart from his work for church relations, Lehtonen was recorded as having "helped to found the Finnish-British Society in Helsinki and has founded an English club at Tampere".¹⁵²

No doubt a neutral Finnish body would have included more clergy of the Finnish Lutheran Church, given their prominent place in Finnish civic society and even politics. However, Lehtonen's good personal relations and language skills were likely to matter more in the FO list than his formal position. Lehtonen and his family not only took part in the British Council's English language activities, but were on friendly terms with Shepherd, whose company they enjoyed greatly.¹⁵³ There is no reason to believe the feeling was not mutual. In British eyes, Lehtonen himself was much more appealing than his church in general.

¹⁵¹ PRO FO 473/1 No.9 Finland: Ideological Report.

¹⁵² PRO FO 473/1 No.10 Leading Personalities in Finland, 1947. Mr. Ledward to Mr. Attlee 16.4.1947.

¹⁵³ KA EG 11 Lehtonen to Gulin 16.11.1946; KA AL 35 Blake to Lehtonen 18.1.1947.

3. Christian reconstruction - spiritual and material

a. Lehtonen supports the emerging Finnish high church movement

Besides his many duties as Archbishop's Secretary, Harjunpää found time to put in practice some of his 'cherished ecclesiastical visions'. The first great public occasion influenced by Harjunpää's historical-liturgical high church tendencies came when the celebration of St Henry, the patron of Finland and an Englishman, was revived. This took place on the Feast of St Henry, 19 January 1946 with a special liturgical vespers at Turku Cathedral.¹⁵⁴

Harjunpää was greatly supported by Lehtonen, who led the service with Dean Ahtola and Harjunpää himself. The vespers included the collect of St Henry from the Mikael Agricola Prayer Book, the first cautiously reformed liturgy in Finnish, and the music was of high quality, with traditional Finnish liturgical music sung by the *Auran Laulu* choir, whose director F. Isacson had composed organ pieces for the occasion.¹⁵⁵ The careful and thorough planning suggests that Lehtonen and Harjunpää hoped to make the vespers a first class event.

Lehtonen had done the preliminary work for the occasion as early as 1925, when he had published a book on vespers called "Vesperale". This combined a historical study of liturgical developments with practical instructions concerning the organising of vespers with examples. The book placed special emphasis on evensong in the Church of England and the revival of vespers in the Continental protestant churches in the 19th century.¹⁵⁶ His election as Archbishop and his appointment of Harjunpää, an able church musician and liturgical scholar, thus provided Lehtonen with an opportunity further to develop the liturgical life of his diocese along evangelical catholic lines. The connection with contemporary Anglicanism was obvious: the focus on the Mikael Agricola Prayer Book brings to mind the Church of England Prayer Book catholic ethos.

Lehtonen preached on the Great Commission, reminding the congregation that they were celebrating the foundation of the Church of Finland, the child of the missionary activities of St Henry and those who preceded

¹⁵⁴ *Hjä 4/25*.1.1946 Piispa Henrikin muistoa vietetty Turussa.

¹⁵⁵ *Hjä 4/25*.1.1946 Piispa Henrikin muistoa vietetty Turussa.

¹⁵⁶ *Lehtonen 1925*.

him. The sermon was later published under the title “The Mission of the Church” and thus received a wider audience.¹⁵⁷

The sermon drew together many themes close to Lehtonen’s heart. One of them was a clear adaptation from the Swedish young church movement’s theology of his youth: through baptism and teaching, he wanted to make the Finnish people Christian.¹⁵⁸ By this he did not imply a rude marriage of Christianity with political nationalism, but rather the incorporation in Christendom of the nation through faith: “Christian mission throughout the centuries led to the point where all Finns had the opportunity to come to personal Christian faith. The Finnish people were welcomed into the one, holy, apostolic Church.”¹⁵⁹ Lehtonen’s preaching had a strong emphasis on apostolicity along evangelical catholic lines. What distinguished his theology was his combining of a catholic emphasis on ecclesiology and liturgy with an evangelical fervour for mission and conversion at home and abroad.

However, there was also something deeply political in Lehtonen’s gloomy reading of the present situation. This emerges in his strong advocacy of infant baptism:

Baptism is adaptation to the family of God, to the holy catholic Church. It is a door through which one enters the Church universal. It is transformation from the dominion of darkness into the light of Christ. It is an outward act for the whole nation, in which the Lord makes disciples for Himself. -- Today I urge you: let us gladly baptise the children of Finland into this fellowship. There may come a time, when there are only two great frontiers in the world: those who confess the name of Christ and those who reject Him. Let us gladly and gratefully baptise the infants of our nation into the fellowship of the same family of God to which we have belonged from our own infancy. Baptism will bring them into the blessed fellowship.¹⁶⁰

There is little room for doubt that the two frontiers Lehtonen envisaged were international Christendom and atheistic communism. The catholicity of the Church and contacts with the rest of Christendom played a major role in Lehtonen’s assessment of the world situation: as it had been during the war, Finland was still for him a western Christian bastion against the communist east.

¹⁵⁷ *Hjä* 4/25.1.1946 Piispa Henrikin muistoa vietetty Turussa; *Lehtonen* 1947, 62.

¹⁵⁸ *Lehtonen* 1947, 63; *Ryman*2005a, 53-54.

¹⁵⁹ *Lehtonen* 1947, 63.

¹⁶⁰ *Lehtonen* 1947, 67-68.

However, these were political views of a kind which were usually kept strictly out of public discussion. Thus, the St Henry's vespers was presented to the general church going public as a festal celebration, and received promisingly good coverage in the local Christian Newspaper *Herättäjä*. *Herättäjä* advertised the service beforehand, explaining that "it is hoped to revive these feasts in order to establish a tradition for future generations."¹⁶¹ Afterwards, there was a detailed report concluding with the hope "that today's congregations might [know] of the life and work of such central men in our Church's history as Bishop Henry and Bishop Mikael Agricola. It would be fitting, at least here in western Finland, that congregations would annually gather in their temples to remember the blessed life work of these men."¹⁶² At least someone in the traditionally pietistic *Herättäjä* had completely understood the intent of Lehtonen and Harjunpää, and gave it whole-hearted support.

However, Harjunpää was quite able to work without the immediate support of the Archbishop in educating his clergy colleagues. He was one of the lecturers in the Clergy Summer Course on ecclesiology. The course was organised by the Finnish Clergy Union together with the editors of the Finnish theological review, *Vartija*, at the Institute of Parish Life in Järvenpää from 8 to 12 July 1946.¹⁶³ The main lecturer was the Rev. Eric Nilsson from the Church of Sweden, who placed particular emphasis on liturgical and devotional revival and the centrality of the Eucharist: a theme no less important for the Church of England at the time. Nilsson was supported by another Swedish lecturer, the Rev. Sven Franzén, who spoke about the application of these ideas in parish work.¹⁶⁴

The other lecturers were Finns, who concentrated for the most part on traditional Finnish Lutheran topics. The Rev. Erkki Kansanaho lectured on "Pietism and Lutheranism" and the Rev. Aimo Nikolainen on "Caesar or God", while the new Finnish folk church vision was presented by the Rev. Osmo Alaja and the Rev. Erkki Niinivaara. Harjunpää, with his topics "The Attempts for Unity between the Churches today" and "What is the Anglican Church?" certainly stood out from the other Finns. In his lecture

¹⁶¹ *Hjä* 3/18.1.1946 Vanhoja kirkollisia muistoja vaalimaan.

¹⁶² *Hjä* 4/25.1.1946 Piispa Henrikin muistoa vietetty Turussa.

¹⁶³ KA SKPL 2 Minutes of the Central Committee 5.4.1946 §4; 31.5.1946 §3.

¹⁶⁴ *Kmaa* 47/12.17.1946 Papiston kesäkurssit 8-12.7.46 Seurakuntaopistossa Järvenpäässä.

on Anglicanism, Harjunpää emphasized the distinctiveness of Anglicanism despite the Roman Catholic and Lutheran elements in it, as *Kotimaa* put it.¹⁶⁵

Kotimaa briefly reported that the lectures by the Swedish visitors “prompted a lively discussion concerning especially the issues of the Eucharist and the raising of liturgy from its present degradation.”¹⁶⁶ It is safe to assume that a revival of parish work along the lines of the Swedish high church tradition gained at least some support among the participants. Harjunpää’s churchmanship was much closer to that of the Swedish lecturers, whose approach in large measure coincided with what he was trying to achieve in his own work, than it was to that of his average Finnish colleague.

This is underlined by the fact that this summer course on ecclesiology with an overtly high church emphasis remained an isolated event in the life of the Finnish Clergy Union. The Union continued to have links with the Church of Sweden, the other Nordic Lutheran Churches and the wider Lutheran world, but these links were in the mainstream, rather than high church. No attempts were made to foster links with the Church of England or other Anglican Churches.¹⁶⁷ Anglican relations were attended to by Lehtonen, who took no active part in the life of the Union, which afforded an indication of the interests of the active mainstream clergy.

However, the Archdiocese of Turku had its own avenues and the following autumn saw another attempt at ecclesiastical education. The programme of the Clergy Union course was adapted, at least in part, becoming “the Scientific Lecture Days of the Archdiocese of Turku”. This took place in Turku from 29 to 31 October 1946 and gathered over 150 clergy from across the diocese and beyond. The Lecture Days had the same ecclesiological theme, with Harjunpää delivering a lecture on “the Church according to the Anglican understanding”.¹⁶⁸

Archbishop Lehtonen lectured on the renaissance of liturgical life. He emphasized the enduring charismatic inspiration of the liturgical and institutional life of the Church. Without this inspiration, spiritual expressions would have passed away; through it, they had been handed to successive generations in liturgical forms. Using one of his favourite proverbs *support*

¹⁶⁵ *Kotimaa* 47/12.17.1946 Papiston kesäkurssit 8-12.7.46 Seurakuntaopistossa Järvenpäässä.

¹⁶⁶ *Kotimaa* 47/12.17.1946 Papiston kesäkurssit 8-12.7.46 Seurakuntaopistossa Järvenpäässä.

¹⁶⁷ KA SKPL 2 Minutes.

¹⁶⁸ *Hjälä* 44/1.11.1946 Puolentoista sataa pappia koolla Turun tieteellisillä luentokursseilla.

custom and it will support you, he promoted the renaissance of liturgical and sacramental life according to the experience of the Church of England:

In this respect, we need a renaissance of liturgical life. Our standards are declining. There is an attempt to replace the traditional ecclesiastical forms of worship with occasional preaching meetings of all kinds. This tendency can be observed at the heart of worship, the Eucharist. Frequent communicating at the Eucharist is in decline. There may be many reasons for this. However, what we need is a strong recovery of the old custom. In the Church of England, the Eucharist is celebrated every Sunday and there are many more communicants.¹⁶⁹

Lehtonen wanted to follow the Anglican example in reviving liturgical customs and frequent communicating. The Church of England served as a good example of what he wanted to achieve in his own church. He criticised the decreasing lay participation in the liturgy together with the decreasing use of vestments, ornaments and liturgical forms among the clergy.¹⁷⁰ Lehtonen's interest in the Church of England strongly influenced his policy at home. He sought to revive and revitalise liturgical and devotional life in Finland along high church lines, corresponding to the catholic revival in the Church of England.

However, it is hard to define exactly how far the Archbishop's personal interest in liturgical renaissance was shared or merely tolerated by the majority of Church of Finland theologians and clergy. Some interesting light is shed by a comparison of how the Finnish church newspapers *Kotimaa* and *Herättäjä* reported the occasion.

Kotimaa's account of the Archbishop's lecture reported his general criticism of too reformed an understanding of worship, but omitted mention of his more specific comments concerning the changes that had impoverished the liturgical life and practice of which Lehtonen was an advocate. Nor did *Kotimaa* mention his citing of the Church of England as a positive example. *Herättäjä*, however, reported the Archbishop's ideas more fully. Harjunpää's general introduction to Anglicanism received next to no interest in either newspaper.¹⁷¹ The Finnish church papers were more interested in news about the Church of England than in attempting any deep understanding of Anglicanism.

¹⁶⁹ *Hjä* 44/1.11.1946 Puolentoista sataa pappia koolla Turun tieteellisillä luentokursseilla.

¹⁷⁰ *Hjä* 44/1.11.1946 Puolentoista sataa pappia koolla Turun tieteellisillä luentokursseilla.

¹⁷¹ *Hjä* 44/1.11.1946 Puolentoista sataa pappia koolla Turun tieteellisillä luentokursseilla; *Kmaa* 78/5.11.1946 Kristillisyyksi ei voi aina elää kuohuaikaa.

On the whole, *Herättäjä*'s reporting was more open and honest, whereas *Kotimaa* tried to harmonize the Lecture Days' message to fit its editorial line. This meant the omission of any reference to "unnecessary" criticism of traditional pietistic low church tendencies in Finnish Lutheranism and to explicit suggestions of how to enrich the liturgy by returning to classical Lutheran tradition, coupled with avoiding the giving of positive examples from non-Lutheran churches and traditions. At a time when the person of the Archbishop of Finland was still very much above public criticism, this was an implicit criticism, silence and restraint in reporting controversy being a traditional way of Finnish opposition.

The Lecture Days involved more than just discussion about liturgy. Among the devotions and services, there was the first celebration of a Mikael Agricola Vespers in Turku Cathedral. The cathedral was full. The vespers was a deliberate follow-up to the St Henry's Vespers, which had been revived earlier the same year. The liturgy was led by Harjunpää and Dean Ahtola, but the preacher was the Rev. Jaakko Haavio, who was no friend of liturgical renewal.¹⁷² Even if the congregation failed to notice it, the liturgy was without a doubt based on Lehtonen's earlier work, Harjunpää's liturgical expertise bringing it alive.

Apart from great public occasions, at the same time Harjunpää established a circle to promote his liturgical reforms.¹⁷³ This was especially remarkable as, in addition to his work as Archbishop's Secretary, Harjunpää was secretary for the reconstruction work and a parish priest in one of the Turku urban parishes.¹⁷⁴ Following many private discussions with his friends, Harjunpää called a meeting to inaugurate the circle, which was to be called The Liturgical Brethren. The meeting was attended by twelve Finnish Lutheran pastors, theologians and church musicians, along with many of their wives. The programme of the meeting was simple: there was a meditation on the season of Advent by the Rev. A.E. Koskenniemi, followed by an outline by Harjunpää of his liturgical plans. Fittingly, the meeting took place at Harjunpää's home, called St Henry's House, at Vasaramäki parish centre, on 2 December 1946.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷² *Hjä* 44/1.11.1946 Puolentoista sataa pappia koolla Turun tieteellisillä luentokursseilla; *Kmaa* 78/5.11.1946 Kristillisyyks ei voi aina elää kuohuaikaa; *Haavio* 1978, 91.

¹⁷³ *Parvio* 1977, 121-122.

¹⁷⁴ Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

¹⁷⁵ *Parvio* 1977, 121-122.

The Rev. Martti Parvio was present at the meeting. He and Harjunpää were kindred spirits. He later recalled Harjunpää's plans based on the minutes of the meeting:

In his outline Harjunpää suggested the establishment of a circle where it would be possible to realize the ideas of liturgical renewal. He stressed that there was a natural coincidence of interest. The purpose was not to attack anybody, but rather to look forward to a new reformation. The spiritual heritage, the Lutheran Confession, the Word and Sacraments were binding, but we had also to build on that which promotes the unity of the whole Church of Christ. In this context, he pointed out that the Finnish Hymnal was both Lutheran and ecumenical with regard to texts and melodies. He dismissed the idea of a special Finnish Christianity and emphasized that in Lutheranism the theology of pulpit and altar had generally been balanced. This being so, a new ecclesiastical revival was needed. The liturgy should be the task of the whole local congregation. It was the clergy rather than the laity who often hindered this. The Church's year should be lived with daily. The *musica sacra* and *ordines minores* should be revived and restored. There should be life in the *ecclesia*.¹⁷⁶

Harjunpää's plan was thus both deeply Lutheran and ecumenical in nature, but the practical suggestions concerning the deepening of the liturgical expression of the whole congregation reflected in essence very much what the catholic liturgical revival had achieved in the Church of England. Both movements drew from the catholic tradition while being true to their denominational identity. Harjunpää's plan can thus be seen as an attempt to establish a Finnish Lutheran version of the Swedish and English liturgical revivals.

The link between Harjunpää's circle's aim to promote a "new reformation" and Anglican influences was also noted by Parvio in his article about the circle. Parvio recalled how Archbishop Lehtonen had sent him for three months to Great Britain in the autumn of 1947 and that members of the Archbishop's family had participated in the activities of the circle.¹⁷⁷ This is another sign that Lehtonen used relations with the Church of England as a channel to provide liturgical stimulus to the life of the Finnish Church.

Whatever his sympathies, Lehtonen never participated in the circle's meetings; his wife and sons did, however. He wished to avoid seeming to take sides or being seen to belong to any particular party for the sake of the unity of his diocese.¹⁷⁸ Notable exceptions to this rule are his *Encyclical Let-*

¹⁷⁶ Parvio 1977, 122.

¹⁷⁷ Parvio 1977, 124.

¹⁷⁸ Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000; The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

ter, 1945, in which he openly supported high church ideas, and the lecture already mentioned.

However, aspects of Lehtonen's churchmanship were sometimes exposed by others, as when the Swedish professor Lydia Wahlström's article "Among the ecumenists in Åland" was reproduced in the Swedish language *Församlingsbladet*. The article had originally been published in *Svenska Morgonbladet* in Sweden and it dealt with an informal ecumenical meeting to which she had been invited in the Åland Islands. The other participants included Archbishop Lehtonen, who spent his summer holidays nearby; the Very Rev. Norman T. Cockburn, the Dean of Edinburgh, visiting Finland on a CRE stipend; Fr Gunnar Rosendal, the vicar of Osby in Sweden and a leader of the Swedish high church revival, and the Rev. Valdemar Nyman, who as vicar of Finström, where they met, acted as host.¹⁷⁹

Wahlström described Lehtonen as fluent in English language and culture, which confirmed what they had already heard in Sweden of his ecumenical activities in general and of his English sympathies in particular. She congratulated the Finnish Church for having such an internationally broad-minded and sympathetic leader. She described how Lehtonen had introduced Cockburn, who was struck by many similarities with Scotland, to the Finnish church and cultural life.¹⁸⁰ One similarity must have been that in both countries church life in general was largely pietistic or puritan in nature.

There was no trace of pietism or puritanism at the Åland meeting, as evidenced by Nyman's speech, which emphasized the unity of the Church in time and space with reference to northern European missionary saints. Wahlstrom further recorded that the late Archbishop of Uppsala, Nathan Söderblom's name was constantly brought up in conversations both in Swedish and in English:

And here was mentioned more than once the name of Nathan Söderblom both in English and in Swedish - he was all the time like an invisible member of the fraternity and a symbol of reconciliation between people, and the sunshine he always spread around him well reflected the warmth of the sun during these blessed days.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ *Fsb* 32/25.9.1947 "Bland ekumener på Åland"; *Parvio* 1977, 124.

¹⁸⁰ *Fsb* 32/25.9.1947 "Bland ekumener på Åland".

¹⁸¹ *Fsb* 32/25.9.1947 "Bland ekumener på Åland".

The "fraternity", including Lehtonen, was clearly happy to follow in the footsteps of the great Nathan Söderblom, acclaimed leader of Nordic Lutheranism and advocate of open ecumenism and evangelical catholicism.

However, as the comparison with Scottish church life confirmed the majority of church members were pretty far from the mindset of the ecumenically and internationally broad-minded high church elite in the Church of Finland. For example, the Archdiocese of Turku contained at that time large parts of Ostrobothnia, a stronghold of the Finnish pietistic revival movement called *Herännäisyys* (the Awakening), which took a rather dim view of all things liturgical. For them, Finnish Christianity was best described by three words: humility, inwardness and truth, which in the liturgical context meant that visible things and forms laid stress on external things, and in some cases on falseness. When this pietistic emphasis was combined with formal religious conservatism and fear of Roman Catholicism, both still very much present in Finnish Lutheranism, it is not surprising that Lehtonen did not want to advocate his views too strongly or explicitly in public.¹⁸² However, when it was possible to avoid upsetting too many people, he did so.

b. A young Church of Finland ambassador in Cambridge

Another way in which Lehtonen promoted Anglican relations and influence in his own church was through exchange between the churches. The theological student exchange began in July 1946 when the Archbishop's son, the Rev. Samuel Lehtonen, arrived in England to spend a year of post-graduate studies at Westcott House, a Church of England theological college in Cambridge.¹⁸³ He studied New Testament exegetics under Professor C.H. Dodd. The exchange had also another purpose: Archbishop Lehtonen wanted to encourage new contacts with the western churches with which the Church of Finland had enjoyed good relations before the war. In addition to Samuel's stay at Westcott, the Rev. Martti Simojoki and the Rev. Mikko Juva, both future Archbishops of Finland, were sent to study in the United States.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸² Parvio 1977, 120.

¹⁸³ KA EG Lehtonen to Gulin 13.7.1946; Ripatti 1990, 239-242; Rusama 1999, 158; Pajunen 2006, 152.

¹⁸⁴ Juva 1994, 35; Simojoki 1995, 49-50; Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

Those who were sent faced a difficult adjustment. All three had spent the war in the army and had first to come to terms with the English language, which had not been part of their curriculum at school. Samuel Lehtonen was compelled to begin his English from scratch, and spent the Trinity term at Cambridge studying English language and academic culture. This was made easier by the fact that in 1946 almost all the other students were, like Samuel, ex-servicemen returning from the army.¹⁸⁵

The choice of people and where they were sent reveals an important aspect of Lehtonen's approach to handling ecumenical relations: all three went to English and American universities, but only one, his son, went to England and gained an experience of Anglicanism. Simojoki and Juva were both sent to the Lutheran world.

Lehtonen did all he could to ensure that Samuel had a pleasant and useful year by putting him in touch with his old English friends.¹⁸⁶ This gave Samuel a unique opportunity to explore English culture and church life. Not long after his arrival in Cambridge, he had tea with the family of Professor Raven, the professor having been one of the participants in the 1933-1934 discussions. Early on he was also taken to an international ecumenical meeting by Miss Eleanor Iredale. Revealingly, one of the Scandinavian participants mistakenly thought he was there on behalf of his father as a Finnish representative.¹⁸⁷ The fact that he was not matters less than the possibility that he might have been. Whether he liked it or not, Samuel Lehtonen was seen as a young Church of Finland ambassador in England, a duty which his father was unlikely to have given to anyone he did not trust.

In any event, Samuel Lehtonen was an able and proactive ambassador. For example, on the advice of the Principal of Westcott House, he informed his father, that Bishop Stephen Neill would be worth inviting to Finland at a suitable moment.¹⁸⁸ Samuel was attending Neill's lectures and considered inviting Bishop Neill to tea to tell him about Finland. The timing could not have been better as Archbishop Fisher had just nominated Neill as his per-

¹⁸⁵ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 10.8.1946; *Juva* 1994, 9-26, 37-41; *Simojoki* 1995, 49-50; Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

¹⁸⁶ KA AL 35 Greer to Lehtonen 27.11.1945, Rawlinson to Lehtonen 25.5.1946; KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 8.1.1947; Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

¹⁸⁷ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 10.8.1946.

¹⁸⁸ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 1.2.1947.

sonal representative to the WCC in Geneva from the summer of 1947, and Samuel judged that relations with the churches in Central and Northern Europe would come under his care.¹⁸⁹

Others took an interest in Samuel Lehtonen's ambassadorial role: the Church of England followed the activities of the students it sponsored. Greer arranged Samuel's holidays. The idea was to give him as thorough and rounded an introduction to British church life as possible.¹⁹⁰ This, coupled with Archbishop Lehtonen's network of contacts, meant that there was no shortage of invitations. Samuel was taken around Oxford by C.B. Moss, spent Christmas with Dr. Temple of the BFBS, visited the Society of Sacred Mission in Kelham and the Iona Community in Scotland, where he learned something of the (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland, and visited the Bishops of Derby and Sheffield.¹⁹¹ The high point was, however, an invitation to Canterbury, where he spent Easter as the guest of the Archbishop. The invitation was secured for him by his father, and Samuel later recalled that it impressed the Westcott students.¹⁹²

This extensive introduction to Church of England life contributed to another of Samuel's ambassadorial responsibilities: informing English and Finnish church people of each other's life. On the academic front, he gave a lecture at Westcott House about the Reformation and Lutheranism in the Nordic countries. This was important: German Lutheranism was more familiar to the English. He also gave a speech about the Finnish SCM at the local SCM meeting.¹⁹³ The widest audience gained by Samuel came with his radio lectures on the BBC and nine articles in *Kotimaa*.¹⁹⁴ Thus the exchange was mutually enriching, even if the balance favoured Samuel.

¹⁸⁹ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 25.1.1947.

¹⁹⁰ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 8.1.1947; Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

¹⁹¹ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 30.9.1946; 8.1.1947.

¹⁹² Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

¹⁹³ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 25.1.1947.

¹⁹⁴ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 25.1.1947; *Kmaa* 65/20.9.1946 Meiltä kysytään panosta ajan kysymyksiin; 71/11.10.1946 Kent - Englannin puutarha; 78/5.11.1946 Päivä Westcott Homessa; 80/12.11.1946 Täysiäinen evankeliumi vietävä maailman kärsineille kansoille; 85/29.11.1946 Pappiskasvatuksessa on tärkeintä rukous; 90/17.12.1946 Englantilaisessa jumalanpalveluksessa; 30/29.4.1947 Pääsiäinen Canterburyssä; 35/23.5.1947 Ihmiset kaipaavat sanomaa koko elämänpiiriään varten; 40/13.6.1947 Veljeskunta Skotlannin kirkossa.

Samuel's articles in *Kotimaa* offered Finnish church people a window on church life in England in general and in the Church of England in particular. The first articles described student life and the events in which Samuel had been involved, and introduced readers to the English collegial system.¹⁹⁵ Samuel's activities ranged from hop-picking in Kent to attending the meeting of the World Evangelical Alliance in London. Reporting on the latter, Samuel Lehtonen particularly emphasized the good relations individual Christians and the different churches enjoyed with each other in England.¹⁹⁶ Samuel's letters home reveal that he had been surprised to find the meeting a positive experience.¹⁹⁷ Recurring themes in these letters were liturgy and prayer and the churches' social responsibility in the world.¹⁹⁸

When not acting as an ambassador, Samuel Lehtonen lived an ordinary student life in Cambridge. His letters describe his experiences, speculate about his future work in the Finnish Church and plan his future family life with his fiancée, whom he would marry on his return.¹⁹⁹ He was, after all, still first and foremost a student.

c. Samuel Lehtonen and the churchmanship of the Finnish visitors

A study of Samuel Lehtonen's time in England reveals much about the connection between the high church group around Archbishop Lehtonen and interest in Anglicanism among the Finns living in or visiting England. Finnish visitors could be divided roughly into two groups: high church people

¹⁹⁵ *Kmaa* 65/20.9.1946 Meiltä kysytään panosta ajan kysymyksiin; 71/11.10.1946 Kent - Englannin puutarha; 78/5.11.1946 Päivä Westcott Homessa; 80/12.11.1946 Täysiääninen evankeliumi vietävä maailman kärsineille kansoille; 85/29.11.1946 Pappiskasvatuksessa on tärkeintä rukous; 90/17.12.1946 Englantilaisessa jumalanpalveluksessa; *Ripatti* 1990, 241-242.

¹⁹⁶ *Kmaa* 71/11.10.1946 Kent - Englannin puutarha; 80/12.11.1946 Täysiääninen evankeliumi vietävä maailman kärsineille kansoille.

¹⁹⁷ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 3.9.1946.

¹⁹⁸ *Kmaa* 65/20.9.1946 Meiltä kysytään panosta ajan kysymyksiin; 71/11.10.1946 Kent - Englannin puutarha; 78/5.11.1946 Päivä Westcott Homessa; 80/12.11.1946 Täysiääninen evankeliumi vietävä maailman kärsineille kansoille; 85/29.11.1946 Pappiskasvatuksessa on tärkeintä rukous; 90/17.12.1946 Englantilaisessa jumalanpalveluksessa; 30/29.4.1947 Pääsiäinen Canterburyssä; 35/23.5.1947 Ihmiset kaipaavat sanomaa koko elämänpiiriään varten; 40/13.6.1947 Veljeskunta Skotlannin kirkossa.

¹⁹⁹ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 1946-1947.

sent by the Archbishop and the rest. The interests, attitudes and relations with Anglicans of the two groups differed greatly.

For example, a recurring theme in both Samuel Lehtonen's letters home and his articles in *Kotimaa* was the emphasis on frequent celebration of Holy Communion in the Church of England. Another theme was his high regard for the religious life. Samuel became interested in 'a rule of life' that might sustain his future ministry in the Finnish Church. These interests, similar to his father's, were not generally supported in the Church of Finland, and he worried about whether monastic life was too 'catholic' a subject for the readers of *Kotimaa*.²⁰⁰

The question was prompted, among other occasions, by his visit to Kelham, where he met Fr. A. Gabriel Hebert, a scholar of Swedish Lutheran theology who knew his father.²⁰¹ Following this visit, Samuel wrote:

The longer one stays here one finds oneself asking certain questions and searching for a clearly grounded "churchmanship". Is it possible to pursue evangelical catholicity in practice? I suppose strict Lutherans, for example, will be suspicious of me now!²⁰²

Samuel knew that developing relationships with Anglicans and adopting an evangelical catholic high church Lutheranism was an unwise career move in the Finnish Church, in spite of his family connections.

A further example of the Lehtonens' anglophilia is seen in their habit of using English expressions in the Finnish text. The term "churchmanship" appeared in English in Samuel's otherwise Finnish letters, as did "St Martin's", a reference to the Finnish parish in which Samuel was considering working.²⁰³ In Finnish the parish and the entire district was designated as 'Martti', but without conscious reference to the actual patron.

What characterized Samuel's churchmanship? He was certainly no conservative Anglo-Catholic, no doubt because of that party's traditionally poor view of all things Lutheran, a view that tended to be reciprocated by Lutherans. Samuel betrays no trace of 'Romanism' in his letters, in which he wrote of his distaste for High Mass without communicants. In the same letter he wrote of having attended "a moderately high" Parish Communion, which

²⁰⁰ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 25.1.1947; 10.3.1947.

²⁰¹ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 10.3.1947; 22.3.1947; *Hebert* 1965, 118-128.

²⁰² KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 10.3.1947.

²⁰³ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 25.1.1947.

was followed by a breakfast in the hall, an old station house. He saw this as representing a healthier trend in the East End of London, where most of the churches were Anglo-Catholic.²⁰⁴ With his keen interest in liturgy and social responsibility, Samuel's churchmanship in English terms was essentially liberal catholic. In the Finnish context, it had much in common with the liturgical renewal movement of Harjunpää's Liturgical Brethren and the new folk church approach of the brothers-in-arms clergy.

Samuel was enthusiastic about the possibility that he would live close to where the Liturgical Brethren met when he returned to Finland, two months after the founding meeting of the circle in January 1947.²⁰⁵ His family must have kept him informed about the circle's establishment.

Like his father, Samuel was keenly interested in the Student Christian Movement (SCM). He had been somewhat prejudiced about the British SCM before making contact with the local branch and finding himself pleasantly surprised. In September, Samuel wrote that he would hesitate to tell some of the jokes he had heard at a local SCM conference to the Finnish SCM, because they were predicated on the assumption that fear of liberal theology had caused the resignation of "a certain" fellow Finn and his move towards Norwegian Professor Ole Hallesby and the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (IVF).²⁰⁶

This "certain fellow Finn" was unquestionably the Rev. Professor Osmo Tiililä of Helsinki University, who like the Finnish SCM was somewhat torn between the World Student Christian Federation (WSCF) and IVF, sympathizing with the latter but desiring to belong to both. Tiililä reflected the contemporary mood in the Finnish SCM: he abhorred the liberal theology of the English SCM and sympathized with the evangelical ethos of IVF, in spite of what he perceived as that movement's overly reformed position. In practice this involved an emphasis on sanctification at the expense of justification. However, as a Lutheran pietist, Tiililä had more in common with IVF's evangelical ethos than with the liberal theology of SCM.²⁰⁷

Tiililä's rejection of SCM did not please Samuel, who thought that it would be foolish for the Finns to move away from the SCM's noble tradition of global Christian unity. He believed the problem lay in an inadequate

²⁰⁴ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 8.1.1947.

²⁰⁵ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 25.1.1947.

²⁰⁶ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 3.9.1946.

²⁰⁷ *Rusama* 1999, 17-19, 65-66; *Junkkaala* 2004, 404-412.

understanding of the English context, resulting in isolationist tendencies among the Finns.²⁰⁸ Samuel's problem was completely the reverse: he agonized over how he might give an objective account of both movements, when he himself wholeheartedly supported SCM. He disliked what he perceived as IVF's "oddity", and dreaded the prospect that he might have to attend one of their meetings.²⁰⁹ The two Finnish visitors differed over more than simply their opposing preferences for competing organisations. Unsurprisingly, there is no evidence that Tiililä ever had any meaningful contact with the Church of England or Anglicanism, which interested him little.

However, Samuel wished to avoid more than just IVF: the formidable Miss Iredale of the CRE was no less popular with him. It seems that Iredale was a little too attentive to the Finnish visitors. This had led to some difficulties for the Rev. Toivo Winter, who visited England for three months to study Bible Work. It seems Iredale subjected him to a rigorous investigation of his use of time.²¹⁰ Samuel described her as "a good person and able, but too energetic and Führer-like."²¹¹

Yet Iredale clearly took a genuine interest in the visitors and how they fared. She liked the Finns and their church. In one of his letters, Samuel wrote of being given a "talking-to" by Iredale, but added that this was because of her concern for his welfare and her interest in Finland. She told Samuel about meeting Harjunpää in Geneva, where "he [Harjunpää] gave an excellent report on Finland and his whole contribution was quite outstanding."²¹² Such positive sentiments must have been very welcome to a foreign student, who still needed to carry a stamp stating "enemy alien" in his passport and to report to the police regularly.²¹³

In the England of 1946, there were few opportunities to speak Finnish.²¹⁴ One of the few places where it was possible was the Finnish Seamen's Church in London. The church had been without a pastor since Harjunpää's return to Finland in the summer of 1945, and the position was advertised in the Finnish church newspapers with a note that the future Seamen's

²⁰⁸ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 3.9.1946.

²⁰⁹ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 8.1.1947.

²¹⁰ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 2.4.1947.

²¹¹ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 8.1.1947.

²¹² KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 2.4.1947.

²¹³ Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

²¹⁴ Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

pastor would also have a role in nurturing relations with the Church of England.²¹⁵ In subsequent advertisements, there was no mention of this role, but there was still much interest in the job.²¹⁶ The Finnish Seamen's Church appointed the Rev. Oiva Pohjanpirkka.²¹⁷

Pohjanpirkka's term started promisingly: Harjunpää obtained references for him from Bishop Bell and the Rev. Dr. John Temple of the BFBS, and Pohjanpirkka and his wife arrived in England in August 1946, having been granted the necessary travel permissions.²¹⁸ Soon after their arrival, Samuel Lehtonen wrote home having enjoyed meeting them in London.²¹⁹

The first challenge for Pohjanpirkka was the poor housing situation in post-war London. He wanted to reclaim the Finnish Seamen's Mission's old house, and was assisted in this by Waddams, who wrote to the Town Clerk on his behalf.²²⁰ Waddams' letter described the hopes the Church of England placed in the new Seamen's Pastor:

The Church of England is always anxious to see that foreigners in this country have adequate provision made for their religious needs, and I hope very much that Mr. Oiva Pohjanpirkka will be able to regain this property as a centre for his domestic life and for his work. The Finnish congregation here has been for some time without a chaplain, and it is therefore urgent that the chaplain's work should be re-started as soon as possible. The last chaplain did much valuable work, not only for his own people, but also for good relations between the Church of England and the Church of Finland, and it is our hope that this work will be carried on by the new chaplain.

You will, doubtless, be aware of the strong reasons of a personal nature which require some provision for a home for Mr. Pohjanpirkka, but I will not speak of this, I should be extremely grateful if you are able to help in the matter, and make his house in Leyton available to him.²²¹

²¹⁵ *Kmaa* 75/5.10.1945 Lontoon pappi; *Hjä* 40/5.10.1945 Lontoon pappi; *Fbl* 35/11.10.1945 Några synpunkter angående tjänsten som sjömanspräst i London.

²¹⁶ *Kmaa* 10/3.2.1946 Lontoon pappi; *Fbl* 6/7.2.1946 Sjömansprästtjänsten i London; *Hjä* 6/8.2.1946 Lontoon pappi; *Fbl* 10/7.3.1946 Sjömansprästen i London; *Kmaa* 19/8.3.1946 Lontoon merimiespapin paikkaan 15 hakijaa.

²¹⁷ *Fbl* 11/14.3.1946 Till sjömanspräst i London; *Hjä* 11/15.3.1946 Pastori O. Pohjanpirkka Lontoon merimiespapiksi; *Kmaa* 21/15.3.1946 Oiva Pohjanpirkka merimiespapiksi Lontooseen.

²¹⁸ KA SMLS Fa10 Harjunpää to Seamen's Mission telegram from London 11.5.1946; *Hjä* 30/26.7.1946.

²¹⁹ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 3.9.1946.

²²⁰ LPL CFR LR file 30/9 Waddams to The Town Clerk 6.9.1946.

²²¹ LPL CFR LR file 30/9 Waddams to The Town Clerk 6.9.1946.

"The strong reasons" Waddams mentioned referred to Mrs. Pohjanpirkka's first pregnancy and the fact that Pohjanpirkka had lost one of his arms in the war. The letter also drew attention to Harjunpää's good reputation, implying that Pohjanpirkka had a hard act to follow.

But Pohjanpirkka was not Harjunpää, and he faced many more challenges. Samuel advised Pohjanpirkka to buy the right sort of clerical collar in order to signify the high churchmanship expected of him.²²² Earlier, Samuel had "confessed" in one of his letters that he generally only wore his collar when outside the College and had asked his parents not to tell this to Harjunpää.²²³ His joke says something of the kind of expectations in London awaiting Harjunpää's successor. It also confirms Harjunpää's closeness to the Lehtons.

The Pohjanpirkkas' promising start did not last long. Their son was stillborn in January 1947.²²⁴ Mrs Pohjanpirkka returned soon afterwards to Finland and stayed there, while her husband devoted himself to his work.²²⁵ Samuel sent his parents the sad news, at the same time offering his assessment of Pohjanpirkka's ability to carry on Harjunpää's pro-Anglican work:

Pohjanpirkka did not seem particularly thrilled with the Anglican Church! [sic] when we last met. He is among other things against all ceremonies. I do not think he is well qualified to understand Anglicanism, so there is not much to be expected of him in this respect. He has, in any case, failed to become acquainted with the Anglican Church from the inside, since he has been so very involved in his work among the Seamen. This he has been doing most diligently.²²⁶

On balance, it seems Samuel's assessment was correct. Pohjanpirkka's only meaningful relations with the Church of England were connected to the immediate needs of the Finnish Seamen's Mission in London. In these matters he received sympathetic help from both Waddams and Miss Iredale of the CRE.²²⁷ Pohjanpirkka's working environment differed radically from Harjunpää's. The end of the war meant that there were many more Finnish

²²² KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 3.9.1946.

²²³ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 10.8.1946.

²²⁴ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 25.1.1947.

²²⁵ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 10.3.1947.

²²⁶ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 10.3.1947.

²²⁷ LPL CFR LR file 30/9 Waddams to the Town Clerk 6.9.1946, Pohjanpirkka to Waddams 22.10.1947, Waddams to the Secretary of War Damage Commission 23.10.1947, 6.11.1947, Hankey to Waddams 7.11.1947; Iredale 1947, 10.

Seamen to take care of. In any case, peace and improved communication provided other avenues for the churches to pursue their ecumenical relations. Direct communication between the church leaders and the exchange of visitors seemed a more effective way of establishing contacts than the services of a single hard-pressed seamen's pastor.

d. The significance of CRE aid in Finland

From 1946 onwards the CRE became an increasingly important organisation in facilitating meaningful interaction between the Churches of England and Finland. The first report of the Church of England Church Assembly Commission on Christian Reconstruction in Europe (CAC CRE) at the Assembly's debate on 18 June 1947 strikingly reflects what was happening in the area of co-operation between the churches. Every contact between the churches benefited in some way from the work of the CRE, and in every aspect of the CRE's work Finland was in some way involved.

As an example, Samuel Lehtonen's studies in Cambridge were made possible by CRE funds. The Principal of Westcott, the Rev. William Greer, was the Chairman of the sub-committee on theological students, which worked in close association with the Student Committee of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations (CFR).²²⁸ Apart from this, the CRE had only one other sub-committee, which worked on the provision of literature and the distribution of books and periodicals to libraries all over Europe. This sub-committee also worked closely with Archbishop Lehtonen, who wished to ensure that the Finnish Church kept in touch with theological developments.²²⁹ The committee also kept Lehtonen informed through subscriptions to English newspapers.²³⁰

This sharing of information accorded well with the ideology of the CRE, which saw its role as extending beyond support of the material reconstruction of Europe to encouragement in hope and faith for European Christians and their churches. The report stated that many European countries had been as

²²⁸ C.A. 848 1947, 7.

²²⁹ LPL Bell papers vol.76 Lehtonen to Bell 22.11.1946, Bell to Iredale 18.12.1946, de Jonge to Bell 23.12.1946; KA AL 42 Iredale to Lehtonen 5.2.1947; KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 30.9.1946; 8.1.1947.

²³⁰ KA AL 35 Roche to Lehtonen 23.10.1947.

severely tested in the post-war period as they had been during the war. They had faced "a period of intensified internal strife and pressure from without the country", and "of internecine strife with the additional suffering which that involves, as well as one in which men have struggled to recover their dignity as men and as citizens". This was especially true, the report testified, in the liberated countries, and in "an even more tragic sense of the defeated countries: Germany, Hungary, Austria, Italy and to a lesser degree of Finland."²³¹ The report's assessment of the Finnish situation accurately described the "internal strife" in the political field between the Finnish communists and the rest, and "pressure from without the country" in the form of the Soviet dominance of the Allied Control Commission.²³² In this situation all contacts and news from the west offered a glimmer of hope.

The cure for Europe's ills was striking:

Interchurch Reconstruction Committees have been formed in all countries collaborating with the World Council of Churches Reconstruction Department,---. Each of these Committees is an instrument strengthening the moral and spiritual forces of the country concerned and making possible the recovery of hope and confidence. They are centres of religious life through which help is given both to the Churches themselves, and (thanks very specially to the generosity of the American people) through the Churches to considerable sections of the population in greatest need of help.²³³

The task of the reconstruction committees was an onerous one. They bore the heavy responsibility of "strengthening the moral and spiritual forces" and recovering "hope and confidence". The assessment that without "the generosity of the American people" this help would not pass to the population at large, but would remain mainly in the bosom of the receiving churches, reflects the reality.

This was certainly true in the case of Finland, where American relief, first through the Quakers, and later especially from the American Lutherans, made an important difference to the lives of the people, whereas the CRE aid was more modest and used mainly for the strengthening of the religious institutions through contacts abroad.²³⁴ This is confirmed by the figures; in 1947 the CRE allocated Finland £6250, of which £6125 came

²³¹ C.A. 848 1947, 1-2.

²³² *Nevakivi* 1999, 225-241; *Jutikkala* 2003, 457-465; *Singleton* 2006, 134-137; *Kirby* 2006, 232-239.

²³³ C.A. 848 1947, 1-2.

²³⁴ *Malkavaara* 1997, 8-11.

from the Church of England. £4125 was given to the Lutherans; £2125 to the Orthodox.²³⁵ At the same time, the American Lutherans aimed to raise up to one million dollars for Finnish reconstruction. In addition, the Americans sent Finland various much needed goods. The final total of American Lutheran reconstruction greatly exceeded one million dollars.²³⁶

There is no doubt that the American aid was considerably more important and effective for the bulk of the population than was the CRE aid, which was mainly used for strengthening ecumenical relations with the Finnish Lutherans and the Orthodox. CRE aid came almost completely from the Church of England and all but neglected the Finnish Protestant Free Churches. The importance of ecumenical relations to the Church of England was underlined by the extent of aid to the Finnish Orthodox Church, with less than two percent of the population as members, while over ninety-five percent belonged to the Lutheran Church.²³⁷ The Orthodox, however, were in great need of help.

Part of the CRE aid to the Finnish Orthodox came in the form of candles, incense and cassocks.²³⁸ The good relations between the Finnish national churches is demonstrated by the fact that the Orthodox were assisted in acquiring the aid by Lehtonen and Harjunpää, who were better equipped to deal with English ecumenical organisations. Lehtonen wrote privately to the CRE asking if they could offer personal support for the Orthodox Archbishop Herman, who was in great need. Lehtonen's request bore fruit.²³⁹

The CRE aid to the Finnish Orthodox thus served two ends. First, it was much needed assistance to a struggling minority church, whose heartland had been annexed by the Soviet Union and the majority of whose people had been scattered as evacuees throughout Finland. Second, it furthered the general ecumenical policy of the Church of England towards the Orthodox world, and was thus easily defended at home.

The ecumenical importance of CRE aid was implicitly acknowledged in the report, which stated that there was "a disposition abroad to look to the Christian forces here, and perhaps especially to the Church of England, for help, spiritual as well as material, in their present difficulties. The fellow-

²³⁵ C.A. 848 1947, 5.

²³⁶ *Malkavaara* 1997, 19-20.

²³⁷ <http://www.stat.fi/tup/suoluk/suoluk_vaesto.html>

²³⁸ C.A. 848 1947, 5.

²³⁹ KA AL 42 Iredale to Lehtonen 5.2.1947; KA AL 35 Iredale to Lehtonen 26.2.1947.

ship established by the Committee for Christian Reconstruction in Europe (C.R.E.) gives an opportunity to us in this country to learn valuable lessons from the harsher experience of the Continental Churches."²⁴⁰ In the Finnish context this applied to both the Lutheran and the Orthodox Church. It is clear that the Lutheran Church in particular saw international contacts as a means of surviving in a tense political situation and of gaining fresh ideas and stimuli for its work.

Another feature of CRE work that contributed to this end was the exchange of "Long Term Visitors":

In co-operation with the Council on Foreign Relations and other Church bodies, the Commission has shared in the invitation to students, ministers and workers in different fields of church work in Europe to spend two or three months in this country, studying the work of British Churches and in particular that of the Church of England. There have been in all eight of these guests, drawn from Norway, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Finland. This mutual exchange of experience and ideas has been appreciated by the Churches of Europe.

Given the small numbers involved, the proportion of Finnish visitors financed by the CRE is significant; and the CRE also financed British visitors to Finland. The Rev. Toivo Winter and the Rev. Aarne Siirala spent three months in England studying Bible Work and Youth Work respectively during the winter of 1946-1947.²⁴¹ Later, these visits were returned by the Rev. George T. S. Prentice from Gravesend, whose guest Winter had been in England, and by the Very Rev. Norman T. Cockburn, the Dean of Edinburgh, who visited Finland in the summer of 1947.²⁴²

There was more to these visits than ecclesiastical junkets: they promoted meaningful contacts between the churches. For example, Winter stayed in England free of charge as Prentice's guest, and had an opportunity to get to know something of the life of the Church of England at first hand. During his stay, he met the Archbishop of Canterbury and preached, with Prentice as translator. Perhaps it was the comical appearance of two preachers in the same pulpit which led to this latter event's being reported in some Eng-

²⁴⁰ C.A. 848 1947, 3.

²⁴¹ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.317 Harjunpää to Bell 16.7.1946; *Hjü* 2/10.1.1947 Voimakasta suopeutta Suomea kohtaan tunnetaan Englannissa; *Ahola* 1996, 70-71.

²⁴² *Hjü* 20/16.5.1947 Englantilainen kirkonmies vierailulle Suomeen; *Hjü* 23/6.6.1947 Kirkkoherra G. Prentice; *Kmaa* 39/10.6.1947 "TochH" - englantilaisten sotilaiden kristillinen järjestö; *Hjü* 24/13.6.1947 Englannin kirkko osallistuu Euroopan jälleenrakennustyöhön; *Kmaa* 55/22.8.1947 Skotlantilainen tuomiorovasti ihastunut maahamme.

lish newspapers.²⁴³ English church people were informed about the Finnish Church mainly through direct contacts when possible. Their exposure to the Finnish Church was thus extremely limited.

In Finland the situation was completely different and the visits, with the exception of Siirala's, received good coverage in the church press. The tone of the reporting was positive, giving the readers an overview of both the visits and their programme, and the Church of England and the reconstruction work done by the CRE.²⁴⁴ Well-informed Finnish church people were thus very aware of the goodwill shown by the Church of England.

These contacts conveyed to the Finnish public that they were not alone and forgotten, but still part of Christendom. All three major Finnish church newspapers published the CRE's New Year's Greeting 1947 to the Finnish Church, which quoted King George VI's Christmas message:

The devastation and suffering everywhere, and especially in stricken Europe, must move the hearts of all of us; but the reconstruction so urgently needed is quite as much spiritual as material; it is necessary not merely to feed hungry people, and to rebuild ruined cities, but also to restore the very soul of civilisation.²⁴⁵

This was also quoted in the CRE report, which acknowledged that the King's "expression of sympathy and understanding" had been deeply appreciated by the churches in Europe.²⁴⁶ There is no doubt that the CRE and the European churches, the Church of Finland included, wanted to restore Christian faith at the heart of European civilisation.

This theme featured strongly in the visit of Miss Eleanor Iredale, the General Secretary of the CRE, to Finland in the summer of 1947. In the spring, Archbishop Lehtonen had contacted her, promising his full assistance with her visit. Harjunpää would prepare her programme and she would always have Finnish clergy at her disposal.²⁴⁷ This reflects more than

²⁴³ *Hjä* 2/10.1.1947 Voimakasta suopeutta Suomea kohtaan tunnetaan Englannissa.

²⁴⁴ *Hjä* 2/10.1.1947 Voimakasta suopeutta Suomea kohtaan tunnetaan Englannissa; *Hjä* 20/16.5.1947 Englantilainen kirkonmies vierailulle Suomeen; *Hjä* 23/6.6.1947 Kirkkoherra G. Prentice; *Kmaa* 39/10.6.1947 "ToCH" - englantilaisten sotilaiden kristillinen järjestö; *Hjä* 24/13.6.1947 Englannin kirkko osallistuu Euroopan jälleenrakennustyöhön; *Kmaa* 55/22.8.1947 Skotlantilainen tuomiorovasti ihastunut maahamme.

²⁴⁵ C.A. 848 1947, 3; *Hjä* 2/10.1.1947 Englannin kristilliset kirkot tervehtivät Suomea; *Kmaa* 3/14.1.1947 Englannin kristilliset kirkot tervehtivät Suomea; *Fsb* 3/16.1.1947 En hälsning från Englands kristna kyrkor till Finlands kyrka. Quoted through C.A. Report.

²⁴⁶ C.A. 848 1947, 3.

²⁴⁷ KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Iredale 21.4.1947.

the Archbishop's generous hospitality, but also the utmost importance given to Iredale's visit to the reconstruction field.

Iredale arrived in Finland on 12 August and spent three weeks visiting parts of Lapland and Kainuu district, guided by Bishops Malmivaara and Sormunen, to whose Dioceses these areas belonged. She also participated in a meeting of the Finnish Reconstruction Committee in Helsinki, which had been convened because of her visit. Iredale brought with her a further £1000 for Finnish reconstruction, which was divided between the churches. Each of the Lutheran Dioceses received 66000 marks to hire a pastor to work in the social field; the Orthodox Church received 75000 marks for their youth work; and the Free Churches received 66000 marks for their work.²⁴⁸ This followed a principle according to which the Orthodox and the Free Churches were treated financially as a diocese of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland.

The importance given to the visit, coupled with the gift she brought, ensured that Iredale's visit received much publicity in the Church of Finland. The church press carried detailed articles about her visit, and interviewed her about the work of the CRE. This guaranteed that Iredale's message that the churches must work together was well reported. In the *Kotimaa* interview, she emphasized that European culture was created by Christianity, and that Christian truth was the key to interpreting and solving the present problems. The better this was understood, the better national reconstruction would be accomplished. It was the task of the Christian churches to think about their sister churches. The Church of England had great sympathy with the Finnish Church, because it shared the same problems, according to Iredale.²⁴⁹

The explicit reference to the Church of England reveals that Miss Iredale did not always consider it necessary to stick strictly to her role as a leader of an ecumenical organisation. Her approach was somewhat patronising, even if she in general spoke against narrow nationalism:

A young nation is like a young people; easily self-aggrandizing on the national basis moving towards isolationism, but more mature will break away from this to serve

²⁴⁸ *Kmaa* 54/15.8.1947 Pääsihteeri Iredale saapunut Suomeen; *Kmaa* 56/28.8.1947 Elävää innostusta kirkossa toisten hyväksi, Kirkkoamme muistetaan jatkuvasti ulkomaisin avustuksin; *Hjä* 35/29.8.1947 Lapin ja Kainuun jälleenrakentajat tekevät työtä rohkeina ja toivorikkaina.

²⁴⁹ *Kmaa* 56/28.8.1947 Elävää innostusta kirkossa toisten hyväksi.

the others. The strength of the people is strengthened in service. I have seen here encouraging energy and will to work. I hope that the Finnish people will bring this contribution to the international cultural life - in future this kind of nation will have its say - and to the Christian work in all the world. The Church cannot isolate in the present troubles, but it must give its own, energetic contribution.²⁵⁰

Iredale's message was against an isolating nationalism and for the active participation of the Church in the world. It followed the approach Waddams had taken towards Finland in December 1944. The main difference was that Iredale's message was backed up by the money she brought and sweetened with compliments. This approach worked much better. Iredale's visit reveals the high esteem in which the CRE was held in the Finnish Church and that her message was heard.

e. The reality of Finnish popular perceptions and interest

In spite of the extensive publicity generated by reconstruction, the relations between the churches remained low key. Apart from Archbishop Lehtonen and Harjunpää, and the ecumenically open and active Bishop Gulin, there were few if any leading personalities in the Church of Finland with any meaningful relations with Church of England people. The editor of *Kotimaa* and Professor of Pastoral Theology at Helsinki University, the Rev. Yrjö J.E. Alanen, had English friends, who tried to re-establish contact with him after the war, but this did not mean that Alanen had his finger on the Church of England's pulse.²⁵¹

In fact, Alanen was more interested in the British Labour Movement than he was in the Church of England. He was attracted by British Christian Socialism, markedly different as it was from Finnish socialism, which was closer in spirit to the continental anti-clerical socialist tradition. British Labour thus received much publicity in *Kotimaa*. In reporting the British general election of late July 1945, Alanen recommended that the Finnish Labour Movement should emulate the Christian example of its British counterpart.²⁵²

This ensured that British news was usually presented positively in *Kotimaa* and the other church newspapers. The Finnish church press focused

²⁵⁰ *Kmaa* 56/28.8.1947 Elävää innostusta kirkossa toisten hyväksi.

²⁵¹ HYK COLL.7.38 Bentley-Taylor to Alanen 26.4.1945.

²⁵² *Kmaa* 51/13.7.1945 Englantilaisia vaalinäköaloja.

more on British society, culture and political life, including religion in general, than it did on the Church of England. The Church of England was usually presented in connection with a particular event or statement, such as Bishop Bell's activities in the ecumenical movement or Archbishop Fisher's comments on Nuclear War.²⁵³

Perhaps the most controversial news concerned the Dean of Canterbury, the Very Rev. Dr. Hewlett Johnson, or 'the Red Dean' as he was called because of his Soviet sympathies.²⁵⁴ The Red Dean of Canterbury was a most embarrassing problem for Archbishop Fisher as they were easily confused with each other abroad, although their reading of Soviet communism was poles apart.²⁵⁵ This, however, did not happen in Finland; nor was there any public criticism of the Red Dean's ideas, which were merely reported in brief.

The only church newspaper which occasionally published something slightly critical was *Herättäjä*, which, for example, reported that London had prepared for the celebrations of the end of the war by stockpiling large quantities of alcohol. *Herättäjä* cited this as a sign of a moral loosening that was also happening in Finland.²⁵⁶ In general it appears the press had decided not to criticise anything British, but to report about Britain in generally positive terms.

If this was the reality of public opinion as reflected by the church press, the world of theology and ecclesiastical politics saw things differently. A good example of the general attitude among Finnish clergy and theologians at Helsinki University is provided by the Rev. Dr. Osmo Tiililä, Professor of Dogmatics, who took a strictly confessional approach to ecumenism in pietistic Haugean Lutheran fashion. It is thus no surprise that Tiililä's reserve towards the English SCM, an organisation held in high esteem outside Britain, as Samuel Lehtonen noted, was reflected in his perception of the ecumenical relations between the churches. He visited England several times to participate in international meetings like the IVF spring conference in

²⁵³ *Kmaa* 47/29.6.1945 Vihalle ja väkivallalle ei rakenneta kansakuntien veljeyttä; *Kmaa* 62/21.8.1945 Sivistyksen edessä valinta elämän ja kuoleman välillä.

²⁵⁴ *Kmaa* 53/20.7.1945 "Uskontoa ei voida lopettaa."; Fsb 27/26.7.1945 Stalinord till domprostsen av Canterbury.

²⁵⁵ *Carpenter* 1991, 140-14; *Hastings* 1998, 320.

²⁵⁶ *Hjä* 16/20.4.1945 Tien ohesta tempomia.

1946.²⁵⁷ However, he never had any meaningful relations with Church of England theologians and showed no particular interest in Anglicanism. A reason for this may lie in the fact that the ecumenical theologians and leaders of the Church of England at the time were indeed often products of the SCM that was so criticized by Tiililä. The same applied to the Finnish advocates of Anglican relations, Archbishop Lehtonen and Bishop Gulin, who represented the older and ecumenically and theologically more open approach of the Finnish SCM, and for whom Tiililä had little respect either.²⁵⁸

Furthermore, Tiililä's reserve towards Anglicanism transmitted itself to the ecumenical education of the future Finnish clergy who were his students. He thus had great influence in Finland, where his views were disseminated widely among theological students through his lectures and the first Finnish language introduction to symbolism *Kristilliset kirkot ja lahkot* (*Christian Churches and Sects*), which he published in 1945. Tiililä divided Christianity into five major categories: Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Evangelical Lutheran, Reformed and 'sects'. The Church of England was considered separately at the end of the section on the Reformed Churches, with a very general introduction amounting to five pages, including a bibliography.²⁵⁹

The introduction was largely based on a summary of the 39 Articles, and introduced some aspects of church life, including an assessment of the different parties, which Tiililä summarized thus:

The life of the Episcopal Church of England is characterized by a concentration on practical questions. The Evangelical movement performs pastoral work intended to evangelize, the High Church party concentrates on their ritualism and emphasizes ecclesial authority, and the Broad Church on cultural issues and social tasks. There is not much discussion about dogma.²⁶⁰

With a hint of criticism, Tiililä paid most attention to Anglo-Catholicism. He described the concept of historical continuity, rituals and the thus far unsuccessful attempts at unity with Rome, which had led to relations with the Orthodox and other churches, including the Finnish Church "with

²⁵⁷ *Kmaa* 23/22.3.1946 Prof. Tiililä Englantiin; *Kmaa* 27/9.4.1946 Kansainvälinen kristillinen ylioppilaskokous Englannissa; *Rusama* 1999, 66.

²⁵⁸ *Junkkaala* 2004, 71-89, 425-430, 595.

²⁵⁹ *Tiililä* 1945, 254-259; *Rusama* 1999, 193.

²⁶⁰ *Tiililä* 1945, 258.

some of our theologians".²⁶¹ The consensus and economic intercommunion achieved in the 1933-1934 discussions and their reception in both churches was not mentioned: an indication that Tiililä did not support ecumenical rapprochement with non-Lutherans.

As the book was based on Tiililä's lectures at Helsinki University and was intended as a text book, it is safe to assume that its presentation of the place and nature of Anglicanism and the relations between the churches influenced a generation of Finnish theologians. From Tiililä they learned that "the Episcopal Church of England forms an interesting and to great extent independent entity within the Reformed Church."²⁶² Tiililä's point of view was very Lutheran: his concentration on similarities and points of departure with Lutheran theology and spirituality did little justice to the spirit of Anglicanism. It is hardly surprising, then, that the majority of Finnish clergy knew little of Anglicanism, or considered it as akin to either Calvinism or Roman Catholicism, or perhaps even both of these traditional opponents of Lutheran confessional orthodoxy. There was great scope for the education among the younger clergy encouraged by Archbishop Lehtonen.

4. Bishop Hunter's introduction to Church of Finland relations

a. The search for a successor to Headlam

Towards the end of 1946 Archbishop Lehtonen's frustration over the lack of a reply about the possibility of a high-level visit by a Church of England representative found expression. In late November, he wrote to Bishop Bell, enquiring about the possibility of such a visit:

I would be very grateful if you could let me know before long, whether there is any chance of your coming to Finland next year for at least a three days' visit. I know how occupied you are especially by your noble work for the British-German Church relations. If it seems to you impossible to come yourself over to Finland, I would be very obliged to you, if you could suggest any other English Bishop, who could come to see us before next Lambeth Conference. What about the Bishop of Wakefield? I

²⁶¹ *Tiililä* 1945, 257.

²⁶² *Tiililä* 1945, 254-255.

have also written about this matter to our old friend, Bishop Headlam, inquiring his opinion. He did great work for our mutual relations, but being now retired, we need a successor.²⁶³

So Lehtonen was prepared to settle for another representative if Bell could not come. However, the alternatives he suggested represented the old guard of Church of England ecumenists, who were no longer actively engaged in overseas activities.

Perhaps Lehtonen understood this himself when he wrote to the retiring Bishop of Fulham thanking him for the interest he had “shown towards the Church of Finland and [our] mutual closer relations, which [he had] personally promoted in such a successful way.” Lehtonen was especially grateful for Bishop Batty’s presence at his installation “in June 1945, at a time, when the world situation was still rather unsettled” and asked him to ensure that his successor would become “acquainted with the Agreement concerning the Resolutions past [sic - *passed*] in 1935 and 1936” and inform him that he would meet a “very warm welcome from the side of the Church of Finland, when he will pay his first visit to Finland.”²⁶⁴ Lehtonen did not want to leave relations between the churches dependent upon Bell’s time and good will, but used every possibility at his disposal trying to engage with the bishops of the Church of England.

Lehtonen did not have to wait long for an answer. Bell replied in late December, thanking him for the kind invitation but graciously declining it: he would have loved to come, but it was impossible. Instead, he assured Lehtonen that there was every chance that another bishop would come to visit Finland with one or two Anglican theologians within a year. Bell promised to do all he could to ensure this would happen before the forthcoming Lambeth Conference.²⁶⁵

Bell had taken on board Lehtonen’s hope that there could be some discussion at the Lambeth Conference on the relations between the churches. He wrote to Lehtonen that as chairman of a group preparing for the Conference he had recommended to the Archbishop of Canterbury that there would be “some official conversations with you or the persons delegated by you on the relationship of our Churches.”²⁶⁶ The method of these con-

²⁶³ LPL Bell papers vol 76. f.321 Lehtonen to Bell 22.11.1946.

²⁶⁴ KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Batty 18.12.1946.

²⁶⁵ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.318 Bell to Lehtonen 19.12.1946, 24.12.1946.

²⁶⁶ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.318 Bell to Lehtonen 19.12.1946, 24.12.1946.

versations remained undecided, but Bell hoped that Lehtonen would soon receive a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury on the matter.²⁶⁷

Bell had by then been in touch with the Continental Churches Committee asking whether it "had any advice to offer to the Archbishop of Canterbury about invitations to Churches 'with whom it might be profitable for such a Committee as that which is likely to be set up on Christian Unity to confer.'"²⁶⁸ He continued:

I am thinking particularly of the reference in the Lambeth Conference 1930 Report, under the heading of the Church of Sweden, pp.148-9, in which, among other things, the Report recommends that a Joint Commission should investigate the relation of the Church of Finland to the Church of England, and then consider further the other Scandinavian and allied Churches. The Commission which dealt with the Church of Finland did not in fact consider these other Churches; but perhaps your Committee would consider whether some action would be desirable with regard to any other Scandinavian Churches before the Lambeth Conference of 1948.²⁶⁹

Lehtonen's continuing insistence that the plan established by the previous Lambeth Conference in 1930, and followed by the discussions of the 1930s with the Churches of Finland, Estonia and Latvia, should be pursued was perhaps a factor in the preparatory team for Lambeth 1948 following up the previous Conference's suggestions. Bell's reading of the situation, however, differed from Lehtonen's. Finland had got its agreement already, and it was time to move on to the churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway. For this reason he did not regard a visit to Finland as urgent.

However, Lehtonen was to get his English visitor. Bell wrote to him on New Year's Day, 1947 informing him that the Bishop of Sheffield could visit Finland in August if he were invited. Bell thought that Lehtonen might know him better as Leslie Hunter, who had worked for SCM. Bell assured him that Hunter was much "interested in relations between the Church of England and the Churches of the North."²⁷⁰ He had been on the same Joint Church Delegation to the British Zone of Germany with Bell recently and was going to Denmark in August "to take part in a theological discussion with Danish theologians."²⁷¹

²⁶⁷ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.318 Bell to Lehtonen 19.12.1946, 24.12.1946.

²⁶⁸ LPL CFR Documents C.C. 63 Lambeth Conference 1948.

²⁶⁹ LPL CFR Documents C.C. 63 Lambeth Conference 1948.

²⁷⁰ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.320 Bell to Lehtonen 1.1.1947.

²⁷¹ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.320 Bell to Lehtonen 1.1.1947; *Jasper* 1967, 302.

The Joint Church Delegation to Germany was clearly the one for which Cotter had been preparing the previous summer; the trip to Denmark was in connection with the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference in the summer of 1947. Bell wished to convince Lehtonen of Hunter's ecumenical standing, which was indeed relatively high and rising. He was an active member of the CAC CRE and thus had an interest in Finland, which benefited in many ways from its work.²⁷²

Lehtonen, however, did not know Hunter, and is unlikely to have been fully satisfied with anyone other than Bell himself. Lehtonen replied:

Dear Doctor Bell,

Thank you very much for your two letters, the latter of which I received only yesterday. I am happy to learn of your personal interest in the Church of Finland. Just before I received your letter of January 1st, I had decided to suggest that perhaps there is no need to hurry with the sending of an Anglican bishop to Finland before the new Bishop of Fulham has paid his first visit to us, which journey he will undoubtedly before long undertake. Under this suggestion still lives a hope, that we would see yourself in Finland either before or after the Lambeth Conference. When we started our work for closer union in 1927 we had a good fortune of getting one of the most representative bishops of England, Dr. Headlam, to come over here. In my opinion even the next steps now will best succeed, if a truly representative Anglican bishop can again come here. Having now received your letter, concerning the Bishop of Sheffield, I naturally welcome him very warmly although I do not know him personally. I am sure that your choice is the right one.²⁷³

Lehtonen wanted Bell, whom he saw as a natural successor to Headlam as patron of relations, to visit Finland in order to win him over. However, he had to settle for Hunter, whom he did not know and whom he did not necessarily consider as "truly representative".

Lehtonen did give Hunter the benefit of the doubt. He immediately commenced work on making his visit possible, and promised to send him an invitation. One problem to solve was the timing. The main event of the summer for all the Lutheran church leaders was the formation of the Lutheran World Federation in Lund, which was to happen between 30 June and 6 July 1947. This was followed in Finland by the summer holidays during which Lehtonen would be abroad. The best time for Hunter to come would have been towards the beginning of September and Lehtonen

²⁷² C.A. 848 1947; CA 1947, 219-221.

²⁷³ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.324 Lehtonen to Bell 9.1.1947.

planned an interesting programme for Hunter either in Scandinavia or Finland before then.²⁷⁴

Bell seems to have taken Lehtonen's desire to secure "a truly representative" figure to heart. He replied to Lehtonen towards the end of January. Bell thought that the new Bishop of Fulham was unlikely to travel much because of his age: he was 67. This meant that other ways of conversing with the continental churches needed to be found. Bell considered that one option might be to send Bishop Stephen Neill, who had been appointed an officer of the WCC in Geneva and was to get a special commission from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bell also saw some difficulties in finding a suitable time for Hunter's visit.²⁷⁵ Bell did his utmost to please Lehtonen even though he could not himself visit Finland.

However, Lehtonen invited Hunter in a letter to him on 16 January:

Dear Bishop,

To my great satisfaction I have a letter from my friend Dr. Bell, the Bishop of Chichester telling me that you would be in a position to accept to visit the Church of Finland. We would very much like to see an Anglican Bishop here before the next Lambeth Conference. I extend you a very cordial invitation on behalf of our Church to come over here in order to promote closer ties between our Churches which now have officially and friendly relations resulting from the dealings of Canterbury and York Convocations in 1935, preceded by mutual negotiations of the Anglican and Finnish representatives in 1933-1934. We find it very important especially now, when our wise and in these questions very merited friend, Bishop Headlam has retired, that there would be in the British Episcopate a person able from his own experience to tell to his Church his personal impressions concerning the post-war Church situation in Finland and the need for further dealings.²⁷⁶

This letter summarised Lehtonen's goals in relation to the visit. Again he recalled the current basis of relations and expressed his wish to have a successor to Bishop Headlam. He wanted a sympathetic Church of England Bishop, who would have a personal knowledge of "the post-war Church situation in Finland and the need for further dealings."

Concerning practicalities, Lehtonen still wanted Hunter to visit Finland at the beginning of September, in order to be able to present him to the University students both in Helsinki and in Turku. He therefore offered to

²⁷⁴ LPL Bell papers vol.76 f.324 Lehtonen to Bell 9.1.1947; *Malkavaara* 1993, 182; *Gritsch* 2002, 233-234; *Ryman* 2005b, 77-78.

²⁷⁵ KA AL 35 Bell to Lehtonen 20.1.1947.

²⁷⁶ KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Hunter 16.1.1947.

plan a programme for Hunter between the Conference in Denmark and the beginning of the term. Lehtonen suggested that Hunter might come with his wife and take the time in between for a family holiday.²⁷⁷ Lehtonen wanted to take maximum advantage of Hunter's visit and use it to broaden the minds of young theologians.

The need to find a new advocate for the Finnish Church among the bishops of the Church of England was underlined when Headlam died in January 1947.²⁷⁸ Lehtonen sent his condolences to Fisher, and used the opportunity to present the latest plans for bringing the churches closer to each other, using his recollection of Headlam's lifework as his introduction:

Since Bishop Headlam's retirement from his Episcopal work, I have felt very strongly for the need of a suitable successor to Dr. Headlam to promote further our mutual relations. I am so glad that the Bishop of Sheffield has given us hope to visit Finland before next Lambeth Conference. I hope also that both new Bishop of Fulham and your personal representative, Bishop Neale (sic), would come to see us before long. We also look forward to the day, which I hope, will be soon, when the Anglican Chaplaincy will be re-established again in Helsinki, our Capital. The interest in Anglicanism is growing in this country.²⁷⁹

Lehtonen was at last reconciled to the fact that Bishop Bell was not coming to Finland and that he must look elsewhere for Headlam's successor. Perhaps the pill was sugared by the prospect of up to three episcopal visits instead of one by Bell.

Lehtonen was clearly concerned to see a new Anglican Chaplain in Helsinki, which had been without one since the war. Again, Lehtonen's initiative was taken up by the Church of England and the search for a new Chaplain began.²⁸⁰ The growing interest in Anglicanism in Finland was largely due to the efforts of the Archbishop and had little if any significance beyond his personal influence.

At times, Lehtonen had the courage to think big, which is underlined by a letter to Fisher about the forthcoming inaugural Conference of the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). Lehtonen hoped that they would "be able to give the rather scattered Lutheran bodies a more definite leadership than hitherto towards a real historically based conception of the Church,

²⁷⁷ KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Hunter 16.1.1947.

²⁷⁸ *Jasper* 1960, 350.

²⁷⁹ KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Fisher 25.2.1947.

²⁸⁰ LPL Bell papers vol.54 Bell to Fisher 24.3.1947, Bell to Cockburn 21.5.1947.

which at the same time is working vigorously for the solution of the present day tasks.²⁸¹ Lehtonen wanted to work for better relations between the Lutheran and Anglican churches at all levels on the theological foundation of evangelical catholicism. Whether he had any chance of achieving this was another matter.

Headlam's death reveals something deeply political in Lehtonen's concern for the relations between the Churches of England and Finland. Lehtonen's letter of condolence to his friend Bishop Rawlinson of Derby was similar in content to his official letter to Fisher, but more personal. He wrote of his twenty year friendship with Headlam, and that Headlam's influence on the happy development of the relations between the churches had been of the utmost significance.²⁸² Rawlinson replied:

Yes, Bishop Headlam is a great loss to us here, although he was beginning to fail in health and had become very deaf during the last year or two before resigning his bishopric of Gloucester. His work was done, as you say. But what a very notable work he did manage to accomplish in the sphere of inter church relations!²⁸³

It is doubtful if Lehtonen in his urgency to find a successor for Headlam ever appreciated that in his old age Headlam had become quite unpopular in England. For example, only a few months before his death Headlam had published an article opposing exegetical form-criticism in general and Rawlinson among others in particular.²⁸⁴ The main reason for his unpopularity, however, lay elsewhere: Headlam's dislike of the Soviet Union and his blindness concerning the true nature of Nazi Germany long after the eyes of many others had been opened had caused much embarrassment.²⁸⁵ Lehtonen's constant reference to Headlam's virtues did not make his task any easier, for all that there still prevailed some sympathy for Headlam because of his ecumenical work, as Rawlinson's reply indicates. The basic problem with Headlam's legacy was that, like the Finns, he had considered the communist Soviet Union the worse of two totalitarian dictatorships.

Something of this can be seen in Harjunpää's obituary of Headlam in *Herättäjä*. Harjunpää painted Headlam as "a sincere friend of the Finnish Church" and gave him great credit for his support of the official relations

²⁸¹ KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Fisher 25.2.1947.

²⁸² KA AL 17 Lehtonen to the Bishop of Derby 17.2.1947.

²⁸³ KA AL 35 Bishop of Derby to Lehtonen 22.2.1947.

²⁸⁴ *Jasper* 1960, 345.

²⁸⁵ *Jasper* 1960, 290-301; *Hastings* 1998, 321-322.

between the churches.²⁸⁶ However, Harjunpää had also known him personally:

As a person Bishop Headlam was modest and could even give an impression of severity. However, deep inside he had a warm heart. He was a fearless advocate of truth and justice. He never let his friends down. During the war this aged Bishop diligently carried his prayers to God especially for the needs of his beloved people and the Church of Finland. Those Finnish churchmen, who had a chance to become closer acquainted with him, remember him with reverence and gratitude. They will be joined by yours truly with a deep sense of yearning.²⁸⁷

The very sympathy for those who had fought against the communist Soviet Union that had made Headlam unpopular in England had made him increasingly popular in the Church of Finland. He was the favoured English bishop among Finnish Lutherans, not only because he knew them best, but because he could sympathise with both their church and their political position. It remained to be seen whether another figure taking a similar stance in the Church of England would emerge.

b. The first post-war Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference

Hunter prepared well for his trip to Finland. He met Samuel Lehtonen in Sheffield and spent a good half hour asking questions about Finland. He also asked if he might bring Canon Alan Richardson, his examining Chaplain in Sheffield, renowned theologian and Canon Residentiary of Durham Cathedral.²⁸⁸ Conveniently, Richardson was attending the Anglo-Scandinavian Conference with Hunter, and the suggestion that he might accompany Hunter was much appreciated by Archbishop Lehtonen.

The visit by Hunter and Richardson to the Nordic countries began with the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference in Liselund Denmark, from 19 to 25 August 1947. The conference drew together eight theologians from the Nordic Lutheran churches and the Church of England to consider the theme “The Church and the Law”.²⁸⁹

²⁸⁶ *Hjä* 6/7.2.1947 Piispa Headlam in memoriam.

²⁸⁷ *Hjä* 6/7.2.1947 Piispa Headlam in memoriam.

²⁸⁸ KA AL 50 Samuel Lehtonen to his parents 4.4.1947.

²⁸⁹ LPL CFR Documents LRC 16 Report of an Anglican Scandinavian Theological Conference held in Denmark in August 1947.

This theme reflects the situation in which the Lutherans found themselves after the Second World War, as the need for a new interpretation of the Lutheran tradition was felt more strongly than ever before.²⁹⁰ This was noted by the English delegates, who reported about the conference to the CFR:

The experience of German occupation seems to have made the Danes and the Norwegians more ready to recognize the responsibility of the Church in social and political matters. It was interesting to note that a rather more rigidly Lutheran line was taken by Bring (a Swede) and Gulin (a Finn). Some extracts from the minutes may illustrate the attitude of the Scandinavians:

--

V. "Prenter thought this (viz. Gulin's opinion that the Church should concern itself with personal relations, and leave the application of principles to 'peripheral' matters such as politics to the State) allowed a dangerous liberty to the experts. There was a danger of the 'technified' society becoming free from moral control."²⁹¹

The divergence in interpreting the Lutheran tradition among the Nordic Churches corresponds with their general attitude to and involvement in the war. During the war all the Nordic Churches had stood in defence of their nations. For Denmark and Norway this had meant at least moral resistance to the occupying German forces, whereas for Finland and Sweden the support of the existing national government had been the best form of defence. Gulin's particular support for personal relations with those in power is explained by the fact that he was whole-heartedly an Oxford Group Revival or Moral Rearmament (MRA) man.²⁹² Yet this approach fitted the Finnish situation well.

In spite of the difference of emphasis between the Swedish-Finnish and the Danish-Norwegian theological traditions, which was also acknowledged by the Lutheran participants, its significance should not be exaggerated. In spite of their differences, the Nordic participants consciously emphasized a unity inspired by a common Lutheran tradition.²⁹³ They made no distinction among themselves in respect of doctrines of ministry and the apostolic

²⁹⁰ *Gritsch* 2002, 228-233; *Ryman* 2005b, 77.

²⁹¹ LPL CFR Documents LRC 16 Report of an Anglican Scandinavian Theological Conference held in Denmark in August 1947, 2.

²⁹² *Krapu* 2006, 76-79, 172.

²⁹³ *Bring* 1965, 185.

succession, a distinction made only by Anglicans, often a cause of unease among Lutherans.²⁹⁴

That unease made the conferences the more important, as they offered theologians from both traditions an opportunity to discuss these issues freely in a convivial atmosphere. The Church of England delegates reported “that the discussions were pursued with perfect amity, and with an obvious desire on both sides to understand each other’s point of view and not to magnify differences of terminology and expression.”²⁹⁵ The conference was held in much the spirit of the previous conferences, which had significantly contributed to the building up of mutual confidence between Anglican and Lutheran theologians. It helped that there was no common statement to be worked for, that there was a certain continuity of participants and that publicity was decidedly low key.²⁹⁶

From the outset, the Church of Finland had been represented by E.G. Gulin, who was the sole Finnish participant until 1947, when he was joined by Samuel Lehtonen.²⁹⁷ The only publicity the conference received in Finland was a short article published by *Församlingsbladet*.²⁹⁸ The Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference 1947 continued on the established lines of low publicity and amicable theological discussion. As such, it gave Hunter and Richardson a positive start to their Nordic Lutheran experience.

c. Hunter’s visit connects the ecumenical and political

When Hunter’s party arrived in Finland, however, the low key publicity ceased. The visit had an important political dimension from the start: Lehtonen invited the British Minister in Finland, Mr. Shepherd, to lunch with the visitors at the Archbishop’s house in Turku on Sunday 7 September.²⁹⁹ However, Shepherd could not attend, as he was in the process of

²⁹⁴ *Österlin* 1995, 257-258, 265.

²⁹⁵ LPL CFR Documents LRC 16 Report of an Anglican Scandinavian Theological Conference held in Denmark in August 1947, 2.

²⁹⁶ *Bring* 1965, 184-189; *Österlin* 1995, 260-265.

²⁹⁷ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia, 19-25.9.1947; *Bring* 1965, 184-187.

²⁹⁸ *Fsb* 30/11.9.1947 Anglo-nordisk teologkongress I Danmark.

²⁹⁹ KA AL 17 Lehtonen to Shepherd 20.6.1947.

leaving Finland to another posting. He wrote to Lehtonen of his regret at having to turn down the invitation, and that he wanted him to know how much he had enjoyed and appreciated knowing him. He had given the task of attending to the Bishop of Sheffield to his deputy, Mr Ledward.³⁰⁰ Shepherd's tone indicates that he and Lehtonen were on friendly terms.

Shepherd's departure indicated that his work in Finland was done. As Finland was about to get a permanent peace treaty at the Paris peace conference, the Allied Control Commission was no longer needed, and the highest political power in Finland was now to be returned to the Finnish Government.³⁰¹

The organisation of Hunter's visit was in good hands with Mr Ledward and Archbishop Lehtonen and his colleagues. The bishop's party was met on their arrival in Turku on the morning of Saturday 30 August by Harjunpää and the British Legation's car waiting to take them to Helsinki. After border formalities, the car collected Miss Iredale from a hotel in Turku. She was about to conclude her visit to Finland and wished to join them for a weekend in Helsinki. This irritated Hunter, who complained in his diary of the car being overcrowded and weighed down, and that he could "not pay sufficient attention to countryside as E.I. talkative."³⁰² Hunter and Iredale had not always enjoyed the easiest of relationships when they were both working for the CRE.

The party stayed at the Hotel Societetshuset [Seurahuone] in Helsinki, where Waddams had stayed some three years before. Waddams had not been fully satisfied with the hotel, and neither was Hunter, though his complaints were different. Apart from being noisy due to the central location opposite the main Helsinki Railway Station and the lack of hot water in the rooms, he found the food prices extortionate, and was concerned that the Helsinki Lutheran Parishes were covering their expenses. Later Ledward and Bishop Gulin assured him that the Finnish State would subsidise them and that the Helsinki parishes were in any case very wealthy.³⁰³ Hunter must have found this odd, given that Finland was one of the countries receiving reconstruction aid.

³⁰⁰ KA AL 35 Shepherd to Lehtonen 21.6.1947.

³⁰¹ *Nevakivi* 1999, 229-231.

³⁰² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia.

³⁰³ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 30.-31.8.1947; *Ketola* 2004, 98-99.

The bishop's schedule reserved Sunday for the Anglican chaplaincy. The day began with an early service of Holy Communion at the church, which was actually a flat in the city centre with one large room furnished as a chapel. Hunter noted that the church was "well arranged and cared for". Among 22 communicants, there were Archbishop Lehtonen's sons Samuel and Risto and Samuel's future wife.³⁰⁴ Hunter was obviously not too concerned with the letter of the existing agreement between the churches, as a strict reading of the agreement allowed communion only to those members of the other church who were cut off from their own services.

Holy Communion was followed by Matins, for which the chapel was full. Canon Richardson sang the office, two laymen, from the British Embassy and the Control Commission, read the lessons and Bishop Hunter preached and led the occasional prayers. Archbishop Lehtonen attended the service: he sat opposite Hunter at the altar and gave the blessing at the end. The congregation, which apart from British people included some Americans and Finns, was very appreciative of this.³⁰⁵

A festive service with a visiting bishop as preacher and attended by the Archbishop of Finland must have been a memorable occasion for the little Anglican community in Helsinki. The community consisted largely of British expatriates, and its links with the British Legation were very close. The bishop's party was invited to a reception at the Legation in the afternoon, where there was "a lot of talking and shaking of hands" with the British colony, numbering about 40, no doubt including most of the congregation from Matins.³⁰⁶

The reception was, however, cut short as Bishop Hunter and his wife had to leave to attend the wedding of Samuel Lehtonen. They clearly appreciated the occasion: Hunter recorded the simple wedding service conducted by the Archbishop in detail to his notebook.³⁰⁷ Much later, when writing about his first visit to Finland Hunter recalled that "the occasion began in a homely fashion, which is one of the delights of Finland."³⁰⁸ This was at least as true of Lehtonen as it was of the nation at large. Hunter continued with a description of his programme in the following week, adding: "But

³⁰⁴ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 31.8.1947.

³⁰⁵ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 31.8.1947.

³⁰⁶ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 31.8.1947; *Hunter* 1965, 25.

³⁰⁷ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 31.8.1947.

³⁰⁸ *Hunter* 1965, 25.

what better beginning could there have been to a week with a good deal of protocol?"³⁰⁹ The programme was indeed heavy: Archbishop Lehtonen had not asked Hunter to reserve enough time in Finland for nothing.

The protocol began on Monday morning, when Harjunpää took Hunter to sign the President's book at his official residence. Hunter was then taken by Ledward to meet the Finnish Foreign Minister Mr. C.J.A. Enckell, who invited them to his private home, which was a flat in Helsinki. The meeting lasted about an hour, during which they discussed church relations and international politics, focusing mainly on the Soviet Union. Enckell made a favourable impression on Hunter, who thought him "cultured", that he "knew his Russia well" and "was not too anxious" about it. Hunter also noted that Enckell "spoke English badly but volubly" and that he "had a reputation as a non-stop talker".³¹⁰

Both Hunter and Ledward were struck by Enckell's interest in the ecumenical movement and the rapprochement of the Finnish and English Churches. Ledward wrote in his report to the Foreign Office:

Mr. Enckell was obviously on a theme close to his heart when he spoke of the importance of maintaining good relations between the Church of England and the Church of Finland. He greatly welcomed the Bishop's visit as a means of reuniting the close ties existing before the war and which had never really been severed. He emphasized the importance in post-war conditions, which were so conspicuously different from the conditions prevailing after the last war in their absence of idealism and religious faith, of maintaining the spiritual undercurrent of international relations. He spoke at length of conditions in Germany, which the Bishop had recently visited, and of the traditionally deep religious and philosophical feeling of the German people, which, he felt, must have survived the fifteen years of nazi oppression and neo-paganism. As with Germany, so with the Soviet Union, he thought that truth must eventually prevail and that the people's desire for truth must eventually overcome all artificial indoctrination and restriction upon the exchange of ideas.³¹¹

Enckell's sentiments may have coincided the feelings of many ordinary Finns, and as Foreign Minister his opinion had governmental force. Friendly relations with the Church of England were important for him as was the maintenance of "the spiritual undercurrent of international relations". Enckell believed that religion had an important place in the world's ideological setting, and that eventually people's desire for truth would break

³⁰⁹ *Hunter* 1965, 25.

³¹⁰ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 1.9.1947.

³¹¹ PRO FO 371/65910 Ledward to Bevin 3.9.1947.

down all forms of governmental oppression, even in the Soviet Union. This would have been daring talk from the Finnish Foreign Minister in public, but in private he was relaxed enough to speak his mind. His open criticism of Soviet ideology served to emphasize the basic democratic values of Finnish society.

However, Enckell was not greatly interested in Great Britain personally. Ledward noted that he was much more interested in conditions on the continent than in England. Enckell was essentially pragmatic and realistic in his approach to the world of ideas. According to Ledward, Enckell “showed himself as a man with an essentially pan-European outlook, a liberal internationalist and scholar, a Hanseatic patrician strongly influenced by the more modern idealism of Geneva”, who was “above all -- enthusiastic over the importance of maintaining the metaphysical as distinct from the material aspects of foreign relations.”³¹² It is thus fair to conclude that religion mattered for the Finnish government because it offered an important channel to help maintain the western orientation of Finland at the beginning of the Cold War.

Another sign of the importance of religion in the world of politics came immediately after lunch when Ledward took Bishop Hunter to meet the Minister of Social Welfare, the Rev. Lennart Albert Heljas, a member of the Agrarian Party and a Lutheran clergyman. Heljas was an exceptional Finnish Lutheran clergyman and an Agrarian politician. He had belonged to the ‘peace opposition’ during the continuation war, and was an anglophile with personal experience of England, having spent eleven years as Finnish Seamen’s Pastor in Cardiff and London before the war. Hunter simply considered him a “friendly but dull chap”. Ledward did not report the meeting at all. However, the Bishop and the Minister shared a mutual interest in social issues and Heljas arranged for them to visit the Deaconess Institute.³¹³ Hunter’s encounter with Heljas confirms that cultural interest and language skills alone were not enough to connect with the foreign visitors, but that there needed to be something more like a common goal or concern to create a meaningful and long lasting relationship.

³¹² PRO FO 371/65910 Ledward to Bevin 3.9.1947.

³¹³ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 1.9.1947; PRO FO 371/65910 Ledward to Bevin 3.9.1947; *Murtorinne* 2006.

While Hunter was meeting the state dignitaries, Gulin was giving the rest of his party a tour of Helsinki. Hunter's notes show that he was impressed by Gulin:

Gulin is the arbitrating person in Finnish Church - immense vitality - aged 54. Did good work as Professor of New Testament at Helsinki - four big books since 1940 - now used as text-books in the Faculty of Theology. Vice President of World's YMCA - one of Rotarian Governors in Finland - a good mixer - visits factories etc., in touch with Labour. Making lively -- good speaker & preacher. Rather disapproved by the conventional churchmen. A year ago an anti-Gulin party, but feeling dying down. Chair of Reconstruction Committee.³¹⁴

As a socially minded and independent thinker Hunter had a liking for unconventional churchmen capable of associating with all sections of society, and workers in particular. Gulin was thus the perfect person to introduce Hunter to Helsinki church life.

That Gulin was not yet the Chairman of the Finnish Reconstruction Committee did not matter, as that was clearly the role he had already assumed. It was only in November 1947 that Gulin formally succeeded Lehtonen as chairman and the Rev. Ahti Auranen succeeded Harjunpää as secretary of the Finnish Committee. Auranen had been secretary for Finnish affairs from the beginning of 1947, while Harjunpää was responsible for the international side of reconstruction work.³¹⁵

There were many reasons behind this rearrangement of personnel. His heavy workload made it all but impossible for Lehtonen to continue as chairman, but he wanted to continue as a member of the committee. Harjunpää was also over-burdened with his several duties as Archbishop's Chaplain, parish priest and secretary of the committee.³¹⁶ The work of the committee was hampered by the anachronism of there being two secretaries, one for home and one for abroad, with correspondence tending to disappear somewhere between them. Finally, Auranen's attempt to resign in October resulted in him becoming the sole secretary. This may have been connected with criticism of Lehtonen's and Harjunpää's running of the committee, especially from the American Lutherans.³¹⁷ It is impossible to determine what Hunter knew of these underlying difficulties.

³¹⁴ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 1.9.1947.

³¹⁵ *Kantala* 2003, 97-98; *Krapu* 2006, 149-150.

³¹⁶ KA EG Harjunpää to Gulin 27.1.1951; *Kantala* 2003, 98.

³¹⁷ *Kantala* 2003, 97-98; *Krapu* 2006, 149-150.

Gulin next took Hunter's party to the Finnish Mission Society's Mission House. Hunter noted that Lehtonen was "anxious to appoint a Missions' Bishop in Africa who could make closer contact with the Church of England", but there were problems with the society's personnel, which would be resolved through imminent retirements.³¹⁸ The idea of appointing a missionary bishop had surfaced a year earlier at the follow-up meeting in London. That Gulin knew and could speak with Hunter about it indicates that the plan was advanced and waited for the right moment to be put into effect.

From the Mission's House the party continued to St Paul's Church and to the Deaconess Institute, both situated in a working-class district of the city, and then to the High Church, later to become Helsinki Cathedral. At the time, Helsinki was still part of the Diocese of Tampere and Gulin informed Hunter that plans to divide the diocese had been suspended for financial reasons.³¹⁹

At the High Church they were met by the Rev. Heimer Virkkunen, a local youth pastor, who gave an introduction to his work, which was of great interest to the visiting bishop.³²⁰ The visit concluded, at Gulin's suggestion, with reciting the Lord's Prayer around the altar, after which the Gulins took the Hunters to dine at the hotel.³²¹

Hunter described Finnish Lutheran youth work in detail in his notebook with some striking observations for a Church of England bishop at that time:

Most of the big parishes have one parson who is primarily the youth worker & some have a woman who has received the same theological training in the University as the parsons -- doing youth work. The economical position of these women is not satisfactory yet as the Church, State does not accept permanent responsibility for them. Considerable feeling that they should be given status by ordination - especially as they are as well qualified as men.³²²

The first women priests in the Danish Lutheran Church were meeting considerable opposition in other churches, but Hunter appears not to have had

³¹⁸ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 1.9.1947.

³¹⁹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 1.9.1947.

³²⁰ *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Välähdyksiä vierailuohjelmasta.

³²¹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 1.9.1947.

³²² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 1.9.1947.

strong feelings about the same possibility in Finland. Indeed, it seems he was already cautiously open to the ordination of women.³²³

The following morning Hunter had a meeting with Pimenoff, who seems generally to have been on hand whenever English ecclesiastics came to Finland. He described himself to Hunter as an internationalist. According to Hunter, Pimenoff "had thought much of the whole European situation and the place of Church in it."³²⁴ He saw Britain as having the vision to lead Europe out of chaos if she had but the economic power to support her policy. Pimenoff also talked much about the Finnish situation. Hunter recorded that he was not pessimistic about "Russia", whose actions he saw as more or less reasonable. Pimenoff also outlined his views of the Finnish left, and his uncertainty of the loyalty of the communists, but suggested that there was no anti-church feeling, or at least less than there had been.³²⁵

Hunter struggled to get the measure of Pimenoff. He recorded in his notebook: "Odd that so thoughtful a man not in a better job, maybe difficult & cranky. Ask Temple."³²⁶ The archives of the BFBS suggest that Temple might have agreed with Hunter's assessment. At least he knew that Pimenoff was very independent, if nothing else.³²⁷

Hunter next met the Rev. Dr. Paavo Virkkunen, Rector of the Parish of Southern Helsinki, and a former Speaker of the Finnish Parliament, who had represented the Conservatives. Virkkunen brought greetings from the Helsinki Lutheran Parishes, whose guests the visitors were. Virkkunen's nephew, the Rev. Heimer Virkkunen, acted as interpreter.³²⁸ Hunter recorded that Virkkunen was "a fine looking man of 72" who, like Lehtonen, had lost a son in the recent wars. The war seems to have featured prominently in their discussions, Hunter acknowledging the high percentage of Finnish losses per capita.³²⁹ Hunter's linking of Lehtonen with Virkkunen suggests that the mindset of the older generation of Finnish clergy affected how they presented themselves. The trauma of personal and national loss surfaced

³²³ *Matchett* 1985, 192-194.

³²⁴ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³²⁵ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³²⁶ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³²⁷ CUL BSA D7/1/2 Box 2 North to Temple 30.5.1945, Haig to Temple 28.7.1945, 3.8.1945.

³²⁸ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947; *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Välähdyskysä vierailuohjelmasta.

³²⁹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

easily in the company of sympathetic foreign visitors. Although Lehtonen was considerably younger than Virkkunen, his precocity meant that he very much belonged to the same generation.

There then followed a visit to the British Council, whose large library impressed Hunter, in spite of its dearth of religious literature, especially in relation to English church life.³³⁰ This highlighted the fact that Lehtonen's request to the CRE that English religious literature be sent to Finland was justified.

Lunch was another grand affair, offered by the Ministry of Education in Smolna, "a fine building in main street - formerly residence of a Russian big wig - used by Government for official receptions - interior of rooms decorated in French-Russian style."³³¹ The Ministry's Church Department head and his wife were hosts. Hunter was seated between the hostess, who spoke no English, and Gulin. The other guests were the Lehtonens, Minister Heljas and his wife, Ledward, Bishop von Bonsdorff and his Chaplain, and Dr. Virkkunen.³³²

The occasion was marked by formal speeches. The first was delivered by the host, Hunter responded by mentioning three bonds between Finland and England which broke down barriers. These were music – and Sibelius in particular, love of freedom and an affinity with the Church.³³³ This was finely judged to be appreciated by his Finnish hosts. Hunter also used the occasion to deliver a greeting from the Archbishop of Canterbury, which was later translated and published in the Finnish church press.³³⁴ It read:

My dear Bishop,

I am glad to wish you Godspeed on your Scandinavian visit. May I take this opportunity of sending through you my warmest greetings to the Archbishop of Finland and the Church of Finland? I recall with greatest pleasure the Archbishop's visit to this country and my meetings with him. It did much to strengthen the ties of friendship and fellowship which unite the Church of England and the Church of Finland. It is my constant prayer that that friendship and fellowship may ever in-

³³⁰ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³³¹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³³² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³³³ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³³⁴ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Fisher to Hunter 25.7.1947; SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947; *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Canterburyn arkkipiispan tervehdys Suomen kirkolle ja arkkipiispalle.

crease between us to the strengthening of the work and witness of the Church to Christ our Lord.³³⁵

Fisher could speak Lehtonen's language when required, even if his priorities were different.

Hunter made a good impression on the Finns. Bishop von Bonsdorff asked him to visit his episcopal seat of Porvoo (Borgå), which, to his great satisfaction, Hunter promised to do the next day. Gulin invited the party to visit Tampere, but this did not happen.³³⁶

Hunter met all the Finnish bishops later the same evening at a dinner "at a delightful restaurant overlooking the water and amid trees outside the city" called Kalastajatorppa.³³⁷ This was hosted by the Archbishop at one of the best restaurants in Finland. Taken with the earlier lunch, it is clear that both state and church offered the very best they could to Hunter and his party. His visit was given the highest priority.

However, Hunter may not have entirely enjoyed himself. Hunter noted that "the 6 bishops & Harjunpää in their black best looked a little foreign" to the restaurant and "the occasion was merely sociable" as the place was full and there was a good brass band playing. Nevertheless, Hunter had prepared a speech for the occasion. Socially the evening was challenging as he was seated between Mrs. Lehtonen and Bishop Malmivaara of Oulu, who spoke no English. This only encouraged the caricaturing of Malmivaara, whom Hunter described as having "a very spiritual, sling face - by repute a pietist."³³⁸ The fact that the Finnish pietists had been influenced by the devotional literature of the English puritans did not make it any easy for them to relate with Anglicans.³³⁹ There were no obvious links between the two traditions, and this was only compounded by the lack of a common language.

The next morning Hunter had breakfast with Bishop Alexander of the Orthodox Church, accompanied by one of his clergymen. Harjunpää acted as interpreter. The Finnish Orthodox came as something of a surprise for Hunter, who "had prepared to meet flowing robes, a long beard and formal embraces". Instead, the Orthodox Bishop was "a beardless gentleman in a

³³⁵ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Fisher to Hunter 25.7.1947.

³³⁶ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³³⁷ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³³⁸ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 2.9.1947.

³³⁹ *Laine* 2000, 394-403.

blue suit and a lay collar and with a shrewd knowledge of the ecclesiastical state of Europe.”³⁴⁰

The meeting lasted a little less than two hours and concentrated on the situation of the Finnish Orthodox Church. Hunter noted that the church was “very poor and lacking in resources”, and “proportionally grateful to CRE.” They had other concerns: the Moscow Patriarchate was exerting pressure on them to submit to it. Whether this “was due to Soviet pressure or to [Moscow Patriarch’s] desire to cash in a Soviet prestige” Bishop Alexander did not know. Hunter noted that he valued good relations with the Church of England, and appreciated the opportunity to meet. Hunter viewed Bishop Alexander as an intelligent Christian.³⁴¹

The day continued with a luncheon hosted by the Ledwards at the Legation. Among the principal guests were Ministers Enckell and Heljas together with Archbishop and Mrs Lehtonen. Hunter noted that Enckell was very friendly and lingered afterwards in the garden with Ledward.³⁴² His visit afforded the Finnish Foreign Minister an excellent opportunity to associate more closely with the British Legation.

Later that day Hunter had tea at Dr. Virkkunen’s home, where he met the vicars of the Helsinki Lutheran Parishes. The Lehtonens and Bishops Gulin and von Bonsdorff were also there. Hunter delivered a speech that was, by his own admission, a long one, interpreted by Harjunpää. He began by recalling the existing relations of the churches from “the clear and mutual consensus” on the essentials of the faith reached in the 1933-1934 negotiations to the break caused by the war. He emphasized that the Church of England considered it very important that these relations were re-established in order to achieve a closer union between the churches. The speech concluded with the Archbishop of Canterbury’s greeting. Both were later published in *Kotimaa* in Finnish, no doubt thanks to Harjunpää.³⁴³

Kotimaa emphasized those sections of Hunter’s speech of most interest to its readers. His exposition of the traditional elements of Anglican theology received a somewhat partial treatment, while the section stressing the centrality of revealed biblical truth as the key to greater mutual understand-

³⁴⁰ Hunter 1965, 25.

³⁴¹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 3.9.1947.

³⁴² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 3.9.1947.

³⁴³ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 3.9.1947; *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Elämän pyhyys ja ihmisarvo vapauden kristilliset perusteet.

ing between the churches was printed in bold. The importance given by the Church of England to the continuity of the tradition of the Church was stressed, along with the shared reformation tradition with the Finnish Church.³⁴⁴ *Kotimaa's* account omitted any reference to the traditional Anglican appeal to reason alongside scripture and tradition. This omission probably stems more from *Kotimaa's* ignorance or tendency to ignore anything with a hint of liberal theology than from Hunter's original speech.

Nevertheless, *Kotimaa* allocated much space to Hunter's description of the British love of liberty, which, he said, had more to do with religious tradition than with political theory, arising from a religious conviction of the sanctity of life and the worth of the individual. Hunter spoke strongly against the aggressive nationalism of wartime. He described how he had ordained a German former Lutheran pastor after the heavy bombing of Sheffield in 1941. He had been anxious about how people might react to this, but there had been no criticism. Hunter thought that this would not have been possible after the First World War.³⁴⁵ This was well received, exemplifying a reconciliatory tone towards Germany which was much appreciated in Finland.

Hunter thought the last war had been more than a battle between two nations, and that nations should be concerned with more than simply the happiness and liberty of their own people. This was impossible without real spiritual renewal in the world. The world was evil, but it could be ordered in a way that made it possible for the churches to function. There were forces everywhere that wanted to get rid of faith. There was thus a need to rediscover a powerful proclamation of the Gospel in words, deeds and common life. For this, the churches must work together and build bridges with each other. One of these bridges was between the Churches of England and Finland.³⁴⁶

Hunter referred to the conversion of Finland by St Henry and wondered whether some Finnish missionary might renew the faith in England at the present time. He wanted many young Finnish pastors to visit England to tell of their own church and professed that the multiplying of personal rela-

³⁴⁴ *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Elämän pyhyys ja ihmisarvo vapauden kristilliset perusteet.

³⁴⁵ *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Elämän pyhyys ja ihmisarvo vapauden kristilliset perusteet.

³⁴⁶ *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Elämän pyhyys ja ihmisarvo vapauden kristilliset perusteet.

tionships was the only way to increase a sense of Christian fellowship. This he had learned during his visit.³⁴⁷

In spite of the close connection of the religious and the political in Hunter's speech, it was made so skilfully that it raised no criticism even among the most conservative pietist Lutherans who kept them separate. The key to this was his use of their nationalism to draw them out of isolation by presenting the support of ecumenism and the foreign relations of the church as a way of fulfilling their Christian duty.

Archbishop thanked Hunter and led the whole company in a hymn. Hunter thought "the whole affair -- warm and friendly."³⁴⁸ Lehtonen told him afterwards that his visit to Helsinki had been a success and the speech much appreciated.³⁴⁹

After tea, the Richardsons spent the evening with Professor Nikolainen, who had succeeded Gulin as Professor of New Testament at Helsinki University. The visit thus promoted contacts among the new generation of theologians. Hunter described Nikolainen as "a promising young man."³⁵⁰

On Thursday Hunter's party travelled to Porvoo, where they met Bishop von Bonsdorff, who took them first to see the cathedral and then to his home for a meal with the usual formalities. As Mrs von Bonsdorff spoke no English and understood it only a little, Alan Richardson engaged her in conversation in German. Bishop von Bonsdorff's English was "deliberately slow, but not at all bad."³⁵¹

Before leaving to conduct a funeral, von Bonsdorff accompanied the guests to the grave of the Finnish national poet Johan Ludvig Runeberg, which Hunter described as the other attraction in the town besides the cathedral. He described von Bonsdorff as "a charming 18th century gentleman - the senior bishop incidentally in the Northern churches - having been a bishop 25 years, albeit 65", who appreciated their visit greatly, as Professor Bring had already informed Hunter when he was in Sweden.³⁵² As a senior Nordic church leader von Bonsdorff had always had some contacts with the Church of England. These were, however, limited to the occasional

³⁴⁷ *Kmaa* 59/5.9.1947 Elämän pyhyys ja ihmisarvo vapauden kristilliset perusteet.

³⁴⁸ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 3.9.1947.

³⁴⁹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 3.9.1947.

³⁵⁰ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 3.9.1947.

³⁵¹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 4.9.1947.

³⁵² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 4.9.1947.

expressions of good will and sharing of information after the war and von Bonsdorff never appeared particularly proactive in his Anglican relations.³⁵³

Despite the bishops' differing outlooks, Hunter clearly enjoyed his visit to Porvoo. Even if von Bonsdorff reminded him of an 18th century gentleman, Hunter also noted an incident revealing the egalitarianism of Finnish culture: after they had finished their meal and proceeded to the drawing room for coffee, the chauffeur was "given his dinner in the dining-room sitting on the chair the Bishop had occupied."³⁵⁴ Class distinctions in Finland were quite different from those in Britain. This was especially true in church circles, whose traditions derived from peasant rather than aristocratic patriarchy.

Back in Helsinki, the party was given tea by the British Press attaché Mr Roper, who, Hunter noted, spoke Finnish like a native. This afforded Hunter the opportunity to meet leading academic, as Roper had invited the Rector and three Professors of Theology from Helsinki University together with the Rev. Sigfrid Sirenus, the head of the Settlement Movement in Finland and a former Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London. Hunter spoke with the Rector in French. Their conversation dealt mainly with the problems of the Finnish academic community.³⁵⁵

Whether Hunter had any sympathy for these problems is difficult to say. He found other concerns:

Also talked to the Dean of Faculty who is a narrow pietist, & is with the Inter-Varsity Unions international set up. Tried to discourage him from running an opposition to SCM. Alan also had some theological argument with him. Archbishop said that he was not up to his position. Dr. Sirenus also critical. By contrast, Prof. Y. Alanen, the author of Revolution or Reformation who speaks English atrociously is chairman of Christian Socialists' group in Social Democratic Party.³⁵⁶

The Dean of Faculty was the same Tiililä, who had already gained a reputation as a narrow-minded pietist in English Christian student circles.

³⁵³ ÅAB MvB 8 Waddams to von Bonsdorff 26.3.1946, Macartney to von Bosndorff 26.7.1950, 19-10.1950, 19.10.1950; ÅAB MvB 51 Bonsdorff to Waddams 18.12.1946, Waddams to Bonsdorff 17.12.1947; ÅAB MvB 21 Hunter to von Bonsdorff Christmas 1947.

³⁵⁴ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 4.9.1947.

³⁵⁵ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 4.9.1947.

³⁵⁶ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 4.9.1947.

The split between progressives and conservative pietists came up the next day, when Dr. Sirenus visited Hunter and told him about his work with the Settlements. Hunter recorded that Sirenus, a fine old man of 70, was the pioneer and chairman of Finnish Settlements, who had been much influenced by the British settlements during the time he had been the Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London. On his return to Finland, Sirenus had tried to bridge the gulf between the Church and the workers. However, according to him, there were "many elements in Church still un-sympathetic -- with workers."³⁵⁷ Hunter noted that Sirenus and his allies were "not approved by the pietists movements who were strong in rural areas."³⁵⁸ Hunter's sympathies lay with Sirenus.

Hunter next met Mr. Roper, the Press Attaché, whom he wanted to educate on church matters and whose views of Finnish society interested him:

He knew little about the Church and was reluctant to express an opinion re its relation to the general community i.e. that it was generally associated with conservative and reactionary - all the parsons in the diet belong to the right. No anti-Church movement though a good deal of anti-clericalism. The left on the whole not extreme. But the Coalition government very weak - i.e. rationing -- very half-hearted much corruption - in fact a big moral deterioration in last 7 years. Professional classes in a poor way.³⁵⁹

The Press Attaché may not have been interested in Finnish church affairs, but he was well versed in social and political questions, where there were some major problems to overcome. The two men also discussed the relationship between the British Council and the Legation. The bishop thought there was insufficient co-ordination and thus an overlapping and wasting of resources.³⁶⁰

Next, Ledward took him to see Parliament House, before the visitors left Helsinki for Turku by Legation car in the afternoon.³⁶¹ Concluding his stay in Helsinki, Hunter wrote down his thoughts about the visit thus far in his note book:

Helsinki expressed the ambitions of people trying not unsuccessfully to be up to date and to put themselves on the map, politically and economically. The collapse of

³⁵⁷ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

³⁵⁸ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

³⁵⁹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

³⁶⁰ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

³⁶¹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

Germany and the onerous peace-treaty a blow to their fortunes for the time being. Their architect rather nationalist and materialist - the moral virtues which make for success were there most admired.

Not a good looking race - though the children are. Sweden has been a very good neighbour - especially to the children, and this is not lost upon them - The contrast with Russia obvious. But Finland needs vis-à-vis Russia a powerful supporters and so looks wistfully to Britain with whom she does the largest export trade.

The Legation knew little of Church - had never met Gulin in whose diocese, Helsinki is. The Church in Helsinki has too few parishes and churches and parsons and workers to be really affective - but as the few large parishes are by their size very affluent, they are unwilling to be broken up. Gulin sums that it can only be done by persuasion as parishes very independent. There is, however, a general Church fund, to which parishes give in order to support the poorer ones in the country.³⁶²

This summary reveals Hunter's strengths and interests. He was quick to get to the heart of the matter in politics and social structures, whether in church or society. He was much interested in the arts and architecture, making many observations and drawings of the buildings he visited. However progressive he was in the social field, something of the old imperialism clings to his remark on the aesthetics of the Finnish race, especially as it was followed by a description of the relationship of the Finns with their neighbours and former rulers, the Swedes and Russians.

d. The Archbishop's hospitality

On arrival in Turku, Hunter moved from the care of the British Legation to the care of Archbishop Lehtonen and his family. The Hunters were accommodated at the Archbishop's House and the Richardsons in a nearby hotel, though they all ate at the Archbishop's House. Lehtonen's easy hospitality was evident from the beginning. Hunter recorded on their arrival: "Our reception was charming. A nice little supper - a hymn and evensong in chapel and so to bed."³⁶³ The chapel was a small room next to the Archbishop's study, which Lehtonen had himself converted.³⁶⁴ He was careful to offer the visitors the opportunity to say the office, which he considered their custom.

³⁶² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

³⁶³ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

³⁶⁴ *Lehtonen* 1951, 141-142.

The following day began with a large English breakfast followed by Book of Common Prayer Matins in the chapel. The guests were then taken to visit the cathedral, which Hunter found more impressive than he had expected, and the Chapter House, which he thought “a mixture of ecclesiastical and secular unlike anything” he knew with the portraits of bishops and register officers.³⁶⁵ The same mix was in evidence at a lavish luncheon later with the Governor of the Province, his wife and the Dean of the Swedish language Theological Faculty, Professor G.O. Rosenqvist, none of whom was “much good at English”.³⁶⁶ This naturally limited Professor Rosenqvist’s contacts with the Church of England, which had been encouraged by his Finnish and Swedish acquaintances during the visits of English ecclesiastics.³⁶⁷

The Hunters had a walk around Turku before supper at the Archbishop’s House, where they were joined by Samuel and his wife who had returned from their honeymoon. After tea, Hunter was taken to the garden for a detailed discussion with Lehtonen. He recorded that Lehtonen was anxious for closer links with the Church of England; as practical steps he mentioned mutual consecrations and exchange of visitors, especially of younger men.³⁶⁸ These were essentially the same steps Lehtonen had already proposed at the unofficial conversations in England.

Lehtonen thought that these steps would serve to “irrigate their back waters and -- help them to develop the sacramental and pastoral side”. He was very happy with the impact of their visit.³⁶⁹ Furthermore, he wanted to dispel inaccurate ideas in England concerning the Finnish “attitude to Church Orders and historical tradition”.³⁷⁰ Hunter noted that the attitude to which Lehtonen referred was expressed in a book by the Archbishop of York and elsewhere.³⁷¹ The Archbishop of York, the Most Rev. Dr. Cyril Garbett, had never had any close contacts with the Church of Finland.

With respect to the possibilities opened by the CRE, Lehtonen agreed with Hunter that young Finnish pastors to be sent to England through the

³⁶⁵ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.9.1947.

³⁶⁶ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.9.1947.

³⁶⁷ ÅAB GOR Brev till Georg Olof Rosenqvist V. Dawson to Rosenqvist 1.8.1944, Brev till Georg Olof Rosenqvist XIX. Waddams to Rosenqvist 23.12.1944.

³⁶⁸ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.9.1947; *Hunter* 1965, 26.

³⁶⁹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.9.1947; *Hunter* 1965, 26.

³⁷⁰ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.9.1947; *Hunter* 1965, 26.

³⁷¹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.9.1947; *Hunter* 1965, 26.

CRE should be sponsored by an English bishop, and asked him to sponsor the Rev. Martti Parvio, who was soon to depart. The CRE had invited the Archbishop to come to England during the Lambeth Conference. However, he was anxious "that visitors should not be held responsible for any Lambeth pronouncement."³⁷² This was a real concern for the politically cautious Lehtonen in the intensifying Cold War climate. The Lambeth Conference might make the sort of political pronouncements that could easily be unhelpful to a Finnish Church keen to keep a low profile in international politics.

Saturday concluded with Compline led by Samuel Lehtonen; Sunday began with Holy Communion. Both took place in the Archbishop's chapel. Hunter presided, Samuel assisted and the Archbishop gave the blessing. The service was a homely affair, attended only by the English party and the Archbishop's family.³⁷³ This reveals something of the publicly discreet but privately quite liberal attitude Lehtonen and Hunter shared with regard to the economical intercommunion between the churches.

Before the main service in the afternoon, the visitors were taken sight-seeing in and around Turku. They visited the city cemetery and took a tour of the archipelago.³⁷⁴ Compared with the heavy programme in Helsinki, the timetable in Turku was much more relaxed. Perhaps Lehtonen's own extensive travelling led him to understand how enervating the effects of a surfeit of new experiences and people could be.

The principal event of the day was the great Service of Word at the Cathedral. Bishop Hunter sat in the Archbishop's pew at the head of the nave during the opening hymn and for the Archbishop's sermon. Lehtonen preached about the Church as a family, citing Hunter's visit and the aid from the CRE, Sweden and the USA as an example of this. Samuel Lehtonen interpreted the sermon for Hunter. Hunter thought the sermon eloquent, simple and short; no bad thing, as he was to preach another sermon.³⁷⁵

During the following hymn, Hunter robed and went up into the pulpit with Harjunpää, who interpreted for him. The sermon was entitled "The Unshakable Foundation" and it began thus:

³⁷² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.9.1947.

³⁷³ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.-7.9.1947.

³⁷⁴ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.-7.9.1947.

³⁷⁵ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.-7.9.1947.

It moves me deeply to be allowed to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ in this noble, ancient Cathedral - a Church whose walls for many centuries have echoed the Liturgy and hymns of the Finnish people and have received the confidence of people who have suffered and endured greatly.

I bring to you of the Church of Finland the greetings of the Church of England. Our Churches have in common one Faith, one Lord, one Baptism. We are both national and reformed Churches standing upon and for the Holy Scriptures. We both possess ancient buildings and Prayer Books, and value the historical tradition which carries us back to the apostolic company at Pentecost and to Jesus, our Saviour, the Incarnate Son of God, in whom, below all differences, we are one.

And in these last years our countries have alike suffered much, and yet have kept their freedom.³⁷⁶

Hunter's reference to the similarities between the churches must have pleased the Finnish congregation. His words picked up Lehtonen's tone and were well suited to the occasion.

The main theme of the sermon was the position of the Church and Christian faith in post-war Europe. He introduced his theme by quoting the question of the President of the British Iron and Steel Federation: "Will the Christian Church be able to renew faith and morals in Europe?"³⁷⁷ According to one of his biographers, this was the focus of all of Hunter's post-war ministry; his quest for a positive answer led him to the heart of European reconstruction, especially in Germany.³⁷⁸

Hunter's sermon advocated the renewal of faith and integrity in society, beginning with the churches and their members, that all might believe. There was no room for complacency: "We must have salt in ourselves - salt not sugar - so that churches may become, far more than they are, Christ-centred communities - caring for all men as he cares, identifying themselves with all human need."³⁷⁹ This was a message which both touched the congregation and was something to which they could relate. Hunter understood that in order to preach an ecumenically minded social sermon for Lutherans, he needed to emphasize the centrality of Christ. In this he succeeded very well.

His sermon continued in a more political vein:

³⁷⁶ SA BHP 3/4/14 The Unshakable Foundation.

³⁷⁷ SA BHP 3/4/14 The Unshakable Foundation; *Arnold* 1985, 173.

³⁷⁸ *Arnold* 1985, 173.

³⁷⁹ SA BHP 3/4/14 The Unshakable Foundation.

Man's predicament, seen only with secular eyes, provokes to despair for society now has power to destroy itself. But no nuclear fission can shatter God's Kingdom or separate us from His love.

The panoply of God is above those who trust in the shadow of His wings, not in the escapist temper of self-regarding piety but with courageous decision to fight on His side. And even if, in the mystery of His inscrutable Providence, He were to allow human society to bomb itself into barbarism, the ark of His Church rides the waters safely. To those whose faith is in the risen Christ, and whose hope is in eternity, the judgements of God, though fearful, are good, because His Love is conquering and unconquerable.

"Other foundations can no man lay except that which is laid by God - even Jesus Christ", to whom be the glory. Amen.³⁸⁰

The early Cold War mentality with its fear of the advancing nuclear threat was clearly gaining a hold on Hunter.

The political aspect of Hunter's message was not emphasized by the Finnish church press, but the sermon received prominent coverage in both *Kotimaa* and *Herättäjä*. Both led on the ecumenical aspect of Hunter's sermon.³⁸¹ The fact that they quoted the sermon to the letter suggests that they had acquired the text from Harjunpää. Despite this, *Kotimaa*, unlike *Herättäjä*, managed to misspell the name of Bishop Hunter's Diocese, Sheffield. Perhaps the proximity of the Turku based *Herättäjä* ensured closer links with the Archbishop and his staff, resulting in better proof-reading.

Following the sermon, the clergy gathered in the vestry: Harjunpää and his colleagues put on chasubles and the Archbishop put on his black gown and took his staff, after which they processed to the altar. Harjunpää chanted Vespers, Hunter said the prayer for unity from the Book of Common Prayer in English, and a member of the Chapter said a prayer for peace in Finnish. Lehtonen and Hunter shared the blessing at the end. The service concluded with what Hunter described as "a friendly Lutheran hymn", the last two verses of the Finnish version of "A Mighty Fortress". Hunter thought the service very moving.³⁸²

The cathedral was full. The congregation looked old to Hunter, but he thought that they sang well. The President and Mrs Paasikivi were present with their daughters and an aide de camp; they had driven from the

³⁸⁰ SA BHP 3/4/14 The Unshakable Foundation.

³⁸¹ *Kmaa* 60/9.9.1947 Yhteisen Herran pöydän tulee olla evankelioimistyon kärkenä; *Hjä* 37/12.9.1947 Meillä on yksi usko, yksi Herra, yksi kaste.

³⁸² SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.-7.9.1947; *Hjä* 37/12.9.1947 Meillä on yksi usko, yksi Herra, yksi kaste.

President's summer residence. After the service the President and his party were invited to supper at the Archbishop's House, which they accepted "to the great thrill of the Lehtonens" as Hunter noted. He wondered how Mrs. Lehtonen managed to prepare a fine meal for everyone at such short notice. The President's party stayed about two hours.³⁸³

Hunter noted that Paasikivi spoke English quite well and had been in Sheffield once. Politically he was keen on a British entente. Hunter thought that Paasikivi "knew his Russian and was not afraid of them." He was also a supporter of Church rapprochement. Hunter described Paasikivi's daughter as a good linguist, who had liked the sermon and wanted more of that sort. The aide de camp had previously served President Mannerheim, for whom he had a great regard. Hunter noted that Mannerheim was "the giant old man of Finland", and there had been no suggestion of trying him as a war criminal along with "the previous pro-German ministers". The evening ended with a hymn and prayer in the Archbishop's chapel after which the President and his party left.³⁸⁴ The visit of President Paasikivi crowned a week full of meetings with the highest representatives of the Finnish establishment, and was the final confirmation of the great importance given to Hunter's visit by the Finnish state.

Monday 8 August was Hunter's last day in Finland. He visited Harjunpää's Parish Centre and met both secretaries of the Finnish Reconstruction committee, Harjunpää and Auranen. Hunter noted that the Finns were "a bit pressured by Eleanor Iredale and her claims to do and give as she liked: ignoring her own committee and their committee."³⁸⁵ Hunter did not think much of Iredale's work as General Secretary of the CRE.

So Hunter and the Finns tried to make the most of the opportunity to meet without the General Secretary:

They agreed that Eleanor Iredale's promise of a motor to the elderly Bishop of Oulu who already had one of sorts was unwise. It ought to be in any event to the diocese - a set of tyres would however keep him going. If car was available it was Gulin Bishop of Tampere who ought to have it. They also agreed that their decisions and similar ones should be made by their committee in the light of the amount available. --

It was a nice point whether a car for a bishop or a dozen cycles for priests was the more useful aid. Probably for the Orthodox - cycles.

³⁸³ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.-7.9.1947.

³⁸⁴ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 6.-7.9.1947.

³⁸⁵ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 8.9.1947.

They also agreed that one pastor from each diocese should come to us if possible and that they should be cared for by a bishop over here and not just sent about by Eleanor Iredale.

Promised to put all this to CRE. -- Also rather shocked by Eleanor Iredale's bills.³⁸⁶

There seems to have been substantial agreement concerning practical decisions: each was to take care of its own side and give the other as much trust and freedom as possible. The problem with Iredale was that she was prone to take care of everything herself, which did not serve a large and dispersed organisation like the CRE well.

After lunch Hunter was taken to see a medieval parish church outside Turku by Samuel and Risto Lehtonen. Hunter's company left Finland on the S.S. Wellamo from the port of Turku. The Lehtonen family saw them off.³⁸⁷ The visit thus concluded in the same friendly way it had begun.

e. Hunter's visit results in reorganising CRE work

The true significance of Hunter's visit started to unfold after his return. The first indication of what would follow came in a letter to Bell from Finland at the end of the visit, which he considered had "served a useful purpose and [had] been enjoyable."³⁸⁸ Hunter had found the hospitality embarrassing in view of the shortages being endured by the Finns. He described his meeting with President Paasikivi.³⁸⁹ Not everything, however, had pleased him:

E. Iredale overlapped us by two days & one was able to estimate a little her visit. I should be curious to know how much it has cost CRE & the Churches of Norway & Finland. She has explored both countries thoroughly & competently - but much more thoroughly than would be necessary for the secretary of CRE to do. While a mere bishop & carer of the Church that helps to find funds of CRE travel at their own charges by more modest means of transport the lady dashes about by planes. And of course she plays the fairy godmother in great style & gives the impression that she has the churches of Britain in her pocket & has freedom to spend the contents of their pockets at her own discretion.

She has made one good suggestion to the Archbishop i.e. that a pastor from each diocese should come to our country for 3-4 mth. but her idea is that she should

³⁸⁶ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 8.9.1947.

³⁸⁷ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 8.9.1947.

³⁸⁸ LPL Bell papers vol 55 Hunter to Bell 7.9.1947.

³⁸⁹ LPL Bell papers vol 55 Hunter to Bell 7.9.1947.

direct their paths. But this she is not competent to do. The importance of such a move should be to draw Coff. & CofE. closer. Therefore these men should be under the auspices of the CA. Commission on the Council of Foreign Relations when they come & each one should be put under a diocesan bishop & study the life & work of churches in a diocese & its parishes - & not just dash about England at E.I.'s direction. It is also important that they should not just be used to form the nucleus of a high church group in the Coff of foreign origin, but should be the means of bringing the two churches in the fullest degree together.³⁹⁰

Hunter was no ecclesiastical free loader, but wanted to make the most of his visit. He was not afraid to make critical remarks concerning the reconstruction system, which he considered had problems at both ends: in England with Iredale and her administration, while in Finland he felt there was a risk of it being used exclusively for fostering a high church revival.

In considering Lehtonen's domestic church policy, Hunter understood that he was partly contributing to it, but there was little else he could do. In his letter to Bell, he gave details about Parvio, who was to visit England for a month as a guest of the CRE at the invitation of Eleanor Iredale, and who was, with Harjunpää, the driving force behind the Liturgical Brethren. Hunter wrote concerning Harjunpää: "the Archbishop's excellent chaplain has been quite bemused by E.I.", which speaks volumes about the situation, as Harjunpää was generally known for his kindness and mild temperament.³⁹¹

Hunter continued his efforts to reorganise CRE aid after modestly returning to England by boat and train through Sweden and Denmark. He completed a *Memorandum by the Bishop of Sheffield on C.R.E. Help to Finland* on 17 September, sending it the same day to Bell with an account of his discussions with Lehtonen and the Secretary of the Finnish Reconstruction Committee about the form CRE aid might take. According to Hunter, the memorandum reflected as much Lehtonen's views as his own.³⁹²

Hunter began with an acknowledgement of the practical gifts of Bishop Gulin, to whom the Church of England had paid little attention thus far. Hunter described Gulin as "much the most practical man in the Finnish Church" and expressed confidence in his ability as chairman of the Finnish Reconstruction Committee. Hunter's trust for Gulin led to his suggesting that decisions with regard to priority and need in Finland should be left

³⁹⁰ LPL Bell papers vol 55 Hunter to Bell 7.9.1947.

³⁹¹ LPL Bell papers vol 55 Hunter to Bell 7.9.1947.

³⁹² LPL Bell papers vol 55 Hunter to Bell 17.9.1947.

to the Finnish Committee after the English Committee had decided how much it could afford to give.³⁹³

Thus, much of Hunter's annoyance with Iredale derived from his view that the extent of her visit to Finland could not be justified. He considered that the Finns were quite capable of making decisions on priorities and needs themselves, and that Iredale's involvement in decision making merely impeded this. The gift of a car proposed for the Bishop of Oulu served as an example. Hunter suggested the car should instead be given to Gulin, but acknowledged the delicacy of the matter:

The bishop who ought to be provided with a car, if possible, is Bishop Gulin, in whose diocese are the two largest towns in the country, Tampere (sic.), where he lives, and Helsinki, the capital. The two places are a hundred miles apart, and he has to depend on buses and a most inadequate train service to get himself about. As he is chairman of the Reconstruction Committee he would be most unlikely to vote himself a car, though the need is obvious, and they all think that it ought to be made more possible for him to be more frequently in the capital of the country.³⁹⁴

It is noteworthy that Miss Iredale and Bishop Hunter were ready to present the car to the bishop in whose diocese and company they had spent the most time. However, Iredale's proposal to give a car to a man who was soon to retire and who already had one, albeit with bad tyres, did not seem wise.³⁹⁵

Hunter estimated that the severe shortages would be overcome within two years with the increase of exports as the economic position of Finland recovered. The chief shortages affecting the church were in transport and in specific items such as foreign theological books and candles and incense for the Orthodox Church. Whatever about cars for bishops, the parish clergy needed bicycles. Hunter had asked if there was more need for one car for a bishop or twenty bicycles for the parish clergy, but that question proved difficult to answer, and so he wanted to leave it to the local committee to decide. However, he suggested that for the Finnish Orthodox Church bicycles would be "more important than one car for a bishop or archbishop", since

³⁹³ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Memorandum by the Bishop of Sheffield LR on C.R.E. Help to Finland, 17.9.1947.

³⁹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Memorandum by the Bishop of Sheffield on C.R.E. Help to Finland, 17.9.1947.

³⁹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Memorandum by the Bishop of Sheffield on C.R.E. Help to Finland, 17.9.1947.

their problem was “to get in touch with the dispersed members of their Church, and this is a job for the parish priest rather than the bishop.”³⁹⁶

Hunter’s assessment indicates that the CRE was in general already spending the money on the right things. It is no surprise that the main difficulty in deciding on spending arose with the provision of cars for bishops, where the choice lay between the practical needs of one against those of the many.

Having covered material needs, Hunter concluded by stressing ecumenical and educational priorities:

Most important is the exchange of visits between the Church of Finland and this country. The Archbishop and the others have therefore agreed that if possible a young pastor from each of the dioceses should pay a visit to this country, long enough to enable him really to see and understand the life and work of the Church. The Archbishop feels, and I agree, that if the purpose of these visits is to bring the Church of England and the Church of Finland more closely together, then these visitors should have some episcopal support and oversight on both sides.³⁹⁷

This demonstrates how Hunter adapted the idea of using CRE aid to strengthen the relations between the Churches of England and Finland, originally suggested by Miss Iredale to Lehtonen eighteen months earlier. Hunter further modified the proposal by suggesting that such visitors should receive direct episcopal support and oversight.

Another modification was that Hunter suggested that the financial provision for the visitors should be the responsibility of the Church Assembly Commission on CRE (CAC CRE), drawing on Church of England funds.³⁹⁸ Hunter was sensitive to the potential pitfalls of using an ecumenical organisation, comprising almost all the churches in England, to foster the bilateral relations of the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland. It was better to separate this particular form of aid from the general material reconstruction aid.

Bishop Hunter’s suggestions were taken seriously by the CAC CRE and the CFR. The CFR recorded in its documents that Miss Iredale had brought “many presents from English people, including two motor cars and

³⁹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Memorandum by the Bishop of Sheffield on C.R.E. Help to Finland, 17.9.1947.

³⁹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Memorandum by the Bishop of Sheffield on C.R.E. Help to Finland, 17.9.1947.

³⁹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 31/4 Memorandum by the Bishop of Sheffield on C.R.E. Help to Finland, 17.9.1947.

50 bicycles, and 50 cassocks for the bishops and priests of the Orthodox Church."³⁹⁹ It seems the documents got the number of cars involved wrong. However, the many complaints about Miss Iredale's way of running the CRE eventually cost her her job. It was increasingly felt that she took too personal an approach to aid and its direction, making it all but impossible for others to work with her.⁴⁰⁰

Bishop Bell was given the difficult task of explaining the situation to the CRE ecumenical partners, among them Archbishop Lehtonen. Bell reminded the recipients of aid that Iredale had been first appointed General Secretary for an experimental year at the end of 1945, and that this contract had been renewed the following year for a further year, ending in 1947. Both the Executive and the General Committee of the CRE had decided not to continue her appointment after 31 December 1947. In acknowledging the good work Miss Iredale had done, Bell also referred to the marked difficulties there had been. The decision was "in no sense a surprise to those who have had to deal with co-operation between Churches on the British Council of Churches; nor, I think, is it a surprise at Geneva."⁴⁰¹

Bell informed the ecumenical partners that a new General Secretary had been appointed: the Rev. L.W. Harland, a minor canon of Lichfield Cathedral, was to commence work on 1 January 1948.⁴⁰² The visits of Iredale and Hunter had thus preceded major changes in the CRE and may even have contributed to it.

Another interesting outcome of Hunter's visit concerns Bishop Gulin, whose position as one of the key figures in Finland he acknowledged. Gulin had received surprisingly little interest from both the Church of England and the CRE given his central role in both Finnish reconstruction and wider international relations. As Chairman of the Finnish Reconstruction Committee, Gulin was responsible for providing information about Finland and its needs to the WCC reconstruction department in Geneva and thus also for the CRE. He was widely known in ecumenical circles and his

³⁹⁹ LPL CFR Documents L.R.F. 23 Report of the Church of Finland, after August, 1947 [by a correspondent of the Council].

⁴⁰⁰ LPL Bell Papers vol.54 part II Welch to Bell 26.3.1945, Note from Lord Luke 14.11.1946, Cockburn to Bell 20.11.1946, Bell to Aubrey 24.12.1946, Bell to Luke 2.1.1947, Bell to Cockburn 8.2.1947, C.R.E. Personnel Changes s.d.1947; LPL Bell papers vol. 55 part I Tatlow to Bell 22.10.1947.

⁴⁰¹ LPL Bell papers vol 55 Bell to Berggrav, Boegner and Lehtonen 4.12.1947.

⁴⁰² LPL Bell papers vol 55 Bell to Berggrav, Boegner and Lehtonen 4.12.1947.

role as Chairman of the Finnish Ecumenical Council (SYKT) kept him in touch with many English ecumenists, and he was constantly asked to assist in ecumenical publications.⁴⁰³ He was also an internationally acclaimed New Testament scholar and was prominent in the WMCA.⁴⁰⁴ Gulin had many personal contacts with Anglo-American Christians through the Oxford Group Movement (later the MRA), of which he was an ardent supporter.⁴⁰⁵

Hunter was no less exceptional, and took care to educate the British Legation about the reality and importance of church relations in general and Bishop Gulin in particular. In his judgement in his notebook that “the Legation knew a little of Church” and “had never met Gulin in whose diocese Helsinki is” was a little harsh, disregarding the excellent relations the former British Minister in Helsinki had had with the Archbishop, his visit nevertheless ensured that Gulin was no longer ignored.⁴⁰⁶

Gulin now became a person of interest to the British Legation. The Vice-Consul, William Cooke, who was based in Gulin’s cathedral city of Tampere, got to know him soon after Hunter’s visit, as did Ledward, who wrote about Gulin following a tour of Finland in November 1947:

Bishop Gulin was, in my opinion, the most outstanding personality we met of the tour; he is a fine scholar of New Testament and is, at the same time, a very popular bishop of the social worker type. He is of course, next in the order of succession to the Archbishopric.⁴⁰⁷

Gulin’s name now appeared in the British Embassy’s list of Leading Personalities in Finland 1948, with the prediction that he would become the next Archbishop.⁴⁰⁸ Hunter’s assessment of Finnish church leaders was clearly respected and acted on by Foreign Office officials. The established church’s links with the British political establishment were felt in Finland, how-

⁴⁰³ EA SYKTA SYT Ea.1. Oldham to Gulin 7.3.1946; KA EG 26 de Pemberton to Gulin 25.6.1946; KA EG 25 Martin to Gulin 21.8.1946; 7.10.1946; 8.4.1947.

⁴⁰⁴ KA EG 26 Boobyer to Gulin May 1946; KA EG 23 Bohlin to Gulin 23.7.1947.

⁴⁰⁵ KA EG 23 Dawson to Gulin 2.6.1947; Gulin 1967, 290-294, 303; *Krapu* 2007, 76-82, 133-134, 170-172.

⁴⁰⁶ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947; *Pajunen* 2004, 118-119.

⁴⁰⁷ PRO FO 371/65929 Report by Mr. Ledward on tour of Finland 11.11.1947.

⁴⁰⁸ PRO FO 473/2 No.11 Leading personalities in Finland. Mr. Scott to Mr. Bevin 18.8.1948.

ever contingent they may have been on the personal relations of influential people.

f. A successor to Headlam?

Apart from reconstruction work, for Lehtonen the crucial question was whether he had succeeded in engaging Hunter and securing him as a successor to Headlam in working for closer relations between the Churches of England and Finland. The first signs seemed positive. Hunter wrote affectionately to Lehtonen on his return:

We have brought back from Finland many very happy memories, and the one which stands out is the friendly hospitality of your own home. Unless one had had the experience, I should not have thought it was possible to establish such warm and friendly relationships with members of another country in so short a time. My wife and I both felt as though we were old friends of your family, though our acquaintance has been so short.⁴⁰⁹

Hunter was no flatterer: his letter went beyond ordinary compliments, revealing that the Lehtonens had bonded well with him and his wife.⁴¹⁰

Hunter promised to take care of the questions relating to CRE aid and informed Lehtonen that he was shortly to give a report of his visit to the Archbishop of Canterbury.⁴¹¹ It is not known if this happened, although there exists a reference by Bell concerning Hunter's draft report that suggests that Bell considered it too daring. Bell wanted to omit or tone down the reference Hunter made to Gulin's successor and a passage that stated that Bishop Alexander had said that the Finnish Orthodox Church was "sitting on the fence".⁴¹² It is not clear if the reference to Gulin's successor was to the positively ecumenical and progressive Professor Nikolainen, who had followed him as chair of New Testament, or to the pietistic and problematic Professor Tiililä, who had succeeded Gulin as the Dean of Faculty.⁴¹³ It is more likely that Bell wanted to tone down criticism of Tiililä than praise for Nikolainen. The second reference clearly related to the problematic situa-

⁴⁰⁹ KA AL 35 Hunter to Lehtonen 17.9.1947.

⁴¹⁰ *Arnold* 1985, 173; The Interview of the Very Revd John Arnold 7.12.2006.

⁴¹¹ KA AL 35 Hunter to Lehtonen 17.9.1947.

⁴¹² LPL CFR LR 31/4 Bell to Waddams 27.11.1947.

⁴¹³ *Junkkaala* 2004, 373, 378-379.

tion of the Finnish Orthodox Church between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Moscow.

Bell also wanted to tone down Hunter's remarks "about Lehtonen's health - or rather his forgetfulness."⁴¹⁴ Bell was afraid that as so many copies of CFR documents marked 'Private and Confidential' circulated, the risk of one reaching the wrong hands was too great.⁴¹⁵ CFR circles included people representing the different foreign churches with which the documents dealt. Hunter's draft shows that it was gradually becoming evident to those close to Lehtonen that his health was in decline, and that Hunter was less interested in ecclesiastical political correctness than either Waddams or even Bell, who was sometimes capable of brutal frankness in his approach to perceived problems.⁴¹⁶

Hunter was even franker in private. He wrote to Bell after the Church of England had begun theological discussions with the Lutheran Churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway later the same autumn:

The rebuff which the Norwegian Church received from ours at Oslo I feel will both make your little meeting at Chichester next week difficult, but will push them towards the Reformed and Presbyterian Church.

It is so important both to cure Anglicanism of its parochialism and to rally the Christian cultural forces in Europe that as soon as possible we should be in communion with some of the more vital and reputable churches in Europe. It does not increase our prestige in Europe that the only body with which we are in communion is so insignificant and rather disreputable a body as the Old Catholics. Waddams is too ecclesiastical in his outlook to see this broad issue, and I rather dread the influence of such a Reunion effort. For the next few years the opportunity for closer relations with the Northern Churches is very real both for religious and political reasons. If we spend this time fussing about the mechanism of the historical succession we shall make a dismal failure in strategy and wisdom.⁴¹⁷

Hunter had personal experience of the desire for closer relations with the Church of England in the Nordic Lutheran Churches, and was an advocate of closer relations despite the remaining theological differences. His first priority was to support Christian cultural forces in Europe; he acknowledged that there were both religious and political reasons for church rapprochement and did not wish to waste this opportunity.

⁴¹⁴ LPL CFR LR 31/4 Bell to Waddams 27.11.1947.

⁴¹⁵ LPL CFR LR 31/4 Bell to Waddams 27.11.1947.

⁴¹⁶ *Jasper* 1967, 299-300; *Arnold* 1985, 175-176.

⁴¹⁷ LPL Bell papers vol 55 Hunter to Bell 1.10.1947.

Hunter's views surely mirrored those of many of Nordic Lutheran church leaders including those who, like Lehtonen, valued the historical tradition. Lehtonen thus had a good chance of assisting Hunter in his engagement with the Nordic Lutheran Churches, and becoming a spokesman for them to the Church of England.

Hunter had been made the English chairman of the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference at his first Conference in Denmark, before his arrival in Finland. He was to be chairman for many years and remained an ardent friend of all the Nordic Lutheran Churches. However, Lehtonen's much desired special relationship of the kind Headlam had enjoyed with the Finnish and Baltic Lutheran Churches failed to materialise. Whereas Headlam, with his partly Estonian ancestry, had happily accepted an almost patronal relationship with the entire Baltic region, Hunter had a broader and more modern approach to ecumenism. He was too much a good European to be so parochial.⁴¹⁸ This does not mean that he did not understand what Lehtonen was trying to achieve. On the contrary, Hunter's later writings show that he did.⁴¹⁹

Hunter also saw the problems of Finnish society at large, although he gave them less prominence in his reports and correspondence. His discussions with Pimenoff had alerted him to the links between nationalism and religion in Finland.⁴²⁰ Pimenoff had told Hunter that Finnish troops had fought cruelly and often treated their prisoners of war badly. The other problem the Finns had was with alcohol. Hunter noted that they got savage, not happy, after drinking, and the church gave no constructive lead beyond teetotalism, resulting in drink claiming casualties as nationalism had before.⁴²¹

Something of Pimenoff's criticism, with his explicit reference to German Christians, registered with Hunter, who later described that "one got the impression that in the years when they were fighting with Germany against Russia, a good deal of religion was very much of the German-Christian variety - on the walls of the churches General Mannerheim was among the saints - but there was nothing of that in Lehtonen, and the influence he

⁴¹⁸ *Arnold* 1985, 172-183; The Interview of the Very Revd John Arnold 7.12.2006.

⁴¹⁹ *Hunter* 1965, 25-26.

⁴²⁰ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

⁴²¹ SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 4.9.1947.

was radiating.”⁴²² For all that the assessment of the link between the church and nationalism was accurate, the photograph of Mannerheim on church walls had more to do with traditional Lutheran Erastianism than any specific link with German Christians. The military flags hanging in English churches would seem somewhat militant to a Finnish visitor, and caused a similar confusion.

Perhaps this was understood by Hunter, who added his comment as an afterthought to the observation that the general mood in 1947, when “under the duress of defeat and crushing reparations all groups were co-operating to repair a disaster which had resulted in a shocking loss of life - the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking populations; the political parties; Lutheran and Orthodox Churches, Church and Government” recalled that of Britain in 1940-1941.⁴²³ Hunter’s ability to draw such comparisons shows the extent of his empathy with Finland, whose church and people had developed so differently, both ecclesiastically and politically.

Hunter was also skilful in reaching beyond the more obvious differences in the common Christian heritage. He judged that the Church of Finland was “well-rooted in the country’s life, its worship marked by a strong simple piety; its liturgical uses rather rough-hewn by our standards.”⁴²⁴ Hunter was able to give some credit even to the patriotic pietists, who surely then constituted the majority of ordinary Church of Finland people.

⁴²² *Hunter* 1965, 26. Compare with SA BHP 7/4/8 Notebook on trips to Scandinavia 5.9.1947.

⁴²³ *Hunter* 1965, 26.

⁴²⁴ *Hunter* 1965, 26-27.

IV The turning tide: 1948-1951

1. Church relations face growing difficulties

a. The saga of Gulin's car and his estrangement with Lehtonen

The problems with CRE aid culminated in the disagreement about cars given to Finland. The clear differences between Iredale and Hunter on the matter resulted in unpleasant repercussions at the receiving end. Hunter's favoured candidate to receive a car, Bishop Gulin, discovered the difficulties when Iredale wrote about trying to find two cars for Finland, "one of which we particularly wanted to go to Bishop Malmivaara, whose Opel car, in which I had the experience of travelling this summer, was in such very bad condition!"¹ Iredale's argument made it all but impossible not to send the first car to Malmivaara, whose Opel Hunter felt could have done with a set of new tyres.

Gulin was thus left with the hope of receiving the second car. This seemed promising, as Iredale wrote to Gulin of having discussed the matter with Dr. Cockburn. According to Iredale, the Reconstruction Committee in Geneva had agreed to place an order for two Austin 16 cars for Finland. The destination of the other car was left somewhat vague: "The committee will no doubt consult as to who should get the second of the two cars. We hope they will help the Churches of Finland in their need."² Iredale did not specify which committee was to consider the matter and which church would receive the donation.

Gulin and the other Finns thought she meant their national Reconstruction Committee and replied that the first car should go to Malmivaara,

¹ KA EG 24 Iredale to Gulin 2.12.1947.

² KA EG 24 Iredale to Gulin 2.12.1947.

suggesting tentatively that the second be given to Gulin. It was only later that they discovered the decision had been made elsewhere, and that the Church of England Church Assembly Commission on Christian Reconstruction in Europe (CAC CRE) had asked that the second car be given to the Orthodox Archbishop Herman.³ Considering the size of the Finnish Orthodox Church and Hunter's suggestion that they would have done better with twenty bicycles for the parish clergy than a car for the Archbishop, it is clear that the CAC CRE decision was motivated more by the general ecumenical concerns of the Church of England hierarchy to maintain good contacts with the Orthodox than any genuine need in Finland.

This conclusion is supported by Iredale's letter explaining the situation to Gulin:

I enclose a letter I have just written to Mr. Auranen, for I am troubled to discover that the fact that we did not recommend the allocation of the second car given by this Committee till after we had told you that the two cars were coming has put you in a somewhat embarrassing position. It was not possible to forestall the decision of the Church Assembly Commission in regard to the car for which they found the funds, but I did write to Mr. Auranen asking that the allocation of the second car should be postponed till after you had heard from this Committee. I think you understand there are two Committees here, both working within C.R.E. and yet each having a special orientation and interest. What I want to assure you personally is that we should be very unhappy if we thought we had deprived you of the gift of a car when you were within sight of getting one!⁴

Iredale's kind words could not hide the fact that Gulin was indeed deprived of the car. She also sought to convey the idea that her leadership of her committee was being disrupted by the CAC CRE. A decision that might have been justifiable on the international ecumenical level, appeared disproportionate on the national level: Archbishop Herman's need for transport was undoubtedly real but hardly comparable to Gulin's. But there was nothing to be done, especially as the Orthodox did indeed suffer from great shortages and needed all the help they could get.

Seeking to resolve an embarrassing situation, Iredale suggested that the remaining funds for Finland might be used to purchase a car for Gulin. This, however, was problematic, as there were restrictions on the amount that could be sent abroad, meaning that no car could be bought until October 1949, when the decision would need to be confirmed by the CAC

³ KA EG 24 Iredale to Auranen 21.12.1947.

⁴ KA EG 24 Iredale to Gulin 21.12.1947.

CRE.⁵ Another solution was to ask the American Lutherans to donate a car to Gulin. Iredale formulated this suggestion almost as a promise though she was hardly in a position to give it:

LATER: Since writing this letter I have just received a line from Dr. Cockburn to reassure me and say that a third car would be found for you by the American Lutherans without fail. This assurance has been given personally to Mr. Auranen while in Geneva. I am delighted to receive this news.⁶

Iredale's attitude reflects the general tendency of the European churches to look to the American churches for financial assistance when their own efforts failed. It is hardly surprising that the Americans did not fully conform to this role.

The changes in CRE personnel at the turn of the year affected Gulin as well. It seems that Gulin remained unaware of the changes until he received a reply from the Rev. L.W. Harland, Iredale's successor, explaining how he saw the situation:

I am afraid that there has been some misunderstanding about the cars - one of them had been intended for you as a gift from the Church of England at the suggestion of the Bishop of Sheffield; owing to the misunderstanding and without wishing to lay the blame on any but ourselves I felt it right to tell Pastor Auranen to give the cars as he and you thought the best.

If, as I understand from your letter, this means that you will not get one of these two cars, I should like you to know that we shall do all in our power to see that you will get one reasonably soon.⁷

Harland's letter arrived too late to resolve an embarrassing situation. It also implies that Gulin had taken Iredale's letter as an accusation that the Finns had caused the embarrassment themselves, which Harland wanted to rectify with a promise to try to find a car for Gulin soon.

Harland's conciliatory tone won Gulin over and resulted in an amicable correspondence, mostly about the car.⁸ They also met in Geneva, where Gulin and Auranen represented the Finnish Committee at the WCC reconstruction

⁵ KA EG 24 Iredale to Gulin 21.12.1947, Iredale to Auranen 21.12.1947.

⁶ KA EG 24 Iredale to Gulin 21.12.1947, Iredale to Auranen 21.12.1947.

⁷ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 20.1.1948.

⁸ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 20.1.1948, 3.2.1948, 2.3.1948, 8.4.1948, 20.4.1948, 5.5.1948, 25.5.1948, 14.6.1948.

meeting in March.⁹ During the meeting Harland told Gulin he had found a car, which he could send Gulin with little difficulty.¹⁰ This was another Austin 16, which Harland wrote was on its way to Finland at the beginning of April 1948.¹¹ Harland thus succeeded in repairing Iredale's damage and was quickly able to establish a friendly relationship with Gulin.

Harland's prompt action was very necessary, as Iredale's suggestion that the car might be donated by the Americans had led to all sorts of problems in Finland. Gulin's wife Helmi had written to the Rev. Jacob W. Heikkinen, the American Lutheran Liaison, trying to expedite the matter. Her enquiry was rebuked by Heikkinen, who responded that Finnish demands for cars during the past year had been indiscreet and unwise, given the many other needs the Americans were attempting to meet.¹² The embarrassment the affair caused thus had transatlantic repercussions as well.

There were yet further complications concerning Gulin's car: it did not arrive in Finland as quickly as expected. Despite the best efforts of the CRE, the car was held at London docks for over a month awaiting the British Government's export licence. It finally arrived at the beginning of June.¹³ Something of Gulin's naïve and enthusiastic personality is revealed by Harland's reply to his confirmation that the car had arrived safely and met the requirements: "Let it be - as you say - an indication of a deep unity in Christ, and may it enable you to do your work more efficiently."¹⁴

A correspondence that had been engendered by an embarrassing situation led to a genuinely pleasant and friendly relationship between Gulin and Harland. Harland considered spending his summer holidays in Finland, which Gulin very much encouraged. However, Harland's holidays were cancelled because of the demands of preparing for the 1948 Lambeth Conference. Instead, he hoped they would meet at the founding Conference of the WCC in Amsterdam.¹⁵ Harland took it for granted that Gulin would participate in that great ecumenical event.

⁹ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 3.2.1948, 2.3.1948; *Krapu* 2007, 153-154.

¹⁰ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 3.2.1948.

¹¹ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 8.4.1948.

¹² *Kantala* 2003, 98-99; *Krapu* 2007, 153.

¹³ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 20.4.1948, 5.5.1948, 25.5.1948, 14.6.1948.

¹⁴ KA EG Harland to Gulin 14.6.1948. *Kantala* fails to see that Harland is quoting Gulin's original words back to him. *Kantala* 2003, 99.

¹⁵ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 20.4.1948, 5.5.1948.

To the great surprise of many, Gulin was not to participate in the Amsterdam meeting. The delegation was nominated by Archbishop Lehtonen in January 1948. The delegation was led by Bishop Ilmari Salomies and consisted of the generally ecumenically positive representatives, the Rev. Professors Yrjö J.E. Alanen, G.O. Rosenqvist and Aimo Nikolainen, and Eljas Kahra. The Rev. Verner J. Aurola was nominated a vice-member and Harjunpää served as secretary to the delegation.¹⁶

Lehtonen's decision was made possible by the fact that Finnish Lutheran Church Law left international ecumenical representation to the discretion of the Archbishop. He could choose the delegation he wanted, as indeed he had decided without consultation that his church should join the WCC. Lehtonen wanted to avoid the risk that the church's involvement might be hindered or criticised by the traditionally anti-ecumenical pietists, and allowed no official discussion on the matter. The General Synod was only informed of the decision the following autumn.¹⁷

Lehtonen's management of the decision is especially ironic when compared with Archbishop Gustav Johansson's barring the church from any official ecumenical participation in Lehtonen's youth. Lehtonen's actions confirmed that even if the attitude to ecumenism had changed, the same autocratic decision making was still very much used.

Lehtonen's decision not to include Gulin in the delegation has caused much debate among contemporaries and scholars alike. Apart from Lehtonen, Gulin was the most ecumenically experienced church leader in Finland, which was acknowledged by the leader of the Finnish delegation, Bishop Salomies. A widely held explanation for Gulin's omission has been that Lehtonen was too cautious to send Gulin, who could be careless and enthusiastic in his talks and actions.¹⁸ Perhaps Lehtonen thought that in the Cold War world the church could not risk sending such a delegate to a great international ecumenical meeting that would also have political significance.

There was in any case a drift in their personal relations; the tone of their correspondence changed from one of keen friendship to one of strict formality at the turn of 1947-1948. This seems to have been prompted

¹⁶ *Kantala* 2003, 95-96.

¹⁷ *Murtorinne* 1997, 41-42; *Rusama* 1999, 137-138; *Kantala* 2003, 104-105, 115-116.

¹⁸ *Nikolainen* 1990, 120-121; *Rusama* 1999, 137-138; *Kantala* 2003, 97, 100; *Krapu* 2007, 158-161.

by several factors, ranging from Lehtonen's wish to restrict Gulin's various activities in order that he would have more time to take care of his diocesan duties in Tampere, his former diocese, to Lehtonen's public insistence that Gulin correct his recollections of John R. Mott's visit to Finland in 1926. Controversies concerning reconstruction work, including the embarrassing situation with Gulin's car, may also have contributed to their personal disagreements.¹⁹

Everything suggests that Lehtonen did not send Gulin because he could not trust Gulin to lead the delegation to Amsterdam in the way he wanted. Gulin was too careless, enthusiastic, independent and competent, with his wide contacts and language skills. He was not only likely, but also able, to act as he saw best, whether or not this conformed with Lehtonen's wishes. To have included Gulin in a delegation led by someone else would have made little difference, as the other delegates would look to him for ecumenical guidance, and he would have become the unofficial leader anyway. This is confirmed by the sympathy he received from the delegates when they learned that he was not to be one of their number.

Perhaps the saddest feature of the controversy was that it appears to have sealed the end of an almost life-long friendship between Lehtonen and Gulin. It is difficult to judge whether this had any bearing on relations between the Churches of Finland and England, as both Lehtonen and Gulin continued to have their own established position, Lehtonen as Archbishop, Gulin as chairman of the Reconstruction Committee. At this stage it seemed that nothing had changed from the Church of England's perspective, but over time relations may have been affected by the increasingly separate endeavours of Lehtonen and Gulin.

b. Student exchange offers a tool for Lehtonen's domestic policy

While Bishop Gulin was struggling with his car problems, Lehtonen's plans to send Finnish pastors of a high church persuasion to study church life in England went forward. The Rev. Martti Parvio spent three months in England from mid-September to mid-December 1947. He got to see many sides of English church life and also spent a week as a guest of the Church

¹⁹ *Kantala* 2003, 97; *Krapu* 2007, 159-160.

of Scotland. On his return, Parvio gave a long interview about his impressions to *Herättäjä*.²⁰

According to Parvio the first thing that caught the attention of a visitor to England was the destruction caused by the bombing during the war. It was thus amazing that the Church of England, which had suffered great losses in the war, was giving so much help to the other European churches through the CRE. Among the beneficiaries was the Church of Finland and pastors sent to study English church life.²¹

Parvio emphasized the place of religion in British society in general and the Church of England as the established church in particular. He was impressed by the Christian convictions of the English Labour leaders; class hatred played no meaningful role in British politics when compared with many other countries. Parvio spoke about the rapprochement between the Church of England and the Methodists and rejoiced that the Finnish revivalists had stayed inside the established church unlike in England.²²

The main focus of Parvio's interview was on the Church of England: it was entitled "The Eucharist as the main service in the Church of England". Concerning church parties, Parvio stated that the high church was especially vital, mentioning Gregory Dix, A.G. Hebert and A.M. Ramsey as examples of its leading theologians; the evangelicals, he said, concentrated on new methods and mission.²³ There was no criticism of any party, but no mention was made of the broad church. The omission may have reflected a failure on Parvio's part to detect its influence, or that he did not want to present it to Finnish church people, who were traditionally critical of theology they considered too liberal.

Lehtonen's influence is discernible in Parvio's description of the Church of England theological training and church life in parishes that had services not only on Sundays, but daily throughout the week. Parvio was especially impressed by the fact that Holy Communion was celebrated every Sunday in all the churches he visited. He saw this as an indication that the Word and Sacraments were in a healthy balance in the Church of England.²⁴ The criticism implicit in this was that the situation was not so balanced at home

²⁰ *Hjä* 1/3.1.1948 Ehtoollisen vietto pääjumalanpalveluksena Englannin kirkossa.

²¹ *Hjä* 1/3.1.1948 Ehtoollisen vietto pääjumalanpalveluksena Englannin kirkossa.

²² *Hjä* 1/3.1.1948 Ehtoollisen vietto pääjumalanpalveluksena Englannin kirkossa.

²³ *Hjä* 1/3.1.1948 Ehtoollisen vietto pääjumalanpalveluksena Englannin kirkossa.

²⁴ *Hjä* 1/3.1.1948 Ehtoollisen vietto pääjumalanpalveluksena Englannin kirkossa.

as the Service of the Word was the most common form of service in most Finnish Lutheran parishes at the time.

Another feature of English church life Parvio appreciated was the early celebration of the Eucharist in the mornings before people went to work, and the general participation of English parish people in their parish churches. Parvio was impressed by their love towards the church, rather than for a particular priest, and described how “a silent, joyful spirit of adoration was the pervasive feature in Anglican worship.”²⁵ This was clearly something Parvio would have liked to see in his own church.

Parvio's interview concluded with his estimation of the relations between the churches:

Everywhere in the Anglican Church people thought with great love of the little sister Church of Finland and felt an essential unity with the episcopal Churches of Sweden and Finland: they saw the churches of different countries as branches of the same tree, which we call the one holy and apostolic Church. Every Church has its shortcomings at this time and there is thus always something to learn from each other. Having connections with the different branches of the worldwide Church of Christ is most important so that worldwide perspectives are not forgotten. The Church of Finland has surely much to give to her larger sister-Churches. I think, for example, of the simple message of sin and grace, but it has surely also much to learn from others and not least the Church of England. The British influence has been a great blessing to our Churches since the time of Bishops Henry and Thomas through to John Paterson in the last century.²⁶

Parvio's interview closely mirrored Lehtonen's desire to bring the two churches ever closer to each other.

Gulin's correspondence with his English colleagues confirms that Parvio's visit also pleased his hosts. Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester had met Parvio and wrote that he and his wife always watched eagerly for news of Finland, understood the trying circumstances of life there, and hoped and prayed that the situation would not become more difficult.²⁷ In all his correspondence Duncan-Jones was very much concerned about the political situation and the fate of Finland. This was his primary concern and perhaps his main motivation in keeping touch with his Finnish friends.

For his part Hunter had other concerns. He wrote to Gulin that Parvio's visit had been “profitable to him, and he [had] made himself very much

²⁵ *Hjä* 1/3.1.1948 Ehtoollisen vietto pääjumalanpalveluksena Englannin kirkossa.

²⁶ *Hjä* 1/3.1.1948 Ehtoollisen vietto pääjumalanpalveluksena Englannin kirkossa.

²⁷ KA EG 23 Duncan-Jones to Gulin 14.12.1947.

liked, and provoked much interest among Church people here."²⁸ Hunter had suggested to Lehtonen that another Finnish pastor, possibly from Gulin's diocese, should come to spread the interest. He emphasized that the visitor should know English reasonably well in order that no time was wasted in learning the language and hoped that he would be "interested in the Church's contacts with social and industrial workers."²⁹ This was an interest Hunter shared with Gulin, but less with Lehtonen. He was thus attempting to broaden the selection of the Finnish pastors beyond the young high church clergy favoured by Lehtonen.

The need for such broadening was obvious, as Lehtonen continued to use relations with the Church of England to encourage and direct high church pastors. This tendency is revealed in a letter Lehtonen wrote to Hunter in January 1948 assessing the outcome of Parvio's visit and suggesting another visitor:

I think that Mr. Parvio's keen interest in liturgy and worship depends on the fact that the Church of Finland is rather poor in this respect. Our services at which the congregational singing is usually strong, have, however, often developed to an one-sided direction. The churches have too frequently become more like auditories without a true spirit of worship. I think that it was just on this most essential and central field of Church life that Mr. Parvio received in England many refreshing impressions. He will be a great help to our Church.

I thank you for your interest in the scholarships for the Finnish clergy. Here is now a good candidate, though he does not belong to my diocese. He is the Rev. Valdemar Nyman, the Vicar of Finström at Aland Islands. He is invited by Canon Cockburn, the Vice-Provost of Edinburgh Cathedral, to stay for three weeks in Scotland. I would be very obliged if, C.R.E. could arrange a short stay for him in England. He intends to come to Scotland for Easter. It would be a pity, I feel, if he could not continue his studies in England for a few further weeks at one of your leading centres, e.g. Oxford or Cambridge. I feel also that I have to tell you confidentially that Mr. Nyman is a gifted man, known in Finland as an author of number of novels. He speaks English fairly well. As for his churchmanship he is known of a tendency to an extreme romanizing direction, and is in my opinion in need of such liturgical inspiration and pattern of worship, which is sound and balanced. He would certainly draw great benefit of the Anglican liturgical life, in which the principles of true catholicism, national inheritance, and liberty of research form a happy union, and the anti-papal basis of which is at the same time clearly recognizable. I think of men like Milner-White, whom I know by his strong work "One God and Father of

²⁸ KA EG 24 Hunter to Gulin 17.12.1947.

²⁹ KA EG 24 Hunter to Gulin 17.12.1947.

All, a reply to Father Vernon." I see in Mr. Nyman's acquaintance with Anglicanism a strategic task, concerning our ecclesiastical home policy.³⁰

While confirming that Lehtonen used the visits as a tool of his "ecclesiastical home policy" educating young Finnish high church clergy, the letter says much about his personal churchmanship and what he valued in the Anglican tradition. He wanted the Church of Finland to be influenced by Anglican worship, in which he saw a happy union of "the principles of true catholicism, national inheritance, and liberty of research" on "the anti-papal basis". This definition closely fitted the Nordic evangelical catholic approach, which was very close to the liberal catholic movement in the Church of England at the time.

There was a wider ecumenical dimension to Lehtonen's request to use CRE funds to assist with Nyman's travel expenses, involving as it did the use of a multilateral ecumenical agency to support his domestic church policy and the fostering of bilateral relations. However, Lehtonen wanted to keep to the policy, set up with Hunter, that the visitors should come from different Finnish dioceses. Nyman, as Lehtonen pointed out, came from the Swedish speaking Diocese of Porvoo.³¹ Canon Cockburn, who had invited Nyman, had visited his parish in the Åland Islands the previous summer.

Nyman's visit was approved, and the CRE, the CFR and Hunter made preparations for the visit. Hunter was also anxious to organise a visit from Bishop Gulin's diocese, but was kept waiting for a suggestion of a suitable candidate by Gulin.³² In spite of Gulin's generally helpful and friendly attitude, he did not share Lehtonen's sense of urgency. This meant that Lehtonen's candidates were likely to be accepted as there was no competition.

Nyman visited Scotland and England in April 1948 for about a month, of which he spent three weeks as Canon Cockburn's guest in Edinburgh, later visiting York, Sheffield, Ely and London. He took part in the Diocese of Sheffield's clergy convention in Swanwick and visited the theological college at Ely.³³ The visit was well organised, covering different aspects of

³⁰ LPL CFR LR file 30/6 Lehtonen to Hunter 23.1.1948.

³¹ LPL CFR LR file 27 Hunter to Waddams 17.1.1948; LPL CFR LR file 30/6 Lehtonen to Hunter 23.1.1948.

³² LPL CFR LR file 27 Hunter to Waddams 17.1.1948; LPL CFR LR file 30/6 Findlow to Harland 30.1.1948, Hunter to Findlow 21.2.1948, Harland to Findlow 23.2.1948.

³³ LPL CFR LR file 30/6 Hunter to Findlow 21.2.1948, Cockburn to Findlow 10.4.1948, Nyman to Findlow 19.4.1948.

church life, and Nyman greatly appreciated the kindness he met.³⁴ Again Lehtonen had prompted a visit that afforded a positive experience of the Church of England to a Finnish pastor whom he considered deserving.

The positive co-operation between the CRE, the CFR and the Finnish Church was further demonstrated by an invitation to Lehtonen to send some Finnish theological students to study at Anglican Theological Colleges, which greatly pleased him:

I find that this kind of approach is the most useful possible. We need men whose knowledge of the Church of England is deep and real.

It happens that I have just now two young men whom I consider well qualified for increasing understanding of the significance of an intercourse between the Churches of England and Finland, and who also seem deeply interested in trying to interpret English Christianity and the Church of England to our people.³⁵

Archbishop Lehtonen's love of English Theological Colleges was well known.

The first of the candidates Lehtonen had in mind was the Rev. Wilho Rinne, who had studied theology in Turku (at the Swedish speaking Åbo Akademi University), receiving high grades, and had continued to post-graduate studies. Rinne could read theology and make himself understood in English.³⁶

Lehtonen's other candidate was his "son Risto (Christopher) Lehtonen, who will finish his degree (M.A.) in the University of Turku at the end of this year".³⁷ Lehtonen emphasized his son's positive view of the Church of England and Anglicanism, adding that he was about to commence preparation for ordination:

When Risto has got his degree, he is going to be prepared for Ordination. He was born in 1926 and has taken an active part in the work of the Student Christian Movement in Finland and in Scandinavia and was one of the Finnish delegates in Oslo Conference last year. He is highly interested in Anglican Church life and theology. I would myself be deeply obliged to you, if he could come.³⁸

³⁴ LPL CFR LR file 30/6 Nyman to Findlow 20.4.1948.

³⁵ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 30.1.1948.

³⁶ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 30.1.1948.

³⁷ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 30.1.1948.

³⁸ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 30.1.1948.

Lehtonen thus made it known that he wanted his son Risto to have the opportunity of studying at an English theological college.

In the accompanying form Lehtonen stated that Rinne would be ready to study Ethics from October 1948 onwards and Risto New Testament and Foreign Missions from the beginning of 1949. The form stated that Risto Lehtonen's M.A. was in science rather than theology.³⁹ For the Church of England this was not an issue as many Anglican clergy gained their first degree in another field before entering theological college, but for the Finnish Church this was unusual and the choice of such a candidate to study theology abroad was thus open to criticism from the start. The fact that the candidate was another of Lehtonen's sons was a further complication, which Lehtonen must have realized. The decision appeared to be that of a father rather than an archbishop.

On the other hand Risto's interest in Anglicanism was genuine, doubtless having much to do both with his family and the high church revival he was living through. However, the fact that Risto Lehtonen and Wilho Rinne both had a positive attitude towards high church ideas and took part in the Liturgical Brethren's meetings, only increased suspicion of Lehtonen's student policy.⁴⁰

Lehtonen hoped that the students could attend a college connected with one of the ancient universities. He had himself visited Westcott House and Cuddesdon.⁴¹ Lehtonen's wish was granted in part, the CFR replying that subject to financial provision being obtained from the CRE preliminary arrangements had been made for Rinne to attend St John's Durham and Risto Lehtonen Cuddesdon in Oxford.⁴² As Samuel Lehtonen had already studied at Westcott House in Cambridge, Finnish students had now been granted places in both the ancient universities.

Lehtonen was overjoyed and sent effusive thanks to the CFR. He thought it would have been difficult to obtain support from the WCC, which had just financed the studies of two Finnish students, one in Switzerland and another in Sweden.⁴³ He had also sent two students to study in

³⁹ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 30.1.1948.

⁴⁰ The Interview of the Revd Risto Lehtonen 2.9.2002.

⁴¹ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 30.1.1948.

⁴² LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Findlow to Lehtonen 19.2.1948.

⁴³ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 28.2.1948.

the USA.⁴⁴ It is clear, however, that of these countries England was the one which Lehtonen favoured:

These two young men who are coming to England have been chosen especially considering the development of our relations with the Church of England, and I trust that their stay and study will be of great benefit both to themselves and to our Church.⁴⁵

The student exchange was thus of the utmost importance in Lehtonen's continuing efforts to promote closer relations with the Church of England.

c. A warning for the Finnish high church movement

Coinciding with these positive international developments, opposition to the Liturgical Brethren and the high church revival supported by the Archbishop began to develop in Finland towards the end of 1947. It began with a debate in the Finnish theological magazine *Vartija* initiated by the Rev. Risto Nivari, who had been involved with the Liturgical Brethren. Nivari's article was entitled "Is There Eucharistic Magic?" He emphasized the promissory character of the Eucharist against its more mystical elements and ceremonies. Nivari was answered by Parvio, who presented ideas discussed and studied in the circle.⁴⁶ The debate was important in that it introduced high church ideas and the ideals of the Liturgical Brethren to a wider audience of academic theologians in Finland. However, it was not enough to spark a large scale public debate among Finnish church people; such a debate required exposure in the popular press.

In January 1948 the journalist Jorma Lundén attended a meeting of the Liturgical Brethren. Lundén was inspired by the meeting and wrote two articles about it. The first of them was published in the local newspaper *Uusi Aura* in Turku with the title "From church idea to concrete churchism". The article detailed the programme of the circle's meeting in Masku and carried an interview with Harjunpää, who stressed that the circle's purpose was to promote deeper study of worship on the basis of the Lutheran tradition and Confessions. Harjunpää also hoped to see a wider interest in the liturgical

⁴⁴ The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

⁴⁵ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Lehtonen to Findlow 28.2.1948.

⁴⁶ *Parvio* 1977, 126; *Kares* 1978, 312.

tradition of the Church of England. He underlined that the circle did not aim to cause division in church life, but rather to be a positive and uniting force. This was evidenced by the fact that the circle was attended by clergy and church musicians from different pietistic revival movements and both Finnish and Swedish language groups.⁴⁷

The subject was of general interest and an interview with Harjunpää was published in the leading national magazine *Suomen Kuvalehti*. Alongside this, *Suomen Kuvalehti* described a celebration of Holy Communion in Masku parish church, which was followed by a lecture by Parvio on English church music, and an interview with Harjunpää. Harjunpää averred that one could not ignore the exterior beauty of worship, and nor should one seek to exclude music and the visual arts in worship as human beings were of both flesh and spirit.⁴⁸ This incarnational defence of the richness of liturgical expression echoed much of contemporary Anglican theology.

The fact that the articles were published outside the traditional church press ensured that they were noticed by friend and foe alike. Such publicity given to high church ideas was bound to provoke a rebuke from their opponents. However, the fierceness of the opposition must have come as a surprise to Harjunpää and the rest of the circle. The opposition was led by a leading pietist, the Rev. Dr. Theol h.c. Olavi Kares, who had observed the circle for some time with growing distaste.

Kares recalls in his memoirs of having first become familiar with the Liturgical Brethren through a radio broadcast from Masku parish church in the autumn of 1947. According to Kares, Archbishop Lehtonen had taken a positive view of the service, which had in general aroused very mixed feelings. Lehtonen had discussed the service with Kares and Bishop Malmivaara during a meeting of the committee preparing the revision of the Finnish Lutheran Liturgy, of which they were members, in Turku on 25 October 1947.⁴⁹ Kares records the conversation in his diary:

He [Lehtonen] began almost immediately to speak about 'the bishop Hemming festival' held in Masku, where the so called Liturgical Brethren had held their semi-catholic services in the presence of the Archbishop. Lehtonen told of having received a letter from Helsinki much admiring the Masku service, and then he turned to Malmivaara and asked how it had come across to him on the radio. Malmivaara

⁴⁷ Parvio 1977, 126.

⁴⁸ Parvio 1977, 126.

⁴⁹ Kares 1978, 308.

replied in a dour and weighty way: 'Up north it sounded very alien and strange.' When the Archbishop, who was a little taken aback by Malmivaara's words, looked at me, I said for my own part: 'Here in south-western Finland it seemed to many of us that what was being offered was a Greek-Catholic service.' The situation was tense. The Archbishop quickly changed the subject. The matter was thus left. When we were returning from the meeting, Bishop Malmivaara said: 'It was good that I got to say what I think about that.' And indeed Lehtonen was left in no doubt about what the Awakening clergy thought about this sort of Anglo-Catholic affair.⁵⁰

Kares' account confirms that the leading pietists in Finland connected the efforts of the Liturgical Brethren with Anglo-Catholic influence from the outset, and saw Archbishop Lehtonen as supporting the movement.

Finally, the public attention given to the circle led Kares to go public: he wrote an extensive, provocative letter to the editor of *Kotimaa* in late January 1948. The letter was full of spite towards all things liturgical. Kares especially criticised the use of vestments and the high church understanding of sacraments. He compared vestments with Santa Claus costumes and claimed that "every manly man, whether pastor or parishioner, was at least amused by these festive decorations, if nothing else."⁵¹ He thought fancy dress was best left to women and children. In support of his observation Kares quoted a recent poem by the Rev. Jaakko Haavio criticising the Liturgical Brethren for the dishonest aesthetics of their liturgical practices.⁵² It is notable, however, that this was the only time an argument that hinted at effeminacy appeared in the public debate, with the exception of the poem itself.

In relation to the sacraments, Kares continued on the lines of Nivari in *Vartija* criticising Parvio and especially the Swedish Lutheran Fr Gunnar Rosendal. Kares was particularly horrified by Rosendal's practice of the ablutions and the possibility that the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation was thus creeping into Lutheranism.⁵³ It was thus not only Anglican influence that exercised Kares but also that of foreign Lutherans. However, Kares mentioned unwanted Anglo-Catholic influence three times, making his point very clear:

⁵⁰ *Kares* 1978, 308-309.

⁵¹ *Kmaa* 9/30.1.1948 Juhana-kuninkaan "Punainen kirja" alkanut kummitella vanhassa Turussa; *Parvio* 1977, 127.

⁵² *Kmaa* 9/30.1.1948 Juhana-kuninkaan "Punainen kirja" alkanut kummitella vanhassa Turussa; *Parvio* 1977, 127; *Kares* 1978, 309-310.

⁵³ *Kmaa* 9/30.1.1948 Juhana-kuninkaan "Punainen kirja" alkanut kummitella vanhassa Turussa; *Parvio* 1977, 127.

The position of the Lutheran Church in the world today is difficult. Finnish pastors and theologians cannot make study trips to the native land of Lutheranism. The trips are thus made to the Reformed world. As an undeniable result there is this Anglo-Catholic tendency about which I would prefer not to speak any more at the moment – but that time may yet come.⁵⁴

Kares' criticism drew together all the traditional Finnish objections to Anglicanism: it was seen on the one hand as too reformed and on the other as too catholic. This represented a dangerous liberty when compared with Finnish Lutheran uniformity. For Kares, traditional Lutheran pietism was the true path to be taken by Church of Finland people. Any departure from this was seen as unpatriotic and un-Lutheran.

Kares' accusation was reinforced by his connecting of liturgical renewal with a pharisaism he stated those who had already survived the war could do without.⁵⁵ He sought to ridicule the movement as unpatriotic. Yet Kares tried to keep Archbishop Lehtonen out of any public controversy. He had supported Lehtonen in the archiepiscopal elections among the Awakening clergy and respected his spirituality.⁵⁶ Kares did not want to offend or accuse his Archbishop whom he held in high regard and considered his friend, in spite of their differences.

This regard was reciprocated. Lehtonen also wished to avoid any controversy with the pietists in his diocese and aimed to support the unity of the church. In this respect he was no party man and did not wish to force his high church ideas on others, which his friendships across the liturgical divide confirm.⁵⁷ Harjunpää shared this liberal attitude towards people of other persuasions. He was too gentle a person for a heated public debate. Instead he tried to reason and seek reconciliation with Kares through private correspondence, though largely in vain.⁵⁸ Kares thought that Harjunpää had no sense of humour, for he took his 'humorous metaphors' so seriously.⁵⁹

Keeping Lehtonen out of the debate concerned Professor Tiililä less, who supported Kares in the next issue of *Kotimaa*. According to Tiililä, Lu-

⁵⁴ *Kmaa* 9/30.1.1948 Juhana-kuninkaan "Punainen kirja" alkanut kummitella vanhassa Turussa.

⁵⁵ *Kmaa* 9/30.1.1948 Juhana-kuninkaan "Punainen kirja" alkanut kummitella vanhassa Turussa; *Parvio* 1977, 127.

⁵⁶ *Kares* 1978, 177-179, 309.

⁵⁷ The Interview of the the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

⁵⁸ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 2.2.1948.

⁵⁹ *Kares* 1978, 311-312.

theranism was the best possible biblical form of Christianity, which meant that there should be no departure from it. He saw the Liturgical Brethren as shaking the foundation of Lutheranism and criticised those in responsible positions in the church for allowing this. Everyone knew that the cult influenced dogma as much as dogma the cult. Tiirilä stated that Kares' long letter "could not but receive the full support of church people as a point of principle" and rejoiced that "someone had dared to raise his voice on a matter that many had wondered about, waiting in vain for a redirection from those with responsibility."⁶⁰ This criticism was clearly directed towards Lehtonen, who nevertheless continued to abstain from the debate.

The public defence of the Liturgical Brethren fell to Parvio, who replied in *Kotimaa* to Kares' criticism. Parvio corrected the obvious factual mistakes Kares had made and asked for room for the circle in the Finnish Church. Furthermore, he pointed out that the circle's liturgical practices, such as chanting the preface, were no alien innovation, but appeared in the Finnish Lutheran Service Books until the end of the eighteenth century. Parvio underlined that the circle did not have to search for these things in England, but that their own "Lutheran tradition was liturgically rich and precious enough."⁶¹ What Parvio omitted to say was that the growing interest in liturgical revival was linked with interest in Anglicanism, and that the circle's methods were very close to those of the Anglo-Catholic revival.

Among Kares' mistakes Parvio corrected the oppositional use of the Finnish terms 'catholic' and 'reformed' when describing the Church of England. Parvio pointed out that it was a mistake to associate Anglo-Catholic with Reformed Christianity; nor was everything coming from England 'reformed' according to the Finnish use of the term.⁶² Whereas the Finnish usage referred mainly to the continental Calvinist Reformed tradition, the English term in relation to the Church of England meant something else.

However, Parvio made a common Finnish mistake when he explained that the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland did not share eucharistic fellowship with the Reformed Church of Scotland, but with the Anglican Church of England, when in fact the relationship was that of *economic intercommunion*. It seems that most Finnish theologians, regardless of their opinion on the matter, could not see the difference between *economic inter-*

⁶⁰ *Kmaa* 10/ 3.2.1948 Kotimaan viime numero.

⁶¹ *Kmaa* 11/ 6.2.1948 Vastinetta tri Olavi Karekselle.

⁶² *Kmaa* 11/ 6.2.1948 Vastinetta tri Olavi Karekselle.

communion, full communion and eucharistic hospitality. This may have been due to semantics as there was but one Finnish term, but if Parvio could not understand the ecumenical status of the relationship between the churches, who could?

Parvio, however, stressed the importance of the special relationship with the Church of England:

And there is much reason for this, because in its best form this Church is for us a noble sister Church, where one senses a doctrinal fellowship already noticed by Archbishop Kaila. There is no need to blacken this Church at a time when our own Church has been able to experience the love and care of the Church of England.⁶³

Parvio was convinced of the deep fellowship the Church of Finland enjoyed with the Church of England, which he held in high regard.

Parvio wrote that he was ready to defend his convictions about the Eucharist at the Turku Archdiocesan Chapter if that was what Kares wanted. He analysed Kares' views, suggesting that they followed a reformed path, in which "the inner word" was stressed at the expense of external forms and the means of grace tied to these forms, and defended Fr Gunnar Rosendal. Parvio stressed that the circle had no intention of engaging in any polemic on liturgical matters with Kares, who admitted his inexperience in such matters. He should have first studied the matter himself before explaining it to the general public in a newspaper.⁶⁴ If Kares' attack had been ungracious, there was also a great deal of polemic in Parvio's answer.

The next issue added to the debate with a response from Kares and a comment from Haakon Wainio, who criticised Kares' original letter for its intolerance. Wainio was especially annoyed by Kares' remarks about the Finnish Orthodox and their liturgical life, which he had ridiculed with an anecdote about an elderly Awakening man's comments on the Divine Liturgy as a comedy. Wainio welcomed healthy criticism, but decried what he saw as a ruthlessness lacking the biblical impulse for unity in the spirit of love, thus producing bitter fruits.⁶⁵

For his part, Kares continued on his earlier lines, playing down the whole affair and the gravity of his mistakes with a light tone. He was not convinced by Parvio's public and Harjunpää's private affirmations that the Liturgical Brethren were acting on a totally Lutheran basis; the same was

⁶³ *Kmaa* 11/ 6.2.1948 Vastinetta tri Olavi Karekselle.

⁶⁴ *Kmaa* 11/ 6.2.1948 Vastinetta tri Olavi Karekselle.

⁶⁵ *Kmaa* 12/10.2.1948 Suvaitsemattomuutta.

claimed by Rosendal, who, Kares had heard, even experimented with incense. In spite of their claims to be building on the Lutheran tradition, Kares saw the Liturgical Brethren trying to recover whatever fragmentary vestiges of the catholic tradition remaining within Lutheranism. This, he said, was confirmed by their interest in vestments and clerical dress.⁶⁶ Kares' obsession with vestments bordered on the pathological, a fact that did not go unnoticed by his contemporaries.⁶⁷

The debate developed into an argument about the correct interpretation of the Lutheran tradition. Kares' interpretation of Lutheranism was based on conservative continental Lutheranism and the Finnish pietistic tradition, which understood Lutheranism as a strict antithesis of Catholicism. Evangelical catholic ecclesiology and church-life were apostasy. This left little room for any synthesis or compromise between the parties.

However, Kares was clearly inspired to continue the debate as he had received so much support from the various different pietistic revival movements during the week. This he saw as confirming "the humble, inner and truthful" qualities of Finnish Christianity, which was not likely to react positively to high church ideas. He suspected that the Liturgical Brethren drew some people from these revival movements, as they claimed, but thought that even the traditionally sacramental Finnish "Evangelicals"⁶⁸ were unlikely as a body to support the movement.⁶⁹

Perhaps Kares understood that his humorous style had indeed been insulting, for he apologised for addressing such a serious matter with humour. On the other hand, the matter was so serious, with some churches and parish halls becoming "the laboratories of this 'festive play-acting'", that the time for a ceasefire had not yet come. Kares only stepped back in his attitude towards the Church of England, which he denied having blackened; indeed, he claimed that this accusation had come to him as a surprise.⁷⁰ This is likely to have stemmed more from Kares' desire to preserve his good

⁶⁶ *Kmaa* 12/10.2.1948 Vielä sananen Turun "liturgisille veljille".

⁶⁷ The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

⁶⁸ A Finnish Lutheran revival movement centred around the Finnish Evangelical Association commonly known as "Evangelicals". The term 'evangelical' refers in this respect more to 'protestant', and to the movement's insistence on the centrality of the Lutheran confession and of the means of grace, in particularly with regard to baptismal regeneration.

⁶⁹ *Kmaa* 12/10.2.1948 Vielä sananen Turun "liturgisille veljille".

⁷⁰ *Kmaa* 12/10.2.1948 Vielä sananen Turun "liturgisille veljille".

relations with Lehtonen than from any sympathy for the Church of England and Anglicanism.

The debate concluded with Professor Yrjö J.E. Alanen's letter in the next issue. Alanen tried to understand arguments and both sides saw his contribution as conciliatory. Alanen agreed with Tiililä that liturgical experimentation could introduce dangerous changes to theology. As an example he took the adoration of the consecrated elements outside the context of the Eucharist, which he saw as "un-Lutheran, un-Biblical and magical". As an outsider to the actual debate he concluded that even if what was wrong and unnecessary should be avoided, no one should mock the good intentions of those who defended the sanctity of the holy.⁷¹

The debate died out as quickly as it had flared. It ensured that the Liturgical Brethren were now much better known in Finland than before. Parvio later suggested that this may have given the circle greater influence than it might otherwise have had, though the opposition to the circle remained strong.⁷²

The debate also shows that in the Church of Finland of the 1940s the person of the Archbishop was still beyond public criticism, Lehtonen being left out of the debate with the sole exception of Tiililä's implied criticism. Lehtonen's caution as a church leader, and his desire to avoid public controversy, means that the debate is likely to have made him even more reserved about sharing the nurturing of relations with the Church of England.

The debate made a strong, unpleasant impression on all concerned. The attention given to the episode even much later confirms this: Parvio wrote an article about it in a book written in honour of Harjunpää in 1977; and Kares gave it much room in his memoirs published a year later.⁷³ Kares' memoirs confirm that his attack on the Liturgical Brethren stemmed from his conviction that the high church movement was alien and detrimental to the post-war "brothers-in-arms" spirit, emphasizing ministry and liturgy in a manner insulting to "the democracy of the people of God", "the internally and externally humble centre of the Lutheran ministry of the servant of the word", linking the high church revival with the influence of the Church of England from 1930s onward.⁷⁴ For Kares the Liturgical Brethren and the

⁷¹ *Parvio* 1977, 127; *Kares* 1978, 313.

⁷² *Parvio* 1977, 127.

⁷³ *Parvio* 1977; *Kares* 1978.

⁷⁴ *Kares* 1978, 308.

high church movement concentrated on secondary, external issues, which obstructed the true proclamation of the gospel.

According to Kares, this was even more harmful in the post-war situation: the majority of younger clergy had shared the fears and horrors of their parishioners in the front line, winning their confidence and breaking down the traditional barriers of class and education between clergy and laity. He saw the liturgical and high church revival, with its emphasis on ministry and sacraments, as rebuilding this barrier. One way or another, he failed to see the admirable parish work pursued, for example, by Harjunpää in his Vasaramäki parish in a working class area.⁷⁵ Kares was thus himself prevented by the liturgical forms he criticised from seeing the dedication with which many of the high church clergy served the ordinary parish people he claimed to champion.

There is a clear link between this controversy and one prompted some years later by the Rev. Erkki Niinivaara's book *The Secular and the Spiritual*. Niinivaara criticised the strong dichotomy between the external and the internal, the secular and the spiritual in Finnish Lutheran pietism, provoking much debate, involving Tiililä and other participants in the earlier debate. Niinivaara's controversy received more attention because it stemmed from Lundian theology, which was much better known and more widely supported in Finland than the tiny high church movement influenced by contacts with the Churches of England and Sweden.⁷⁶ In the end, liturgical reform did not concern very many people in the Finnish Church, and those who were concerned preferred to continue their experiments for the most part outside the limelight.

d. A threat in the form of the Finnish-Soviet Treaty

The issue of student exchange and problems with car donations and church politics lost their significance in early 1948 with the darkening political situation. Political tension had heightened in Finland and abroad. Internationally, the divisions between east and west were rapidly intensifying. The west united around the Marshall Plan and the east around Kominform. Significantly, Finland was excluded from both. The Soviet Union prevented

⁷⁵ The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

⁷⁶ *Ahola* 2001, 488-450; *Heiene* 2005, 125.

Finland from receiving Marshal Aid, which was launched before the Soviet Union had ratified the final Finnish peace treaty. The Finnish Communist Party was left out of Kominform, as they had failed to follow the example of their eastern European comrades in seizing power.⁷⁷

The Finnish Communists had been heavily reliant on Soviet support. Following the signing of the final peace treaty and the departure of the Allied Control Commission, they surely realised that they needed to be more effective if the People's Democrats were to take power in Finland, as there would be no outside help. A hard struggle in the Finnish Labour Movement ensued between the communist led People's Democrats and the western oriented Social Democrats.⁷⁸

Stalin's invitation to begin negotiations on a defence treaty between Finland and the Soviet Union, which was signed on 22 February 1948 and made public a few days later made the situation even more serious. The Soviet Union had made similar agreements with its eastern European neighbours at the same time that confirmed their status as Soviet satellite states. The Soviets had wanted the Finns to propose negotiations for a defence treaty after the signing of the peace treaty, but this crossed the line, and President Paasikivi was prepared to do what ever it took to avoid such an agreement. He delayed the beginning of negotiations for as long as he could, and then when Stalin's invitation finally came, prepared an essentially different agreement than the Soviets offered to their satellites.⁷⁹

The fact that Stalin's invitation coincided with the communist *coup d'état* in Czechoslovakia alarmed both the Finns and the British about the potential for a similar occurrence in Finland. The threat was intensified by strikes organised by the Finnish communists in support of a defence treaty with the Soviet Union according to Moscow's prescription. There were also rumours of possible communist and fascist coups in Finland in April, which were taken very seriously by the police and army.⁸⁰

In the end there was no coup, and the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance was signed on 6 April 1948 and ratified afterwards by the Finnish Diet. The Finns had secured the changes they wanted

⁷⁷ Nevakivi 1999, 282; Jakobson 2001, 26, 34-35; Kirby 2006, 238-240; Palmer 2006, 376; Upton 2006, 65-66.

⁷⁸ Jakobson 2001, 35; Kirby 2006, 237-238.

⁷⁹ Nevakivi 1999, 245-247; Jakobson 2001, 35-38, 45-58; Kirby 2006, 238-239.

⁸⁰ Nevakivi 1999, 245-250; Jakobson 2001, 39-44, 61-64; Palmer 2006, 377; Kirby 2006, 62, 66.

in the Soviet proposal and the treaty differed significantly from those of the Soviet satellites. It acknowledged Finland's "desire to remain outside the conflicting interests of the Great Powers" and affirmed that Finland would not allow any foreign attack on the Soviet Union through its territory. In case of an attack on either country the treaty allowed for the convening of military consultation. This was the most feared aspect of the treaty throughout the Cold War period, because the Finns wanted to avoid any such consultation and feared that the Soviets might use it as an excuse to take over Finland.⁸¹

The treaty was a success for Finland in general and Paasikivi in particular, as it satisfied the Soviet need for security on its north-western border and kept Finland from becoming a Soviet satellite. The balance in the Nordic area was achieved when Norway and Denmark became NATO members while Sweden and Finland served as a neutral buffer zone between east and west, Sweden with a western, and Finland with an eastern, orientation.⁸² A western journalist captured the Cold War reality well, when he wrote some ten years later that one was conscious of the closeness of Leningrad when arriving in Finland from the west, but that to arrive in Finland from the Soviet Union was immediately to be assured of having arrived in the west.⁸³

The Iron Curtain was thus drawn on the eastern, rather than the western border of Finland. The proximity of the Soviet Union meant certain adjustments, especially as Finland remained in the Soviet military sphere of influence, as neither Britain nor the United States were prepared to assist her in the event of Soviet aggression, a reality understood by the Finnish political leaders.⁸⁴

The churches remained largely ignorant of such considerations and relied on whatever news they could get. This meant that the CFR reports at the beginning of the year 1948 show no sign of the increased political tension. Apart from the usual reviews from the Church of Sweden Year Book, the Anglican Chaplain of Stockholm, the Rev. C.H. Jones, asked Bishop Gulin to provide him with a short account to include with his re-

⁸¹ *Nevakivi* 1999, 247; *Jakobson* 2001, 50-61; *Palmer* 2006, 376-377.

⁸² *Nevakivi* 1999, 245; *Palmer* 2006, 377-378.

⁸³ *Jakobson* 2001, 226.

⁸⁴ *Kirby* 2006, 66-68.

port to the CFR.⁸⁵ As Gulin did not find time to do it, Jones asked him to find someone to write a report about 1948 either in Swedish or directly in English and send it to Jones in order to save time. Jones regretted the fact that Lehtonen's review went only as far as August 1947 and thus did not cover the Bishop of Sheffield's visit.⁸⁶ The tone of Jones' letter to Gulin was friendly: Gulin's wide network of international friends included Jones and his family. The suggestion that Gulin might complement information provided by Lehtonen may have been unwittingly insensitive, given the drift in their relations.

The superficial harmony of church life was disrupted by the news of the communist *coup d'état* in Czechoslovakia and Stalin's invitation to begin negotiations with Finland. This caused much fear, especially among the friends of Finland in Britain. The British Government felt that the start of the negotiations might well mean the beginning of the end for a democratic Finland.⁸⁷ The increased political tension is evidenced in the correspondence between Gulin and Harland. The gravity of the situation is revealed in Harland's wish on 8 April 1948 "that the political events will not prevent our meeting again and strengthening our friendship."⁸⁸ There was now a general concern for the future of Finland in England for perhaps the first time since the end of the war.

The deepest manifestation of the concern among the friends of Finland in the Church of England came when the Rev. C.B. Moss, a veteran of ecumenical relations, established a prayer circle to pray for Finland.⁸⁹ Among the first to join was Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester. Other church leaders whom Moss tried to involve were the Bishops of Chichester, Derby and Sheffield, the Rev. Dr. C.E. Raven, and four younger priests with Finnish contacts. Moss asked Bell if he approved, hoping that he would join and would write to the church press encouraging others to do so. Moss wanted the newspaper advertisement to carry the name of Bell or someone else in a senior position, because he did not want the initiative to be thought of as his particular obsession, and feared that "most of our people are profoundly

⁸⁵ KA EG 24 Jones to Gulin 12.1.1948; LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 22 The Church of Finland.

⁸⁶ LPL CFR LR file 25 Jones to Waddams 10.2.1948; KA EG 24 Jones to Gulin 7.2.1948.

⁸⁷ *Upton* 2006, 66-67.

⁸⁸ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 8.4.1948.

⁸⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Moss to Bell 11.3.1948.

ignorant about Finland."⁹⁰ This Moss knew well, having supported and explained the Finnish cause throughout war.⁹¹

Moss also stressed the neutrality and religious intention of the circle: "My idea is to have, at least for the present, no rule but the daily collect, no subscription, and no committee: and to raise no ecclesiastical or political questions, so that anyone with any views could join, if sufficiently interested."⁹² Moss wanted to keep the circle out of the obvious ecumenical and political controversies, but this was surely wishful thinking. There appeared to be little interest among those he approached, and in the end the letter appeared under his own name:

FINLAND

Sir, – Finnish Christians have a special claim upon us just now. The Church of Finland was founded by an Englishman, St. Henry, and is in formal relations with the Church of England.

I wish to form a group of people who will undertake to say daily the Collect for the Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, with special intention for the Churches of Finland, both Lutheran and Orthodox, which between them include practically the whole Finnish nation.

I propose no other obligation, no subscription (unless it is found to be necessary), and no committee. I wish to raise no ecclesiastical or political controversy.

Will anyone who will join please write to me, or to Miss Bessie M. Swan, 21 Tarvet Street, Edinburgh 3, who has undertaken to act as Hon. Secretary. The proposal is commended by several leading promoters of friendship between the Anglican and Finnish Churches. – Yours, etc.

C.B. Moss.
Appleton Manor, near Abingdon,
Berks, England.⁹³

The 'leading promoters' Moss referred to at least included Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester and Canon Cockburn of Edinburgh Cathedral, who had found the honorary secretary for the circle. It is hard to say whether any of the bishops Moss approached joined the circle; at least none of them was prepared publicly to support it. Pohjanpirkka, the Finnish Seamen's pastor in London, promised to provide information about events in Finland.

⁹⁰ LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Moss to Bell 11.3.1948.

⁹¹ *CT* 4230/18.2.1944. Summary; 4231/25.2.1944. Finland.

⁹² LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Moss to Bell 11.3.1948.

⁹³ LPL CFR LR file 27 cutting from Ch. of Ireland Gazette 25.3.1948.

This was later gathered into a newsletter and circulated to the members, of whom, by the end of 1948, there were fifty.⁹⁴ There was a tiny group of enthusiasts for the Finnish cause.

The political tension which had prompted the establishment of the circle was soon to ease. Confirmation that Finland was not to follow the path of people's democracy came with the parliamentary elections of July 1948, when the Finnish People's Democratic Party suffered a significant loss in representatives and was left out of the subsequent government led by the Social Democratic Party, which had also defeated the communists in the fight to control the Finnish Labour Movement. This was interpreted in the west as a sign that Finland would continue with its western democratic political system. Ironically, the development actually strengthened the Finnish economy. The Soviet Union had reduced reparation payments before the elections to bolster the People's Democratic Party's campaign; after the elections the Americans guaranteed loans for Finland as a way of supporting her intention of keeping a western system.⁹⁵ This meant a major boost for the Finnish economy and led to a general recovery gradually reducing the need for reconstruction aid, whether to the churches or more generally.

According to the popular perception in the west, Finland was behind the Iron Curtain and there was very little the Finns could do to overcome this misconception. The prayer circle's newsletters, however, remained a source of information about Finland in England, which would have been otherwise difficult to get from the British secular or religious press.⁹⁶ Even though English church people remained generally ignorant of the Finnish situation and church life, the circle ensured that there was a nucleus of people who took the Finnish cause very much to heart and who endeavoured to keep informed about what was happening. Many of them were motivated by both religious and political concerns: supporting Finland was a means of opposing the advance of atheistic communism. This is reflected in the membership of the circle, chief among them Dean Duncan-Jones.

⁹⁴ LPL Bell papers vol. 76 Moss to Bell 11.3.1948; *Hjå* 11/8.4.1949 Yleiskirkollisesta liikkeestä keskusteltu nuorisotyöntekijäin kurseilla.

⁹⁵ *Nevakivi* 1999, 245-251; *Jakobson* 2001, 64, 70.

⁹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 25 Extract from letter from: The Rev. O. Pohjanpirkka 28.1.1949; LPL Douglas papers vol.73 Newsletter from Finland No.1 February 1949, News from the Church of Finland letter No.2; LPL CFR OC file 148 News from the Church of Finland letter No. 3 November 1949, News from the Church of Finland letter No.4. July 1950; *Pekkarinen* 2008, 46-48.

e. Harjunpää in America

The increased political tension in Finland had unexpected results: Harjunpää and his family emigrated to the United States of America. There may have been many reasons, but perhaps chief among them was his wife's Estonian origins, for the increasing sense of Soviet threat must have made life in Finland uncomfortable for her.⁹⁷ Furthermore, Harjunpää's workload during the years after the war had been impossible. As he later wrote, he had had 'five posts and six hungers' to satisfy. This led to his being unable to attend to reconstruction work as well as he wanted.⁹⁸ The American Lutherans had in any case been dissatisfied with the management of both Harjunpää and Lehtonen of reconstruction affairs, and had taken steps to remove him from the Reconstruction Secretary's position.⁹⁹ Taken with the harsh treatment suffered by the Liturgical Brethren a departure from Finland must have seemed an attractive option for Harjunpää.

Harjunpää left Finland in May 1948. He was succeeded by the Rev. Samuel Lehtonen both in his parish work and as Archbishop's secretary and by the Rev. Martti Parvio as leader of the Liturgical Brethren and Secretary of the Finnish Delegation to the WCC Amsterdam Conference in 1948.¹⁰⁰ Lehtonen used the opportunity to promote the young high church clergy he had nurtured, including his own son.

On his way to America, Harjunpää visited the CFR in London and was met by Waddams. He was offered a lecture tour of Scotland and Ireland, which he accepted.¹⁰¹ Harjunpää was much liked and respected by his friends in the Church of England. During his years in England he had learned English and acclimatised to English church culture better than any other Finnish pastor. Harjunpää's departure was a real blow to the Church of Finland's relations with the Anglican world.

⁹⁷ The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000; The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

⁹⁸ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 27.1.1951.

⁹⁹ *Kantala* 2003, 97-98; *Krapu* 2007, 149-150.

¹⁰⁰ *Rusama* 1999, 142; *Kantala* 2003, 95-96; The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

¹⁰¹ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Findlow to Haselmayer 1.9.1948; LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 3.4.1959.

However, Harjunpää was in no way severing his relations with Anglicans. Soon after his arrival in the United States, he contacted the local Episcopalians, leading the Rev. L.A. Haselmayer to seek Waddams' advice about how to proceed with Harjunpää:

A layman in Philadelphia just two weeks ago brought to me a Reverend Toivo Harjunpää of the Church of Finland, who was for some years Finn Chaplain in London. He spoke of you. He bore a letter of introduction and authorization from Aleksi Lehtonen to present him in the U.S.A. Harjunpää is here for a year under the auspices of the United Lutheran Synod. But he wants to make Anglican contacts and especially Catholic contacts. He will be able to do very little with the Finns in the U.S.A. The Suomi Synod is more nationalistic than Finland, completely un-American, very Protestant, and very standoffish. He had already had one rebuff from them. I spent the evening with him in my house and talked with him at length. I could see his Anglican contacts were genuine enough and that his authorization was OK. On the basis of this, and having spent the afternoon checking up on the Anglican Finn situation, I told him of a list of persons in the Anglican Church he should see, and gave him about ten letters of introduction for persons around New York City. I hope that through him we can personalize this Anglican-Finn situation. He apparently has written a short volume on the Church of Finland in English (about 150 typewritten pages that he would like to have published). I gave him a letter of introduction to Clifford Morehouse in this regard. If you can send me any information about him and guidance as to whether I should continue to foster him, stop with what I have done or begin to draw back from this much, I would appreciate it.¹⁰²

Harjunpää and the American Episcopalians clearly got on well, and the Episcopalians considered nurturing Finnish-Anglican relations with his aid, Harjunpää's catholic churchmanship being seen as most helpful to such an endeavour. However, the Episcopalians appeared, at least at grass root level, disinterested in the compatibility of ecumenical dialogues, meaning that the Church of England's agreement with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland was not automatically transferable to the American context. Perhaps this and other potential difficulties led Haselmayer to seek Waddams' advice.

The CFR Assistant General Secretary, the Rev. John Findlow, quickly replied on Waddams' behalf, who was engaged with WCC affairs in Amsterdam. Findlow gave Harjunpää a very positive reference. He confirmed that Harjunpää had spent the war years in England during which he "proved a very good, genuine and keen friend of the Anglican Church, of which he has a good understanding and to which he is deeply attached" and ven-

¹⁰² LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Haselmayer to Waddams 29.8.1948.

tured that anything they could do to assist Harjunpää would prove worthwhile.¹⁰³

Assistance was forthcoming. Harjunpää was clearly more comfortable in Episcopalian circles than he was in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity in New York where he first served. His correspondence with Gulin, which was at times extensive and close, supports this view. It also reveals that Harjunpää's adjustment to life in America was far from easy. He missed "the deep minor chords of the Church at home" and found it hard to adapt to a church with no bishops.¹⁰⁴ Harjunpää missed England, which he described as better fitting his temperament, scarcely less than Finland.¹⁰⁵

Harjunpää's short volume on the Church of Finland must have been the final outcome of Lehtonen's original desire to publish his own *Encyclical Letter, 1945* in English. He also planned to write other articles related to historical and liturgical issues, some of which were later published, some in Finnish, some in English.¹⁰⁶ Harjunpää's academic writings and correspondence ensured that his influence on Finnish Lutheranism was not completely lost with his emigration.

In addition to Gulin, Harjunpää kept in touch with Archbishop Lehtonen, Bishop Ilmari Salomies and the Rev. Martti Parvio.¹⁰⁷ His correspondence with the Archbishop was friendly, but not as close as with Gulin. Indeed, Harjunpää confided to Gulin that he was disappointed with Lehtonen:

I have sent [Archbishop Lehtonen] two long reports concerning the ecclesiastical situation and my observations here. In one I gave a detailed explanation of certain difficulties here and asked for his support and advice, but - strictly between us - in his reply the Primate, resorting to the cautious wisdom of the church diplomat so typical of him, he felt unable to say any more than: "As I do not know the circumstances there I cannot say anything concerning your enquiry." (This in spite of the fact that I had explained in great detail the problems at hand.) Oh, how we poor priests yearn in so many things for support and clear instructions from our bishops! They have not been called "Fathers in the Lord" throughout the ages in vain. I acknowledge the great abilities and gifts of our Archbishop, and I wish him blessing and guidance from above with all my heart, but that pastoral attitude I have often missed in him.

¹⁰³ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Findlow to Haselmayer 1.9.1948.

¹⁰⁴ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 30.12.1948, 27.10.1952.

¹⁰⁵ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 27.1.1951.

¹⁰⁶ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 30.12.1948; Bibliography of the writings of Professor Harjunpää 1977, 207-211.

¹⁰⁷ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 30.12.1948, 3.8.1951, s.d.

Wisdom is a most important virtue, as is caution in many matters. However, it is important that the Bishops as followers of the Apostles do not lose sight of the essential quality of fearlessness in the apostolic kerygma. -- I am sure that you understand and are sympathetic with these 'glossas' of mine. There are few among the clergy of our Church who hold a higher (and more catholic) understanding of episcopacy and the Ministry of the Church in general. I think I may even come close to those borders the crossing of which would mean my being remembered as a heretic! I was, however, prompted in these reflections by your mention in your letter that "his grace" has opposed the resolution concerning the question on marriage.¹⁰⁸

The question on marriage concerned the marriage of the divorced in church, which was then a controversial matter in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland. Both Gulin and Harjunpää disapproved of Lehtonen's cautious diplomacy on the issue. For Harjunpää this caused especial anxiety because of his catholic view of ministry.

However, the main reason for Harjunpää's distress lay elsewhere. He was anxious about the form and adaptation of episcopacy in the United Lutheran Church of America (ULCA), which was a matter of controversy. Harjunpää was in favour of adopting the historic episcopate, but thought that the ULCA General Synod Committee considering replacing the present system of separate Church Synods and Presidents with an episcopal system was unlikely to achieve it. He considered writing about this in the Lutheran Theological Review or some other magazine as he felt the matter to be both very important and delicate.¹⁰⁹

It is hardly surprising that Harjunpää sided with high church Lutheran circles in America. He was disappointed that Lehtonen refused to offer advice, let alone support, on the matter. His disappointment was compounded because he knew that Lehtonen was in favour of the historic episcopate, but was unprepared to damage good relations with the American Lutherans by supporting a solution that was likely to cause controversy in the American Church, which drew together not only Nordic but also German and other continental Lutheran traditions. In this setting, the Swedish and Finnish Lutheran high church approach was one espoused by a minority.

Perhaps his disappointment led Harjunpää to consider his options: he kept in touch with the local Episcopalians. Harjunpää found it hard to adapt to the ULCA, and what he considered the constant absence or disinterest of his local Lutheran "Bishop", that is the Synod President of New

¹⁰⁸ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 30.12.1948.

¹⁰⁹ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 30.12.1948.

York", while feeling that episcopal support on the Episcopalian side was much stronger. He also struggled in an uninspiring parish position in New Bedford, Massachusetts, and was anxious to find a teaching position in the field of liturgy, hymnology and church history.¹¹⁰

Following Lehtonen's death in the spring of 1951, Gulin offered to try to get Harjunpää a position, probably as head of the Järvenpää Institute in the Church of Finland, were he to succeed Lehtonen as Archbishop, and Simojoki him in Tampere. Harjunpää, however, declined the offer as he felt unable to take on such an important position, that he lacked the academic qualifications needed for nomination and had been away for too long, of which most Finnish clergy would disapprove. In any case, Harjunpää wrote that while he was ready to go home himself, his wife was not, at least for the time being.¹¹¹ Harjunpää's reply summed up the reasons for his emigration in the first place: his humility aside, he felt his nomination to any higher position would meet the disapproval of his brother clergy in Finland, and his wife would not be happy in Finland due to the Soviet threat.

In any case, Gulin did not become Archbishop. The new Archbishop, Ilmari Salomies, did however hope that Harjunpää would be able to return to Finland.¹¹² In spite of his doubts and his long absence from Finland, Harjunpää continued to be held in high regard by Finnish church leaders.

The temptation to become an Anglican grew especially strong when Harjunpää was offered a position as Associate Rector at Grace Episcopal Church in New Bedford, where he already taught weekly. After long consideration Harjunpää declined the offer. As an Anglican he would have been better off financially, and the Rector was his great friend.¹¹³

Harjunpää confided in Waddams having turned down the New Bedford job.¹¹⁴ Waddams replied immediately, welcoming him wholeheartedly if he were to reconsider. Waddams imagined "that the atmosphere of the Lutheran Church in America is very different from Scandinavia" and promised to pray for him.¹¹⁵ Waddams observed propriety in his support, and did not

¹¹⁰ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 30.12.1948, 3.8.1951.

¹¹¹ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin Pentecost 1951.

¹¹² KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 3.8.1951.

¹¹³ KA EG 6 Harjunpää to Gulin 27.10.1952.

¹¹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 2.11.1952.

¹¹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Waddams to Harjunpää 6.11.1952.

encourage Harjunpää to convert or remain a Lutheran, though he clearly felt for him.

Harjunpää never left the Lutheran Church. His decision to stay was in part motivated by the teaching position in liturgy, hymnology and church history at the Pacific Lutheran Seminary he secured with the assistance of the Rev. Franklin Clark Fry, one of the Lutheran church leaders in America. The renewal of the American Lutheran Liturgy afforded him a “good possibility to work toward a more Catholic type of parish life.”¹¹⁶ He found his place in the seminary, which had a group of evangelical catholic Lutheran teachers and students, and maintained his close contacts with his Episcopalian friends. Harjunpää wrote to Waddams in 1959 that his position was basically the same as it had been when the two were in closer touch.¹¹⁷

Harjunpää followed his evangelical catholic calling to the end of his life. During the war and the years immediately afterwards, it made him the perfect liaison between the Churches of England and Finland; after the Cold War settlement and his emigration to the USA, it led him briefly to wonder whether he would be better off leaving the Lutheran Church and joining the Anglican-Episcopalian Church. In the end, American Lutheranism, with its vast opportunities, was able to find him a good home.

2. Lambeth 1948: a point of convergence and departure

a. Lehtonen's controversial decision to prioritise Lambeth to Amsterdam

Archbishop Fisher invited the Nordic Lutheran Primates and church leaders “to join us in prayer and consultation” at the Lambeth Conference in 1948, or to send a representative. The conference lasted for most of July, but the ecumenical guests took part only in certain sections of it at the opening. They were able to attend the opening service and confer with bishops and CFR members before the plenary sessions. In a letter to Lehtonen, Fisher assured him that the matter of strengthening “further those ties of sympathy and understanding which already exist between the Anglican Communion

¹¹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 3.4.1959.

¹¹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 30/1 Harjunpää to Waddams 3.4.1959.

and other Christians throughout the world" would be one of the most important to be considered.¹¹⁸

Lehtonen accepted the invitation with gratitude:

I fully see that this means a new step forwards in our relations. I find it important that above all those Churches which already as a matter of fact are close to each other as to their structure and essence should try to realize their unity and fellowship.¹¹⁹

Lehtonen saw the invitation as an important ecumenical development and wrote about the conference having "an immense significance for the reunion of Christendom". In spite of his many duties as Archbishop he therefore accepted the invitation, which meant he could not take part in the formation of the WCC in Amsterdam in August the same year, sending instead 'an able substitute'.¹²⁰ Lehtonen made it clear how much he appreciated the invitation and what he needed to sacrifice in order to accept it.

Archbishop Lehtonen was invited from Saturday 26 June to Tuesday 3 July 1948. His programme included various meetings and functions organised by the Finnish Minister in London, Mr. Eero A. Wuori, Pohjanpirkka, the Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London, and the CFR. The Finnish delegation consisted of the Archbishop, his wife Margaretha and eldest son Samuel who came as his Chaplain.¹²¹ Lehtonen's decision to prioritise the Lambeth Conference and his selection of the delegation was a further indication of his tendency to treat Anglican relations almost as a family business. It was something he did not want to trust to anyone else.

What Lehtonen failed to mention to Fisher was that joining the Lambeth Conference also meant that he would miss the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), which was to convene just before the WCC Assembly in Amsterdam. The fact that he missed both the WCC Assembly and the LWF Executive Committee was criticized both at home and abroad. At home Lehtonen was criticized privately by Gulin, who was upset at being left out of the Amsterdam delegation; abroad Lehtonen had especially annoyed the American Lutherans.¹²²

¹¹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen 1.12.1947.

¹¹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 10.2.1948.

¹²⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 10.2.1948.

¹²¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen 1.12.1947, Lehtonen to Fisher 10.2.1948, Pohjanpirkka to Waddams 10.6.1948, CFR to Lehtonen 25.6.1948.

¹²² AELCA NLC 2/4 Box 2/10. Finland - Jacob W. Heikkinen, 1948. Heikkinen to Empire 9.6.1948.; *Krapu* 2007, 159.

There was, however, no public criticism, though Lehtonen must have understood this did not signify universal approval of his priorities.

Lehtonen's decision was especially criticized by the Rev. Jacob W. Heikkinen, who had just returned to the USA after spending a year in Finland co-ordinating, planning and supervising American Reconstruction aid:

The Archbishop tells me that he plans to journey to England this summer with his wife and his son, the Rev. Samuel Lehtonen. He makes no mention of his intention to participate in the meetings of the LWF executive committee in Amsterdam later in the summer. He has accepted the invitation of the Church of England to participate in the LAMBETH conference, and thus, because of reasons of health he cannot attend the Amsterdam meetings. I was under the impression already last fall that this might occur, and therefore encouraged him to go to Amsterdam, too. Undoubtedly, the priority of LAMBETH in the mind of the Archbishop of Finland who is a member of the executive board of the LWF will cause some embarrassment. The invitation to the LAMBETH meeting is to be understood in the light of the existing agreements regarding altar fellowship between the Church of England and both the Church of Sweden and the Church of Finland. These were drawn up some 10-15 years ago. However, the Archbishop of Finland is a great admirer of the Anglican Church, gladly receives Anglican guests and willingly selects young churchmen for the Anglican scholarships. There is, of course, a certain positive good gained from all these contacts; however, several of the young men upon their return to Finland seem to feel that they can find their liturgical ideals realized mainly in the Anglican Church. Should this trend continue - although, looking at the picture as a whole, the Archbishop stands out quite alone as a devoted friend of the Anglicans - it is quite reasonable to hold that the Church of England could in time exercise considerable influence in Finland.

I encouraged Pastor Engstrom to take along (rather to have sent) several of our best common service books so as to demonstrate something of our American Lutheran liturgical achievements and aspirations.

In connection with the Archbishop's travel to England I cannot help but be mindful of the funds made available by us to the Church of Finland for the furtherance of ecumenical relations. I would like to believe that the Church of England finances his journey. In case she does not, then there are left only two other possibilities, namely, that either the Bank of Finland has granted the needed foreign currency (which could well be, since English pounds are more easily available), or then that our dollar resources are used, in which case the situation would be even more embarrassing.¹²³

Heikkinen possessed an acute mind and his analysis of the Finnish situation was astute. The Lambeth Conference fitted well with Lehtonen's foreign and domestic policy, and he certainly looked to the Church of England for spiritual as well as material help and encouragement. Although they

¹²³ AELCA NLC 2/4 Box 2/10. Finland - Jacob W. Heikkinen, 1948. Heikkinen to Empire 9.6.1948.

acknowledged this, the Americans grew weary of the fact that while the Archbishop was perfectly happy to receive their reconstruction aid, his primary ecumenical interest was in the Church of England and Anglicans.

It is possible that Lehtonen considered that as he indeed stood alone as 'a devoted friend of the Anglicans' in the Finnish Church his decision was justified because there were able candidates for the two other meetings, while he was the only choice for the Lambeth Conference. However, it remains the case that Lehtonen showed deeper personal interest in Anglican relations than in the LWF or the WCC. Other Finnish church leaders will have judged the Lambeth Conference as being some way down the pecking order.¹²⁴

However, Heikkinen's criticism also had financial repercussions. He did not want American money to be used for the fostering of Anglican relations and was generally concerned about the Anglican liturgical influence in Finland. The financial concern was very real since it is likely that the Church of England was able to provide hospitality for the foreign church leaders only after their arrival in England. Fisher's invitation suggests that this was the case and included no mention of reimbursement of travel costs. Indeed, Fisher regretted the restrictions the post-war reconstruction in England inevitably placed on their hospitality.¹²⁵ Since there is no evidence that Lehtonen and his party's travel costs were met by the CRE from the funds allocated to the Church of Finland, it is quite likely that they were indeed met by the American Lutherans.

This is further supported by Lehtonen's vague approach to applying for financial aid from the one million dollar fund the Americans had allocated for the Church of Finland:

Ecumenical relations (see page 7, paragraph 7):6000 dollars. The purpose: To help sustain and to strengthen the relations, which have during the recent years come into existence between the Church of Finland and the other Churches, and particularly to foster the cause of the Lutheran World Federation. For this paragraph I need only a confirmation from you that this sum is available for the first of June. This support will make possible the Finnish Lutheran representation at the meetings of the Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Federation and of the World Council of Churches, both to be held in Holland, August next. Also other urgent Church conferences will take place this year.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ *Krapu* 2007, 159.

¹²⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen 1.12.1947.

¹²⁶ AELCA NLC 9/2 Box 1. Geographical - 8. Finland. Lehtonen to Long 10.1.1948.

There is no doubt that the Lambeth Conference featured prominently among the 'other urgent Church conferences'. If indeed American aid was used for participation in the Lambeth Conference, it must have seemed more than a little deceitful to the Americans, especially as Lehtonen and the Finnish Church's Ecclesiastical Board continued to ask for these funds, already agreed upon by the Americans in April and May without any direct reference to how they would be spent.¹²⁷

Heikkinen sought ways to balance Anglican influence in Finland with American Lutheran influence. He offered Lehtonen the opportunity to become familiar with the Lutheran liturgical tradition and progress in America. Heikkinen had also taken a leaf out of Lehtonen's book and suggested a special "Spiritual Reconstruction Program" as part of the American relief aid in Finland:

3. The Special "Spiritual Reconstruction Program." A word in regard to its importance is in place. In order to understand how it enters into the picture we should bear in mind that our program operates on a wider basis and under larger concept than "immediate emergency aid", which as the "living need" category is only a portion of the total plan. To view the "Institutions" and the "Reconstruction of Churches" in the light of emergency needs alone would actually invite wasting of funds, but seen as long-range post-war projects integrated into the total reconstruction task in which we help the Finns to help themselves our dollars can perform a lasting service to the cause of Christ in Finland. This is true also in regard to certain "spiritual needs", some of which were directly created by the war and others accentuated by the war and particularly by post-war poverty.

For some 5 - 8 years (no one knows exactly how long) Finland will be paying her war reparations to Russia; this means a continuing low standard of living on the one hand, and virtual isolation from the rest of the Christendom on the other. Because of currency difficulties contacts with other Churches are out of question. Because of this and general poverty opportunities to promote advanced studies and to help develop new leadership to cope with the present day problems are almost at a zero point (the Church of England, however, is showing great interest in drawing young pastors to study in England). The American Lutheran aid-dollar alone can provide the sorely needed opportunity to breathe sorely needed "fresh air" from the outside.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ AELCA NLC 9/2 Box 1. Geographical - 8. Finland. Lehtonen, Archbishop Aleksis, 1948. Long to Lehtonen 16.1.1948, Lehtonen to Michelfelder 18.5.1948; AELCA NLC 9/2 Box 1. Geographical - 8. Finland. 6. General, 1948. Ecclesiastical Board to Empie 20.4.1948.

¹²⁸ AELCA NLC 2/4 Box 2/10. Geographical - 8. Finland - Jacob W. Heikkinen, 1948. Report of the Rev. Jacob W. Heikkinen. Commissioner to Finland, 2-3.

The American Lutheran "Spiritual Reconstruction Program" was in fact very similar to the CRE's plan for "Spiritual Reconstruction in Europe". Heikkinen may have understood this as he mentioned the influence of the Church of England in his report, with which the American aid undoubtedly sought to compete.

The main difference between the two aid programmes, however, was the size and the efficiency of the plans. While the total sum of American Lutheran aid was much bigger, Anglican aid was used particularly for the furthering of church relations, whereas the primary concern of the Americans was to offer emergency aid for basic needs and the reconstruction of churches and institutions. The American Spiritual Reconstruction Program was thus an innovation on a par with the CRE's spiritual reconstruction, as they both for the most part targeted the ecclesiastical elite. However, it was a tiny component of the total American aid, which was of great importance because of its size and effect on the population as a whole.¹²⁹

b. The Nordic situation reviewed

At the Lambeth Conference the Nordic representatives were invited to a special "Scandinavian Discussion Group" on 30 June.¹³⁰ The meeting was chaired by Bishop Bell and attended by ten other bishops from various parts of the Anglican Communion, together with the Nordic bishops, including Lehtonen, Bishop Hans Fuglsang-Damgaard of Copenhagen, Bishop Sigurgeir Sigurdsson of Iceland and Bishop Gustaf Aulén of Strängnäs. Bell regretted that Norway had been unable to send a representative because Bishop Berggrav "had not been at all well" and had been unable to send anyone else. However, all the Nordic Seamen's pastors in London were present at the meeting together with some other Anglican and Lutheran theologians. The Norwegian Church was thus represented by an observer, the Rev. Kjell Weyde, the Norwegian Seamen's Pastor in London.¹³¹

¹²⁹ *Malkavaara* 1997, 10-20; *Ryman* 2005b, 72-73.

¹³⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Samuel Lehtonen to Waddams 3.6.1948; LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, June 30th, 1948, held at Church House, Westminster, S.W.1. from 11-1 and from 2.30-4.30.

¹³¹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group.

Waddams had prepared an agenda for discussion. In Waddams' absence the secretarial duties were given to the Rev. J.R. Porter, Bell's Chaplain.¹³²

The first item was the development of the relationship between the Anglican and Nordic Lutheran Churches since the last Lambeth Conference in 1930. Bell recalled the existing relations from an Anglican perspective, referring to the Lambeth Conferences since 1908, the negotiations with the Church of Finland, the Churches of Estonia and Latvia, and more recently the conversations with the Churches of Denmark and Iceland, with observers from Norway. After this brief summary, he invited the Nordic delegates to give their views and raise any issues or developments they wanted to put before the conference.¹³³

The Lutherans responded in turn, from the Church of Sweden, whose ties with Anglicanism were closest, to the Churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway who had no formal agreements with the Church of England. Aulén recognised that there had been no significant development in the Church of Sweden since 1930, when the last change in the constitution of the church had been made, but the liturgy had been renewed, and was now "richer and more in close relation with the Old Christian tradition. The new books had been gladly accepted."¹³⁴ The meeting was 'business as usual' for the Church of Sweden, which had no particular aspirations with regard to the Church of England.

Finland was different: Lehtonen pushed for ever closer relations between the churches. He summarized the existing state of relations and wished to go forward. He claimed "the Church of Finland had passed the decisive moment in its relations with the Church of England":

The Report of the discussions between the representatives of the two churches in 1933-4 had been accepted by both sides, and the Finnish Church was now ready for further discussions, especially as he himself, and many others had come to appreciate more the historical forms of the ministry, particularly the episcopate founded on real church lines.¹³⁵

Lehtonen's care not to annoy other Lutherans, especially the Americans, with his view on the "historical forms of the ministry" was abandoned at

¹³² LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 1-2.

¹³³ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 1-2.

¹³⁴ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 2.

¹³⁵ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 2.

the Lambeth Conference; the opportunity for further rapprochement with the Anglicans was simply too good to be wasted.

Lehtonen also introduced two controversial questions: the ordination of women and relations in foreign missions. The Church of Denmark had already ordained the first women with government support. Lehtonen affirmed that the decision in Finland would be made only by the church in the Church Assembly.¹³⁶ He was critical of government interference in church life and doctrine.

Concerning foreign missions, he referred to problems in South West Africa between Anglican and Finnish Lutheran Missions, though the minutes do not reveal their nature. Lehtonen also expressed his hope that Anglican bishops might soon be welcomed at Finnish episcopal consecrations.¹³⁷ All these points confirm that Lehtonen's aim was to convince the Anglican participants of his church's readiness to proceed from what he understood as the interim decision by the Canterbury Convocations 1935.

Although the discussion group was called "Scandinavian", the meeting was intended to cover the whole Nordic and Baltic region. Bell had reserved a space for the Baltic churches after Sweden and Finland. The post-war reality meant that there was no Baltic representative present and no news from these churches beyond what was heard from the Baltic refugees scattered in Sweden, Britain and America. This was discussed and deemed deplorable, but there was little that could be done about it.¹³⁸

Bell next introduced the Chichester Conference held between representatives of the Churches of England, Denmark and Iceland in Chichester in the autumn of 1947 with observers from Norway. Bell brought the recommendations of the Chichester Conference to the discussion and continued with his own questions for future work:

Two recommendations had been made, which members of the Conference had been asked to discuss with their respective authorities:-

- (i) To recommend further meetings either at the end of 1948 or in 1949.
- (ii) To recommend for further consideration two questions which had arisen at the fifth session of the conference, at the end of the Bishop of Chichester's statement, i.e.

¹³⁶ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 1-2.

¹³⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 1-2.

¹³⁸ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 2-3.

1. Could we aim as a way of fulfilling the Lambeth Appeal conception of Christian unity - a Pan-episcopal union of all churches which agreed in the essentials of the Faith and possessed the historic Episcopate and if so by what means? Or:
2. Should we do our best to promote a practice of occasional inter-communion between our churches without formal union, according to which our respective Church authorities would allow the members of the Scandinavian churches to receive Communion in the Church of England and the members of the Church of England in the Churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway, and if so, by what means?

These questions raised the problems of:

- (a) conditions of intercommunion, both in general and in the special cases of those isolated from their own churches and in cases of emergency.
- (b) the possibility on interconsecration of bishops.
- (c) the reasons for which a church may refuse to hold communion with another Christian body.¹³⁹

Bell's questions got to the heart of ecumenical rapprochement, the fundamental nature of the unity they sought. The Lambeth Appeal had sought to achieve unity in diversity with a common episcopal ministry between Christians of different traditions building towards one visible Church. This had contributed to the Lutheran-Anglican discussions of the 1930s though the agreements themselves merely established occasional or economic intercommunion and possible interconsecration.¹⁴⁰ In modern parlance, Bell wanted to discuss whether they should work towards full communion or be content to achieve eucharistic hospitality, and how either might be achieved.

Bell's introduction was followed by responses from Denmark, Iceland and Norway. Bishop Fuglsang-Damgaard said that the Danish Church had been very happy to send delegates to the Chichester Conference and this had been unanimously supported by all nine Danish Bishops. Fuglsang-Damgaard was, however, very conscious of the possible hindrance the ordination of women might cause. "He asked those present not to regard the practice as a hindrance to unity, and pleaded for a closer relationship between the two Churches."¹⁴¹ In fact Fuglsang-Damgaard emphasized that only two of the nine bishops had approved of the ordination of women,

¹³⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 2.

¹⁴⁰ *Hill* 1993, 53-56; *Österlin* 1995, 239-244, 249-259; *Kemp* 1998, 135-139.

¹⁴¹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 3.

expressed the hope that not many more would be ordained and that the practice would not spread. This sparked a lively discussion on the nature of ordination and ministry. The general view of the ordination of women was one of disapproval.¹⁴² There were no women present.

Another issue raised by Fuglsang-Damgaard that prompted lively discussion concerned episcopal consecrations and the apostolic succession. Fuglsang-Damgaard believed that "a step towards unity had been taken when at the last consecration in Denmark, before the war, the Archbishops of Uppsala and Finland had come to take part" and "hoped that very soon an Anglican Bishop would take part as well."¹⁴³ This led the Rev. Dr. Moss to ask whether "they had actually taken part in a consecration or had -- merely been present at the service."¹⁴⁴ Fuglsang-Damgaard had to admit that there had been restrictions for fear of public opinion, but since there had been no public reaction, these restrictions would not be in place on the next occasion.¹⁴⁵ The restriction he referred to was that the Finnish and Swedish bishops had refrained from the laying on of hands in order that it could not be suggested that the apostolic succession of bishops had passed to the Danish Church accidentally.

The participants' answers to the question of unity varied from the more systematic to the more practical. The Bishop of Iceland Sigurgeir Sigurdsson and the Norwegian observer the Rev. Kjell Weyde stressed the latter. Sigurdsson was optimistic and thought that "the Church in the world was facing great possibilities" having been a fortress and having stood for liberty during the last ten years. He gave an introduction to his church and said that there was a "great desire in Iceland for reunion, though the Church of Iceland and the Church of England did not agree on all matters of creed and doctrine."¹⁴⁶ In spite of the doctrinal differences, he thought that the churches should come together and co-operate as much as they could, since "in reality" they were "all brethren."¹⁴⁷ Sigurdsson's optimism and practically motivated ecumenism resembled very much Gulin's approach.

¹⁴² LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 3-5.

¹⁴³ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 3.

¹⁴⁴ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 3.

¹⁴⁵ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 4.

¹⁴⁶ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 4.

¹⁴⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 4.

There were, however, less optimistic voices supporting practical co-operation between the churches. The Norwegian observer Weyde “felt that the Church of Norway and the Church of England were in very close contact.” He said that the Norwegians were tired after the occupation and had “in a way collapsed spiritually” though “there was something of a revival beginning in spiritual matters.” He thought that they needed “to unite against the enemies of Christianity. There was a big spiritual fight ahead.”¹⁴⁸ There was something of the Cold War crusade mentality in Weyde’s words.

This was especially supported by Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester, according to whom “the Churches represented might differ on the question of ecclesiastical unity, but they were one in their views as to the doctrine of God and the nature of man. They were one in facing modern secularism, and that was more important than formal church unity.”¹⁴⁹ For Duncan-Jones a united Christian witness against atheistic communism was the most important motivation for ecumenism.

A median position between practical co-operation and organic union was expressed by Bishop Karl Morgan Block of California; he wanted to emphasize “the things that our Churches had in common and” not to “dwell too much on points where we disagree.” He wanted to encourage both.¹⁵⁰

Hunter’s approach was similar. He spoke of his visit to Finland and was “glad that the Archbishop [Lehtonen] advocated the importance and value of the possible interchange of visits not only of bishops, but also clergy and even laity.”¹⁵¹ Hunter, like Lehtonen, wanted a close affinity between the people of both churches. He supported Fuglsang-Damgaard’s hope that the ordination of women would not impair relations: “If we are all to be judged by our irregularities God help us all.”¹⁵² Hunter was exceptional among the participants in his relaxed and supportive attitude to the ministry of women.¹⁵³ It is hard to say whether his was the only liberal voice, but it can at least be said that the liberal position was not as strongly represented by anyone else.

¹⁴⁸ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5.

¹⁴⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5.

¹⁵⁰ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5.

¹⁵¹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 4-5.

¹⁵² LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5.

¹⁵³ *Matchett* 1985, 184-194.

The discussion flowed freely and different experiences and agendas were brought into the conversation. This led the Rev. Dr. A.J. Macdonald to wonder whether they were supposed "to frame any common resolution at the meeting, expressing our unity in fundamentals, along the lines suggested by the Scandinavian bishops."¹⁵⁴ Bell replied that they were free to do so if they wished, but a discussion with the Nordic representatives indicated that they did not wish to frame any resolution.¹⁵⁵ This was understandable as there was not enough time for deep theological discussion and there were so many views represented even amongst the Nordic churches. The Swedes and Finns already had their agreements and negotiations were under-way with the rest. A resolution would merely have exposed the process to criticism at home.

There was, however, a desire to achieve something. Bishop Stephen Neill, who in a sense embodied a step towards unity having had a Swedish co-consecrator, wanted the impediments to the reunion of the Anglican Communion and the Nordic Churches faced boldly, chief among them the apostolic succession and the ordination of women:¹⁵⁶

The first arose from the Oslo Conference of 1947. If Bishop Berggrav had invited Swedish clergy to celebrate, the entire English delegation would have communicated, but as the Norwegian clergy celebrated they did not do so. It was an important accident that the Swedes had retained the historic episcopate and the Norwegians not. Secondly, there was the question of the ordination of women. A case had occurred in the Anglican Communion and had been officially disowned. But the practice was increasing in the Continental churches: among others it was used in the canton of Geneva and by the Church of Holland, as far as work overseas was concerned. This issue could not be dismissed easily.¹⁵⁷

Bishop Neill addressed the question boldly, but so did the Norwegian Church. The Norwegians, Bishop Berggrav prominent among them, had been hurt by what the Church of England perceived as 'an important accident' barring Anglicans from receiving the sacrament at their altars.¹⁵⁸ It may indeed have been this experience which contributed to Norwegian dif-

¹⁵⁴ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5.

¹⁵⁵ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5.

¹⁵⁶ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 4.

¹⁵⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 4.

¹⁵⁸ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

faculties in sending a representative to both the Chichester and Lambeth Conferences.

Nordic representation thus varied from the strong delegations of the Churches of Denmark, Finland and Sweden with a sympathetic approach to Anglicanism, to Norway's single observer. The Church of Iceland fell somewhere in between with Sigurdsson as their first ever representative to a gathering of this kind. The Icelandic presence was noted with thanks by the chairman, Bishop Bell.¹⁵⁹

Before breaking for lunch, the conference found time to address another matter, namely the possibility of wider ecumenical dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church. This was especially important in the light of the impending Amsterdam Conference. Roman Catholic participation in the ecumenical movement and possible reunion schemes raised great interest among the Anglicans. There was less enthusiasm among the Nordic representatives, though Bishops Aulén and Fuglsang-Damgaard were positive and supported co-operation with the Roman Catholic Church; Bishop Sigurdsson explained how few Roman Catholics there were in Iceland.¹⁶⁰ The Finns and Norwegian did not comment on the question at all. There was a strong pietistic element in both churches, which was suspicious of the ecumenical movement in general and Roman Catholicism in particular. The fact that there were only a very few Roman Catholics in these countries did not really help, but perhaps even reinforced anti-catholic prejudices.

The pietistic theme continued after lunch. Aulén made a statement in reply to the critique of Lutheranism made in a pamphlet called *Catholicity*¹⁶¹ by a group of Anglican theologians. Aulén refuted the pamphlet on six points concerning anthropology, Natural Law, church-state relations, justification, ecclesiology and tradition. Aulén pointed out that the critique of *Catholicity* "was levelled against pietism not against true Lutheranism" and showed similar misunderstandings on all other points.¹⁶² Aulén, who was of the Lund school of Lutheran theology, had little sympathy for the pietistic interpretation of the Lutheran tradition.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 3.

¹⁶⁰ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5-6.

¹⁶¹ *Catholicity* 1947.

¹⁶² LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 5-6.

¹⁶³ *Heiene* 2005, 124-125.

Aulén's statement sparked a lively discussion with the Anglican theologians, who found many points of convergence between the classical Anglican theology, represented by figures such as Hooker, and Lutheranism. The discussion was erudite but restricted to the small circle of professional ecumenical theologians. Bishop Neill admitted that "there was still a great ignorance of Luther's real teachings in the Anglican circles"¹⁶⁴ This reflected the reality that the majority of ordinary church people and theologians alike were guided more by their prejudices than actual knowledge and understanding of the other tradition.

However, the Lutherans were hardly uniform in interpreting their own tradition, a fact highlighted by Bell, who asked "how far misinterpretations of Luther's theology were current in the Lutheran World outside Scandinavia."¹⁶⁵ He had learned that "many Germans admitted that undue subservience to the State was the true Lutheran teaching and regretted it."¹⁶⁶

He was answered by Fuglsang-Damgaard, who "recommended Luther's 'Preface to the Epistle to the Romans' as containing a very deep conception of what Lutheranism really was."¹⁶⁷ He emphasized the important place of the Fathers of the Church and the first four centuries in early Lutheran teaching and stressed that for Luther justification and sanctification were inseparable gifts of God's mercy.¹⁶⁸ It was implicit in his answer that the Nordic version was a more authentic interpretation of true Lutheran tradition than the German.

Bell then guided the discussion back to the question of the nature of unity and introduced three different ecclesiastical relationships: *full organic union*, *formal intercommunion* and *informal intercommunion*.¹⁶⁹

Full organic union derived from the Lambeth Quadrilateral, which Bell quoted to the letter. He pointed out, however, that this was especially framed to meet the situation among the English-speaking peoples.

Regarding *formal intercommunion* Bell quoted the Report of the Conference with the Church of Sweden:

¹⁶⁴ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 6-7.

¹⁶⁵ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 7.

¹⁶⁶ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 8.

¹⁶⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 8.

¹⁶⁸ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 8.

¹⁶⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 8.

The Bishop of Kalmar “presumed that it might be held to be full and permanent intercommunion ‘necessitate premente’: he desired that intercommunion should eventually be regarded not merely as a matter of comity, but as a right that might be claimed.” Such intercommunion left the Churches involved as independent societies, which could come into close agreement if they wished, e.g. as in the Bonn Agreement between the Church of England and the Old Catholics.¹⁷⁰

Thus, *formal intercommunion* was the relationship the Church of England had with the Old Catholic Church and perhaps to some degree with the Church of Sweden, although the term ‘intercommunion’ had been avoided in the Swedish negotiations.¹⁷¹

Bell explained *informal intercommunion* as follows:

This was a matter of custom and practice, and was not canonical or formal. It implied occasional giving and receiving of Communion to and by the Churches concerned in one another’s territories. This was the relationship that had normally prevailed between the Church of England and the Protestant Churches on the Continent during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹⁷²

What Bell did not say was that this was substantially the outcome of the agreements with the Finnish and Baltic Lutheran churches. Here as well the term ‘intercommunion’ had been avoided by the Anglican chairman, Bishop Headlam, who had spoken instead of ‘economic communion’.¹⁷³ The need to achieve this had arisen from the change of emphasis in Anglican theology and ecclesiology with the rise of the Oxford Movement and the subsequent insistence on the historic episcopate in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral.¹⁷⁴

The discussion that followed revealed that the different levels of ecumenical relationships were unfamiliar even to the Anglican ecumenists. Dr. Moss, for example, “did not understand what was meant by ‘organic union’. He had always understood that intercommunion was the fullest form of union, and that the relationship of the Anglican Church with the Old Catholics was the same as that existing among the various churches of the Anglican Communion.”¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁰ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 7.

¹⁷¹ Hill 1993, 53.

¹⁷² LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 7.

¹⁷³ Hill 1993, 55-56.

¹⁷⁴ Chapman 2006, 77-80, 120-122.

¹⁷⁵ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 9.

Bell explained that intercommunion did not "require full acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all essentials of the Christian faith." Organic union involved a complete interchangeability of ministers. There were two elements to be considered: "Christian Fellowship in practical service and friendship" and "religious fellowship, by which the Churches communicated together." He thought that the latter would greatly impress the pagan world.¹⁷⁶

All in all the discussion was lively, but for the most part between the Anglican representatives, the great majority of whom supported religious fellowship. The Rev. J.P. Hickinbotham presented as the ultimate ideal that there should be "a regional or provincial Church in each country, which would be autonomous but in full communion with all other provinces in the sense that there was intercommunion, but intercommunion with some restrictions upon the interchangeability of ministers."¹⁷⁷ Hickinbotham's idea was a modern application of the unity of the national churches in the Middle Ages, without Rome at the centre.

Moss clearly approved this idea and read a statement on the Lambeth Quadrilateral, which he had prepared:

It is impossible usefully to discuss the reunion of the Church, until we are agreed on what the Church is. The Lambeth Quadrilateral assumes that we are agreed on this. For it is not a compromise between different Anglican parties: if it were, we should have no more right to offer it to other Churches as a basis of union, than the Thirty-Nine Articles. It is a rough summary of the faith and order of the ancient Church: it assumes that we are agreed in recognising the authority of the ancient Church. Some years ago, when I was staying with the Archbishop of Finland, he made a remark which struck me very much. I had pointed out that in the Church of Finland the Sundays are reckoned from Trinity, not from Pentecost, and the Epistles and Gospels for them are the same as in the English Prayer book. He said, "That is because we are both provinces of one Western Church." We approach our Northern friends, not as separate societies which have never been united, but as ancient provinces of one visible Church which seek to restore a union which they once had. The Churches of Sweden and Finland, and with some qualifications the others also, are not sects founded by any man, but go back to St. Anskar, St. Eskil, St. Henry, St. Olaf, and St. Thorlak, as the English Church goes back to St. Augustine and St. Aidan. This is for us not a matter of historic sentiment, but of dogma. We believe in one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, which is not a mass of denominations but a single Divine kingdom with one faith and one order shared by its self-governing

¹⁷⁶ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 9.

¹⁷⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 9.

provinces. At the Bonn Conference in 1931, of which I was a member, the Old Catholic delegates asked us: 'Do you all agree that your Church is continuous with the mediaeval Church of England?' When Bishop Graham-Brown answered 'Yes', the conference had turned the corner, and its success became certain. This shows that our doctrine on this point is not peculiar to Anglicans, but is the basis of successful union with others.

Now I want to ask our Northern friends the same question, which I should not do if I were not pretty sure that they would give the same answer. 'Do you all hold that your Churches are not new societies founded by anyone, however eminent, but are continuous with the mediaeval Church in your countries?'

If you can give us this assurance, we shall have a logical basis of agreement, starting from which we can reasonably discuss the Lambeth Quadrilateral. For the Canon of Scripture, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Ministry, together with the definitions of the ancient Councils which your *Confessio Augustana* recognises just as we do, come to us on the authority of the ancient Church, of which your Churches and ours are alike the heirs.¹⁷⁸

The Nordic delegates gave the assurance for which Moss asked.¹⁷⁹ However, they took part in the discussion on the form of unity only when asked to do so. Concern for the form, essence and mechanism of reunion was much more characteristic of the Anglican side.

In general Moss' statement indicated he had an excellent understanding of the Nordic Churches, their history and theology. He did not use the word 'Scandinavian' once, being the only English ecumenist of his generation to understand that the word excluded the Finns because of the difference in language and geography. Moss' understanding reached beyond Finland. He supported the historic continuity of the Danish Church through a lengthy quotation in German of von Döllinger's words from the Bonn Conference of 1874.¹⁸⁰

There is no gainsaying Moss's great knowledge of the Nordic Churches and their ethos. More important still was the way he managed to find a substantive convergence between the high church theology of national churches in both traditions despite divergence in ritual. This approach to ecumenical theology appealed especially to evangelical catholic Lutherans like Lehtonen and many Swedish theologians.

After Moss's long statement, the meeting again focused on the practical issue of how best to foster church relations. These ranged from the inter-

¹⁷⁸ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 10.

¹⁷⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 10.

¹⁸⁰ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 10.

change of students to the provision of information and the encouragement of links through publications and correspondence. There was also a suggestion that the Anglican Chaplains in the Nordic area should take a closer interest in the life of the indigenous churches and seek to educate English churchgoers based on their personal experience.¹⁸¹

Duncan-Jones asked if negotiations should be held with the Nordic churches as a bloc or with each church separately. All the Nordic representatives supported separate discussions with each church.¹⁸² The different state of relations with Anglicans was one factor; another was their reluctance to get involved in discussions likely to cause controversy between them.

Neill came up with the novel suggestion that as there was a very real sense of common faith with the Nordic Lutheran churches, the bishops of these churches should be invited to the Lambeth Conference as of right. Neill thought this would be an organic and formal expression of a union that was spiritually strongly felt.¹⁸³ This was not impossible: the organisation of the Lambeth Conference was very flexible. The conference was not a regulatory body, its authority being derived from spiritual consensus.

However, time ran out and Neill's suggestion was left hanging. Bell skilfully drew the different strands of the discussion together. He called the occasion historic, for it was the first time bishops from all the churches had met in this way. The Anglicans had learnt much about Lutheranism and of how easily eminent theologians could misunderstand it. Bell concluded:

We had realised afresh how close the character of the Church of England was to the character of the Scandinavian Churches. How could we go forward from the stage which we had now reached? How could we make better use of the existing opportunities? The importance had been emphasised of taking all possible steps by personal acquaintance, by correspondence, by articles in the press, by books and by interchange of clergy and students to get into closer contact with one another. The Chairman was sure that all present were glad to meet the Scandinavian visitors.¹⁸⁴

What was missing was the theological wisdom and imagination to proceed on the basis of any of the models that had been discussed. Nevertheless, the discussions expressed the deep sense of unity that already existed between the Anglican and Nordic Lutheran participants. The discussions were later

¹⁸¹ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 11.

¹⁸² LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 11.

¹⁸³ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 11.

¹⁸⁴ LPL Bell papers vol. 182 Lambeth Conference 1948. Scandinavian Discussion Group, 12.

taken up in the sessions of the conference, and the ideas presented were left to ferment.

c. The propaganda value of the Lambeth Conference

There was much more to the Lambeth Conference than the Scandinavian Discussion Group. The conference was officially opened at Canterbury Cathedral on 1 July. Three hundred and thirty bishops from all over the world attended, together with ecumenical guests. There followed a week of general discussions, and two weeks of committee work to draft the reports and resolutions which were to be considered by the full conference during the last two weeks. The final outcome of the conference was then summarised in an encyclical that was published on 18 August 1948, a few days before the opening of the WCC Assembly in Amsterdam.¹⁸⁵ This ensured a hectic summer for professional ecumenists in general and Anglicans in particular.

The day after the opening of the conference, there was an introductory session for the guests, which was, according to Samuel Lehtonen, especially warm towards the Nordic Lutheran Bishops. Archbishop Lehtonen was the first Nordic visitor to reply. He summarised the contacts between the two churches from St Henry onwards and gave his account of the importance and meaning of the negotiations of the 1930s as “a first step towards the sacramental unity of our Churches”.¹⁸⁶ He thereby suggested that the economic inter-communion already achieved was only a step on the way to the real goal, “the sacramental unity of the Church”.

Lehtonen thus averred that his church was ready to proceed further and emphasized how “the Church of Finland had learned to appreciate, perhaps better than ever before, the value of the Ministry of the Church based on purely Biblical and ecclesial principles.”¹⁸⁷ He spoke strongly against secularism and for the liberty of the Church, taking up the central themes of his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*. According to Lehtonen, “The Church of Finland

¹⁸⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948; *Kmaa* 55/9.7.1948 “Olemme yhdistetyt Herran alttarin ääressä.”

¹⁸⁶ *Kmaa* 55/9.7.1948 “Olemme yhdistetyt Herran alttarin ääressä.” Anglikaanisen kirkon piispat eri puolilta maailmaa koolla Lontoossa; *Lehtonen* 1950, 81-82.

¹⁸⁷ *Kmaa* 55/9.7.1948 “Olemme yhdistetyt Herran alttarin ääressä.” Anglikaanisen kirkon piispat eri puolilta maailmaa koolla Lontoossa.

does not dare to push away the out-reaching arms of the sister churches and Christian brethren at this time when the forces of darkness, opposition and hatred of this world threaten the Christian Church."¹⁸⁸

The greeting ended:

And thus it is acknowledged that our Churches are both in order and life close branches of the same tree. And so can we gratefully confess: "*Oceanis divisi, Eucharistia coniuncti*. Even if we are divided by the seas, the Lord's Holy Communion, thanksgiving and praise unite us to each other".¹⁸⁹

Although Lehtonen had not taken an especially active part in the discussions of the Scandinavian Group, he was very outspoken about his desire for full communion. He portrayed the official relations as being closer than they in fact were, given that the question on inter-communion was far from settled and the unity at the Lord's table somewhat restricted.

The Archbishop's greeting was later published in Finland, first in a news report in *Kotimaa* by Samuel Lehtonen and later in his collected speeches. The report presented the gist of the speech, which was later published in full in the book, with the notable omission of the sections of the speech addressing the ministry and troubled times.¹⁹⁰ The omission is likely to have stemmed from Lehtonen's own self-censorship: he wanted neither to upset the pietists nor the political left.

The Lambeth Conference also involved less official meetings between the participants, representatives and the wider secular world. The Finnish Minister in London, Mr. Wuori, hosted a lunch for Lehtonen and other distinguished guests at the Finnish Legation on Friday 2 July. Wuori sought Pohjanpirkka's help with the invitations for the Anglican and Nordic Lutheran church leaders.¹⁹¹ The Finnish Legation wanted fully to exploit having the Archbishop's presence in London.

The task of inviting the right people proved demanding for Pohjanpirkka, who turned to Waddams for help. The CFR came up with a list including all the Nordic bishops; the Archbishop of Canterbury; Archbishop George Frederick Kingston of Nova Scotia, the Primate of All Canada; Bish-

¹⁸⁸ *Kmaa* 55/9.7.1948 "Olemme yhdistetyt Herran alttarin ääressä." Anglikaanisen kirkon piispat eri puolilta maailmaa koolla Lontoossa.

¹⁸⁹ *Lehtonen* 1950, 81-82.

¹⁹⁰ *Kmaa* 55/9.7.1948 "Olemme yhdistetyt Herran alttarin ääressä." Anglikaanisen kirkon piispat eri puolilta maailmaa koolla Lontoossa; *Lehtonen* 1950, 81-82.

¹⁹¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Pohjanpirkka to Waddams 10.6.1948.

op Bell; his Chaplain Roy Porter and Waddams of the CFR; the Rev. Dr. C.B. Moss; Dean Duncan-Jones; Bishop Rawlinson of Derby; Bishop Batty and the Rev. Professor C.E. Raven, as figures involved in the discussions of the 1930s; Bishop Hunter and Harland of the CRE, representing the latest contacts through reconstruction; Bishop Stephen Neill of the WCC, the Rev. O.S. Tomkins of SCM and the Rev. Canon Leonard Hodgson of the Faith and Order Movement, representing the ecumenical organisations.¹⁹² This comprehensive list illustrates the range and quality of Church of England leaders with meaningful relations with the Church of Finland, whether or not they were able to attend.

The CFR had also reserved two dinner meetings for Lehtonen with Bishop Hunter. Hunter had promised to write an article on the Lambeth Conference “for primary publication in a Finnish monthly magazine.”¹⁹³ The invitation had come from the British Central Office of Information through Waddams. Its brief was precise: they wanted Hunter’s article to “be factual, suitable for the general Protestant church-going public” giving “a comprehensive picture of the Conference, its history and its value to international relations” with “some reference to Finland and Dr. Lehtonen’s present visit and a passing reference to the fact that the Conference is being held at the same time as the Olympic Games.”¹⁹⁴ The British Information authorities’ contacts with Waddams made it easy for them to tailor propaganda which benefited state and church alike.

Hunter followed the order to the letter. He gave an excellent introduction to the history and method of the conference. Concerning the particular ecumenical relations of the Anglican Communion, Hunter wrote about the Lutheran and Orthodox visitors and the Scandinavian Discussion Group, which met to “discuss our relationships and to consider how to promote closer contacts.”¹⁹⁵

Hunter emphasized the contribution and warm welcome given to the foreign guests in general, and to Lehtonen in particular:

It was a particular pleasure to the writer to meet again Archbishop and Mrs. Lehtonen and their son, the Reverend S. Lehtonen, from whom he and his wife received such kindness last September in Finland, and to learn how things were in

¹⁹² LPL CFR LR file 28 CFR to Lehtonen 25.6.1948.

¹⁹³ LPL CFR LR file 28 CFR to Lehtonen 25.6.1948, Nelson to Waddams 8.7.1948.

¹⁹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 CFR to Lehtonen 25.6.1948, Nelson to Waddams 8.7.1948.

¹⁹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948, 3.

your country. There is in Britain great admiration for the sturdy independence of the Finnish people; we share their love of freedom. This feeling gave added warmth to the reception of Finland's archbishop at Lambeth as it also will to the reception of the splendid Finnish athletes at the Olympic Games, which overlap in time the meetings of the Conference.¹⁹⁶

Hunter provided the best possible kind of propaganda: it was impossible to detect the prescription he had received from his text. His tone was both flattering and encouraging for Finnish readers, who were doubtless grateful for the support for the Finnish independence and freedom from a western observer.

Hunter emphasized the global nature of the Anglican Communion beyond the boundaries of the British Empire. The Anglican tradition offered a bond "between England and important sections of opinion in the United States of America." The political importance of the Communion was further underlined by the fact that the formation "of the Anglican Communion as a free association of independent Churches [had] foreshadowed in a striking way the later developments within the British Commonwealth of Nations. It may be truly claimed that it was the Church which provided the pattern which was afterwards adopted by the Statesmen of the Commonwealth, and the unity of the Anglican Communion is a not unimportant element in the relations between different members of the Commonwealth."¹⁹⁷ So Hunter reminded statesmen of the reciprocal and mutually beneficial relations between the state and church.

Hunter noted that the conference took place "at so critical a time when the Christian faith and interpretation of life are being challenged and tested in many countries" which led it to consider "the Christian doctrine of man and the relation of the Church with the life of the Community and the modern state."¹⁹⁸ It was "these big issues which [gave] added importance to the discussions on Church unity and the whole work and life of the Anglican Churches, and such practical pastoral matters as marriage and family life."¹⁹⁹

Although Hunter did not explicitly mention the tension between Christianity and atheistic communism, the tension between the two was clear at the end of the article, where he hoped that the conference would:

¹⁹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948, 3.

¹⁹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948, 2.

¹⁹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948, 3.

¹⁹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948, 3.

-- be guided by the Holy Spirit to a wise and courageous strategy for the Church in the modern world, which may be of some assistance to Churches of other countries which have much in common with us. The critical issue which confronts the Church in all industrial countries is whether the body of industrial workers will be satisfied with a materialist utopia or whether they can be persuaded by the preaching of the Church and the fine quality of its corporate life to seek the Kingdom of Christ.²⁰⁰

The reference to the political relations of the Anglican Communion was somewhat problematic in the Finnish context. On the one hand it was exactly the kind of church relationship, supporting the western orientation of Finland and its Lutheran Church, that Lehtonen craved; on the other it suggested that the church was amongst the most ardent supporters of reactionary forces in Finland, making it liable to suspicion and marginalization in the social sphere, especially by the communists. The link between Christianity and international politics was a double-edged sword.

d. From theological rapprochement to political estrangement

Hunter emphasized an important ecumenical principle in his article, namely that the conference would lose its significance if it were not properly received.²⁰¹ In the case of Nordic Lutheran relations this entailed a multi-faceted process, which began at the conference itself with the debate on the outcome of the Scandinavian Discussion Group. Resolution 70 in the section on the Unity of the Church, entitled 'The Church of Finland', recommended that the 1933-1934 Report and its recommendations "be brought to the attention of such Churches and Provinces of the Anglican Communion as have not yet considered them."²⁰² This was a significant achievement, as it brought the original recommendations to the consideration of the Anglican Communion at large after they had been in part approved and in part rejected by the Canterbury Convocations in the Church of England.

Of all the Churches and Provinces this was at least acted on by the synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, which accepted the recommendation, approving it the following autumn.²⁰³ In practice this meant that the Church

²⁰⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948, 4.

²⁰¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lambeth Conference 1948. Leslie Sheffield 8.7.1948, 4.

²⁰² Lambeth Conference 1948, 44.

²⁰³ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 John Glasgow & Galloway 18.11.1948.

of Finland's closest relations with the Anglican world were with the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Another part of the reception process was the information provided to the Finnish public. This task was undertaken by the Rev. Samuel Lehtonen, who reported on the conference in *Kotimaa* and *Herättäjä*.²⁰⁴ The first articles appeared on 9 July when the Archbishop's party was still on their way home. Samuel Lehtonen described the opening of the conference and the reception of the ecumenical guests, referring to the main points of Archbishop Lehtonen's speech, thus ensuring that the Finnish public were made aware of the close relations and deep affinity between the Churches of England and Finland.²⁰⁵

The article in *Kotimaa* gave the first positive impressions from the conference; the article in *Herättäjä*, published on the same day, concentrated on the history of the Lambeth Conferences and its present challenges. These were first the question of the Church of South India, which had been a matter of wide controversy throughout the Communion; second, the ordination of women, which had been tentatively proposed by the Chinese Anglicans, but which was most unlikely to be supported by the conference; third, the actions of maverick bishops with regard to the apostolic succession; and fourth, the orthodoxy of the teachings of the liberal Bishop E.B. Barnes of Birmingham.²⁰⁶ The article appeared without a by-line, but was probably written by Samuel Lehtonen, who was among the very few in Finland with the knowledge deep enough to write such an informed article.

On his return, Samuel wrote again in both *Kotimaa* and *Herättäjä* about his main impressions. He had been very much impressed by the global atmosphere of the conference, which made him realize how the Church of Finland had through its relationship with the Church of England entered a truly global fellowship.²⁰⁷ Samuel considered this richness of witness in time and place inside one confession as a strength of the Anglican Communion:

²⁰⁴ *Kmaa* 55/9.7.1948 "Olemme yhdistetyt Herran alttarin ääressä." Anglikaanisen kirkon piispat eri puolilta maailmaa koolla Lontoossa; *Hjä* 29/16.7.1948 Anglikaaniset piispat koolla rukouksen, uskon ja lähetystyön merkeissä; *Hjä* 30/23.7.1948 Suomen kirkko astunut maailmanlaajaan kristilliseen rintamaan; *Kmaa* 58-59/23.7.1948 Maailmanlaajan kirkon eteneminen kaikissa maanosissa. Päävaikutelmat Lambeth-kokouksesta.

²⁰⁵ *Kmaa* 55/9.7.1948 "Olemme yhdistetyt Herran alttarin ääressä."

²⁰⁶ *Hjä* 28/9.7.1948 Lambeth-kokous.

²⁰⁷ *Kmaa* 58-59/23.7.1948 Maailmanlaajan kirkon eteneminen kaikissa maanosissa. Päävaikutelmat Lambeth-kokouksesta; *Hjä* 30/23.7.1948 Suomen kirkko astunut maailmanlaajaan kristilliseen rintamaan.

The strength of the Anglican Church has thus derived from its steadfast adherence to the apostolic faith of the first centuries, the wonderful protestant tradition of the springtime of the Reformation and the Anglo-Saxon's keen love of freedom, which is also manifested in the Church and theology. On this basis the ancient tradition of the Christian Church is adhered to nationally by each country, which is clearly evidenced by the church politics of Lambeth.²⁰⁸

Like his father, Samuel valued all the traditional strands of Anglican theology, catholic, evangelical and liberal, with particular emphasis on its global character.

In *Herättäjä* Samuel emphasized the historic nature of the event as it was the first time that ecumenical guests from sister churches had been invited. He recalled the existing relations between the Churches of England and Finland and explained to his readers the meaning and importance of these.²⁰⁹ In view of the many common misunderstandings, he did this exceptionally well. The article was timely, as there was a pressing need for positive ecumenical reporting; there was an increasingly anti-ecumenical atmosphere in the Church of Finland, reflected from time to time especially in the pages of *Kotimaa*.²¹⁰

Knowing this, Samuel wrote that the documents explaining the present state of relations between the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland had just been published in English and were to be published in Finnish and given to the members of the Finnish Church Synod the following autumn. He attested that the reply of the late Archbishop Kaila would persuade anyone that Lutheran principles in general and justification by faith in particular had been clearly emphasized in these discussions.²¹¹

Samuel stressed the warm welcome given to the Archbishop of Finland at the Conference and the affinity of the two churches:

The Church of Finland is linked with the Church of England above all by the fact that they are both national churches, sharing as their basis the same common Chris-

²⁰⁸ *Kmaa* 58-59/23.7.1948 Maailmanlaajan kirkon eteneminen kaikissa maanosissa. Päävaikutelmat Lambeth-kokouksesta.

²⁰⁹ *Hjä* 30/23.7.1948 Suomen kirkko astunut maailmanlaajaan kristilliseen rintamaan.

²¹⁰ *Kantala* 2003, 95, 105-108; *Krapu* 2007, 174-177.

²¹¹ *Hjä* 30/23.7.1948 Suomen kirkko astunut maailmanlaajaan kristilliseen rintamaan; *Bell* 1948b.

tian faith. The liturgical life of both Churches is based on the same western tradition purged of medieval abuses.²¹²

He continued by emphasizing the moderate nature of the Protestant Reformation in both countries, which had bestowed on the churches great blessings in the form of the Book of Common Prayer in England, and the Agricola Prayer Book, the New Testament in the vernacular and the birth of Lutheran hymn singing in Finland.²¹³ This exposition of the many similarities with a strong emphasis on the Protestant and Lutheran features of Anglicanism was intended to give a positive impression concerning the Church of England. Samuel's somewhat defensive tone testifies to the need to guard against the often implicit, and sometimes explicit, criticism of ecumenism in general and Anglican relations in particular.

However, Samuel's reports opened the door to fresh criticism, especially in his treatment of the bishops' wives' meeting at the conference. This meeting had lasted for four days and had been convened by Mrs. Fisher. Among the powerful personalities had been the widow of the late Archbishop Temple, and the wives of Bell and Hunter. Samuel informed the readers of Kotimaa that Mrs. Margaretha Lehtonen had had the honour to bring greetings from the European region.²¹⁴ It seems the otherwise cautious Samuel failed to realize that the constant association of his family with Anglican relations was likely to become a cause of envy and lead to the accusation of nepotism.

Samuel's views coincided with his father's, which was reflected in the latter's letter of thanks to Fisher. Archbishop Lehtonen wrote that the conference had been "a source of great inspiration" for him, reinforcing his understanding of "the world-wide and unique character of [the] Anglican Communion". Lehtonen welcomed the publication of the documents concerning the relations between the churches in *the Documents on Christian Unity III*, edited by Bell, and promised to do his "best to promote the further practical steps."²¹⁵ These were all points Samuel had covered in his reports for the Finnish church press.

²¹² *Hjä* 30/23.7.1948 Suomen kirkko astunut maailmanlaajaan kristilliseen rintamaan.

²¹³ *Hjä* 30/23.7.1948 Suomen kirkko astunut maailmanlaajaan kristilliseen rintamaan.

²¹⁴ *Kmaa* 58-59/23.7.1948 Maailmanlaajan kirkon eteneminen kaikissa maanosissa. Päävaikutelmat Lambeth-kokouksesta.

²¹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 21.7.1948.

Fisher replied to Lehtonen in November, sending him the conference report “not only as a formal act of courtesy, but also because I am sure that you have brotherly interest in our deliberations.”²¹⁶ Fisher was full of hope and gratitude:

The bishops assembled at Lambeth for the Conference showed an intense desire to further the cause of Christian solidarity and understanding, and I can on their behalf assure you of their very warm sense of friendship and brotherhood for your Church.

The presence at the Lambeth Conference of you yourself was very much appreciated by all the bishops, as well as by me personally and I hope that you were convinced of this by the enthusiasm of your reception. I trust that this visit will make a contribution towards closer fellowship in our Lord Jesus Christ of our two Communion.

I have the greatest pleasure in assuring you and your Church of the warm and brotherly feelings of the Church of England and the Anglican Communion and would ask you to accept my own personal good wishes and prayers for God’s blessing upon you and your work.²¹⁷

Fisher’s tone had become increasingly friendly and fraternal, suggesting that Lehtonen’s work for closer relations was acknowledged and much appreciated. Lehtonen replied in equally friendly terms, saying that he greatly valued the report as they shared the same problems to a great degree, and promising to send Fisher a copy of the full report on the relations and agreements between the churches published in Finland.²¹⁸ Lehtonen continued to work for closer relations both at home and abroad.

The world situation, however, presented an almost insurmountable obstacle in the way of the unity. Samuel’s reports refer only to the sufferings of recent years being traceable on the faces of some of the bishops, who had endured imprisonment. He thus emphasized the effects of occupation especially on the Asian churches during the Second World War, rather than the threat presented by the rise of atheistic communism.²¹⁹ That threat, however, had been a central theme of the conference, as it sought to determine the position of the Anglican Communion as the Cold War set in.²²⁰

²¹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen 17.11.1948.

²¹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen 17.11.1948.

²¹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 2.12.1948.

²¹⁹ *Kmaa* 58-59/23.7.1948 Maailmanlaajan kirkon eteneminen kaikissa maanosissa. Päävaikutelmat Lambeth-kokouksesta.

²²⁰ *Kirby* 1990, 267-277; *Kirby* 1999, 203-213.

The stance the Lambeth Conference took against communism only became known in Finland towards the end of August with the publication of the encyclical to be read in all Anglican churches on Sunday 10 October.²²¹ It is understandable that the Archbishop and his Chaplain wished no less to downplay the anti-communist stance of the Anglican Communion than to underline the closeness of its relationship with the Finnish Church. Bishop Hunter's article on the Lambeth Conference, for example, was never published in any leading Finnish church newspaper.

Archbishop Lehtonen's caution had already been revealed by his wish, expressed during the preparations for the conference, that the ecumenical guests should not take part in any public statement. Perhaps his experience of the ecumenical movement and other conferences made him aware of the pitfalls: signing a petition against communism would have been criticized at home as unwise in the face of the national interest to appease the Soviet Union; while refusing to sign such a petition would have resulted in much international embarrassment. To avoid the whole question in public seemed the best approach. However promising the theological and ecumenical developments, the increasing political polarization of the world was beginning to push the Churches of Finland and England apart.

3. "The soul of a truly virile nation" - Bishop Dunlop's Finnish experience

a. Debate about the Eucharist precedes Dunlop's visit

The practical implementation of the unity achieved were put to the test soon after the Lambeth Conference when Archbishop Lehtonen asked Archbishop Fisher to send a bishop to take part in the 400th anniversary of the first Finnish New Testament on 3 October 1948. Lehtonen underlined the importance of the occasion by informing Fisher that the service would be attended by the President of the Republic and by bishops representing the Scandinavian sister churches. He wanted, if possible, an Anglican bishop to bring greetings from the British and Foreign Bible Society. Lehtonen had

²²¹ *Kmaa* 68/24.8.1948 Epäluulo, pelko ja viha uhkaavat maailmanrauhaa; *Fsb* 28/26.8.1948 Lambethkonferensen i London mot kommunismen.

had a preliminary conversation with Bishop Stephen Neill about the occasion and he was willing to come. Lehtonen also wanted Neill to give some addresses on Foreign Missions during his visit.²²² The idea of this visit came from Lehtonen, who wanted to use the occasion to further his interests in Bible Work and Foreign Missions.

However, Bishop Neill could not come. His hectic schedule of the year in 1948 allowed few trips, apart from to the many important official conferences. He promised Fisher he would travel to Finland if he considered it necessary; otherwise Waddams was already searching for another bishop who could be sent.²²³

In the event, Fisher sent Bishop Colin Dunlop of Jarrow as his personal representative. Describing Dunlop thus was doubtless intended to temper Lehtonen's disappointment, since he was not the ecumenical heavyweight Neill was.²²⁴ Indeed, Dunlop considered himself "rather 'small beer' for an Anglican ambassador", although he accepted the task with pleasure having already "a superficial acquaintance with all the Scandinavian Churches".²²⁵ He had attended the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference in Norway in 1936.²²⁶

Another reason for sending Bishop Dunlop was his membership of the Church of England Commission on Christian Reconstruction in Europe. The Chairman of the commission was Bishop Hunter, who had informed Waddams of Lehtonen's plan to exploit the visit to provide information about the Anglican attitude to biblical research.²²⁷ The Bishop of Jarrow was well suited to the task. Waddams asked Harland of the CRE whether they could cover Bishop's travel expenses. Waddams stressed the importance of the visit, explaining that it was likely to contribute to the growing solidarity between the Church of England and the Finnish Church, and "would be well worthwhile from every point of view."²²⁸ The visit was thus endorsed by the Church of England's official ecumenists.

²²² LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 21.7.1948.

²²³ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Neill to Fisher 2.8.1948.

²²⁴ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Fisher to Lehtonen 6.8.1948.

²²⁵ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Dunlop to Fisher 6.9.1948.

²²⁶ KA EG 23 Dunlop to Gulin 7.9.1948; *Bring* 1965, 186.

²²⁷ C.A. 894; LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Waddams to Harland 6.9.1948.

²²⁸ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Waddams to Harland 6.9.1948.

Problems arose when Dunlop raised a practical question arising from the seemingly unclear theological relations between the churches. Dunlop asked for two letters from Fisher, one for Lehtonen and the other for public occasions. He also asked whether he could receive Holy Communion in the Finnish Church. Dunlop was open to Fisher's advice, and offered his own views on the matter. He realized that Lehtonen was in a technical sense in the apostolic succession, but in the same technical sense there was no inter-communion.²²⁹ The question was delicate:

My feeling is that I would personally dislike doing anything, which might hurt the feelings of a Church, which has borne -- so much of the 'burden in the heat of the day' in its remote Christian bastion. On the other hand, as a representative of another Church, private feelings cannot determine everything. I would be grateful for your Grace's ruling.²³⁰

As 'small beer', Dunlop wanted to be sure of his position in what might cause a controversy. He had great sympathy for the Finnish Church, to the extent that his words mirrored those the Finns might have used until the end of the war but which they were now politically constrained from using. This was an early sign that Dunlop might fall into the category of church leaders regarding "as their main task the over enthusiastic exaggeration of the virtues of those small nations who live on the borders of the Soviet Union" whom Waddams had wanted to discourage four years earlier.²³¹

The political situation and the position of the Church of England had changed dramatically. In the post-Lambeth 1948 Cold War world, it was no longer necessary to exercise caution in the expression of attitudes towards the Soviet Union in Britain; on the contrary, a crusade mentality against the Soviet bloc was now in the ascendant among western Christians.²³² This did not apply to Finland, however, whose foreign relations were guided by the pact of co-operation, friendship and assistance with the Soviet Union.²³³ The two churches were now moving in opposite directions in their approach to the political realities of their respective societies.

It proved difficult to obtain a ruling from the Archbishop. The first response to Dunlop's letter came from the Archbishop's Secretary John Luy,

²²⁹ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Dunlop to Fisher 6.9.1948.

²³⁰ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Dunlop to Fisher 6.9.1948.

²³¹ LP CFR LR file 31/3 Memorandum "Finland", 2.

²³² Kirby 1999, 211-216.

²³³ Nevakivi 1999, 245-249; Lauha 2005, 35-36, 38-39; Singleton 2006, 137-140.

who explained that the Archbishop was abroad on holiday and was only receiving the most urgent letters. He considered that there was no need for any letters from Fisher, as he had just met Lehtonen at the Lambeth Conference. Concerning the issue of communicating at a Finnish celebration of the Holy Communion Luy had consulted the CFR. According to Luy communicating “would not be in accordance with the usual practice” and he did not think that Archbishop Lehtonen would expect Dunlop to do so: “He himself will certainly understand if you refrain from communicating and I think that many clergy would understand this too.”²³⁴ The decision based on the CFR’s advice is likely to have originated from Waddams, who knew Lehtonen well enough to venture an opinion on what he was or was not likely to do, while the reference to ‘many clergy’ was based on ignorance at best, as the Finnish clergy were highly unlikely to understand Anglican sensitivities in this matter.

The advice did not satisfy Dunlop who replied:

I am afraid you are wrong about ‘the usual practice’ as to intercommunion in Finland. On last year a bishop & priest from England were invited to communicate by Archbishop Lehtonen & did so. It was precisely because of the ambiguity that I wished to have his Grace’s opinion.²³⁵

The bishop and priest had been Hunter and Richardson, who had neither asked nor received any direction in the matter, but had used their own judgement. This perplexed Dunlop, who wanted to make the correct decision.

This time Luy rang Bishop Bell, who made a distinction between the case of a private individual and an official delegate. Had Dunlop been a private individual, Bell would have encouraged him to communicate, but as he was an official delegate the situation was more complex. Bell explained that the Church of England delegation had not communicated at the WCC Amsterdam Conference when the Archbishop of Sweden had celebrated. He advised Luy to send the correspondence to Fisher.²³⁶ The situation was thus so complex that even Bell, the most experienced Church of England ecumenist, hesitated to offer advice on the matter, passing it to the Archbishop for a final ruling.

²³⁴ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Luy to Dunlop 9.9.1948.

²³⁵ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Dunlop to Luy 10.9.1948.

²³⁶ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Luy to Fisher 11.9.1948.

Fisher disagreed with Bell concerning Amsterdam. He remembered that there had been a Lutheran celebration with four celebrants from the USA and elsewhere, but not including Archbishop Eidem, at which the Anglicans had refrained from communicating. There had been a Swedish celebration on another day at which the Anglicans had not communicated, but this was because they had been guests of the Old Catholics on the same Sunday.²³⁷ Amsterdam did not offer a precedent.

Fisher proceeded to give his advice, which Luy quoted to Dunlop:

"Our relations with Finland have been approved by Convocations, but I cannot recall the terms. If they permit us to communicate in Finland openly, the Bishop of Jarrow could certainly avail himself of their permission. If they do not so permit then (a) as a private individual, he could certainly follow his conscience and if it so directed him communicate (b) but he is an official delegate. As such he ought not deliberately to go beyond the Finland terms of Convocation. If he wants my advice, I should say he should choose between (i) If asked, robing and sitting in the Sanctuary and not communicating, and (ii) sitting in the congregation and being free to communicate if he wished to do so."²³⁸

Fisher's reply was very pragmatic. He had been presented with a difficult decision while on holidays after what must have been a stressful summer. The outcome left Dunlop to adjust to the situation as he wished. It is likely Fisher considered making a more precise ruling in such a situation generally unwise.

The terms of the relations which Fisher had trouble recollecting were not obvious even to those who had access to them, as Luy discovered when he studied the status of relations in Bell's recent book *Documents of Christian Unity*. He quoted the *Documents* to Bishop Dunlop at length giving him the basic information for his own consideration as he found it difficult to fathom precise extent of the implications of the Convocation's decision:

The Joint Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and Turku in its recommendation No.2 says "The Anglican Delegation recommends the admission of communicants of the Church of Finland to Communion in the Church of England and takes note of the fact that the Church of Finland is already accustomed to admit to Communion at its altar communicants not belonging to the Lutheran Confession". This resolution was approved by the York Convocations in January 1935. In June 1935 the Upper House of Canterbury Convocations approved that

²³⁷ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Fisher to Luy 13.9.1948.

²³⁸ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Luy to Dunlop 14.9.1948. Quoted from LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Fisher to Luy 13.9.1948.

proposal in the form "That members of the Church of Finland may be admitted to Communion in the Church of England provided that they are at that time admissible to Communion in their own Church". The Lower House of Canterbury Convocation allowed it according to the terms of Resolution 2 (a) on the Unity of the Church communicated by the Upper House to the House on 11th June 1931 (i.e. where no other facilities are available).

None of the documents of Convocation seem to mention Church of England members communicating in Finland.

It may be that since we recognise the validity of the Finnish episcopal succession, it is automatically permitted but no doubt you are far better acquainted with this than I am, and will find sufficient guidance in the section I have quoted from the Archbishop's letter.²³⁹

It proved all but impossible to define the actual level of relations between the churches. Clarity and consistency were not among the Convocation's virtues and no Anglican leader could fathom the precise bearing of the decision on the practical issue of communicating at a Finnish Lutheran celebration.

Dunlop, however, was satisfied, and thanked Luy for passing Fisher's 'clear instructions', which had been exactly what he needed.²⁴⁰ Practical advice was what he had sought, even if the actual level of relations and their implications were left open. The episode offers a vivid illustration of the Anglican ethos, which combined a strict attitude towards binding decisions of the church with a certain vagueness and individual freedom in their application.

b. Dunlop surprised to find a free and independent Finland

The Bishop of Jarrow arrived in Finland on 25 September and stayed until the anniversary celebrations on 3 October 1948. He sailed from Stockholm and was the only Englishman aboard. He became quickly acquainted with his cabin companion, "a friendly and charming Finn from the university staff at Helsinki" Professor Paavo Kastari.²⁴¹ Kastari had attended an MRA conference in Switzerland, which gave them something to discuss. Dunlop recorded that Kastari's experience had not encouraged a greater involvement

²³⁹ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Luy to Dunlop 14.9.1948.

²⁴⁰ LPL Fisher papers vol.44 Dunlop to Luy 15.9.1948.

²⁴¹ Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

in church life, although it had strengthened his faith in the reality and sovereignty of God. Dunlop appreciated that Kastari, "though much stirred", "was nevertheless critical" of the MRA.²⁴² Dunlop was not a great friend of the movement himself.

Another matter united them: their critical attitude towards the Soviet Union:

We discussed Finnish politics and the attitude of Russia. I was a bit diffident since Moss had warned me "not so much as to mention Russia". Both Professor Paavo Kastari and all Finns I have met since seem unaware of such a necessity. They discuss it loudly and publicly. The great tonic one gets here is the supreme contempt the people have for Russia – a contempt which broadens into amusement.²⁴³

If the political situation made public criticism of the Soviet Union very unwise, ordinary Finns were not constrained in voicing their critical opinion as private persons. This was no problem for Dunlop, who shared the Finnish antipathy.

Indeed, Dunlop had recorded in his diary how "a feeling of melancholy came over me at leaving the familiar and lovely scene as we steamed eastwards toward the heathen East."²⁴⁴ The 'heathen East' could only mean the Soviet Union, transformed by the Cold War into the great enemy of the western Christians. Dunlop must have thought at first that Finland belonged to the Soviet bloc.

Dunlop also confessed to "becoming somewhat nervous about the prospective train journey" from Turku to Helsinki, which involved travelling through the Soviet leased military zone of Porkkala. His fear, however, proved groundless as he was met on his arrival by the British consul Mr Mackenzie, who took him and Professor Kastari by Legation car to Helsinki, bypassing the military zone.²⁴⁵ The close links between the Legation and the established church were much in evidence.

Besides offering hospitality to Dunlop, the Legation had just acquired its first Chaplain since the war, the Rev. Sydney Linton. Dunlop lunched with Linton and his family when he arrived in Helsinki, finding him perfectly suitably for the post:

²⁴² Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

²⁴³ Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

²⁴⁴ Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

²⁴⁵ Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

He is a tall and very impressive young man married to a Swede with two young sons. Though he is "Moral Rearmament", and his wife, I find them delightful and altogether admirable. They are extremely kind and hospitable in a completely effortless and habitual way and I enjoy their society and conversation very much.²⁴⁶

Though generally positive, Dunlop was reserved about Linton's MRA contacts. However, the Lintons were just the kind of people to impress pious and modest Church of Finland people.²⁴⁷ Even their link with the MRA spoke in their favour, because it provided a channel through which they were already known to the local Lutheran bishop, Gulin.²⁴⁸

Dunlop's stay in Helsinki was divided between the Anglican chaplaincy and the diplomatic community, which somewhat overlapped each other, and contacts with the Finnish churches.

Sunday was naturally reserved for services at the chaplaincy. Dunlop began with the Eucharist in the morning with about 15 communicants, followed by Matins with a congregation of 88 and Evensong at the English Church, "a corner block of flats" in the city centre. Dunlop gave Linton "an informal inauguration" by saying "some prayers 'over' him" at Matins and confirmed Mrs Linton after Evensong.²⁴⁹ The number of communicants indicates that the Helsinki expatriate community still reflected the traditional Church of England pattern of a relatively small proportion of confirmed communicants against a largely uncommunicating, and perhaps also unconfirmed, mass of parishioners.

Dunlop soon discovered that the chaplaincy had been established by refugees from the St Petersburg Chaplaincy after the Russian Revolution. Between the services Dunlop breakfasted with a Miss Henley, who had "lived in St Petersburg in the old days and who [had] seldom been far away from that city." She still lived with "her faithful servant Miss Alexandrov" in a one room apartment. Dunlop noted how "in spite of her exile life and her horribly cramped circumstances she is a typical English lady, her room is elegant and her clothes and general appearance are really chic." For Dunlop she was thus "a wonderful embodiment of the wholesome strength and tenacity of our English middle class and of the quiet uncomplaining courage of a tradition now passing away, of its adaptability to changing and worsen-

²⁴⁶ Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

²⁴⁷ The Interview of the Very Revd John Arnold 7.12.2006.

²⁴⁸ KA EG 25 Linton to Gulin sd 1948; *Gulin* 1967, 291-292.

²⁴⁹ Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

ing circumstances without any loss of essential characteristics."²⁵⁰ Dunlop's sentiment says much about the character of the chaplaincy at the time.

In addition to the refugees from the Russian Revolution the chaplaincy served the English speaking diplomatic community in general and the British Legation in particular. Matins was followed by a lunch hosted by the American Minister in Finland, Mr Avra M. Warren. The lunch guests included British and Dutch diplomats together with the world famous violinist Yehudi Menuhin, whose concert Dunlop attended with the British Minister, Mr. H.A.F. Hohler and his wife the following day.²⁵¹

Lunch at the American Legation made a lasting impression on Dunlop, who recorded his amazement that they "were waited on by a butler and three maids in lovely Edwardian frilly aprons. Everything was sumptuous, both to look at and to taste, red and white wine, cigars, etc, etc. It is wonderful to be able to eat too much again."²⁵² The luxury enjoyed by diplomatic circles provided a sharp contrast with the privations of war and rationing in England.

Less opulence was on display when Dunlop began his meetings with Finnish churchmen, but there were still some surprises awaiting him. Dunlop met the Orthodox Archbishop Herman on Monday. He was surprised to find the Archbishop beardless, which he considered greatly increased his approachability. Herman spoke no English, so the conversation was interpreted by his daughter-in-law. This initially puzzled Dunlop, who expected Orthodox bishops to be celibate: he now learned that it was possible for widowers to be bishops.²⁵³

They discussed the blow to the Finnish Orthodox Church of the Soviet annexation of Karelia, the consequent loss of property and the evacuation of parish people all over Finland. Herman was grateful of the help they had received from the Church of England and showed Dunlop a cassock made of English cloth.²⁵⁴ For the most part, it was a courtesy visit.

On Tuesday Dunlop met Bishop Eelis Gulin, who took him to the meeting of the Finnish Ecumenical Council.²⁵⁵ Dunlop had met Gulin at

²⁵⁰ Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

²⁵¹ LP CFR LR file 31/5 Hohler to FO 28.10.1948; Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁵² Dunlop's Diary 27.9.1948.

²⁵³ Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁵⁴ Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁵⁵ Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948; *Rusama* 1999, 151.

the Anglo-Scandinavian Conference in Norway in 1936. Before arriving in Finland, Dunlop had hoped it would “be with your full approval that I introduce myself within your jurisdiction” and wished to meet him during the stay.²⁵⁶

The Finnish Ecumenical Council appeared strikingly out-of-date to Dunlop, who described it in his diary as “the committee of the all-but defunct World Alliance.”²⁵⁷ However, Dunlop was much impressed by Gulin, who gave him a magnificent welcome as the chairman:

I was greatly impressed with Gulin. I was hardly prepared for his obvious growth in spiritual stature. He was always attractive and striking, but now he is almost a Luther. I happened to grip his arm gently and was amazed at his physical strength. “Arms like steel” would be no exaggeration.²⁵⁸

Gulin’s warm, open and optimistic style won as many friends as it irritated others.

Dunlop gave a speech about the origin and growth of the Anglican Communion at the meeting. Himself of Scottish origin, he stressed the importance of the Scottish Episcopal Church in the formation of the overseas dioceses and the growth of Anglican Communion. Another theme of his speech was the ecumenical nature of Anglicanism, which was later described in both *Kotimaa* and *Hetättäjä*:

The Anglican Communion has quite a loose structure and unity. The actual uniting factor apart from common history and tradition is the Book of Common Prayer, which, however, is not exactly the same everywhere. The 39 Articles of the Anglican Church, the constitution, is not, for example, dogmatically on a par with the Augsburg Confession in the Lutheran world. Indeed, the Bishop remarked that his church lacks a real common confession. However, it has a strong Ecumenical ethos, as it has been and still is one of the pillars of the Ecumenical Movement, as Bishop Gulin remarked in his reply. The Ecumenical ethos of the Anglican Church was well expressed by the Bishop of Jarrow at the end of his speech when he said that “The Church of Christ must have both visible and invisible unity.”²⁵⁹

²⁵⁶ KA EG 23 Dunlop to Gulin 7.9.1948.

²⁵⁷ Dunlop’s Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁵⁸ Dunlop’s Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁵⁹ *Kmaa* 78/1.10.1948 Anglikaaninen kirkko voimakkaasti yhteishenkinen; *Hjä* 40/1.10.1948 Anglikaanit kaikkialla maailmassa muodostavat kiinteän hengellisen yhteisön.

This was an unusually accurate summary of the confessional difference between Lutherans and Anglicans. The article's accuracy may have been connected with the fact that the meeting was attended by many of the leading ecumenists in Finland, including the new Anglican chaplain, who was able to compare and contrast the two traditions based on his own experience.

Dunlop shared lunch with the head of the British Council, Dr. Grundy, the Roman Catholic Apostolic Delegate in Finland, Bishop Gulielmus Cobben, and the Chaplain General of the Finnish Forces, the Rev. Johannes Björklund. During lunch Dunlop discovered that the Chaplain General was called in Finnish 'Field Bishop', although he was not a bishop in the theological sense having not been consecrated. This was bound to raise concern among Anglicans. The matter was hardly made easier by the fact that the Chaplain General spoke no English, and relied on his wife to interpret for him. The Apostolic Delegate, however, "a sprightly Dutchman", whom Dunlop liked very much, "spoke every language there is".²⁶⁰

The day was full of meetings and continued with a reception, at which Dunlop met members of the English congregation, and a dinner hosted by the British Military Attaché, J.H. Magill. At dinner, Dunlop met the Finnish Foreign Minister, Mr. Enckell, with whom he had a long discussion. Enckell told Dunlop the story of his life: he had been a cadet in the Russian Imperial Guard, and a Finnish representative in St Petersburg during the Revolution who had negotiated with Lenin. Now he had to negotiate with Stalin in Moscow. Dunlop confessed to having missed a good deal of what he had said: "I wish he had spoken more clearly, that I were not so deaf and that the others had not talked so loud, for I would have liked to have heard all he said."²⁶¹

Dunlop concluded his stay in Helsinki by celebrating the Michaelmas Eucharist at the English Church on Wednesday 29 September. Helsinki had offered this Church of England visitor an international, political and ecumenical experience he was unlikely to forget. Contacts with the Finnish Church had been limited, the emphasis having been on the life of the Anglican chaplaincy and the diplomatic community. In any case, Gulin, though friendly, was not as deeply interested in or impressed by the Anglicans as Lehtonen. Helsinki and Turku differed greatly in this respect.

²⁶⁰ Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁶¹ Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

c. Dunlop's introduction to the Finnish high church tradition

On his arrival in Turku, Dunlop went straight to pay his respects to Lehtonen. Unlike Hunter, Dunlop was not invited to stay at the Archbishop's House, but was accommodated at a hotel. It is likely that there were so many guests for the celebrations that the Archbishop was unable to accommodate them. Lehtonen made a good first impression on Dunlop, who noted in his diary that the Archbishop had great charm and that "a delightful atmosphere pervades in his house."²⁶² Lehtonen reminded Dunlop of a Nordic Adam Fox, a member of the Inklings literary group and a former Dean of Divinity and Professor of Poetry at Oxford University.²⁶³

On his first night in Turku, the Rev. Samuel Lehtonen took Dunlop to supper with "Herr Winter, the Secretary of the Bible Society, whom [Dunlop] did not specially like."²⁶⁴ Dunlop's diary gives no explanation for his dislike, but Winter's title suggests that he was too Germanic for the bishop's liking. It seems that Winter's time in England as a guest of the CRE could not overcome Dunlop's prejudice.

Any suspicion of too German an influence on the Finnish Church must have been dispelled the following day, when he was shown the cathedral and taken around the parishes of Turku "in a vast Buick which somehow or other was driven by a vast bull-necked policeman."²⁶⁵ Lehtonen clearly wanted to look after his English guest well.

Dunlop's excursion into the Finnish countryside afforded new surprises:

It was a glorious afternoon of autumn sunshine and the country looked superb. In one vicarage we entered, a prie-dieu in the study carried an open English bible with a rosary! The churches are all of granite stones heaped up haphazard but all flushed to a uniform surface. Very large stones are used. Inside they are plastered and lime-washed though often there is open brick-work in the arches and windows. The ceilings were lightly painted with graceful designs. Glass or brass candelabra hung in the naves. In St Catherine's church was a mediaeval sanctus bell in a miniature wooden steeple, now hung outside the sacristy door. In the Brigittine church at Naantali was a reconstructed Sacrament house with iron grilles. In this same church were a number of portable hatchments, hung on the walls. They belonged to noble families and were used in funeral processions. A fine carved head of our Lord (from the Middle Ages) was placed at the west end under a carved triptych.

²⁶² Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁶³ Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁶⁴ Dunlop's Diary 29.9.1948.

²⁶⁵ Dunlop's Diary 30.9.1948.

In the parsonage at Raisio I was shown one of the few existing copies of Missale Aboensis (late XV or early XVI century) printed at Lübeck and a fine example of printing in Black Letter. It is in beautiful condition and seemed complete. The calendar was interesting – not too many saints – and included St Henry on 20th January, St Eric, St Olav. The feast of St Peter's Chair was in Feb: the rite is that of the Dominicans.

At the most distant of the churches was an ancient shrine of St Henry which used to contain some relics of the saint. It is in shape like an altar tomb with a fine brass of the saint in full pontificals on the top. Round the sides the story of his life and of miracles after his death is done in small brasses in a most spirited manner.

The village of Naantali with its little wooden houses and charming little park and numerous birch trees is the nicest village I have seen outside England.²⁶⁶

Dunlop was impressed to find the medieval roots of Finnish Christianity intact in the Archdiocese of Turku. Lehtonen appears deliberately to have sought to draw attention to those roots, which while familiar for an Englishman were often a marginal feature of Finnish church life outside the Archdiocese.

Later the same day Dunlop was immersed even more deeply in Finnish culture, when he dined with the Rev. Martti Parvio, who took him to sauna afterwards. According to Dunlop, "the heat was terrific but the whole process leaves one with the impression that one has never been clean before."²⁶⁷ The experience was reinforced by Parvio, who "duly beat" Dunlop "with birch branches and it seemed just the right climax to 15 minutes sweating on top of the high bench. I was washed with loofah and soap by an old woman with incredible efficiency and then had a cold shower. A quiet lie down came next and then the old woman came and dried me with much smacking and slapping."²⁶⁸ Afterwards he felt like "a new man, as light as air."²⁶⁹

The following day Samuel Lehtonen took Dunlop to see Turku Castle and the craft museum, both of which he enjoyed. The bishop was then treated to strong tea, butter and marmalade at the Archbishop's house. Again a visitor was charmed by Lehtonen and his wife: Dunlop described

²⁶⁶ Dunlop's Diary 30.9.1948.

²⁶⁷ Dunlop's Diary 30.9.1948.

²⁶⁸ Dunlop's Diary 30.9.1948.

²⁶⁹ Dunlop's Diary 30.9.1948.

them as “irresistibly attractive. He is the incarnation of kindness, natural dignity and an impish humour.”²⁷⁰

After a couple of days of rest, the official ceremonies in connection with the Jubilee of the 400th anniversary of the first Finnish New Testament translated by Mikael Agricola began. Dunlop participated in the meeting of all the Bible Societies working in Finland at the Turku Chapter House on Friday 1 October. The meeting was attended by some fifty pastors, including Bishop von Bonsdorff of Porvoo.²⁷¹

Dunlop was introduced at the meeting by the Archbishop “with generous warmth” and interpreted by Samuel Lehtonen. He spoke about bible reading in England and especially the work of the Scripture Union, which aimed to revive a disappearing habit. The speech was later reported in *Kotimaa*, together with information about plans to establish a similar society in Finland. Lehtonen wanted the Agricola celebrations not only to commemorate the past but to prepare for the future.²⁷² Dunlop’s visit supported two causes close to his heart: the Bible and closer links with Anglicanism.

Dunlop thought the meeting “went over fairly well”.²⁷³ As the meeting coincided with the start of the Finnish Church Synod he had the opportunity to see something of that as well. He again met Bishop Gulin, who waved at him enthusiastically from his seat when he noticed him in the balcony.²⁷⁴ Gulin’s boyish charm and unconventional appearance made a positive impression on Dunlop.

Otherwise the possibility of socialising with Finnish clergy were hampered by the lack of a common language. Only two or three among the fifty clergy attending the Bible Societies’ meeting could speak English. These few, however, seemed glad to talk with the bishop over coffee following the meeting.²⁷⁵ Dunlop was not troubled by the difficulties in communication:

²⁷⁰ Dunlop’s Diary 1.10.1948.

²⁷¹ Dunlop’s Diary 1.10.1948; *Hjä* 40/1.10.1948 Agricolajuhlassa arvokas ohjelma; *Kmaa* 80/5.10.1948 Meillä on liian vähän Raamatun lukijoita.

²⁷² Dunlop’s Diary 1.10.1948; *Kmaa* 80/5.10.1948 Meillä on liian vähän Raamatun lukijoita.

²⁷³ Dunlop’s Diary 1.10.1948.

²⁷⁴ Dunlop’s Diary 1.10.1948.

²⁷⁵ Dunlop’s Diary 1.10.1948.

What a fine people the Finns are. The men finely built, manly, solemn dignity: the waitresses, unmade-up and ladylike in dark coats and skirts and white blouses. If only Mary could be here to enjoy it all too.²⁷⁶

Personality and context were everything. Whereas Waddams had been lonely and irritated in December 1944, Dunlop approached everything with an open mind and greatly enjoyed himself.

The celebrations proper began on Saturday 2 October. Besides Dunlop, guests had been invited from the Nordic Lutheran Churches of Denmark, Norway and Sweden and the American and German Lutheran Churches. They met each other for the first time at lunch at the Hotel Seurahuone, where they were staying. After lunch they were taken to see the cathedral and the chapter house. There was a reception at the Archbishop's House, which Dunlop again enjoyed greatly:

A marvellous reception at the Archbishop's house with coffee and cream cakes - all most friendly. It does you good just to stand in the same room as a group of Finnish pastors - fine husky fellows, big in body, mind and spirit, open-hearted and courteous.²⁷⁷

Lehtonen could hardly have hoped to make a better impression.

Dunlop noticed that there seemed to be no one from Denmark, although the Bishop of Copenhagen had been expected. Those who were present were the Rt Rev. Eivind Berggrav, Bishop of Oslo, the Rt Rev. B. Jonzon, Bishop of Luleå, Sweden, the Very Rev. Dr. A. Haapanen, President of the Suomi-Synod, USA, Dr. S.C. Michelfelder from the Lutheran World Federation, Dr. S.E. Engstrom from Lutheran World Action and the Rev. G. Sentzke, Rector of the German congregation in Helsinki.²⁷⁸ The guests represented well the priority given by Lehtonen to ecumenical relations: the Finnish Church's closest links were with the Nordic Lutheran Churches, the American Lutherans and the Church of England, whereas the situation with the German Lutherans was very unclear in the aftermath of the war.

Of these visitors it was perhaps the pipe-smoking Bishop Berggrav who impressed Dunlop the most. They sat next to each other at lunch, where Berggrav spoke of having introduced Bell to Churchill in 1945. Dunlop, naturally aware of the tension between the two, asked whether Berggrav

²⁷⁶ Dunlop's Diary 1.10.1948.

²⁷⁷ Dunlop's Diary 2.10.1948.

²⁷⁸ Dunlop's Diary 2.10.1948; *Kmaa* 80/5.10.1948 Jumalan sana ollut voima ja innoittaja kansamme vaiheissa läpi vuosisatojen.

liked Churchill, to which Berggrav turned to him in blank surprise and replied that of course he did.²⁷⁹ Dunlop was left bemused that although he was a close friend of Bell, Berggrav saw no contradiction between his friendship with the Bishop of Chichester and his unreserved admiration for the wartime Prime Minister.

The day ended with compline from the Mikael Agricola Prayer Book at the cathedral with “an immense congregation” and a sermon by Bishop Salomies of Mikkeli. This was the first time compline with words and music from the sixteenth century had been used in modern times.²⁸⁰ Dunlop considered this “an inspiring occasion” and was awed by the congregational singing. Though new to everyone, the congregation sang the medieval plain-song tunes in Finnish, which Dunlop joined in in English.²⁸¹ The service was part of an attempt by Lehtonen to revive the hours in modern Finnish church life. Dunlop’s own tradition meant he felt very much at home.

The next day began with the Sunday service for St Michael and All Angels at the cathedral. Dunlop noted that whereas the Church of England observed Michaelmas on its traditional date, 29 September, the Finnish Church had transferred it to the following Sunday. Dunlop had a keen eye for detail, noting similarities and differences in church customs:

Nobody in Finland bows to the altar on entering a church but there is universal mutual bowing between persons. When a pastor enters the vestry of a church he stands for a moment in prayer, his face turned to the wall. In Åbo [Turku] cathedral the Bishops attending a service do not robe or sit in prominent seats. The bishops occupy three rows of pews near the pulpit in the nave and sit in their suits and overcoats. The front of these three rows is reserved for the Archbishop and his family. During those parts of the service in which he was not officially occupied, the Abp mouched about the cathedral unattended and unobserved. There are no attendants, no pokers. Everyone sits for hymns unless they happen to be special acts of praise. Everyone stands when the Bible is read – even for a short text. They stand for the Epistle at Mass. At all services I attended in the Cathedral four lighted candles burned on the High Altar, two tall and two shorter. Altar frontals seem universal. The clergy at the altar – and services are only conducted from the altar, even Compline – face the people nearly all the time e.g. for the Nicene creed. The collects were said at the altar (even declaimed) but the responding Amen was sung. At the High Mass (without Communion) three priests all in full Gothic white chasubles stood at

²⁷⁹ Dunlop’s Diary 2.10.1948.

²⁸⁰ Dunlop’s Diary 2.10.1948; *Hjä* 40/1.10.1948 Agricolajuhlassa arvokas ohjelma; *Kmaa* 80/5.10.1948 Jumalan sana ollut voima ja innoittaja kansamme vaiheissa läpi vuosisatojen; Yöluku 1947.

²⁸¹ Dunlop’s Diary 2.10.1948.

the altar. After the sermon (which followed the Creed – there was no Gospel today) the Bishops and visiting representatives of other churches left their seats in the nave and robed in the sacristy. The Finnish bishops vested in alb and cope: they each held their crozier. Visiting priests and other Finnish priests in the procession wore chasubles – some wore very short albs revealing at least 18" of trousers. The two American (non-episcopal) Lutheran visitors wore albs and stoles (worn straight) of different colours. I wore rochet, stole and cope and carried my mitre. The Abp said his people were very like Ulster Protestants!²⁸²

If some of the church customs were a little alien to Dunlop, he witnessed nothing in Finnish liturgical life that struck him as Ulster Protestant. Dunlop may not have realised that the Archbishop's point referred more to the piety of the people and the underlying pietistic ethos than to outward vestures and customs, which most Ulster Protestants would have found very catholic.

However, Dunlop did find one profound difference in the ethos of Finnish Lutheranism from his own tradition:

Nothing can describe adequately the magnificent congregational singing. It is in effect their sacrament. I was quite stunned with its majesty. Voices rose full-throated, passionate, ecstatic, wholly un-self-conscious in their superb modal melodies. I have always admired German congregational singing, but the Finnish singing knocks it right out of the running. The tones and overtones of it all are running in my head as I write. We disperse and evenly distribute our worship in every direction. They concentrate it all in their hymn singing. Bishops may converse during the prayers and nudge one another in sermon and collect, but in the singing everybody is all out in the act of praise. It seems an inseparable and indivisible element in Lutheranism.

I always feel with Lutherans in the Nordic countries that their traditions are greater than they know. I have never felt it more than here. They cannot analyse their inheritance. If one judged them by their words and description of themselves one would very much misjudge and underrate the glory of their traditions and church ethos.²⁸³

This is something only an outsider would remark, as one's own tradition is always so very difficult to discern and communicate to an outsider. However, it is an indication of Dunlop's sympathetic approach to Finnish and Nordic Lutheranism that he was able to analyse it on its own terms rather than by forcing alien categories upon it.

However friendly his reception, Dunlop's experience was not entirely positive. In the afternoon there was a service of greetings which took some

²⁸² Dunlop's Diary 3.10.1948.

²⁸³ Dunlop's Diary 3.10.1948.

two and a half hours. It began with a lecture on Mikael Agricola by Professor Puukko and continued with greetings: people queued to be greeted by the Archbishop, who gave a little speech to each of approximately five minutes. Poor Dunlop understood nothing until he reached the Archbishop who greeted him with a reference to St Henry. Dunlop's reply was translated by Samuel Lehtonen:

I reminded them of the vision in Revelation – the true heavenly setting of the Church as lamps in heaven and pictured our mutual greeting on earth being confirmed by greetings between the angels of the churches above. The high church people liked it: I doubt if the rest did. Gulin seemed a trifle disappointed. You can't tell with the Archbishop: he would give you the same amused and affectionate regard whatever you said.²⁸⁴

The high church people Dunlop referred to must have been the young clergymen like the Samuel Lehtonen and Martti Parvio, who had entertained him before the celebrations. Dunlop's take on the reactions of Gulin and Lehtonen to his speech reflects his analysis of the tiny high church group in the Finnish Church. Gulin was definitely not a high churchman, nor was he greatly impressed by Dunlop's greeting, whereas Lehtonen's stance was always more difficult to determine, as he kept his private feelings very much to himself, unlike his more voluble brother bishop, Gulin.

It is also possible that Dunlop interpreted the reaction to his speech wrongly and that it had nothing to do with churchmanship. Dunlop's speech was later printed in full in *Kotimaa*, which had no high church sympathies.²⁸⁵ However, Dunlop's analysis reveals that he was aware of divisions between the tiny high church group and the others. For example, he recorded in his diary that the Theological Faculty in Helsinki was opposed to the liturgical movement.²⁸⁶ Dunlop's friendly reception by the members of this movement in Turku appears to have made him well disposed towards them.

Apart from the public church occasions there were two great banquets attended by all the distinguished guests. The first was a lunch hosted by the Turku City Council. The foreign guests were presented to the President of the Republic, whom Dunlop describes vividly in his diary. He considered the President "astoundingly ugly" though one was "aware of his quiet power

²⁸⁴ Dunlop's Diary 3.10.1948.

²⁸⁵ *Kotimaa* 80/5.10.1948 Kirkko on lamppu Jumalan edessä.

²⁸⁶ Dunlop's Diary 5.10.1948.

and intelligence -- in quite new and unusual ways". Finnish relations with the Soviet Union were constantly on Dunlop's mind and he recorded that it was said that Stalin's regard for Paasikivi explained his 'gentleness' with Finland; he also wondered whether Stalin's respect for the Finnish army had an equal say in the matter.²⁸⁷

At lunch, Dunlop was seated between the Minister of Justice and the President of the Turku bench. The Minister, who spoke English quite well, told Dunlop of having been in a delegation to the Soviet Union in February, and agreed with Foreign Minister Enckell's description of Stalin as "personally attractive, very well informed, and amusing."²⁸⁸ Dunlop was very much interested in issues related to the Soviet Union, and his sympathies were clearly on the Finnish side.

The day ended with dinner for the distinguished guests, the foreign visitors and senior Finnish politicians including the President, several members of the government and the Speaker of the Parliament, at the Archbishop's House. Dunlop described the event as:

-- a blend between extreme stateliness and decorative formality on the one hand and an informal intimacy, wholly unthinkable in English dinner parties, on the other. Nearly all the guests wore decorations and many of them. Jonzon, the Swedish bishop, looked like some ancient portrait of royalty or a famous general. The Finnish bishops had gay collars and stars and medals to a man. The laymen on the whole seemed to have fewer decorations -- all wore white waistcoats and tailcoats. I who up to now have felt almost overdressed, felt as if I had been dragged in from the highways and hedges.²⁸⁹

The nature of the festivities was hard for Dunlop to predict; he just needed to wait, see and adjust, which he managed to do apparently very well.

The programme included music and speeches, and a presentation of a medal commemorating Mikael Agricola to each foreign guest. Lehtonen gave a long speech "with some very nice things said about England." This was followed by a quiet, unemotional but emphatic speech by the President, in which he averred that as God had always upheld Finland in the past in unimaginable dangers, he could not be expected to desert her in the future however dark that might be. The speech was followed by the hymn "How

²⁸⁷ Dunlop's Diary 3.10.1948.

²⁸⁸ Dunlop's Diary 3.10.1948.

²⁸⁹ Dunlop's Diary 3.10.1948.

sweet the name of Jesus sounds". The dinner ended with another hymn and prayers in the Archbishop's private chapel.²⁹⁰ The mix of religion, politics and national feeling appears not to have bothered Dunlop.

On Monday Dunlop and the other foreign guests were entertained by Åbo Akademi University, the Swedish Theological Faculty in Turku, whose professors he had already met. Dunlop spoke shortly after the host's welcome words about the difficulty the English had in understanding Lutheranism because of their history. However, he found the experience of Lutheran worship a considerable help in this regard. Dunlop emphasized that they were determined to understand and valued the contacts they had with the Nordic Lutheran Churches, and hoped thereby for the enrichment of their own faith.²⁹¹ Dunlop's speech was very much what Lehtonen hoped for, as it pointed towards an ever greater communion in faith.

Dunlop was then taken to see some examples of modern Finnish church life like the new St Martin's church and the City Cemetary. Finally in the evening he visited Samuel Lehtonen's home, which he found "excellently built and planned" "a sort of 'church plant'" with mission church, kindergarten, club rooms and sauna. They had "a pleasant tea and much talk" and were later joined by Martti Parvio, who went through a number of English and Finnish hymns with the bishop, some of which he copied for his own use. The evening ended with compline in English.²⁹²

The fact that the two were high churchmen was no coincidence. This was confirmed the following day by Archbishop Lehtonen, who had a private discussion with Dunlop after he had lunched with the Archbishop's family. Dunlop recorded that Lehtonen hoped:

that contact with the CofE [would] help them to deepen their liturgical movement which he says is gaining strength. Like ours in its earlier stages this movement seeks to make the Church true to its earlier, post-reformation traditions which have become obscured and neglected. Even reciting the Creed is a novelty with them, though it is part of their rite. He spoke of their own "pietistic" movements (of more than one kind) with great pride. All these movements remain within the national churches, subject to its bishops. One of them insists on praying on the knees, instead of sitting, and is said to have some historical continuity with ancient Franciscan

²⁹⁰ Dunlop's Diary 3.10.1948.

²⁹¹ Dunlop's Diary 5.10.1948.

²⁹² Dunlop's Diary 5.10.1948.

influence. Another, in the North, specialises in mutual confession of sin: it has no connection with Buchmanism!²⁹³

The link between relations with the Church of England and the fostering of a liturgical movement in the Church of Finland was key to Lehtonen's thoughts and actions. This was another factor contributing to the handling of all Anglican relations by the Archbishop and the young high church clergy he supported. Lehtonen was, however, never a full-blooded party-man as is seen in his love of the pietistic revival movements. He wanted to cherish all these traditions in the one folk church, while supporting their medieval and primitive Christian roots.

Dunlop left Finland on Tuesday 5 October. It remained to be seen how his visit would benefit the relations between the churches. In Finland the visit was well appreciated and much followed by the church press. Dunlop himself felt he had made many friends, including the Bishop of Kuopio with whom he had had a lively conversation in German by merely replying "ja" and "so" in appropriate places, missing much of what was actually being said. There were also some difficulties in communication with the Archbishop: Dunlop confesses in his diary of being "so charmed with the Archbishop as a person that I often miss a great deal that he says."²⁹⁴ For all the communication problems, however, Dunlop succeeded in making a deep and accurate analysis of Finnish church life.

d. The CFR perspective

On his return to England, Dunlop reported to the CFR. The report summarised the schedule and gave a good indication of his interests. Dunlop began with his experience in Helsinki, giving special emphasis to the Anglican chaplaincy. He was full of praise for the new chaplain, the Rev. Sydney Linton. Linton was "just the kind of chaplain the recent Lambeth Conference hopes will become the general rule."²⁹⁵ He had already made his mark both with the Finns and the British, and the bishop thought he would be "a very valuable agent of the Church of England both as pastor of the English

²⁹³ Dunlop's Diary 5.10.1948.

²⁹⁴ Dunlop's Diary 5.10.1948.

²⁹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Report of a visit to Finland. Colin Jarrow 8.10.1948, 1.

congregation and community, and as a liaison with the Finnish Church.”²⁹⁶ The local Lutheran Bishop Gulin had a very high opinion of Linton, who spoke Swedish and was already acquiring a working knowledge of Finnish. Linton had also been able to prepare Dunlop to correct some common Finnish misconceptions of Anglicanism in his speech at the Finnish Ecumenical Council.²⁹⁷

Dunlop’s account of the rest of his time in Helsinki simply reported the main ecclesiastical events and people he had met, concentrating on the meeting of the Ecumenical Council and his meeting with the Orthodox Archbishop.²⁹⁸ Strikingly omitted was his contact with the political and diplomatic elite in Helsinki. Perhaps Dunlop considered this as having been purely social, and did not consider it relevant for the CFR.

In considering his time in Turku, Dunlop wrote of Lehtonen and his family:

I was received with the affectionate, quiet, welcome which any those who have met Dr Alekski Lehtonen can adequately realise. His love for the English Church is fervent & well informed; he has intimate knowledge of its history & personalities & a deep desire for closer union. Under the guidance of his chaplain & oldest son, Samuel Lehtonen, I saw during my stay all the sights, ecclesiastical & otherwise of the ancient capital of Finland & its neighbourhood. Both he & a young Pastor, Martti Parvio, answered my endless questions & looked after me in every way during my visit. They are both enthusiastic members of the young but growing Liturgical Movement in the Finnish church which aims at restoring many of the Post-Reformation customs, traditions & church ways which have dropped out, who look very much towards the Anglican church, of which they have first-hand experience in England. (The Helsinki theological faculty is said to be hostile to this movement).²⁹⁹

Lehtonen’s love for and knowledge of the Church of England were connected in Dunlop’s analysis with the efforts of “the young but growing Liturgical Movement in the Finnish church”. The Archbishop had, after all, entrusted the visitor to the care of his son, a member of that movement. In the eyes of the Church of England, the desire for closer union with the Church of England and the restoration of liturgical customs, belonged together and were embodied by the family of Archbishop Lehtonen.

²⁹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Report of a visit to Finland. Colin Jarrow 8.10.1948, 1.

²⁹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Report of a visit to Finland. Colin Jarrow 8.10.1948, 1.

²⁹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Report of a visit to Finland. Colin Jarrow 8.10.1948, 1.

²⁹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Report of a visit to Finland. Colin Jarrow 8.10.1948, 1.

The four hundredth anniversary of the translation of the New Testament into Finnish by Mikael Agricola had given Dunlop the opportunity to speak about Bible work in England. Dunlop noted that the fact that the celebration coincided with the Finnish Church Assembly meeting in Turku made it possible to meet bishops and a representative gathering of pastors from all over the country. Dunlop also reported having met representatives of other churches close to the Finnish Church. He noted the high state representation at the celebrations, including as it had President Paasikivi, and spoke glowingly of the greeting given to him by the Archbishop at the celebrations.³⁰⁰

Dunlop's report was positive. He had greatly enjoyed his stay, and noted that people had spoken with gratitude and appreciation of the previous visit by the Bishop of Sheffield and Canon Richardson. His report concluded:

Throughout the visit I was struck with the spirit of hopeful fortitude & calm trust in God which animates the Finnish people. The enterprise & determination with which they are shouldering their reparations burden so successfully is well known. The Finnish Church must be largely responsible for this prevailing mood: when you see an assembly of Finnish pastors & layman & note their magnificent physique, their intelligent, spiritual faces you are not surprised that the Church they represent is the soul of a truly virile nation.³⁰¹

Dunlop's tone differed greatly from Waddams' just four years earlier.

The report was dated 10 October, although Dunlop sent it to Waddams some two weeks later. Perhaps the intervening time had given him a chance to reflect further on his experience and he wanted to amend his original report, echoing what Bishop Hunter had said earlier: "I agree with the Bishop of Sheffield that steps for securing closer relations, on an official basis, with the Church of Finland should not be delayed." Dunlop realised, however that:

--Abp Lehtonen will not live for ever & I cannot imagine which of the existing bishops could adequately carry on his pro-Anglican work. I don't think any of them are against us - far from it - but they have not the same eagerness which is necessary in the early stages.³⁰²

In spite of Dunlop's positive Finnish experience, he understood that Finnish enthusiasm for the furtherance of relations with the Church of England

³⁰⁰ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Report of a visit to Finland. Colin Jarrow 8.10.1948, 4-5.

³⁰¹ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Report of a visit to Finland. Colin Jarrow 8.10.1948, 5-6.

³⁰² LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Dunlop to Waddams 26.10.1948.

rested almost entirely on the shoulders of Archbishop Lehtonen. If progress were to be made, action was needed while Lehtonen was still alive. This point was underscored by the observation of both Dunlop and Hunter that Lehtonen's health had become a concern.

The response of the Council on Foreign Relations was very practical. Waddams took Dunlop's suggestion on board, and said he was very much in favour of achieving something solid with the Church of Finland, but he wanted to clarify what Dunlop meant by "securing closer relations on an official basis". While Lehtonen's friendliness should be used, Waddams did not know what could be done. The next stage would have been an agreement to establish full intercommunion, but that he did not consider possible as long as all the Finnish bishops were not in the apostolic succession and a substantial number of clergy ordained outside the succession. Moreover, the new discussions with the Churches of Norway, Denmark and Iceland suggested to Waddams that "it would be better to try to get the whole Scandinavian position more or less in line, and not to push ahead with the Finnish question for the moment."³⁰³

It is thus clear that the CFR under the guidance of Waddams and Bell did not share Lehtonen's vision of using the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland as a forerunner in relations with the other Nordic Churches. The Finnish case was left to "mature". Waddams wanted to address the Nordic Churches as a bloc, even if this went against the explicit wishes of the Nordic Bishops present at the Lambeth Conference.

This proved enough for Dunlop, who acknowledged that it would be better not to include the proposed additional final sentence as little could be done in practical terms before the apostolic succession had 'percolated' the Finnish Church. Dunlop had had in mind, among other things, the strengthening of ties through the encouragement of mutual participation in episcopal consecrations. However, he did not want to add anything that might be misinterpreted as leading to full intercommunion before the prerequisite conditions of the apostolic succession had been met.³⁰⁴

Dunlop's visit thus served to strengthen the ecumenical status quo. The Church of England would take no action before the apostolic succession had 'percolated' the Finnish Church. This, however, was never explicitly communicated to Lehtonen, whose time was already running short.

³⁰³ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Waddams to Dunlop 27.10.1948.

³⁰⁴ LPL CFR LR file 31/5 Dunlop to Waddams 29.10.1948.

e. The inter-consecration of Bishops revisited

However, Dunlop's suggestion on achieving something practical with the Finnish Church did have a somewhat unexpected outcome. It sparked a discussion at the Lutheran and Reformed Committee of the CFR about the proposal that had come out of the negotiations of the 1930s supporting the inter-consecration of the bishops. Surprisingly, the committee decided to recommend caution in sending an English bishop to a Finnish consecration. As the Rev. Dr. C.B. Moss, a committee member and the founder of the circle praying for Finland, was not sure whether he could attend the forthcoming council meeting he explained his view in a letter to the Rev. Dr. G.L. Prestige, the Acting General Secretary of the CFR while Waddams was away.³⁰⁵

According to Moss there were good reasons why the recommendation to invite bishops to take part in episcopal consecrations should not be acted upon. There were two reasons for this: first, it would irritate the Orthodox; second it would probably serve only to complicate the Finns' relationship with the Soviet Union.³⁰⁶

Moss admitted he had not before realized that for the Orthodox the inter-consecration of the bishops was the final mark of full communion. He reasoned that sending an Anglican bishop would gain nothing essential in regard to the apostolic succession, as the Finnish succession had already been restored by the Swedes, but would harm Orthodox relations:

If we join into the consecration of Finnish bishops, nothing will persuade the Orthodox that we are not in full communion with the Church of Finland. And this would be disastrous: because we are not in full communion, & there are good reasons why, at present, we cannot be. We should be putting an obstacle in the way of union with the Orthodox, and getting nothing for it.³⁰⁷

He did not want to be guided only by the Orthodox opinion, but thought inter-consecration at the moment quite unnecessary.³⁰⁸

Moss considered the other argument concerning Fenno-Soviet relations less important, yet he felt it was important enough to be borne in mind. He

³⁰⁵ LPL CFR LR file 27 Moss to Prestige 23.2.1949.

³⁰⁶ LPL CFR LR file 27 Moss to Prestige 23.2.1949.

³⁰⁷ LPL CFR LR file 27 Moss to Prestige 23.2.1949.

³⁰⁸ LPL CFR LR file 27 Moss to Prestige 23.2.1949.

was afraid that the Soviet Union would use the participation of an English bishop at a Finnish consecration as an excuse to remonstrate:

They always think English ecclesiastics have more political importance than they really have. Such an event, highly publicized all over the world as it would be might bring our Finnish friends into serious danger.³⁰⁹

In the early Cold War world the position of Finland seemed too precarious for the Church of England ecumenists to interfere with it.

There was also a third point in Moss' argument, which came as an afterthought. He gathered "that some circles in the Church of Finland" were "not keen on closer relations with us." It might in any case therefore be impolitic to proceed at the moment.³¹⁰ Perhaps Moss' Finnish contacts led him to realise that the positive influence of Lehtonen did not extend to the whole Finnish Church. Moss claimed to be "heartily pro-Finn" and that this was indeed acknowledged by Lehtonen.³¹¹ This was also well known at the CFR, which gave weight to his suggestion.

The matter was debated at the following CFR Council meeting on Friday 25 February 1949. The council's decision confirmed the approved practice:

The Chairman (of the Lutheran and Reformed Committee) said that the Committee had received Council Minute 808.(c). and though unable, owing to present circumstances to recommend the immediate participation of the English episcopate in Finnish consecrations, advised that if the Archbishop of Finland should invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to commission a bishop to take part, the invitation should be accepted.³¹²

This minute summarizes the CFR policy towards the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland in the post-war years: the CFR would respond positively to Finnish initiatives but was not proactive in furthering relations.

Something of Moss' caution lingered even though his main motivation, concern for good relations with the Orthodox, was completely neglected. Discussion continued during the following months with even some Finnish involvement. Harland of the CRE, who had been asked by the CFR to

³⁰⁹ LPL CFR LR file 27 Moss to Prestige 23.2.1949.

³¹⁰ LPL CFR LR file 27 Moss to Prestige 23.2.1949.

³¹¹ LPL CFR LR file 27 Moss to Prestige 23.2.1949.

³¹² LPL CFR LR file 27 Note to the Archbishop 2.3.1949.

prepare a statement on the matter, had discussed inter-consecrations with Bishop Gulin at a reconstruction meeting in Geneva. Gulin must have found the English caution quite unnecessary and Harland promised to take the matter up with the Dean of Chichester. He was glad to have Gulin's opinion though he also wanted to know what Archbishop Lehtonen would think of it.³¹³

It is hard to establish whether Harland got Lehtonen's view or not. Lehtonen's lack of involvement in the discussion suggests that his health had already started to fail. From the Finnish perspective the Church of England's political caution must have appeared incomprehensible: the rationale of Lehtonen in all his ecumenical endeavours from before the war had been to strengthen relations with the western churches in order to safeguard western democratic society and freedom of religion in Finland. Furthermore, the Soviet threat to Finland was at its lowest since the beginning of the war. The danger of occupation had ceased and the society enjoyed the normal western political and academic freedoms.³¹⁴

There seems to have been further confusion on the English side. Talk of inter-consecrations naturally opened up the possibility of Finnish bishops taking part in Church of England consecrations. It seems that only a very few figures like Waddams had realized that this was a question which the Canterbury Convocations had left open. In Waddams' absence this possibility came up in Harland's discussions, even though it was not the matter the CFR had originally addressed. Thus, Prestige, the Acting General Secretary of the CFR, was compelled to emphasize to Harland that he had only enquired into the question of Finnish consecrations, not vice versa:

Nobody in this office was aware that anybody had in view the sending of a Finnish Bishop to take part in an English consecration. We all understood that the matter under discussion was simply the repetition of what had already taken place, namely, the participation of an English Bishop in some future Finnish consecration. If, however, it is desirable, as it may well be, to raise the question of inviting a Finnish Bishop over to England, your line is to write me a note to that effect, saying that so far as you know Finnish opinion is strongly in favour and feels no political or other difficulty, and then we can put it on the agenda for the next Lutheran and Reformed Committee meeting.³¹⁵

³¹³ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 5.4.1949.

³¹⁴ *Jutikkala* 2003, 466-467; *Pekkarinen* 2008, 46-48.

³¹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 27 Prestige to Harland 21.4.1949.

Harland had complicated the matter by involving the Finns. Fearing an embarrassing situation, Prestige consulted Fisher informally in case he had any private views or information on the matter, and planned also to contact Pohjanpirkka, the Finnish Seamen's Pastor, for his view.³¹⁶

Fisher's view was clear. He had not discussed the matter with Lehtonen, but had checked "that while there was joint agreement to the plan of sending an English Bishop to join in consecrating a Finn, the Lower House somewhat pointedly ignored the suggestion of inviting a Finnish Bishop to take part in an English consecration."³¹⁷ Neither did Fisher think it desirable to invite a Finnish Bishop to take part in an English consecration at the moment "in view of the present state of Russo-Finnish relations."³¹⁸ Prestige assured Harland that the Archbishop had "not the faintest objection to the plan in principle, and indeed would welcome to carry it out. But he thinks for the present that it is impolitic on the two grounds stated above."³¹⁹

This meant an end to discussion on inter-consecrations for the moment, and the Church of England now awaited a possible initiative from the Finnish Church. The matter was settled by Archbishop Fisher with little if any study of the political situation in Finland or consultation with Finnish church leaders. Fisher was familiar with the actual agreement and the decision of the convocations and felt no need to revise them. Politically, he was more willing to follow his gut instincts with regard to Finland than to pay attention to the Finnish interpretation that there was no real political or other difficulty in proceeding. This suggests that for Fisher Finland was beyond the Iron Curtain; the fact that it was not hardly mattered. The assumption would rule future policy towards Finland.

In Fisher's defence, it must be said that he was still quite new to ecumenical circles, and had more pressing matters to deal with. These included the transition from war to Cold War, with all the attendant ethical questions, such as the threat of nuclear warfare; the inauguration of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948 and the Lambeth Conference in the same year; the formation of the Church of South India; and the revi-

³¹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 27 Prestige to Harland 21.4.1949.

³¹⁷ LPL CFR LR file 27 Prestige to Harland 25.4.1949.

³¹⁸ LPL CFR LR file 27 Prestige to Harland 25.4.1949.

³¹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 27 Prestige to Harland 25.4.1949.

sion of the Canon Law of the Church of England.³²⁰ The Church of Finland could only be on the periphery of his day-to-day concerns, especially at the beginning of his archiepiscopate.

However, it is not impossible to interpret Archbishop Fisher's ecumenical initiatives more as practical responses to the changing ecumenical climate than as an outburst of personal enthusiasm for the actual implementation of the *oikoumene*. In a 1946 university sermon in Cambridge, Fisher, encouraged by the ecumenical development during and after the war, pleaded for the British Free Churches to re-institute the historic episcopate for the sake of unity, but offered very little in return: not reunion, but eucharistic hospitality. This stemmed from his desire to leave his own church unaltered.³²¹ This was in effect very much what the Church of England had achieved with the Finnish and Baltic Lutheran churches; but in the British context it led nowhere.

In the end, Fisher resembled more a reliable headmaster than an imaginative visionary.³²² It is thus no surprise that Fisher was no great enthusiast for the cause of real reunion with the Finnish Lutheran or any other church: his cause was more to maintain and preserve the Church of England as he had received it than to allow the change a real reunion would require.

Fisher's political perception of Finland was hardly unique, but a common misconception even among the informed in the west.³²³ A similar attitude was adopted, for instance, by the General Secretary of the United Bible Societies Olivier Beguin in his report *Four weeks behind the Iron Curtain*, which he wrote after visiting Finland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia in 1949. Beguin confessed having "hesitated before putting Finland behind the iron curtain since it is more like a no-man's-land between East and West, but for the sake of clarity and convenience, I have included her in this report with the other countries visited."³²⁴

Furthermore, Beguin did not believe in Finnish neutrality:

Although Finland is not actually behind the iron curtain and has made a remarkable recovery from the ravages of war, there is nevertheless a sense there of being very isolated and cut off from the rest of the world; and in fact contacts with the west,

³²⁰ *Carpenter* 1991; *Hastings* 1998, 381, 423, 436-437, 439.

³²¹ *Hastings* 1998, 449-450, 452-453, 466-469, 522-523.

³²² *Hastings* 1998, 449-450, 452-453, 466-469, 522-523.

³²³ The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000; *Pekkarinen* 2008, 46-48.

³²⁴ UL BSA D7/3/1 *Four weeks behind the Iron Curtain*, 1.

with the exception of Sweden, are rare. I noticed it more particularly in the difficulty which I had to maintain a direct conversation with the people to whom I was introduced. Everyone lamented the lack of opportunity for speaking the foreign languages which he had learnt at school and the fact that he had now forgotten them, and the visit of a foreigner such as myself, was greeted as a most unusual occasion.

It is difficult to forecast what is in store for Finland in the future; the shadow cast over the country by Russia is dark; according to the latest news, that shadow seems to be deepening and one cannot help wondering whether the assurance and the freedom which the Finns seem to show are not for the most part assumed and whether behind that appearance there is not hidden a profound anguish which no one is willing to admit. The people need the Bible, to draw from it comfort, hope and assurance. That is why the work of the Bible Society is so important and necessary; that is also why it is so important that she should have made good use of this time of respite afforded her and have become rooted in the life of the Church and the nation: come what may, we can hope that, even under more difficult circumstances, she will be able to continue her useful and beneficial work.³²⁵

Western church leaders found it hard to believe in the Finnish freedom or that it would last in the deepening Cold War world. Finland did not fit into their categories resulting in even greater anguish on its future than the Finns themselves showed.

4. The end of the ecumenical reconstruction era

a. The last long-term student

The sorely needed financial approval for the Finnish students to study at theological colleges in England came in the spring of 1948. The CRE awarded a grant to the Rev. Wilho Rinne to study for a year at St John's College, Durham, while the WCC would meet his travel costs.³²⁶ This was not the end of financial problems, which continued until Rinne commenced his studies, as the Church of England had no particular scheme for financing Finnish students: the scholarship was offered in response to the initiative of Lehtonen.³²⁷

Risto Lehtonen, however, had decided not to go, but to study his theology in Finland. He later explained that his decision was motivated by the

³²⁵ CUL BSA D7/3/1 Four weeks behind the Iron Curtain, 11-12.

³²⁶ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Fox to Findlow 24.8.1948.

³²⁷ The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

concern that there would be no way back to Lutheranism had he gone to England.³²⁸ Whether or not Risto's recollection is influenced by Rinne's subsequent career, Risto's decision says much about the perceived difference in ethos between the Anglican theological colleges and the Finnish theological faculties in the minds of informed and interested observers like him and Rinne. This is certainly reflected in their very different subsequent careers.

Rinne received news of the funding in the summer of 1948. He left Finland in early September, first attending a WSCF theological conference in Zeist in the Netherlands, then continuing to London, where he was offered much appreciated accommodation by the CFR.³²⁹ The early correspondence between Rinne and the Rev. John Findlow of CFR concerning the travel arrangements shows that Rinne was very capable of conversing with Church of England clerics, as his English was excellent and style appropriate.

Rinne remained in touch with Findlow, who found him interesting people to meet and places to visit during the vacations. Rinne returned to London for the Christmas break, staying at the Finnish Seamen's Church. Findlow had, however, been in touch and sent contact details of eight clergymen so that they could make arrangements to meet him and show him something of their ministry.³³⁰ Rinne managed to meet almost all the clergy, enjoying especially the company of the more catholic-minded. In his letter of thanks to Findlow, Rinne mentioned the dates of his Easter holidays.³³¹ He clearly looked forward to a similar opportunity then.

Rinne spent the Easter holidays in Westmoreland as the guest of local clergy. The holiday plans were very important, because he had to leave the college during the breaks and did not have many places to go. The associated travel costs were met by the CRE, which required thorough planning. The Lake District was especially appealing to Rinne, as its proximity meant cheaper travel expenses, affording him the possibility to buy some books he could not otherwise have afforded.³³² Rinne's holiday plans were approved.³³³ While in the Lake District he was able to preach and give talks about the Church of Finland on several occasions. After the holidays Rinne

³²⁸ Interview of the Revd Risto Lehtonen 2.9.2002.

³²⁹ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Findlow 31.8.1948, Findlow to Banfield 4.10.1948.

³³⁰ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Findlow to Hamilton 4.1.1948; Findlow to Rinne 5.1.1948.

³³¹ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Findlow 13.1.1948.

³³² LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Prestige 7.3.1949; Rinne to Prestige 10.3.1949.

³³³ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Prestige to Rinne 16.3.1949.

wrote to the CFR that he had had “a grand time” and that his “picture of the Church of England ha[d] again become a little more complete.”³³⁴

In addition to reporting to the CFR, Rinne also wrote articles for *Herättäjä* during his stay in England. These articles focused mainly on liturgical life. The first described the celebration of the Feast of the Patrons of Durham Cathedral and the Christmas celebrations; the second the Easter services.³³⁵ The articles gave detailed descriptions, but were neither polemical, nor sought to compare English with Finnish practice. Rinne’s somewhat romantic portrayal of the co-operation of the two churches is illustrated by his account of the Easter service in Sawrey:

The sunbeams reflecting from the silver communion vessels make the white altar linen with its crosses shine ever brighter, as the Anglican vicar of Sawrey assisted by a priest of the Finnish Church distributes Holy Communion to the parishioners kneeling at the altar rails. In the co-operation between two priests two historic Churches reach their hands towards each other: The Church of England and the Church of Finland, despite their differences, have very much in common in their tradition, even if they have not yet been able to attain full inter-communion.³³⁶

This raises an interesting question concerning orders. Did the agreement really allow for Lutheran priests to preside at Anglican altars?

Rinne had not actually read the 1930s agreement between the churches before leaving for England, but had been told by Archbishop Lehtonen that he could communicate while in England. The question of presiding arose during his visits to parishes, when he was often asked to celebrate by local Anglican priests. Wanting to know the exact state of relations, Rinne approached the local suffragan Bishop of Jarrow, Dunlop, who explained the present situation to him. As he had been ordained by the Bishop of Porvoo, von Bonsdorff, and was thus outside the succession, it would not be appropriate for him to preside at an Anglican Eucharist. Rinne therefore politely refused invitations to preside, and concentrated on preaching. Dunlop invited him to assist at the distribution of Holy Communion during his parish visits.³³⁷

³³⁴ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Prestige 21.4.1949.

³³⁵ *Hjä* 2/14.1.1949 Välähdyksiä Englannin kirkon elämästä; 14/29.4.1949 Pääsiäinen englantilaisessa maalaispitäjässä.

³³⁶ *Hjä* 14/29.4.1949 Pääsiäinen englantilaisessa maalaispitäjässä.

³³⁷ The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

Rinne clearly enjoyed his stay enormously, and missed no opportunity of seeing more of English church life. He was particularly attracted to Anglo-Catholicism, to an extent that caused some concern to his supervisors. In his report about the foreign theological students the Principal of St John's, the Rev. R.R. Williams wrote:

Rinne is a very pleasant member of our community and we like him very much. His actual subject of study is The Social Ethics of William Temple, but it does not seem to represent his main interest which lies in Liturgiology and Church Order. He does not seem very interested in finding out what the Church of England as a whole stands for and teaches, but attaches himself to one section of our Church in a rather unfortunate way. However we are doing what is necessary to put things right and ensure that he gets a broad and representative picture of the Church of England during his stay in this country.³³⁸

The Principal was looking for more than charm from his foreign students. He wanted them to get a real and comprehensive picture of his church.

St John's was a low to broad church college, so Rinne was in fact gaining a wider experience than was suggested. Williams was a moderate man, and allowed him to take part in services at the nearby Anglo-Catholic college of St Chad's with the proviso that he would not take anyone else with him.³³⁹ Rinne's high church inclinations were also revealed by his choice of places to visit during the vacations. When arranging his Easter holidays, Rinne reminded the Rev. Dr. G.L. Prestige, who had taken over Findlow's position at the CFR, that Findlow had once mentioned the possibility of spending a week at the House of the Society of the Sacred Mission (SSM) in Kelham. Rinne explained that it made no difference whether he spent some time there at Easter or in the summer before returning to Finland.³⁴⁰ However, the letter reveals his deep desire to visit Kelham and experience an Anglican religious community training men to give their lives to the divine service, to missionary work at home and abroad and to the study of theology.³⁴¹ Rinne got his wish in the summer.³⁴²

³³⁸ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Reports on Theological Students Received from College Principals - January 1949. (Through C.R.E.) Extract.

³³⁹ The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

³⁴⁰ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Prestige 7.3.1949.

³⁴¹ <http://clutch.open.ac.uk/schools/willen99/w_religion/ssm/ssm_home.html>

³⁴² LPL CFR LR file 30/7 The Guestmaster of SSM to Prestige 17.3.1949.

The sending of Rinne to various places during his holidays seemed a good way to broaden his understanding of Anglicanism. At the end of his studies it was possible for the Principal of St John's to report to the CFR:

I have no hesitation in saying that the Rev. W.R. Rinne profited by his time here and also made a real contribution to the life of the College. We all learned a great deal from him about the Church of Finland and its outlook on liturgical and theological matters. Personally he was very popular and some lasting friendships have been made. It took him some time to realise that the Church of England was not uniformly of the ecclesiastical colour which he had hoped and believed it to be but every effort was made to give him a comprehensive view of the Church of England during his three terms.

He engaged on special work on the social teaching of William Temple. I think this acted as a useful focus for his reading but his real interests were liturgical rather than sociological.³⁴³

Rinne was originally encouraged to study Temple by the Rev. Canon Michael Ramsey of Durham University.³⁴⁴ Implausible as it might appear, this unconsciously followed Waddams' suggestion, broadcast to Finland in February 1945, that the Finns should translate and study the thoughts of Temple from the original sources.³⁴⁵ Perhaps Rinne was seen as capable and willing enough to undertake the task, even if his personal interests lay elsewhere.

Rinne left England in July 1949. He tried to contact Prestige of the CFR to thank him and to ask for a certificate confirming that he had studied in England under the CFR's aegis. However unusual the request may have seemed to the CFR, a certificate would be useful for a Finnish student to present at his own university. Rinne did not manage to speak with Prestige, but was able to contact Colonel Barron, who was left with the impression that he was "very grateful to everyone in this country."³⁴⁶

The impression was confirmed by Rinne's letter of thanks to Prestige from Finland:

I feel most grateful for the whole time, for all the help and kindness which made such a happy time of my year at St. John's College in Durham. And it was a very

³⁴³ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Williams to MacCartney 12.10.1949.

³⁴⁴ The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

³⁴⁵ *Kmaa* 13/16.2.1945 Englantilainen saanut voimakkaan vaikutuksen suomalaisten rohkeudesta.

³⁴⁶ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Barron to Prestige 11.7.1949.

useful year from the point of view of my study on William Temple and of my interest in Anglican church life in general. I hope now that also I can contribute - at least a little - to ever better and closer relations between the Church of England and the Church of Finland.

St. John's Staff were very helpful and kind to me. Besides, I must mention Canon Ramsey who took a personal interest in my study and gave me good advice. I'll miss Durham and England very much indeed.³⁴⁷

Rinne greatly appreciated everything he had learned, but especially the help of Michael Ramsey. He had already earlier written to the CFR about Ramsey's kind personal guidance in his study on William Temple and that he hoped that his knowledge of Anglican church life in general had thus grown.³⁴⁸ Rinne had been taught by one of the foremost Anglican theologians of the age.

Finnish church people benefited from Rinne's new knowledge in the interviews he gave to *Herättäjä* and *Församlingsbladet* on his return. In these interviews, Rinne described the Church of England working hard for the unity of the Church both at home and abroad. In *Församlingsbladet*, he described the Church of England's worldwide ecumenical endeavour as its particular charisma. Rinne mentioned the agreements the Church of England had with the Lutheran Churches of Sweden and Finland, and expressed the hope that the newly established committee would reach a similar agreement with the other Nordic Lutheran Churches.³⁴⁹ This was the first time the negotiations between the Church of England and the other Nordic Churches were written about for Finnish church people. By virtue of his study in England and personal interest, Rinne was exceptionally well informed about the ecumenical development in the Nordic area between Anglicans and Lutherans.

A more practical indication of Rinne's deep knowledge of the English situation was his concern for the financial difficulties and the shortage of parish clergy in the Church of England. This served to remind the Finnish public that the church taxation system served to make the Church of Finland relatively wealthy by comparison with the Church of England, whose

³⁴⁷ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Prestige 21.7.1949.

³⁴⁸ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Prestige 7.3.1949.

³⁴⁹ *Hjä* 27/29.7.1949 Yhtenäisyyspyrkimykset leimaa-antavia Englannin kirkolliselle elämälle; *Fsb* 28/25.8.1949 Kyrkligt aktuellt från England.

income was almost exclusively derived from collections and individual donations.³⁵⁰

Both interviews ended on a positive note, emphasising Rinne's profound gratitude. In *Församlingsbladet* he concluded:

The Church of England holds the Fathers in high esteem, loves that which has been, but does not stand still. There is life, a pulsing life inside the old walls, and by God's help they will go forward despite the slings and arrows. During the remarkably rich year of study which I spent in England, I learned to love the Church of England, which in her own country will take care of the pound God has given her. The Church of England is a church of practical methods, a church of prayer and a church of worship.³⁵¹

While affirming the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism, Rinne especially emphasized the 'pulsing life' of its tradition.

In response to Archbishop Lehtonen's wish Rinne also produced a short but comprehensive article on relations between the Church of Finland and the Church of England in Swedish.³⁵² The article was published in *Kristen Gemenskap*, an annual publication of the Nordic Ecumenical Council.³⁵³ Rinne sent the article to Waddams, who read Swedish, and received some advice from him concerning the correction of some minor inaccuracies.³⁵⁴

Waddams pointed out that the Church of England was not in full communion with the Church of Sweden, as the matter had never been brought before the convocations, "the only bodies which can give authority to such an arrangement", besides which the Swedish bishops took part in Lambeth Conferences as guests, not members.³⁵⁵ These inaccuracies, Rinne responded, were the result of the need to simplify the article for the Nordic audience on the one hand, and semantic difficulties on the other. While admitting that he should not have used the Swedish word 'nattvardsgemenskap', it being "technically quite incorrect", it was the term that best communicated the practical outcome of the relations – that Swedes could

³⁵⁰ *Hjä* 27/29.7.1949 Yhtenäisyyspyrkimykset leimaa-antavia Englannin kirkolliselle elämälle; *Fsb* 28/25.8.1949 Kyrkligt aktuellt från England.

³⁵¹ *Fsb* 28/25.8.1949 Kyrkligt aktuellt från England.

³⁵² The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

³⁵³ *Rinne* 1949, 164-172.

³⁵⁴ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Waddams 20.12.1949, 27.1.1950, Waddams to Rinne 6.2.1950, Rinne to Waddams 11.2.1950.

³⁵⁵ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Waddams to Rinne 6.2.1950.

receive Holy Communion at Anglican altars.³⁵⁶ The debate ended on this note. What it showed was that the Nordic Lutheran vocabulary, whether Scandinavian or Finnish, was not well suited for Anglican definitions. This led to frequent inconsistencies in theological debate even among the best educated Nordic theologians like Rinne, who was one of the best candidates to continue Lehtonen's pro-Anglican work in the young generation of Lutheran theologians.

The long term contribution of Rinne to Anglican-Lutheran relations was limited because of his growing interest in Eastern Orthodoxy. The early connection between Rinne and Ramsey is thus the more interesting, as later in life Ramsey recalled having been more an eastern than a western Christian thinker as a professor, something that changed only when he became a bishop.³⁵⁷ Rinne joined the Finnish Orthodox Church in 1966 and eventually became His Eminence Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea. Whether Rinne's Anglican experience served as a catalyst for his conversion is a matter for speculation. He later explained that studying the concept of the Kingdom of God in the theology of William Temple brought him indirectly closer to the Orthodox Church, as the Church Fathers enjoyed such an important role in Anglican theology.³⁵⁸

b. The CRE ceases its work

The relief work of the British churches through the CRE gradually changed with the economic resurgence of continental Europe. As there was no longer a pressing need for basic assistance in most parts of Europe, CRE funds were more and more used for "the spiritual reconstruction in Europe", the title the CRE had advocated from the start. This was reflected in the Church Assembly Committee on CRE reports in 1948. The report for March 1947 - April 1948 stated the primary objects of the CRE as follows:

- (a) Personal aid in case of need to individual ministers and full-time lay officers; temporary subsidies for their stipend or for necessary purchase of equipment; and contributions towards the needs of dependents of any ministers who were victims of persecution.

³⁵⁶ LPL CFR LR file 30/7 Rinne to Waddams 11.2.1950.

³⁵⁷ *Chadwick* 1991, 288.

³⁵⁸ *Virtanen* 2003, 16-17.

- (b) Provision of facilities for holding religious services or giving religious training, including temporary hutments or limited contribution towards equipment of Church buildings, theological colleges and ministers' libraries.
- (c) Provision of Bibles and necessary Christian Literature.
- (d) Financial assistance in the theological training of clergy and laity preparing to work on the Continent of Europe.
- (e) Contributions to Churches and Institutions on the Continent seeking to meet immediate post-war needs by special methods new or established, including social or educational.
- (f) The financing of visits, to this country from the Continent, or from this country to the Continent of Europe, of ministers and lay workers able to contribute to or to learn from the experience of the countries visited, so long a such visits are calculated to further Christian Reconstruction in Europe.³⁵⁹

Reconstruction had become an educative tool for maintaining links with the continental churches.

By April 1948 Finland had received reconstruction aid worth £8920 from the CRE, of which £6950 had come from the Church of England.³⁶⁰ This help came in various categories as was indicated in the report from April to December 1948, which listed a further £520 given to Finland in the form of a car to the Lutheran Church, a typewriter for the Reconstruction Committee, stoles for Orthodox priests and blankets for church orphanages.³⁶¹ As this figure does not include expenditure in the sections (d) or (e) above, it seems the cost of Rinne's study was budgeted in some other way. Funding of students and visitors aside, the reports give an accurate picture of the kind of assistance the CRE gave to Finland.

However, change was coming to the CRE, which was signalled in November 1948 by the resignation of Bishop Bell as chairman because of his duties as chairman of the Central Committee of the WCC. Bell was replaced at the CRE by Bishop Leslie Hunter of Sheffield.³⁶²

The debate on the report at the Church Assembly indicated that further changes lay ahead. The Church of England was struggling to meet her target of £250,000 towards the £1,000,000 total target of the CRE organisa-

³⁵⁹ C.A. 894 1948, 2.

³⁶⁰ C.A. 894 1948, 2.

³⁶¹ C.A. 915 1949, 4.

³⁶² C.A. 915 1949, 1.

tion.³⁶³ Furthermore, the CRE's initial urgency and optimism was fading with the onset of the Cold War.

The speech of Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester to the Church Assembly, in which he urged the Church of England, in spite of her hardships, to maintain her leadership role in reconstruction, throws this into sharp relief:

The situation had got worse in some ways. The term "Christian reconstruction" was used, because of the pathetic hopes that after the war all people would have to do would be to build up what had previously existed. But what had happened (as after the First World War) was that an entirely new situation had been created in which they had to salvage from chaos something which was worth preserving. They could not reconstruct the Christian Church in Europe to-day; they could only hope to save something vital in it. They should always bear in mind that hundreds of thousands of Christians were suffering the most frightful tyranny ever inflicted upon the Christian Church. He urged upon the Assembly that the Church of England should be careful in these matters to maintain that vocation to which God had called it, and not to allow itself to be merged into some Council of Churches or anything of that kind. They had a special responsibility which the Church of England had recognized throughout its history, and he pleaded that the ordinary members of the Church should be informed of the situation.³⁶⁴

There is no doubt Duncan-Jones' phrase 'frightful tyranny' was a reference to the Soviet bloc. His speech reflected a general pessimism and caution towards the WCC; he feared it would become a means for Church of England people to evade their traditional vocation to help Christians in need abroad.

Duncan-Jones' ardent anti-communism was revealed in 1950, when he referred to "the enormous, unceasing attack upon Christianity in all its forms which was going on from Soviet Communism" during the debate on the work of the CRE at the Church Assembly.³⁶⁵ For him, as for many others, the political purpose of relief work was to foster Christian resistance to international communism. This converged well with the traditional sentiment of the Finnish Church, which had seen Finland as a bastion against the pagan east before and during the war, a sentiment that was now left unstated.

In Finland, the work of the CRE continued as before until the summer of 1949. Bishop Gulin, who had now managed to acquire his car, tried to

³⁶³ CA 1949, 152-156.

³⁶⁴ CA 1949, 154.

³⁶⁵ CA 1950, 64.

get another, for Bishop von Bonsdorff of Porvoo, along with fifteen motorcycles. His enquiries were responded to by C.E. Josephson, the Secretary of the Scholarship Committee of the WCC Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid. Josephson had discussed the matter with the Rev. Dr C. Mackie, the Director of the Committee, and Harland, the General Secretary of the CRE. The response was clear: as the ecumenical reconstruction funds had been reduced greatly in the last two years, there were more pressing needs in Europe, particularly in Germany, and the Finnish request could not be granted. Josephson hoped that something might be found towards a car for von Bonsdorff, but emphasized that neither the WCC nor the CRE had made any commitment. Some hope was offered that funding for a few motorcycles might come through the CRE, but this would involve the most urgent cases should be presented, along with detailed information, for a fund-raising campaign in Britain.³⁶⁶ The reply indicated that there was no longer very much money for the ecumenical reconstruction beyond the most essential needs, which were in Germany. The age of ideological Christian reconstruction in Europe was passing.

A certain weariness in the work of the CRE was also noted by its present and former chairmen, Bell and Hunter, who corresponded on the matter in the summer of 1949. Hunter was especially worried that Harland's heart was no longer in the work and thought he should be released.³⁶⁷ Such a change proved unnecessary as the CRE ceased to exist at the end of the year and its functions were taken over by the Inter-Church Aid and Refugee Service of the British Council of Churches (BCC).³⁶⁸

The final report of the Church Assembly Commission on CRE regretted that the Church of England had managed to find only £175,000 of its target of a quarter of a million pounds. The report acknowledged that the Church of England had played an especially valuable role in giving aid to the Orthodox Churches, which the donors from the churches of Switzerland, Sweden and the USA had been less eager to support. In Finland the aid was given largely to the Lutherans and to some extent to the Orthodox Church. The grand total of general funds at the disposal of the CRE for Finland was £9400, besides which the Finns gained from separate funds allocated for literature, theological scholarships, exchange of personnel and probably also

³⁶⁶ KA EG 24 Josephson to Gulin 8.6.1949.

³⁶⁷ LPL Bell papers vol 55 part I Hunter to Bell 4.6.1949; Bell to Hunter 7.6.1949.

³⁶⁸ C.A. 950 1950, 2; C.A. 951 1950, 1.

conferences.³⁶⁹ Compared with the aid given to Finland by the American Lutherans, the sum was very small, but given that the aid was often directed to such prominent purposes as student and personnel exchange, theological literature and means of transportation for church leaders, its propaganda value was much higher than the actual amount would suggest.³⁷⁰

In the debate on the final report Hunter explained to the Church Assembly that the aid:

-- had been well spent, and that this first-aid was valuable out of all proportion to the actual amount, partly because it arrived in time, and partly because it was given and received as the sacrament of Christian friendship and hospitality.

There were gifts of all kinds. There was a motor for a bishop in North Finland to enable him to cover the enormous distances in his diocese, there were cycles for parish priests and ministers in large parishes; theological books for individuals and colleges who were almost bereft of books owing to war damage; and there was equipment of every kind. Last year, over £100,000 was spent in gifts of that sort all over Europe. There was the provision of scholarships for ordinands from other countries to study theology in the theological colleges of this country, and at the present thirty-seven students held these scholarships.³⁷¹

Ironically, the formerly vexed issue of cars for Finland could now be used as a positive example of the diversity of reconstruction aid, although the other categories of help mentioned by Hunter also applied to Finland.

The winding up of the CRE brought all this to an end. The scope of the BCC board that replaced the CRE was to extend beyond European boundaries, helping churches, church institutions and individual Christians in want "whether as a result of war, famine, persecution, or other distress throughout the world."³⁷² No further ideological aid would be given by the British churches in general and the Church of England in particular to the Finnish churches as a means to promote ties between the churches. Other channels for ecumenical endeavours and ecclesiastical diplomacy were required in the uneasy Cold War peace.

³⁶⁹ C.A. 951 1950, 1-5.

³⁷⁰ *Malkavaara* 1997, 10-11, 19-20.

³⁷¹ CA 1950, 63.

³⁷² C.A. 951 1950, 2.

c. Permanent peace-time links established and stabilized

As ecumenical reconstruction came to an end in Finland, other methods of communication between the Churches of England and Finland gained more importance. Among these were the personal encounters enabled by the Anglican Chaplaincy in Helsinki, the Finnish Seamen's Church in London and Moss' prayer circle for Finland.

The Anglican Chaplaincy in Helsinki's first post-war chaplain, the Rev. Sydney Linton, had taken up his post just before the visit of the Bishop of Jarrow, arriving with his wife Karin on August 1948. The chaplaincy had first looked for an unmarried Chaplain, but as no such candidate emerged they settled for Linton.³⁷³ Dunlop's praise for Linton confirms that this was a good decision both for the chaplaincy and for relations with the Lutheran Church.

In a short time Linton became well grounded in Finnish church life, especially on its Swedish side, which reflected his background. Having been ordained deacon in Wakefield in 1932, and priest in 1933 and served his title, Linton was granted permission to work for the fellowship of the Oxford Group Movement. This took him to Denmark, Norway, Holland, Ireland, Sweden and Finland. Linton got married with his Swedish wife Karin in Sweden in 1940. They spent most of the war in Sweden, where Linton assisted the Anglican chaplain in Stockholm in his parish work, visiting interned Allied soldiers and taking services in the English churches of Stockholm and Gothenburg. Linton visited Finland in 1939 and two subsequent years on Oxford Group Movement business.³⁷⁴ He thus had useful Swedish language skills and a good basic understanding of the Finnish situation and temperament on his arrival.

Linton already had an amicable relationship with Bishop Gulin through the Oxford Group Movement, and Gulin was an ardent supporter of the Movement in Finland. A sign of how unusually close they were is that Linton's letter informing Gulin that he had been appointed to Helsinki and expressing the hope that they might meet when Gulin was in Helsinki after the summer, was addressed "Dear Eelis".³⁷⁵ The two had a warm working relationship from the start. Linton was able to ask Gulin's advice concern-

³⁷³ *Hjä* 48/26.11.1948 Englantilainen seurakunta Suomessa.

³⁷⁴ *Hjä* 48/26.11.1948 Englantilainen seurakunta Suomessa; Linton to Pajunen 2000.

³⁷⁵ KA EG 25 Linton to Gulin sd 1948a.

ing which clergy, if any, he ought to get to know, and whom the Bishop of Jarrow should meet.³⁷⁶

Linton's dignified but unreserved nature made it easy for him to liaise with Finnish church leaders. This naturally led to his serving as mediator between the churches. Linton reported on Finnish affairs to the CFR and C.B. Moss for the newsletter of his prayer circle.³⁷⁷ This complemented the information the chaplain in Stockholm still sent regularly to the CFR, which mainly consisted of translations from Finnish sources in Sweden.³⁷⁸ Linton both informed Finns about the nature of Anglicanism and interpreted it for them, and guided Anglican visitors to Finland.³⁷⁹

Linton associated easily with Swedish-speaking church people in Helsinki. As an Anglo-Catholic, Linton soon became acquainted with the Swedish speaking St Henry's Circle, which drew together Finnish Swedish Lutheran high church clergy.³⁸⁰ His contacts with Finnish-speaking clergy were more restricted, but he knew Lehtonen and Gulin, and a handful of active ecumenists in Helsinki well. Linton readily admitted his less extensive contacts among Finnish-speaking clergy when he sent Waddams a document entitled "Notes on personalities in the Church of Finland" in March 1951.³⁸¹ Linton thought that Waddams would know some of the people better and might disagree with some of his opinions.³⁸²

The list gave short descriptions of sixteen Finnish churchmen. If elementary, the document painted a vivid picture of Finnish clergy. Each description ended with an evaluation of the English skills of its subjects. This, together with remarks on ecumenical interests, revealed who in the Finnish

³⁷⁶ KA EG 25 Linton to Gulin sd 1948b.

³⁷⁷ LPL CFR LR file 25 Linton to Waddams 4.9.1948, 18.10.1948, 19.1.1949, 7.2.1949, 13.3.1951; LPL Douglas papers vol. 73 News from the Church of Finland letter No. 2; LPL CFR OC file 148 NEWS FROM THE CHURCH OF FINLAND LETTER No. 4 JULY 1950; Linton to Pajunen sd. 2000.

³⁷⁸ LP CFR OC file 148 Church advance in Finland 1945-1950 by Archbishop of Finland, Aleksis Lehtonen. Extracts translated from Svenska Dagbladet, Stockholm.

³⁷⁹ EA SYKTA SYT Ha. Yleiskirkollisen nuorisotyökurssin osanottajalista 1820.3.1949; *Kmaa* 18/22.3.1949 Keskinäinen yhteys kristillinen välttämättömyys; Linton to Pajunen sd. 2000.

³⁸⁰ LPL CFR LR file 25 Linton to Waddams 19.1.1949; Linton to Pajunen sd. 2000; *Kilström* 1990, 261-264.

³⁸¹ LPL CFR LR file 25 Linton to Waddams 13.3.1951.

³⁸² LPL CFR LR file 25 Linton to Waddams 13.3.1951.

Church had any meaningful relations with the Church of England. Succeeding generations of chaplains amended the document by hand well into the 1970s.³⁸³

The list began with the most prominent friends of the English Church:

Turku/ Åbo Archbishop Aleksii Lehtonen, sturdy, kindly, well-informed and alert. Respected by his own people. Alive to Church issues in other countries. Speaks English.

Rev. Samuel Lehtonen, son and secretary and chaplain to the Archbishop. Received part of his training at Westcott House, Cambridge. Informed and intelligent. Speaks English.

Rev. W.R. Rinne, spent some months in England studying Church life there and has written well of this since returning to Finland. Speaks English.

Tampere/
Tammerfors Bishop Eelis Gulin, formerly professor in Helsingfors University, tall, extremely kindly and friendly, charming, able church leader. Keenly interested in relations with other churches. Lives in Tampere/Tammerfors but Helsinki/Helsingfors is part of his diocese. Speaks English.³⁸⁴

The core of Finns who knew English and had meaningful contacts with the Church of England, including the young clergy he had sent to study in England, was still very much built around Archbishop Lehtonen. Gulin was the only other church leader who seemed interested in other churches.

The rest of the list consisted mainly of Helsinki church leaders and Swedish-speaking clergy with an interest in liturgy. Linton described Professor Paavo Virkkunen, "the Rural Dean of Helsingfors" as "officially the No. 1. man in Church life in the capital" and a former Prime Minister having still "a reputation of being rather a foxy politician." Among Swedish-speaking high church people were the Rev. Sigtrygg Serenius, the Rev. Bruno Westerlund and the Rev. Alvar Nyqvist, the Swedish-speaking Vicar of Vasa, who was described as being interested in the English Church, liturgy and vestments.³⁸⁵ However, there is no evidence that this interest entailed any contact with the Church of England apart from Linton.

³⁸³ ACFA Notes on personalities in the Church of Finland.

³⁸⁴ LPL CFR LR file 25 Linton to Waddams 13.3.1951, Notes on personalities in the Church of Finland.

³⁸⁵ LPL CFR LR file 25 Linton to Waddams 13.3.1951, Notes on personalities in the Church of Finland.

Linton also listed some he clearly considered of declining influence, like the Rev. Verner J. Aurola, whom he considered "burly, jolly and talkative", but "probably not [having] a very acute mind" and "no longer-young", and Bishop Max von Bonsdorff, whom he recorded as the last bishop left from the time when Finland had lost the apostolic succession. Linton thought von Bonsdorff "kindly, but not apparently very dynamic or forceful", and speaking little English.³⁸⁶ Lehtonen and Gulin were thus the only church leaders to converse with the Church of England.

The situation with the Finnish Seamen's Church in London was completely different. Samuel Lehtonen's prediction was accurate: Pohjanpirkka, though unquestionably successful in his work among Finnish seamen, never developed meaningful relations with the Church of England. His connections with the CFR were restricted to times when he needed practical help, for example in restoring the damaged church building. He did, however, give an interview to the CFR in 1950, probably at Acting General Secretary W. H. Macartney's request, and he occasionally passed information to Moss' prayer circle.³⁸⁷ This amounted to very little when compared with his predecessor's efforts; but the times had changed significantly.

However, the information gathered by the Finnish Pastor in London, the Anglican Chaplain in Helsinki and Moss' other correspondents for the prayer circle's newsletter provided a good overview of Finnish cultural and church affairs for the CFR, which collected it for its own use.³⁸⁸ In this respect the CFR monitored developments in Finland well. It was less adept at the distribution and use of the information, especially where the enlightening of English Church leaders was concerned.

There were, however, some challenges in international relations. The old feud between the Anglican and Finnish Lutheran Missions in South-West Africa reared its head in late 1949. Bishop John Boys of Lebombo, on behalf of his brother provincial bishops, sent Waddams information relating to the activities of the Finnish Missions, including a questionnaire prepared at the

³⁸⁶ LPL CFR LR file 25 Linton to Waddams 13.3.1951, Notes on personalities in the Church of Finland.

³⁸⁷ LPL CFR LR file 25 Extract from letter from the Rev. O. Pohjanpirkka to the Rev. Dr. C.B. Moss 28.1.1949; LPL Douglas papers vol.73 News from the Church of Finland letter No.1; LPL CFR LR file 30/9 Interview of the Rev. W.H. Macartney with Pastor Oiva Pohjanpirkka. 26th January, 1950.

³⁸⁸ LPL CFR LR file 25 News of the Lutheran Church of Finland; LPL CFR OC file 148 News of the Church of Finland.

request of the Bishop of Damaraland for the Finnish Missions. The questionnaire had been answered by the Superintendent of the Finnish Missions in Ovamboland, the Rev. A. Alho, and was for the most part concerned with the understanding of ministry. This raised no particular problems.³⁸⁹

However, more was to follow. A month after the first letter, Bishop Boys sent Waddams further information about the Finnish Missions. The second letter included four comments “from an unofficial but probably reliable source”, which the Bishop thought might be of interest to Waddams. These comments indicated several misgivings about the Finnish Mission. The first reference was to the Mission’s marriage discipline, which the source saw as “grotesquely un-Christian”, giving Finnish Missionaries the right to separate a married couple and find a new wife for the husband. Second, the source bemoaned the habit of the Finnish Mission to vilify the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Mission of St Mary for mariolatry, among other things. The third complaint concerned the obsession of the Finnish Mission with “the notion of the certainty of Our Lord’s return in the lifetime of the present generation”, which had led at least once to the neglect of the mission fields resulting in starvation and the need for emergency food aid from the local administration. The final complaint referred to the Mission’s prevailing puritanism, claiming that “The Assistant Native Commissioner was recently assured by a European Finnish Missionary that ‘those who smoke tobacco go straight to hell’.”³⁹⁰

It is not easy to establish how founded these anonymous accusations were. Finnish sources reveal nothing of the Mission’s alleged extremism with regard to the parousia. However, church discipline in Amboland, as the Finns called the area, was certainly considerably more severe than in Finland. Indeed, a letter to *Kotimaa* explained that they followed the strictures of the Apostle Paul in disciplining their Mission parishes as they were in a constant struggle with paganism.³⁹¹ It may be that pietist missionaries used the opportunity to enforce much stricter rules among the Ambo people than they could at home.

The accusation did not do any particular damage to relations. No formal complaint came from the CRF to the Finnish Church, nor was any com-

³⁸⁹ LPL CFR LR file 25 Bishop John of Lebombo to Waddams 3.11.1949 and accompanying questionnaire: CHURCH OF FINLAND MISSION IN THE ANGLICAN DIOCESE OF DAMARALAND (South West Africa).

³⁹⁰ LPL CFR LR file 25 Bishop John of Lebombo to Waddams 15.12.1949.

³⁹¹ *Kmaa* 8/28.1.1949 Kirkkokuri Ambo-seurakunnissa.

plaint received by the CRF from Finland. The only appearance of action was Lehtonen's repeated assurance to the Anglicans that a bishop would be appointed to supervise the Finnish Missions as soon as a suitable candidate could be found.

Moss recorded in his newsletter that the proposed appointment of a bishop for the Missions was hindered by the difficulty in finding a candidate who would have both the high academic standing expected of Finnish bishops and the necessary gifts for missionary work, and that there was very little money as the Finnish Missions depended heavily on American funding.³⁹² Lehtonen may well have used these as excuses for postponing a project he in principle supported, but which required much effort and good will from others in the Finnish Missionary Society and the church to be effected. It is doubtful whether Finnish missionaries wanted a Mission Bishop in the first place, and it may be that the suggestion was made by Lehtonen to appease the Anglicans and his own desire for an established and ecumenically reliable church life.

d. Lehtonen's long good-bye

The gradual deterioration of Lehtonen's health towards the end of the 1940s meant that he was no longer so personally involved in ecumenical affairs as he had been before, but that the day-to-day responsibility of nurturing the ecumenical relations of the Finnish Church was in practice shifting towards Gulin and the next generation of theologians supported by the Archbishop, including Professor Nikolainen, the Rev. Martti Parvio and the Rev. Aarne Siirala.³⁹³

The changing situation had ruptured the relationship of Lehtonen and Gulin, and caused a power struggle between the former friends, at least from the time of the preparations for the WCC Amsterdam Conference in 1948. Lehtonen had excluded Gulin from the delegation, but nominated Nikolainen, and Parvio when it became necessary to replace Harjunpää. At the Conference Bishop Ilmari Salomies, whom Lehtonen had chosen as leader of the delegation, was elected onto the Central Committee of the

³⁹² LPL CFR OC file 148 NEWS FROM THE CHURCH OF FINLAND LETTER NO. 3. NOVEMBER 1949.

³⁹³ *Kantala* 2003, 130-131.

WCC. Salomies hoped that Gulin might be his deputy, but to no avail. The role was assigned to Nikolainen.³⁹⁴

Furthermore, Nikolainen was assisted by Parvio, to whom Lehtonen entrusted an increasing number of ecumenical responsibilities. In the summer of 1949 Lehtonen sent Parvio with Nikolainen to the WCC meeting and with Professor Tiirilä to the LWF Executive Committee meeting.³⁹⁵ Lehtonen's somewhat clumsy approach to ecumenical representation towards the end of his life was shown in his attempt to send Parvio first as his substitute, and when that did not work as "an assistant secretary of the Finnish delegate Professor A.T. Nikolainen", to the WCC Central Committee meeting in Chichester. This did not conform with the requirements of the WCC, Finland having only one seat on the Central Committee, as Dr. Visser 't Hooft explained to Parvio. Parvio could only travel to Chichester as Lehtonen's substitute at the Faith and Order Commission meeting.³⁹⁶ It seems his position as Archbishop of Finland did not open as many doors as Lehtonen would have liked.

In Finland, however, the situation was different, as Church Law gave the Archbishop the greatest authority in all things ecumenical. The reorganisation of the international ecumenical scene thus allowed Lehtonen to reorganise the Finnish scene as well. This afforded him another opportunity to sidetrack Bishop Gulin, who chaired the Finnish Ecumenical Council.

The fact that the Council was originally a National Committee of the World Alliance (WA) gave Lehtonen a legitimate reason to reconsider its function. Lehtonen had urged Gulin and the Council in 1947 to follow the Norwegian and British Councils in resigning from WA membership. The Finnish Ecumenical Council severed its ties with the WA in November 1947, soon after which the international organisation made itself redundant.³⁹⁷ The Finnish Ecumenical Council had thus become an independent national body with no defined relations with the new international ecumenical order.

The next question concerned the organising of the relations of individual Finnish churches with the WCC and nationally with each other.

³⁹⁴ *Rusama* 1999, 137-139; *Kantala* 2003, 94-97; *Krapu* 2007, 159-61.

³⁹⁵ EA SYKTA SYT Ea.2. Parvio to Aurola 3.2.1949; *Kantala* 2003, 133.

³⁹⁶ HYK COLL.460.55. Rhodes to Parvio 15.6.1949; Parvio to Neill 19.6.1949; Parvio to Rhodes 20.6.1949; Visser 't Hooft to Parvio 24.6.1949; Parvio to Rhodes 4.7.1949.

³⁹⁷ *Kantala* 2003, 125-127.

Lehtonen's answer was to establish a completely new body, The Council for Christian Unity. Lehtonen for the most part invited the same people who had been members of the Finnish Ecumenical Council, with some new faces, to serve on his new Council in March 1949. The inaugural meeting of the new body was in December 1949. The first chairman was Lehtonen himself; the vice-chairman was Gulin and Parvio was chosen as secretary.³⁹⁸

By the summer of 1950, it had become clear that the new arrangement did not work. Parvio, who had come to the conclusion that the Council was working in name only and that the Archbishop now lacked energy due to his health, asked Gulin for his advice.³⁹⁹ Lehtonen had had another stroke in the summer of 1950, from which he never fully recovered.⁴⁰⁰ Gulin remained loyal, if somewhat critical, throughout; he had continued on the Finnish Ecumenical Council while accepting the Archbishop's invitation to serve on the new Council.⁴⁰¹ Gulin's approach was to wait and see what transpired. This proved wise, as the new committee died with Lehtonen in 1951, and it proved possible to rewrite the constitution of the Finnish Ecumenical Council to meet the needs of a new ecumenical era.⁴⁰²

Inevitably, Lehtonen's deteriorating health also took its toll on relations with the Church of England. Following the Lambeth Conference in 1948 and Bishop Dunlop's visit the following autumn his passion and energy for closer relations with the Church of England declined with his health. There were no more visits to England and correspondence began to dry up. Lehtonen merely responded to English visitors and their initiatives as they came.

One such occasion was the visit of Sir Ronald Storr, a British Member of Parliament, as a guest of the British Council in March 1949. Lehtonen had met Sir Ronald in England 1946, and was invited to dinner in honour at the British Embassy. Storr conveyed a message from the Archbishop of Canterbury wishing a blessing on the Finnish Church.⁴⁰³ A similar occasion

³⁹⁸ *Kantala* 2003, 130-138; *Krapu* 2007, 161-163.

³⁹⁹ *Kantala* 2003, 138-139; *Krapu* 2007, 163.

⁴⁰⁰ *Kantala* 2003, 144.

⁴⁰¹ *Kantala* 2003, 134-139; *Krapu* 2007, 161-165.

⁴⁰² *Rusama* 1999, 145-148; *Kantala* 2003, 140-142, 144-146; *Krapu* 2007, 167.

⁴⁰³ *Kmaa* 17/1.3.1949 Englannin kirkko tervehtää Suomen kirkkoa.

was the visit of eight British MPs later the same year to Turku, where they were entertained by the Archbishop at his house and at the cathedral.⁴⁰⁴

Both occasions gave Lehtonen the opportunity to meet English visitors and to promote friendly relations between the churches and nations. They also indicated the esteem in which he was held by the British Embassy. Yet the Archbishop no longer had the energy to exploit these contacts. With his deteriorating health and the stabilizing political situation, the entertaining of distinguished British visitors had become something of a chore.

Lehtonen tried to keep in touch with the Church of England with occasional telegrams to Archbishop Fisher. One such telegram marked the celebration of the 400th anniversary of the first Finnish liturgy in November 1949.⁴⁰⁵ The message received a courteous response the same day.⁴⁰⁶ Such tokens of affection could not, however, conceal that the ailing Archbishop no longer had the energy for grand ecumenical gestures. Even Anglican relations were left more and more to Gulin and the younger generation.

There was one area of ecumenical policy where Lehtonen still exerted great influence. Lehtonen supported the revival of parish life on high church principles influenced by Anglicanism. This was reflected in the work of the Finnish General Synod commission that prepared the renewal of the Liturgy, which he chaired. The committee had planned that the new prayer book should include offices for morning and evening with the cycle of lessons.⁴⁰⁷ This was a novelty for the Finnish Church.

Although the prayers were drawn from Finnish sources there were obvious models for the new book: in principle it followed Reformation breviaries such as the Book of Common Prayer and the Mikael Agricola Prayer Book, but was inspired by the modern use of the BCP in the Church of England and the revival of the divine office in the Church of Sweden with the publication of the unofficial book of daily prayers in 1944.⁴⁰⁸ As a liturgical scholar, Lehtonen wanted to follow the Swedish-Anglican model in moulding the spirituality of his church.

⁴⁰⁴ *Kmaa* 70/20.9.1949 Brittiläiset parlamentinjäsenet Turussa arkkipiispan vieraana; *Hjä* 35/23.9.1949 Englannin parlamentin jäseniä tutustumismatkalla Suomessa.

⁴⁰⁵ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher, telegram received 29.11.1949.

⁴⁰⁶ LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen, telegram sent 29.11.1949.

⁴⁰⁷ *Hjä* 17/20.5.1949 Rukouskirja kodin aamu- ja iltahartaushetkiä varten suunnitteilla.

⁴⁰⁸ *Parvio* 1978, 7. The Swedish book was called *Den svenska tidegården, stycken ur psaltaren jämte lovsånger och böner för dagliga bönetimmar*, and was compiled by theologians Arthur Adell and Knut Peters.

However, Lehtonen's vision of closer relations with and positive influence from the Anglican world was far from being universally shared. An example of the attitude of educated church people was given by the pseudonymous V.H.P., writing in *Herättäjä* about ecumenism and high and low churchmanship in October 1949 and July 1950 respectively.⁴⁰⁹

In the first article, V.H.P. gave a sympathetic introduction to ecumenical development from the 1930s. He mentioned the negotiations of the 1930s with the Church of England, the war-time lack of actual hostilities, the compliments received by the Finnish Archbishop, the exchange of students, and averred that the material aid Finland had received from the west would not be forgotten.⁴¹⁰

However, V.H.P. was critical of certain developments these improved relations had inspired:

The development of the past few years in relations with the Church of Finland and the western churches is understandable. A small nation should not belittle any tokens of friendship it may receive from abroad. However, in the realm of religious life all superficial imitation should be guarded against. We want to be Lutheran Christians, faithful to the word of the Bible.⁴¹¹

The attitude of the writer was defensive. Although the Finns were content to receive financial and other benefits of good relations with the Anglo-American churches, they did not want to receive foreign influence in theology and church life. Instead the writer hoped that the American Lutherans might learn how to keep the different strands of Lutheranism inside one church as the Finns had managed with their revival movements.⁴¹²

V.H.P. mentioned two disturbing Anglican phenomena, one abroad, one at home. The first was the public appearance of the 'Red Dean' of Canterbury, Hewlett Johnson, in international communist circles; the second the Anglican influence which had led to a fascination with grand liturgical forms and intercessions for the departed. V.H.P. asked rhetorically whether it would be unthinkable to have requiems in Finland.⁴¹³ The perceived threats inherent in closer relations with Anglican were thus dubious politics

⁴⁰⁹ *Hjä* 37/7.10.1949 Ekumeenista ja kotoista; *Hjä* 30/28.7.1950 Korkeakirkollista ja matalakirkollista.

⁴¹⁰ *Hjä* 37/7.10.1949 Ekumeenista ja kotoista.

⁴¹¹ *Hjä* 37/7.10.1949 Ekumeenista ja kotoista.

⁴¹² *Hjä* 37/7.10.1949 Ekumeenista ja kotoista.

⁴¹³ *Hjä* 37/7.10.1949 Ekumeenista ja kotoista.

on the international scene and an over catholic churchmanship in the spiritual realm.

However, there was something in Anglo-American church life V.H.P. admired, namely new methods in parish work that might offer a healthy impetus in Finnish church life. The Finnish Church had a valuable mission to preserve and develop the Biblical Lutheranism it had inherited from the Reformation on the one hand, and on the other embrace with healthy discernment the impetus contemporary contacts with Anglo-American Christianity presented.⁴¹⁴ Progressive influence on parish work was acceptable with regard to new methods, but not if it introduced catholic features to church life.

In the latter article V.H.P. remained critical of high church influence especially in liturgy, which he considered the official relations with the Church of England had inspired. "The external liturgical practice", he suggested, "has led to forms once unknown to us".⁴¹⁵ The article began, however, with a note that it was customary to accuse proponents of Christian faith of being 'high church', which term had come to signify all kinds of aggrandising abuse of power in the church.⁴¹⁶ This echoed Lehtonen's concern, expressed in his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*, that in common Finnish Lutheran parlance the very term 'high church' had negative connotations.

V.H.P. explained the etymology of the term as used in the Church of England. This was problematic, as he could not interpret the Anglican tradition from its own perspective, but tried to employ Finnish Lutheran categories to explain it. This led to a strikingly inadequate understanding of the Anglo-Catholicism. V.H.P. neglected all its revivalist and socially concerned tendencies and concentrated on the early conversions to Roman Catholicism and the lack of interest in co-operation with Protestants. He compared the English and Swedish high church movements: the latter had led to a declaration forbidding pietistic meetings in the realm of Sweden including Finland.⁴¹⁷ The presentation was calculated to emphasize the similarities between Finnish pietists and English evangelicals, who nonetheless were not discussed at length.

⁴¹⁴ *Hjä* 37/7.10.1949 Ekumeenista ja kotoista.

⁴¹⁵ *Hjä* 30/28.7.1950 Korkeakirkollista ja matalakirkollista.

⁴¹⁶ *Hjä* 30/28.7.1950 Korkeakirkollista ja matalakirkollista.

⁴¹⁷ *Hjä* 30/28.7.1950 Korkeakirkollista ja matalakirkollista.

V.H.P.'s main emphasis was on Finnish church life, where he wanted to oppose the kind of high churchmanship which led to "liturgical expressions unnatural to the Finnish Lutheran Church" on the one hand, to an unnecessary dependence on the favour of the church leaders in clergy appointments on the other.⁴¹⁸ The article was thus a cloaked criticism of Lehtonen, his ecumenical and liturgical policies, and his administration of the Archdiocese.

V.H.P.'s distorted understanding of Anglicanism was the rule rather than the exception among educated Finns. They knew best the volatile extremes of the Church of England parties, while the grey centre of moderate church people remained largely unknown. Most Anglican church leaders and theologians with relations with the Finnish Church are best described as belonging to the latter category. They were generally middle-of-the-road, moderately liberal or liberal catholic churchmen. The casual Finnish observer saw them as 'high-church' because Anglo-Catholicism had influenced the Church of England mainstream, and because Finnish tradition was so heavily influenced by Lutheran pietism, which starkly contrasted with anything 'catholic'.⁴¹⁹

An odd feature of the churches' relations was the fact that the evangelicals in both churches never really found each other. They were either poorly represented or not very interested in ecumenical work. Gulin, who can be seen as representing the evangelical wing of the Finnish Church, was more interested in evangelism and the practical side of affairs than in institutional ecumenism. Among pietists like Professor Tiililä the main obstacle to involvement in ecumenism was concern for the purity of their own tradition, which resulted in a Lutheran isolationism. Furthermore, even if the Church of England evangelicals did not stress the importance and efficacy of the historic episcopate as the Anglo-Catholics did, the few evangelicals in the hierarchy were still bound to hold it as part of Anglican identity.⁴²⁰ This, coupled with their generally more reformed understanding of salvation and sacraments, did not make it any easier for the Finnish Lutheran mainstream to relate to them.

Given that the churches' ecumenical leadership was effectively free from an evangelical element, the evangelicals' scope for ecumenical encounter

⁴¹⁸ *Hjå* 30/28.7.1950 Korkeakirkollista ja matalakirkollista.

⁴¹⁹ *Chapman* 2006, 86-93.

⁴²⁰ *Hastings* 1998, 455-457, *Chapman* 2006, 69.

was largely restricted to the international evangelical student and missionary movement. There, however, they had too few contacts to have any real effect on the churches. The only contact they had thus came indirectly through the influence of international revivalism in its various forms, which united them in the common evangelical ethos but in no denominational or structural way.

e. The humble remains of reconstruction work

Despite the winding up of the CRE, exchange of personnel with the Church of England continued, now directly with the Church of England through the CFR. Finnish pastors visited England in 1950 to study, among other things, the social work of the church (the Rev. Haakon Wainio) and Sunday school work (the Rev. Pentti Kankaanpää and the Rev. Arne Rosenqvist). Through subsequent interviews in the Finnish church press their experience of Church of England life gained the attention of a wide audience.⁴²¹

Church of England Sunday school was introduced in interviews with Kankaanpää in *Herättäjä* and Rosenqvist in *Församlingsbladet*. Kankaanpää had studied the subject for three months at Westhill Training College in Birmingham and Rosenqvist in London and Glasgow. The latter's study was financed by the Swedish Cultural Foundation and the British Council, while the former was probably invited as the guest of the Church of England. Both gave a good account of Sunday school work, its new methods and its pragmatic approach to Christian nurture.⁴²²

The Rev. Haakon Wainio recounted his experiences on his return to Finland in *Herättäjä*, emphasizing the close links between the British Labour movement and the church and the vitality of Anglican social work. He had met Lord Burden, a prominent Labour Christian parliamentarian, who had assured him that the millions of Labour voters had a positive at-

⁴²¹ *Hjä* 28/14.7.1950 Toimintamuotojen runsauteen kiintyy huomio Englannin kirkkoon tutustussa; *Hjä* 30/28.7.1950 Englantilaisissa pyhäkouluissa on monipuolinen toiminta hallitsevana periaatteena; *Hjä* 42/20.10.1950 Piirteitä Englannin kirkon sosiaalisesta työstä teollisuusalueilla; *Fsb* 42/7.12.1950 Avlönad söndagskolsekreterare i varje församling i England.

⁴²² *Hjä* 30/28.7.1950 Englantilaisissa pyhäkouluissa on monipuolinen toiminta hallitsevan piirteenä; *Fsb* 42/7.12.1950 Avlönad söndagskolsekreterare i varje församling i England.

titude towards the Church and most of them were in fact church-goers.⁴²³ This was particularly striking for a Finnish observer, as the Finnish Social Democratic Party had only recently abandoned its traditional insistence on the separation of church and state.⁴²⁴

Later the same autumn, Wainio wrote an extensive article for *Herättäjä* on the social work of the Church of England in industrial areas. Wainio was impressed by the vitality of social work, from work with Sunday school children to youth, students, workers and old people. He had been especially impressed by the commitment of clergy and laity in spite of a lack of resources. Wainio paid tribute to their service through various work methods and organisations including the Church Army, Settlements and religious orders.⁴²⁵

The same theme had been taken up earlier by *Herättäjä*'s columnist *Vaeltaja* (Wanderer) who had understood that 'England had indeed won the war, but lost the peace': its economic recovery was not as fast as elsewhere in Europe. In Finland foreign aid had enabled the building of many new churches and vicarages, but this had not happened in England.⁴²⁶ Acknowledging the favourable circumstances of the Finnish Church's service of the entire population compared with those of the Church of England, *Vaeltaja* nonetheless recognized the strengths of the latter culture:⁴²⁷

The experience has resulted in this author's determination to work always and in everything in the best interests of the congregation. We greatly respected those many brother clergy in the Church of England, who faithfully day by day went early to their churches for prayer and who distributed the holy sacraments in their communion services. Availing of the opportunity to follow them in their pastoral visiting until dusk, I found myself asking if I only half-heartedly served in my own ministry. Differ as our traditions may, there is undoubtedly something for us to learn in this respect. We may leave the regular offering of daily prayer for a time that better understands the need to deepen Christian practice in this respect, and we may still continue to celebrate the Lord's Holy Communion seldom as of old, yet it remains a fact that we should visit our parishioners' homes more, especially in city parishes. This was the abiding impression for this visitor.⁴²⁸

⁴²³ *Hjä* 28/14.7.1950 Toimintamuotojen runsauteen kiintyy huomio Englannin kirkoon tutustuessa.

⁴²⁴ *Gulin* 1968, 128-129; *Mäkinen* 2008, 6-7.

⁴²⁵ *Hjä* 42/20.10.1950 Piirteitä Englannin kirkon sosiaalisesta työstä teollisuusalueilla.

⁴²⁶ *Hjä* 38/22.9.1950 Tien ohesta tempomia.

⁴²⁷ *Hjä* 38/22.9.1950 Tien ohesta tempomia.

⁴²⁸ *Hjä* 38/22.9.1950 Tien ohesta tempomia.

What Vaeltaja – on this occasion, probably Wainio – did not understand was that the Anglican clergy, whom he so much admired for visiting their parishioners, saw both these visits and the offering of public worship as integral and mutually supportive aspects of their priestly ministry. Vaeltaja, like most Finnish church people, did not see the reintroduction of the daily office and a more frequent celebration of Holy Communion as a realistic option. In this respect he differed from Lehtonen, who indeed advocated them as part of a high church revival of parish life.

Vaeltaja's assessment of the differences between Finnish and English church life was confirmed in *Herättäjä* by Dr. Edvard J. Burgen, an English Anglican, who visited Finland and told the newspaper that regular participation in Holy Communion was indeed a cornerstone of Anglican church life. While Finnish church life was marked by a strong spirituality he wished that the centrality of the Eucharist might receive greater emphasis in the life of the church and the individual Christian. For Burgen, the celebration of the Eucharist was the centre and source of all church life, because it communicated the grace of God in a real way to the congregation. He also stressed the education of clergy in this matter at the theological colleges, where ordinands were taught the meaning of liturgical life as a blessing for their future ministry.⁴²⁹ This was undoubtedly one of the reasons Lehtonen had so valued the theological colleges and supported their possible introduction in the Finnish Church.

While Finns were still being sent to England, Gulin continued his ecumenical work in his own particular way. Gulin, while ecumenically very open, did not share Lehtonen's passion for Anglican theology and church life. He took a relaxed view of faith and order issues, preferring practical action. Gulin had initially been reluctant to join the 1930 negotiations, and he retained his reserve for institutional ecumenism between churches. He was more interested in practical ecumenism between people and common Christian action in evangelism and service.⁴³⁰

Gulin's extensive correspondence with several churchmen from various countries and traditions exemplifies his ecumenical approach. He was always ready to help Christians in need, for example assisting the Finnish

⁴²⁹ *Hjä* 31/4.8.1950 Herran Pyhän Ehtoollisen säännöllinen viettäminen anglikaanisen kirkon peruspilari.

⁴³⁰ *Krapu* 2007, 71-76, 147-157.

Orthodox Church in their communication with the CFR.⁴³¹ When the Rev. L.W. Harland, the former Secretary of the CRE, asked Gulin's assistance in 1950 in finding a flag pole for his friend the Dean of Lichfield, Gulin was quick to oblige. Gulin delivered the flag pole as a gift from the Diocese of Tampere in return for the cars the Finns had received from England. The flag pole was delivered with a silver plate, as *Kotimaa* explained to its readers.⁴³² Gulin was pleased to be able to help his English friends as they had helped him.

The reciprocity Gulin encouraged led to the establishment of a modest au-pair scheme, when he asked assistance in accommodating a young woman from his diocese the following autumn. In the event, Harland suggested she come to his own home, as their previous Norwegian au-pair was about to leave.⁴³³ While Gulin's approach certainly promoted friendship, it contributed little to theological rapprochement between the churches, which was better left to others.

5. Lehtonen's influence fades

a. Moss and the Apostolic Succession

The question of apostolic succession remained the basic problem in the relations of all the Nordic Lutheran Churches with the Church of England. This became especially clear during the visit of the Rev. C.B. Moss to Finland and Norway in the summer of 1949. The visit followed the Nordic Bishops' Triennial Conference held in Sauvo, Finland, in August 1949, which Lehtonen hosted.⁴³⁴

The timing of Moss' visit ensured that the Nordic Bishops' Conference was still fresh in Gulin's thoughts when Moss met him in Tampere. Gulin told Moss that almost all the Swedish, and all Finnish, bishops had been

⁴³¹ LPL CFR LR OC file 121 Prestige to Dix 25.10.1949; KA EG 24 James to Gulin 2.11.1949.

⁴³² KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 15.4.1950, 10.5.1950, 2.6.1950, Iremonger to Gulin August 1950; *Kmaa* 49/16.6.1950 Suomesta lipputanko Lontooseen.

⁴³³ KA EG 24 Harland to Gulin 23.10.1950.

⁴³⁴ KA EG 11 Lehtonen to Gulin 5.7.1949.

present, but that there had been only three bishops from Norway, while the Bishops of Copenhagen and Iceland had been absent.⁴³⁵ The atmosphere had been somewhat strained:

There was a sharp division between the Swedes and Finns on one side, and the Danes and Norwegians on the other, about the Apostolic Succession. Bishop Gulin said that all the Swedish and Finnish bishops were scholars and doctors of divinity: the Danes and Norwegians were not, and consequently had a feeling of inferiority.⁴³⁶

Anglican relations lay behind the debate on succession, as the Church of England had endeavoured to enter a similar theological discussion with the Churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway as it had earlier had with the Finnish and Baltic Lutheran churches.⁴³⁷

The difficulties at the conference had been exacerbated by the different academic backgrounds of the Nordic bishops. Understanding the issue posed no challenge to Moss and Gulin, who were both established scholars.⁴³⁸ It soon became clear, however, that even the Finns and Swedes, of whom the other Nordic churches were critical on this point, did not agree with the Anglican understanding of apostolic succession.

For Gulin, “the Apostolic Succession was not, as for the Roman Catholics, the conveyance of something material, but a principle of Church unity.”⁴³⁹ He thus could not understand why Bishop Berggrav had prevented him from participating in the consecration of the Bishop of Trondheim. Moss understood Berggrav’s refusal; he thought that the “Succession should not be restored by a sort of accident”.⁴⁴⁰ For Moss and Berggrav apostolic succession was too important a principle to be addressed lightly; for Gulin it was a practical matter.

⁴³⁵ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴³⁶ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴³⁷ *Österlin* 1995, 279-280.

⁴³⁸ *Hjä* 33/9.9.1949 Englannissa ei sodan jälkeen ole ollut herätyksiä.

⁴³⁹ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁴⁰ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

Moss pointed out that apostolic succession for all was necessary if their goal of a universally recognised ministry in a united Church were to be achieved. Although Gulin assured him that he agreed, Moss felt there was a distinction in their understanding. Moss suspected that whereas "for me the Succession is the necessary instrument for union, for him it is only a symbol of union."⁴⁴¹ Moss was probably correct, and it made a world of difference to their attitude towards the importance of the manner of how a universal succession might be achieved. Moss' understanding arose from the Lambeth Quadrilateral; Gulin was influenced by the Lutheran theology of ministry, and the practical difficulties which had led the Finnish Church both to lose and reinstate succession by what might be seen as an accident.⁴⁴² Moss' view is illuminating in a broader sense, as it highlights the general Anglican – and not only the Anglo-Catholic position – on the unity of the Church built on a ministry united by the historic episcopate.

Despite the differences in opinion, it was an amicable meeting. Moss recorded that Gulin was extremely cordial and that they had prayed together in his chapel. In his report to the CFR entitled "The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession"⁴⁴³ Moss emphasized that he had asked no question about the conference, but that what Gulin had told him had been "quite unsolicited."⁴⁴⁴

Lehtonen discussed the matter in a more constrained way with Moss when he visited him in Turku. His irritation with Gulin's carelessness is understandable. Lehtonen made no comment on the conference to Moss beyond "that he could not understand why the Danes and Norwegians, who had been so closely connected with the English in politics, were so distant from them ecclesiastically".⁴⁴⁵ Lehtonen preferred not to discuss Nordic

⁴⁴¹ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁴² *Gulin* 1944, 50-51; *Gulin* 1967, 258-266; *Gulin* 1968, 26-33; *Krapu* 2007, 69-74, 146-147, 190-191.

⁴⁴³ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949. The Document bears no author. This has led *Krapu* to suppose that it was written by Bishop Colin Dunlop, who visited Finland in 1948. *Krapu* 2007, 144-145.

⁴⁴⁴ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁴⁵ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949; *Österlin* 1995, 278-279.

Lutheran problems with Moss. He felt such discussions should stay within the Lutheran family.

Significantly, Lehtonen expected the political relations of the Nordic Countries with Great Britain to affect the ecumenical considerations of the Nordic Lutheran Churches in their relations with the Church of England, and was surprised to find that this was not so where the Danes, Icelanders and Norwegians were concerned. A nation state's foreign policy was a key area for him as a leader of a national church in considering ecumenical relations, and he expected the same from his Nordic Lutheran peers. Theology notwithstanding, good relations with the Church of England were for Lehtonen an important means to strengthen Finnish political ties with the west.

Times were changing: Lehtonen lacked his former energy and enthusiasm. This did not mean that Moss did not receive a thorough introduction to Finnish church life. Indeed, he was taken around Helsinki and Turku, visiting many church institutions and historical sites which he described in his newsletter to the prayer circle. During the ten days Moss spent in Finland, he met the Orthodox Bishop Alexander in Helsinki and spent an evening singing alternately English and Finnish hymns, some of which had common roots, probably with the Rev. Martti Parvio, his family and friends.⁴⁴⁶ The programme was thus close to that provided for previous English visitors.

Publicity, however, was more low key. Moss was interviewed only by the Turku-based *Herättäjä*. Moss opined in the interview that the churches had much to share with each other and that he had always learned something when in Finland, this being his fifth visit to the country. He recalled the process by which relations had strengthened, beginning with the inter-war period, and stressed the importance of Lehtonen's input. The interview gave a detailed account of academic and theological life, but one aspect aroused *Herättäjä*'s interest, and was used in the article's headline. No organised revivals had occurred in England after the war, but Sunday attendance remained somewhat higher than in Finland.⁴⁴⁷ This, it seems, was what Finnish readers understood and cared about.

⁴⁴⁶ LPL CFR OC file 148 NEWS FROM THE CHURCH OF FINLAND. LETTER NO. 3. NOVEMBER 1949.

⁴⁴⁷ *Hjä* 33/9.9.1949 Englannissa ei sodan jälkeen herätyksiä.

The reduced interest in Moss' visit may have reflected a general reduction in interest by the Finnish media as the political situation stabilised, and the Archbishop's lack of effort to make the visit an occasion. Some elementary errors in the interview testify to the fact that it had not been proof read by Lehtonen or those close to him.

From Finland Moss continued to Norway where he met Bishop Berggrav. The significance of the apostolic succession was high on the agenda. Moss, who had not met Bishop Berggrav before, was taken aback by the intensity of his reception: Berggrav began "at once, without any warning" with what Moss described as "a bitter complaint against the Anglican policy."⁴⁴⁸

Berggrav was offended that the Anglicans had recognized Swedish and Finnish orders, but not Danish and Norwegian.⁴⁴⁹ He did not accept the Anglican insistence on the historic episcopate, but emphasized instead the apostolic succession in faith and baptism, which he considered much more important. Berggrav's concept of Christian unity stemmed from the faith of an individual believer, which broke down all barriers. Unity was for him a God-given gift through faith, and there was no need for harmonized church order for the kind of unity in diversity he advocated. Instead, the different traditions should accept and respect their differences, while allowing concrete expressions of God-given unity in a common endeavour for righteousness and freedom in the world, and in common intercession and Eucharistic celebration.⁴⁵⁰ This differed markedly from the Anglican, and even the Swedish and Finnish Lutheran, understanding of Church unity and its practical implications.

A recent incident at the ecumenical Oslo Youth Conference had exacerbated the situation. Anglicans had at first accepted an invitation to attend a festive Eucharist, with the approval of the Bishop of Fulham, but it was later declined when Bishop Neill read a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury forbidding Anglicans to communicate. The incident had caused a breach in the conference's unity, and Berggrav felt very deeply about it.⁴⁵¹

⁴⁴⁸ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁴⁹ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949; *Heiene* 1992, 417; *Krapu* 2007, 144-145.

⁴⁵⁰ *Heiene* 1992, 417-418.

⁴⁵¹ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949; *Krapu* 2007, 144-145.

He was also upset that some Norwegian pastors had been refused Communion in England while Finns and Swedes were given Communion without question. Moss felt “a certain element of jealousy” in Berggrav’s attitude.⁴⁵²

He said that the Finns had no more got the succession than the Norwegians had. The Archbishop of Uppsala had been invited, as a friend, to take part in some of their consecrations: but there was no act of the Church, and his presence there was only accidental. It was not a proper basis for the distinction drawn by the Anglicans between the Finns and the Norwegians.⁴⁵³

A proper understanding of the meaning of the apostolic succession of bishops seems to have been especially important, both for those who considered it necessary for the unity of the Church and those who completely rejected its value.

Berggrav also sought to show that the succession had been broken during the time of St Irenaeus. He had been encouraged in this by Professor Molland, who had arranged the meeting for Moss. Moss did not want to get involved in a theological dispute, but adopted a more diplomatic approach. He explained that the Church of England was in no position to make concessions about the succession as it “would give a handle to the Romans to attack us, would destroy our long-standing friendship with the Orthodox, and would weaken our position in relation to the Free Churches.”⁴⁵⁴ Moss could take a practical approach to the matter when it suited him. However, his was a markedly Anglo-Catholic ecumenical stance, emphasizing unity with the historic churches through the historic episcopate, and a separate approach to relations with the free churches.⁴⁵⁵

Moss also commended the bravery of the Norwegian Church during the war, which seemed to mellow the Bishop a little, who thought that if there was no direct solution an indirect one might be found. He would bring the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to send representatives to a

⁴⁵² LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁵³ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁵⁴ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁵⁵ *Avis* 2000, 20-21.

commission to discuss relations to the other bishops in November.⁴⁵⁶ This commission studied whether it was possible to achieve a similar agreement to that which the Church of England had signed with the Finnish and Baltic Churches in the 1930s.

Moss explained the Anglican attitude to Berggrav's grievances. The Church of England did not have 'full communion' with the Swedish or the Finnish Church. The only non-Anglicans with whom they had full communion were the Old Catholics. He claimed to know this well, having participated in all the ecumenical dialogues.⁴⁵⁷ In fact, Moss' detailed understanding of the different levels of communion dated only from the 1948 Lambeth Conference, when Bishop Bell had explained the distinction.

Moss also assured Berggrav that this was understood by the Finns, as Lehtonen had told him a few days before that they were not yet in full communion. "The agreement with the Finns was only an interim agreement: some points were not yet settled about the Finnish succession." Moss would not dispute what Berggrav had said, but "it was not at all in agreement with what we had been told."⁴⁵⁸ While Moss was taking the official position of Finnish relations, approved and advocated by Lehtonen, Berggrav was more familiar with Finnish popular opinion, which did not place a high priority on the apostolic succession, but was happy to have achieved de-facto eucharistic hospitality.

Moss explained the ecumenical praxis of the Church of England, which made it impossible for English Anglicans to communicate at large public Eucharists. He explained that it would be possible for Norwegians to receive permission from the bishop of a diocese to communicate at his altars, as there was no doubt concerning the orthodoxy of the Norwegian Church. In regard to the apostolic succession, Moss explained that it had been an Anglican principle before the Oxford Movement, but that Erastian issues had made the Tractarian emphasis on it increasingly necessary.⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁶ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁵⁷ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁵⁸ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁵⁹ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

Moss was correct in his assessment of the importance of the historic episcopate for all Anglicans, whose history meant that the episcopate, if not any particular theory about it, had become a cornerstone of Anglican identity. The distinction between the Anglo-Catholics, who dominated much of the ecumenical discussions of the time, and the rest is seen only in the different theological theories concerning and importance attached to the historic episcopate.⁴⁶⁰ This is well illustrated by the liberal Bishop Hunter's more practical approach to the question.

Moss' explanations seemed to pacify Berggrav. He saw Berggrav as a fighter, who needed to air his grievances from the outset. Moss' experience of Bishop Fuglsang-Damgaard, whom he considered a diplomat, was very different. However, Moss doubted what he might be able to achieve with Berggrav. He thought the Norwegians in general were jealous of the Swedes, who had not shared their suffering in the war, and doubted whether Berggrav really understood what they meant by the apostolic succession or why they thought it necessary. He considered Berggrav needed "very careful and sympathetic handling" and doubted whether it was of any use to argue with him.⁴⁶¹

Moss drew his findings together in four suggestions:

1. The Danes and Norwegians have a succession though not an episcopal one, and the Augsburg Confession which they accept assumes the continuance of the old ministry: They are therefore in a totally different position from those who reject the sacerdotal type of ministry and with it the principle of succession. This should be emphasized. It was not mentioned by us at all.
2. We ought to make it quite clear that Apostolic Succession is not, in our view, anything magical, but simply the only possible source of ministerial authority, and the only means by which a ministry recognized by the whole of Christendom can ever be obtained. This is so obvious that I do not see why we should not all agree about it, without raising the question whether episcopal ordination is necessary in theory. If we are to have a united Christendom, it is necessary in practice.
3. The Bishop of Oslo clearly had to conciliate the Pietists: and it must therefore be shown that the Apostolic Succession is no mere legality, but has an important spiritual value.

⁴⁶⁰ *Bell* 1948a, 17-31; *Norris* 1999, 333-344; *Avis* 2000, 19-21.

⁴⁶¹ LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

4. In all these countries, Rome is still a great bugbear. We must therefore show that our controversy with Rome, if nothing else, made it impossible for us to make any concessions.⁴⁶²

What applied to the Norwegian attitude applied also to the Finnish; the difference was with the leadership. In Norway Bishop Berggrav had doubts about the historic episcopate; in Finland Lehtonen was in favour of it. The fact that he was the first Finnish Bishop from an Anglican perspective to enjoy the re-established apostolic succession, together with his love for the English Church made all the difference.

b. The Church of England's policy towards the Nordic Churches

The discussion on the meaning and importance of the apostolic succession continued to dominate official relations between the Church of England and the Nordic Lutheran Churches throughout the post-war period. The different status in relations with the different Nordic churches further complicated the discussions between the churches. There was confusion in the Church of England concerning how best to handle the different sets of discussions with the Nordic Lutheran Churches.

The Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conferences, begun in 1929, were unofficial gatherings of distinguished theologians and church leaders, drawing together all the churches, but without the aim achieving any formal agreements. Their aim was to learn more about each other and to build bridges between Lutheran and Anglican theology and ecclesiology rather than to issue public statements.⁴⁶³ As such their work was largely unknown even by theologians.

Besides this series of conferences, the Church of England continued to have an official theological dialogue with the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Denmark, Norway and Iceland. This dialogue began with a preliminary conference with these churches in Chichester in 1947 and the 1948 Lambeth Conference resolutions urged the churches to continue. The purpose was to attempt to achieve a formal level of unity and Bell, for instance,

⁴⁶² LPL CFR Documents L.R.C. 35 The Scandinavian Bishops and Apostolic Succession. 28.9.1949.

⁴⁶³ *Bring* 1965, 184-187; *Österlin* 1995, 261-263.

saw it as a continuation of the discussions held with the Finnish and Baltic Churches in the 1930s.⁴⁶⁴

The underlying ecumenical strategy of the Church of England towards the Nordic Lutheran Churches thus entailed the complex task of distinguishing between and balancing the two sets of conferences. This is vividly illustrated in the preparation for and evaluation of the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference held in Durham in 1950, which coincided with the start of the official dialogue with the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway.

Confusion began soon after the 1948 Lambeth Conference decision to confer informally with the three Nordic Churches. As early as September 1948, the Rev. Reginald Cant asked Waddams on behalf of the Bishop of Hereford, Richard Godfrey Parsons, if unofficial conferences were still considered worthwhile, and if they should be guided by the formal dialogue and be conducted in parallel. Cant had learned that the Nordic Churches were anxious to continue the unofficial conferences. He suggested Durham as a possible venue, but stressed that the decision should be made quickly were it to be organised in 1949.⁴⁶⁵

Waddams discussed the matter with Archbishop Fisher, who thought it best to continue the unofficial conferences “without taking any notice of other plans for discussions as the result of the Lambeth Conference.”⁴⁶⁶ Waddams explained to Cant that the two conferences were unlikely to clash or even to overlap very much. He thought “it much better to continue as before” since he “was sure these unofficial conferences can do a good deal in the way of theological discussion which cannot be undertaken by more formally appointed committees.”⁴⁶⁷ Waddams was thus thoroughly convinced of the value of the unofficial conversations. This was natural, as he had himself been their secretary in the 1930s.⁴⁶⁸

The next challenge was to find a suitable English chairman for the unofficial Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference. Waddams was keen to have a bishop as chairman, as this would increase the prestige of the Church of England delegation, given that the Nordic churches often had several

⁴⁶⁴ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Bell to Waddams 8.8.1950.

⁴⁶⁵ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Cant to Waddams 1.9.1948.

⁴⁶⁶ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Cant 5.10.1948.

⁴⁶⁷ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Cant 5.10.1948.

⁴⁶⁸ *Bring* 1965, 186-187.

bishops in their delegations.⁴⁶⁹ Indeed, the only regular participant from Finland was Bishop Eelis Gulin, who had participated in the conference long before his consecration.⁴⁷⁰

Waddams considered Bishop Leslie Hunter of Sheffield as the most likely candidate for the chairmanship and portrayed him "as very keen on relations with Scandinavia" knowing many of the countries, and being practically gifted.⁴⁷¹ Some of the English organisers, such as Michael Ramsey, thought the chairmanship should be given to an able theologian rather than to a capable organiser. A consideration of suitable theologians among the English and Scottish episcopate by Ramsey and Waddams failed to produce many candidates: the Bishops of Derby, Oxford, Truro, Bristol and London in England and of Brechin in Scotland were mentioned.⁴⁷² The task was eventually given to Hunter, who performed it well for many years to come.⁴⁷³

So, finding a theologically able Church of England bishop with a strong commitment to ecumenical dialogue with the Nordic Lutheran Churches was not an easy task. The older generation was passing away, while men like Ramsey, who was not yet a bishop at the time, were still too young. This was a common challenge for the churches in the immediate post-war years. The war had created a break between the generations of theologians.

An unexpected outcome of the unofficial nature of the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conferences was that the CFR decided that it would be unable to fund the accommodation of foreign visitors. The Assistant General Secretary, the Rev. W.H. Macartney, refused Hunter's appeal against this: the CFR was a council of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and concerned with official matters: unofficial conferences were beyond its purview. Macartney advised Hunter to turn to the CRE.⁴⁷⁴ This was a natural continuation of Waddams' policy of distancing himself and later his office from the

⁴⁶⁹ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Parsons to Waddams 15.11.1948, Waddams to Parsons 17.11.1948.

⁴⁷⁰ *Bring* 1965, 186-187.

⁴⁷¹ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Parsons 17.11.1948.

⁴⁷² LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Ramsey to Waddams 12.1.1949, Waddams to Ramsey 14.1.1949.

⁴⁷³ *Österlin* 1995, 267; *Arnold* 1985, 172-173; The Interview of the Very Revd John Arnold 7.12.2006.

⁴⁷⁴ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Hunter to Prestige 9.11.1949, Macartney to Hunter 16.11.1949.

unofficial conference after he had joined the CFR.⁴⁷⁵ One can only guess if he would have approved the decision, which was made in his absence.

However, the distinction between the official and unofficial conferences remained unclear among the Anglicans involved in them. For example, in May 1950 the Acting General Secretary of the CFR, the Rev. Dr. G.L. Prestige had to explain the difference to Canon Norman T. Cockburn of Edinburgh Cathedral. Cockburn had been present at the Oxford meeting between the Church of England and the Churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway and had sent his observations to Prestige. In explaining the difference, Prestige explained the over-all policy with the Lutherans as he saw it:

Personally, I think there is a good deal to be said for some drawing together of persons professing High Church principles in Anglican, Lutheran and Old Catholic bodies. But it is essential, to my mind, that they should be at great pains not to split, or seem to desire to split, Lutheranism into two lumps – the one “Episcopal Lutheranism” and the other “non-Episcopal Lutheranism.” I feel strongly conscious of two things: (1) that all Lutherans are Lutherans first and fundamentally (just as virtually all Anglicans are Anglicans first and fundamentally), (2) that any High Church influence on Lutheran or Reformed bodies should work like leaven from inside, and not like high explosives from outside.⁴⁷⁶

Whatever opportunity for ecumenical rapprochement the Lutheran high church revival might offer, denominational unity and integrity remained more important for Prestige. The very fact that he had to explain it to Cockburn, who had contacts with Nordic high church Lutherans, indicates that others had a different view.

The issue of two set of discussions also sparked a debate about the Church of England’s general ecumenical policy towards the Nordic Lutheran Churches. Bishop Bell wrote to Waddams explaining the situation as he saw it. The distinction between the two was not as important for Bell as it was for Waddams. Bell saw much overlapping between the two, especially where both English and Scandinavian participants were concerned. He therefore thought that the unofficial conference should be postponed in order to save the time and money of the visitors, some of whom could take part in both conferences.⁴⁷⁷

Bell was, however anxious about the outcome of the process:

⁴⁷⁵ LPL CFR LR file 117/1 Waddams to Parsons 22.5.1947, Parsons to Waddams 24.5.1947, LPL CFR LR file 177/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁷⁶ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Prestige to Cockburn 17.5.1950.

⁴⁷⁷ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Bell to Waddams 8.8.1950.

I think with Berggrav that if we do not take a step forward with the official commission this time, in the way of agreeing on recommendations for some sort of limited intercommunion, there is very great danger of a serious step back. Better not to meet than to meet without some tangible result. You however think that we should enter upon a course of theological discussion. You may be right: but I do not think that our official commission is a proper body for that. You will remember that at Chichester the Norwegians and the Danes were most anxious to get to grips with the problem of ecclesiastical relations. If we could start from where we left off at Chichester, we should be carrying the matter forward ecclesiastically. But you may say that it is impossible to get agreement in the Church of England on any proposals of this kind. If so, then I think we had better wait before we start in on the official line, letting the unofficial conference go on with their theological issues.

I envisage the conference with the Norwegian, Danish and Icelandic churchmen as a direct continuation of our conferences with Finland and the Baltic Churches; and I should be sorry if we did not get at least as far as we did with the Baltic Churches: though I am sure we cannot possibly expect the Church of Norway to accept the Apostolic Succession at the present juncture. The very idea of proposing it to them would meet with strong reaction. By all means discuss the nature of the Church and so forth: but let it be done through the theological commission rather than ours. Or if you like, let the theological commission be given quite different terms of reference, and be brought into some definite relations to our commission.⁴⁷⁸

Bell saw that the churches had reached a difficult stage in their negotiations. It was highly unlikely that the remaining Scandinavian Lutheran Churches would accept the re-introduction of the historic episcopate and agree to refrain from non-episcopal ordinations, which had made possible the agreement with the Finnish and Baltic Lutheran Churches in the 1930s. At the same time he doubted whether the Church of England could accept a practical agreement with the Scandinavians with the same outcome as with the Finnish and Baltic Churches without a commitment to apostolic succession, even if he personally seemed happy with such an agreement.

Furthermore, Bell knew the Norwegians and realised that any further indication of lack of unity and disregard for their ministry would only push them further from the Church of England. It was therefore very doubtful whether they should continue with official negotiations at all at the present juncture; rather, it might be better to allow the unofficial theological conference to do the work needed for theological rapprochement.

Bell's approach raised some difficult questions for Waddams, who disapproved of the popular tendency to expect concrete and immediate results from ecumenical conferences lest they be seen failures:

⁴⁷⁸ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Bell to Waddams 8.8.1950.

This psychological attitude seems to me to be harmful to the cause of reunion as a whole, because it means that unless we are pretty sure of getting positive results we cannot hold a conference at all for fear of causing serious disappointment. I have, therefore, been rather anxious to try to break down this idea, because if the reunion movement is to progress it seems to me that in most cases official conferences spread over a long time will be required before any attempt is made at negotiating particular agreements. The reason I think these are necessary is that there is a big job of education to do amongst ordinary lay people, and in a good sense a big job of propaganda, not only in the Churches with whom we may be having discussions, but also in the Church of England. Some of the educational work of a very valuable kind can be done by unofficial conferences, but normally these will never touch more than a very small and select band of theologians, and it is only by official conferences that we can get the necessary publicity for the kind of propaganda and education which I have in mind.⁴⁷⁹

Waddams' claim for the propaganda and education value of the theological conferences for ordinary people was very much ahead of its time: his wartime experience in the Ministry of Information was no doubt a factor in this.

Another reason Waddams wanted to have solid theological discussions alongside the practical negotiations was his desire that "the latter can be seen to spring out of a solid and well defined agreement on theological principles."⁴⁸⁰ "This method", he thought, would "do something to counteract the accusation which is so easily and readily made by certain circles in the Church of England that the negotiations are simply schemes by the officials or by individual Bishops to push the Church of England into ill-advised schemes of union with the protestant churches."⁴⁸¹ Waddams was very much aware of such a risk and wanted to remove any weapons from the hands of those who made "such ill-advised and misleading allegations".⁴⁸² The reality was that large sections of the Church of England were not necessarily in favour of odd agreements with little-known foreign churches. This had already been seen in the public debate about the Finnish agreement in the mid-1930s, which had been opposed by conservative Anglo-Catholics.⁴⁸³

Waddams had a concise view of the general policy towards the Nordic Lutheran Churches and the different sets of conferences:

⁴⁷⁹ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁸⁰ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁸¹ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁸² LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁸³ *Jasper* 1960, 258-261; *Helle* 2007, 27-35.

To come to Norway. As you know, for a number of years I was intimately associated with the unofficial theological conferences between Anglicans and Scandinavians, as I was the English Secretary, and indeed it was I who produced the present set-up and got the Anglican team established and Cant made Secretary. I deliberately dis-associated it from C.F.R. and myself because I felt the importance of keeping the conferences unofficial. They have, I believe, done a most valuable and useful work, and I should have serious hesitations about your suggestion that they should be made more official. I think a good deal of their value derives from the fact that they have a freedom of expression and investigation which could hardly be preserved in an official conference, and I hope you will not press your idea at the present.

There is a further complication that these conferences deal not only with Denmark, Norway and Iceland but also with Sweden and Finland, and indeed the Swedes have, I think I may say, played the most prominent part on the Scandinavian side since the beginning. It would be impossible to exclude the Swedes and Finns from this series and if they were retained it might be rather confusing.

I entirely agree with you that it would be a great gain if all the Scandinavian Churches were on the same footing, but as our negotiations with the Finns have been concluded pro tem and it has been decided that the Swedish question should not at present be brought before Convocation, I think the best course left to us is to continue with the other three Churches and to try to reach some agreement which is similar to the Finns.⁴⁸⁴

From the Church of England's perspective the negotiations with the Finnish and Swedish Churches were in deadlock, and the other Nordic Churches held the key. There was thus nothing Lehtonen could do to further the cause of real reunion beyond what had already been done.

In following Bell's line, Waddams was realistic about the prospect of reaching an agreement with the remaining Scandinavians, and thought it better not to push the dialogue if a tangible result was unlikely, as public disappointment might do more harm than good. However, Waddams did not see "any insuperable objection to reach an agreement on the lines of the Baltic Church or Finnish agreement".⁴⁸⁵ Waddams feared that the first time inter-consecration were recommended at the conference a difficult situation would result, the resolution of which would largely depend on the chairman, and that it might then be difficult to get the agreement accepted in the Church of England without it sharing the fate of the previous agreements, where the Lower House of Canterbury had "removed most of the best part of the resolutions by not approving the invitation of a Bishop from Finland or the Baltic to take part in one of our consecrations, and by

⁴⁸⁴ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁸⁵ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

restricting the reception of members of those Churches to Holy Communion to those cut off from their own."⁴⁸⁶ Waddams at least understood how little in the end had been achieved by the 1930s negotiations, and was ready to offer the same arrangement to the remaining Nordic churches without a formal agreement.

Waddams was in favour of closer union with the Nordic Lutheran Churches, but remained realistic concerning what might be achieved by given actions. Although he disagreed with Lehtonen, who wanted his church to serve as a fore-runner, on the methodology of reunion, they were both convinced of its desirability.

Indeed, Waddams had grown weary of the way ecumenical dialogues were conducted: he did not consider "the time-honoured method of dealing with these questions -- at all satisfactory", but rather saw that it had "the effect of making people think of our relations in terms of their differences instead of in terms of their agreements." He had no alternative to suggest but "to try to put the conference on as broad a basis as possible."⁴⁸⁷

This illustrates that Waddams had moved from the suspicious reserve of the early twentieth century Anglo-Catholics towards all Lutherans to an appreciation of the Nordic churches and their traditions. This was particularly true of the Church of Sweden, about which he published a short introduction in 1946 in English, "as an encouragement for ordinary churchmen in England to take more personal interest in this neighbouring Church."⁴⁸⁸ However, as Waddams' later writings confirm, this interest was not sufficient to give Lutheranism a prominent role in the ecumenical field. On the contrary, Waddams' account of church history from the ecumenical perspective was, while very learned, also decidedly English and Anglican, with little room for Lutheran development.⁴⁸⁹ Unity with the Lutheran churches was simply not on the main ecumenical agenda of the Church of England in the mid-twentieth century.

Bell acknowledged the additional complication Swedish participation might bring to the conference and refrained from his idea of uniting the conferences, which continued independently.⁴⁹⁰ The Anglo-Scandinavian

⁴⁸⁶ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁸⁷ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Waddams to Bell 9.8.1950.

⁴⁸⁸ *Waddams* 1946, vii.

⁴⁸⁹ *Waddams* 1968.

⁴⁹⁰ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Extract from letter from Bell to Waddams 11.8.1950.

Theological Conference thus met in Durham in September 1950, and the Lambeth Commission with the Churches of Denmark, Iceland and Norway in Oslo in 1951. The official conference did not achieve a real breakthrough, and the churches' original positions remained largely unchanged. The only progress achieved was the subsequent permission for Danish, Icelandic and Norwegian Lutherans to communicate in the Church of England if they were cut off from their own ministrations.⁴⁹¹ This was undoubtedly the practical minimum outcome for which Bell and Waddams had hoped, so the conference was not seen as a complete failure. However, all in all the post-war period of ecumenical goodwill and reconstruction failed to bring the Church of England and the Nordic Lutheran Churches to 'real re-union'.

c. Last contacts with the Church of England

The discussion relating to the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference was not as intense in Finland as in England, although it is possible that preparations for the conference were not completely without controversy. The 1950 meeting in Durham was the first since Gloucester in 1934 not attended by Gulin. One reason for this was that it happened in close proximity to a long trip he was undertaking to Canada and the United States, of which Lehtonen disapproved. He distrusted Gulin's political wisdom, fearing what he might say in the USA.⁴⁹² The last thing he wanted was an international political schism resulting from the western relations of the Finnish Church.

Lehtonen is in any case likely to have been irritated by Gulin's decision, as his trip clashed with the Anglo-Scandinavian Conference. Gulin and Samuel Lehtonen had been invited to the Theological Conference by Bishop Leslie Hunter in December 1949. At the same time, Hunter had invited them to keep a few days free after the conference to come to Sheffield and "do a little speaking about Finland and Christian Reconstruction."⁴⁹³ Lehtonen, who had prioritised Lambeth over the WCC Amsterdam Conference, had a different set of priorities from Gulin, who thus missed an

⁴⁹¹ Österlin 1995, 278-280.

⁴⁹² Krapu 2007, 165-167; Bring 1965, 186-187.

⁴⁹³ KA EG 24 Hunter to Gulin 3.12.1949.

almost unprecedented opportunity to propagate the Finnish cause in England.

The Durham conference was attended by Samuel Lehtonen and Professor Aimo Nikolainen. The English team numbered eight, including Bishop Hunter, as the chairman, with Professor Michael Ramsey and Canon Alan Richardson, who had visited Finland with Hunter, among the participants. The theme of the conference was “The Eucharist & the Christian Life” and it was considered useful by both the Anglican and Lutheran participants.⁴⁹⁴ The Conference decided to meet next in Finland in 1952, with the theme “The Doctrine of Man”.⁴⁹⁵ The Finnish invitation may have been prompted by the coincidence of the Olympic Games the same summer in Helsinki.

Professor Nikolainen, who had given a paper on “The Eschatological Significance of the Eucharist”, effectively reported the substance of the conference in *Kotimaa*. He explained the theme, the various positions, and Eucharistic practice and understanding at length, the tone being generally ecumenically open and positive.⁴⁹⁶ Samuel Lehtonen gave a shorter interview about the Conference to *Herättäjä*, in which he emphasized the importance of the conference in making the respective traditions known to the other church.⁴⁹⁷ There also appeared a small notice of the forthcoming conference in Swedish.⁴⁹⁸ Although the conference had been a low key event, it received good publicity in the Finnish church press.

Later, Hunter thanked Lehtonen for inviting the conference to Finland. He promised that they would take a lot of trouble to bring “a representative group of English churchmen”, although it would probably to a large extent be a new team. He suggested Lehtonen “make use of them individually for a week or two before or after the Conference in different parts of Finland.”⁴⁹⁹

⁴⁹⁴ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Anglo Scandinavian Theological Conference, Extract from letter from Hoffmeyr to Fisher 19.9.1950; *Bring* 1965, 187. For some reason *Bring*'s list does not include Samuel Lehtonen.

⁴⁹⁵ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Anglo Scandinavian Theological Conference.

⁴⁹⁶ LPL CFR LR file 117/2 Anglo Scandinavian Theological Conference. The Eschatological Significance of the Eucharist by Professor Aimo T. Nikolainen, Helsinki; *Kmaa* 75/15.9.1950 Ehtoollinen ja kristillinen elämä englantilais-pohjoismaisen keskustelun kohteena.

⁴⁹⁷ *Hjä* 37/15.9.1950 Herran ehtoollisesta keskusteltiin anglo-skandinaavisessa teologikokouksessa.

⁴⁹⁸ *Fsb* 2/21.1.1950 Engelsk-nordisk teologkongress i England.

⁴⁹⁹ KA AL 35 Hunter to Lehtonen 21.9.1950.

Hunter remembered that Lehtonen had been anxious to get 'a truly representative' bishop when he first visited Finland, and hoped he would use the opportunity of hosting the conference to advocate the cause of Anglican-Lutheran relations.

Though delighted at Samuel's presence, Hunter wrote that the conference had learned "with deep concern and sympathy of your illness." The situation must have been serious as Samuel Lehtonen had written to Hunter after the conference to inform him of his father's recovering health.⁵⁰⁰

When Hunter recalled his first meeting with Lehtonen in 1947 in the mid 1960s, he stated that he had died only two years later. Hunter's account says much about how he perceived the Finnish situation in the late 1940s:

The Archbishop was a finely sensitive man. The Russian War, in which the Finns had terrible losses, was a deep tragedy to him - the more so because it brought a personal loss - he took me to see his eldest son's grave - and separated his country from us. He was already a rather sick man, and he realized with a sad courage that his days would be shortened. This gave poignance and urgency to his words. I remember vividly a long conversation for which he had prepared carefully on a seat in the little garden in front of the cathedral. He opened to me his hopes and fears for his Church and people, his desire to renew the links with our English Church and told me what he hoped I might do to strengthen them. He resumed the conversation more than once. He asked me to say the Prayer Book Compline which he loved, in his chapel, partly because it symbolized for him the tie with our Church. It was an unexpected and moving experience to be taken so quickly and fully into his confidence and to be allowed to see when the veil of shyness was lifted the spiritual quality of the man - a memory that I cherish. He died two years later at the age of 56 - a loss to the Scandinavian Churches and of a potential leader in the ecumenical movement, for he was both scholarly and resourceful.⁵⁰¹

Hunter saw and sympathised with the political, theological and personal aspects of Lehtonen's programme for closer relations with the Church of England, presenting them in his account. Intuitively he misplaced Lehtonen's death around 1949. The lost years to a great extent reflect Lehtonen's lingering final illness, along with the subsequent petering out of the previously lively communication.

The less active relations that followed were apparent during the first visit of the new Bishop Fulham, the Rt. Rev. George Ingle, to Finland in June 1950. The visit was well planned by the Church of England and Lehtonen was informed of Ingle's impending arrival in March by Archbishop Fisher.

⁵⁰⁰ KA AL 35 Hunter to Lehtonen 21.9.1950.

⁵⁰¹ *Hunter* 1965, 25-26.

He was sure that Lehtonen would warmly welcome Ingle and hoped that "as he gets to know your Church, he will contribute much to fostering the brotherly relations which so deeply and firmly bind our two Churches together."⁵⁰² This was merely ecumenical politeness: Fisher sent a similar letter with almost identical wording to Archbishop Herman of the Finnish Orthodox Church.⁵⁰³ The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland enjoyed no special relationship with the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The visit of the Bishop of Fulham was in the normal course of his ministry. He came to "minister his own flock resident among you" as Fisher explained to the Finnish Archbishops.⁵⁰⁴ It was thus natural that the practical arrangements were the responsibility of the Anglican chaplain in Helsinki, the Rev. Sydney Linton. Linton met the bishop in Turku on his arrival by boat from Stockholm on Saturday 10 June 1950, accompanied him in Finland and then to Moscow on the following Tuesday.⁵⁰⁵

By chance Bishop Ingle met Lehtonen in Stockholm before his arrival in Finland. They both happened to visit the Bishop of Stockholm at the same time; Lehtonen and his wife were on their way home from Switzerland.⁵⁰⁶ Four days later Ingle arrived in Turku and was met by Linton and one of Lehtonen's sons, who took him to breakfast at the Archbishop's house. Ingle's report of the occasion shows all the usual signs of Lehtonen's hospitality towards English visitors:

Their hospitality was charming. Afterwards, prayers in the little private chapel, read by the son who is a minister and chaplain to his father, and went to Westcott House. Another son played the American organ. Prayers in English. We sang "The Church's one Foundation" and "Now thank we all our God". I found the Archbishop a most delightful man. He had been ill and had just spent some weeks in Switzerland.⁵⁰⁷

⁵⁰² LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen March 1950.

⁵⁰³ LPL CFR OC file 121 Fisher to Herman Aav 16.5.1950.

⁵⁰⁴ LPL CFR LR file 28 Fisher to Lehtonen March 1950; LPL CFR OC file 121 Fisher to Herman Aav 16.5.1950.

⁵⁰⁵ KA EG 25 Linton to Gulin 31.5.1950, 8.6.1950; LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950; *CT* 4575/13.10.1950 The Bishop of Fulham in Sweden.

⁵⁰⁶ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Stockholm June 6th.

⁵⁰⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Abo June 10th.

Lehtonen's illness apart, he and his family were still able to offer a warm welcome to a foreign visitor.

Ingle recorded seventeen points in his conversation with Lehtonen. These included his practical observations on the Church of Finland situation and practices, but also Lehtonen's thoughts on the Church of England and Nordic Lutheran co-operation. According to Lehtonen "Norway would most naturally receive Apostolic Succession from Sweden, but wants nothing from Sweden", for nationalistic reasons.⁵⁰⁸ Lehtonen recognised the fundamental challenge in Nordic Lutheran – Church of England relations, but had no suggestion of how to overcome it.

With regard to his own church, the Archbishop was content:

Finland and Church of England relations never so good as now. The Archbishop said that much depends on Brilioth. Sweden and Finland have settled relations with the Church of England. Now it remains to foster these relations.⁵⁰⁹

Lehtonen had now come to share the CFR view that the relations of the Church of England with Sweden and Finland were settled for the time being. It is a matter for debate whether this was because of the lack of response from the Church of England to his endeavours to proceed further with the Finnish case, the reduced political tension in Finland, the recommendation of the 1948 Lambeth Conference that the whole communion should receive the results of the 1930s negotiations, or his declining health. It is likely that all these played their part in Lehtonen's loss of the urgency he had shown immediately after the war.

However, Lehtonen continued planning for closer future relations. He advised Ingle to get the Swedish high church theologian Bo Giertz to England and involve him in the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conferences. He also wanted to welcome a strong delegation from England in 1955 to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the Church of Finland.⁵¹⁰

Later, Lehtonen wrote to Fisher thanking him for the greeting Ingle had brought, and expressing his hope that a visit by Bishop Neill, whose latest book *The Cross over Asia* he had read "with great delight", might still be

⁵⁰⁸ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Abo June 10th.

⁵⁰⁹ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Abo June 10th.

⁵¹⁰ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Abo June 10th; *Heiene* 2005, 124.

possible. Lehtonen described Ingle as “a very attractive man who certainly will bring our Churches closer to each other” and rejoiced that “the relations between the Church of England and the Scandinavian Churches are improving year by year.”⁵¹¹ Unlike Fisher, Lehtonen, motivated by his deep personal interest, continued to plan to build on the good relations already achieved.

Yet Lehtonen’s efforts to foster relations were exceptional among Finnish bishops. Linton had some difficulty in putting Ingle in touch with Gulin.⁵¹² Ingle found Gulin “a vigorous person with oecumenical experience.” He recorded four points arising from his conversation with Gulin. These points complemented in part what Lehtonen had already said, including mainly observations concerning the Finnish situation. There was, however, one notable difference. Gulin revealed that Lehtonen’s absence from the WCC Amsterdam Conference had been criticized in Finland.⁵¹³ Gulin saw no reason to conceal this, which serves to confirm his rift with Lehtonen.

Gulin’s meeting with Ingle seems to have been little more than an enjoyable social event. As such it resembled Ingle’s meeting with the Finnish Orthodox representative in Helsinki the same day.⁵¹⁴ It should be admitted, however, that the same definition might have been applied to Ingle’s meeting with Lehtonen. The usual hospitality was there as always, but there had been no extensive planning of great public occasions, which had been Lehtonen’s trademark.⁵¹⁵

Ingle’s main exposure in Finland came through the press. He gave an interview to *Kotimaa*, where he explained the duties and structures of the Church of England chaplaincies, chaplains and the Bishop of Fulham in Germany and Northern Europe.⁵¹⁶ He was interviewed by the main Swedish language newspaper *Hufvudstadsbladet* and there was a small report

⁵¹¹ LPL CFR LR file 28 Lehtonen to Fisher 26.6.1950.

⁵¹² KA EG 25 Linton to Gulin 31.5.1950, 8.6.1950; KA EG 24 Ingle to Gulin 16.6.1950.

⁵¹³ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Helsinki June 12th.

⁵¹⁴ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Helsinki June 12th.

⁵¹⁵ *Jokipii* 1951, 83.

⁵¹⁶ *Kmaa* 48/13.6.1950 Englantilainen piispa käynnillä Suomessa.

about his visit in the Swedish church newspaper *Församlingsbladet*.⁵¹⁷ Despite the coverage, Ingle's visit was not the public event that previous Anglican bishops' visits after the war had been. The churches had returned to regular peace-time activities: the intensive seeking of recognition from foreign churches was over.

d. Archbishop Lehtonen's legacy

Archbishop Aleksii Lehtonen died of a stroke on Easter Monday, 27 March 1951.⁵¹⁸ It is hard to assess the precise state of his health during his last year, but Samuel Lehtonen's reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury's expression of condolence reveals at least something of it:

There was a serious breach in my Father's health last autumn, but he recovered to some extent and was able to take part in Bishop's and Chapter meetings and read books. He could not, however, visit parishes or preach. So we think that it was God's mercy to take him away from the middle of the Easter festival of his home. This was much better than long years of illness and inactivity. On Easter Monday my brother Michael was confirmed in the House Chapel. One of my Father's last acts was to lay hands on his son and to bless him. This brought great consolation to us.⁵¹⁹

Lehtonen's untimely death at the age of fifty-nine was not unexpected. Indeed, the situation had become so serious that there had been discussion about his possible retirement in the family just before his death.⁵²⁰

There was an interesting detail in Samuel Lehtonen's account of his father's last day, which certainly went unnoticed by Fisher, namely the remark that he had confirmed his own son. This may not have been completely unknown, but generally parish priests confirmed in the Church of Finland, not bishops as in the Anglican tradition.

Many obituary writers both in Finland and in England acknowledged Archbishop Lehtonen's contribution to the ecumenical movement in general and Finnish Lutheran - English Anglican relations in particular. Gu-

⁵¹⁷ LPL Bell papers vol. 88 Report from the Bishop of Fulham after his tour in Scandinavia, Moscow, Warsaw, Germany, May-July 1950, Helsinki June 12th; *Fsb* 23/22.6.1950 Engelsk biskop på besök.

⁵¹⁸ *Kurki-Suonio* 1951, 144-151 gives an account of the Archbishop's last day.

⁵¹⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Samuel Lehtonen to Fisher 11.6.1951.

⁵²⁰ *Kantala* 2003, 144.

lin set aside whatever argument there might have been, commissioning a book dedicated to Lehtonen's memory, covering many aspects of his life and theology. Among the authors were many of his old friends and family. Gulin wrote about Lehtonen and youth work. He highlighted the important influences of Anglo-American, and especially Anglican, Christianity on Lehtonen. Gulin recalled that Lehtonen had pasted Fr. Edward Pusey's prayer on the wall of his summer study: "Let our ordered lives praise the beauty of Thy peace!"⁵²¹

Gulin quoted the same prayer in another obituary, explaining that "Lehtonen's mentality was attracted by the Anglican pursuit for sanctification, which is fundamentally alien to Lutheranism."⁵²² This he wrote in a positive spirit, seeking to pinpoint Lehtonen's fundamental debt to his early Christian mentor Baron Paul Nicolay of Monrepos, an international Lutheran revivalist, who was thus also an admirable figure to Gulin. At the same time, however, he revealed the prejudice of many that the Anglican insistence on sanctification was incompatible with the Lutheran insistence on the overarching centrality of justification.

Others identified further Anglican influences on Aleksi Lehtonen, especially in the field of ecclesiology. The late Archbishop's love of the Church was evident to all who knew him, but this led to various interpretations. Lehtonen's successor as Archbishop, the Most Rev. Ilmari Salomies emphasized the domestic origins of Lehtonen's love of the Church.⁵²³ It was perhaps in his interests to stress that the features of Lehtonen's theology closest to Anglicanism were home grown, not a foreign import.

A more straightforward connection between Lehtonen's ecclesiology and his love of the English Church was made by Armo Nokkala, who wrote an article on Lehtonen's ecclesiology in the book dedicated to his memory. Nokkala connected Lehtonen's childhood in south-western Finland, with its medieval traditions, to his youth in the Student Christian Movement and his first ecumenical experiences, especially of the Swedish Young Church Movement, and the distinctive high churchmanship of his mature years. This, though Finnish in origin, was close to Anglicanism, by which Lehtonen had been attracted since his days as a young theologian in the Finnish theological Monday club. According to Nokkala, Lehtonen had

⁵²¹ *Gulin* 1951, 48.

⁵²² *Gulin* 1952, 59.

⁵²³ *Salomies* 1951, 10-13.

"loved the English spirit. And this love had served to link those impressions he had acquired from Anglican spirituality."⁵²⁴ The connection between Lehtonen's interest in Anglicanism, with his high church theology, and his quest for unity was evident to his contemporaries.

It was fittingly an Englishman who expressed this link best. Bishop Leslie Hunter's obituary in his diocesan magazine portrayed Lehtonen as a church leader who used his influence to draw his distant church into the mainstream of western European Christian thinking and life, and to further contacts with the Church of England in order to enrich the liturgy of his own church and for its general benefit.⁵²⁵ Hunter had fully understood Lehtonen's desire to exploit Christian reconstruction in Europe, even if he did not necessarily agree with every aspect of this policy.

However, there were other features of Lehtonen's ministry and personality that attracted the attention of English writers, many of whom had been his friends. Almost all of them emphasized the fundamental influence of Lehtonen in securing the 1930s negotiations. He was seen as a resolute and reasonable church leader with many English friends and contacts. On the personal side, Lehtonen was credited for his hospitality and Christian charity. English friends tended to link his strong spirituality with his good sense of humour and his attachment to his neighbour, which, as the Dean Duncan-Jones of Chichester, put it, was a somewhat rare ability among his countrymen.⁵²⁶

Duncan-Jones' obituary was published in *the Guardian*.⁵²⁷ The CFR had sent a release to the Times, the Church Times and the Guardian, indicating that Duncan-Jones and Moss had known Lehtonen well.⁵²⁸

Alongside the obituaries, Lehtonen's death caused some confusion and embarrassment among official ecumenists in the Church of England. Canon Douglas, the former General Secretary of the CFR, remonstrated:

Is anything being done in the way of a memorial to my very dear friend Lehtonen whom I have loved since he was a youthful student?

⁵²⁴ *Nokkala* 1951, 132.

⁵²⁵ Arkkipiispa Aleksi Lehtosen muisto 1951, 86-87.

⁵²⁶ Arkkipiispa Aleksi Lehtosen muisto 1951, 86-88.

⁵²⁷ Arkkipiispa Aleksi Lehtosen muisto 1951, 86.

⁵²⁸ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 News Item telephoned to C.I.B [Miss Bampton] for release to the general press and Church papers. 30.3.5.; LPL CFR LR file 28 Archbishop Lehtonen. Sent with compliments to the Obituary Editor, The Times, 30.3.51.

It was with him that I fitted up the terms of the 1931 concordat before the Helsinki Conference which our convocations implemented synodically and which Lord Lang regarded as a great achievement... I'd be wishful to know... But don't worry to answer.⁵²⁹

Douglas' bitterness stemmed from his fear that the great deeds of the inter-war generation were being forgotten.

Douglas' letter was directed to the Assistant General Secretary of the CFR, the Rev. W.H. Macartney, who was somewhat thrown by the enquiry, since he had not known Lehtonen personally. He sought advice from Canon Tissington Tatlow, who had known Lehtonen personally, and whose London church would have been a possible venue for a memorial service. Macartney was concerned that "a poorly attended one would leave a worse impression than no service at all" though he promised to do all he could from his "office to interest our members and to put out publicity for the service."⁵³⁰

Tatlow's reply was not encouraging:

You ask a very difficult question. I do not think Lehtonen could have known very many people in England. Those interested in him were people like myself, old members of S.C.M. because we used to meet him at the conferences of the World Student Christian Federation - he in his youth having been General Secretary of the S.C.M. in Finland. I do not suppose any of the present S.C.M. staff have ever even heard his name. The best chance of a congregation would be when the Foreign Relations Council was meeting, in which case I suppose the Service ought to be at a Church adjacent to the Church House.⁵³¹

Tatlow had lost contact with Lehtonen a long time previously, and was unfamiliar with his contribution to the relations between the Churches of England and Finland after he had become Archbishop. This accurately reflects the value given to foreign relations in general and Finnish Lutheran relations in particular, even among informed Church of England people. The Finnish Church was little known, and perhaps even less understood.

"After various enquiries and some cogitation" Macartney felt "driven to the conclusion that it would not be feasible to hold a memorial service for the late Archbishop Lehtonen."⁵³² This itself was a fitting memorial for Lehtonen and his endeavours for closer relations with the Church of England.

⁵²⁹ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Extract from Canon Douglas to Mr. Macartney 3.4.1951.

⁵³⁰ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Macartney to Tatlow 5.4.1951.

⁵³¹ LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Tatlow to Macartney 9.4.1951.

⁵³² LPL CFR LR file 28/1 Macartney to Tatlow and Douglas 18.4.1951.

V Summary

The relations between the Church of England and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland were guided by a small number of active people. In Finland Archbishop Aleksii Lehtonen was by far the most active advocate of Anglican relations. As the leader of ecumenical relations he to a great extent chose whom to include in the official contacts between the churches. Besides him, only Bishop Eelis Gulin entertained some independent contacts with Anglican ecclesiastics. Gulin was less interested in Anglicanism than he was in the ecumenical movement and Christian charitable work in general.

In the Church of England, the people who had any meaningful relations with the Church of Finland consisted of a group of old friends of Finland. The most active were the Rev. Dr. C.B. Moss and the Very Rev. A.S. Duncan-Jones of Chichester. The Church of England Council on Foreign relations, with Bishop A.C. Headlam of Gloucester as its Chairman and Canon J.A. Douglas as its General Secretary, was also a significant player. Apart from Douglas, they had all participated in the 1930s negotiation between the churches and were advocates of closer relations. Duncan-Jones and Moss in particular sought to explain the Finnish cause in England throughout the war, and continued to do so after it ended.

1945 saw far-reaching changes in the leadership of both churches, with Lehtonen now Archbishop of Finland and Fisher of Canterbury. Gulin succeeded Lehtonen in Tampere and was consecrated the same summer, and Bishop G.K.A. Bell of Chichester and the Rev. H.M. Waddams replaced Headlam and Douglas respectively at the CFR. The official policy and strategy of the Church of England was formed by the CFR, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Anglican visitors to Finland.

Relations between the churches were very much guided by the communication between and decision making of these leaders. There were also certain institutions like the ecumenical movement, the Finnish Seamen's

Church in London, and the Anglican chaplaincies in Stockholm and Helsinki which allowed the churches to engage with each other. The impulse for the development of relations was, however, encouraged by visits between the churches.

As the churches had been separated by international politics, it was apt that the first contacts after the war were made with political goals in mind. The Rev. H.M. Waddams' visit to Finland in December 1944 was organised by the British Ministry of Information, although he also represented the Church of England, and it was in this latter role that Church of Finland figures saw him. Although they were not swayed by his pro-Soviet propaganda, they took his visit as a sign of the revival of friendly relations after the war.

They were unaware, however, that Waddams' report painted a less than positive picture of them. In Finland, Waddams had tried to conceal his true feelings, but his antipathy was obvious in the report, which portrayed the Finns as ignorant nationalists who did not want to accept that the Allies were united, and who were afraid and suspicious of the Soviet Union. They therefore needed to be educated by Allied propaganda, which would reveal the true nature of Nazi Germany (bad), the Soviet Union (good), and their true position in the world (insignificant).

Waddams' report found its way to the Allied Control Commission, where some of its content was brought into the debate between the British representative Mr. Shepherd and the Soviet representative Colonel-General Andrei Zhdanov. Shepherd tried to emphasize the more positive features of Waddams' report, explaining the Finnish ignorance of Soviet progress and the evils of the Nazis, and the strength of the church as a component of civic society. Zhdanov, however, was uninterested in and ignorant of religion, whether in Finland or the Soviet Union.

Political considerations continued to dictate the Church of England's approach when the Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London, the Rev. Toivo Harjunpää, suggested that a representative of the Church of England be sent to the installation of the new Archbishop of Finland in Turku. After much debate and discussion the Archbishop-elect of Canterbury, Fisher, decided that the Bishop of Fulham might attend if he wished. The decision was guided by a balancing of practical and political arguments against the ecumenical benefits. It was finally decided that there were no international political reasons to prevent the visit. The same approach to Church of Finland invitations was used during most of the period.

Bishop Batty took part in the installation of Lehtonen, and met the Finnish leadership, including President Mannerheim. Batty was convinced of Finnish benevolence, and that the Finns were pro-British. From the turn of the year until the summer of 1945, political motives for closer church relations were very much on the agenda. The Finns sought good relations with the Church of England along with the other western churches as a means to strengthen their western orientation and their independent western democratic society under-girded with Christian values.

There was more to good bilateral relations. This became evident on the election of Lehtonen as Archbishop. Lehtonen was well known as an ardent friend of the Church of England. As Archbishop, he began to draw the churches closer by inviting the Finnish Seamen's Pastor in London, Harjunpää, who had good contacts with and excellent knowledge of the Church of England, to become his Chaplain, and by beginning gently to advocate the kind of high church theology in his church which converged with Anglican theology. Harjunpää was also an ally in this respect, as he wanted to experiment with some of his "cherished religious-ecclesiastical ideals and visions".

Lehtonen introduced his theology in his *Encyclical Letter, 1945*, in which he followed Nathan Söderblom's evangelical catholic approach, seeking to attain a synthesis of Nordic Lutheranism and Anglicanism, allowing for a positive appraisal of the historic episcopate without a rejection of the Lutheran confession. Lehtonen also supported a liturgical high church revival, especially among the younger clergy and in his own Archdiocese of Turku. This evoked the catholic revivals in the Churches of England and Sweden. However, Lehtonen was not a party man, and wanted to maintain and foster the unity of his diocese and church. The book was also very appreciative of the Finnish pietistic revivals, which traditionally took a very poor view of all things liturgical.

Lehtonen wanted to publish the book in England, and he asked Wadams' help for this. When he became aware of the change in personnel at the CFR, he contacted the new Chairman and asked for the continuation of the 1930s negotiations as encouraged by the preamble of the Canterbury Convocations decision. Perhaps Bell's other concerns meant that Lehtonen received no immediate answer. At the same time, Bishop Gulin sought Bell's help in assisting in the return of an anti-nazi refugee of Jewish origin, who had spent the war in Finland: such pleas to Bell poured in from all over Europe at the time because of his prominent role in both the ecumenical

movement and the reconstruction of Germany. Nonetheless, Gulin received an answer.

Post-war reconstruction offered the churches an opportunity to liaise with each other on more than just a bilateral front. Two very significant movements in the relations of the Churches of England and Finland were the ecumenical movement and the Bible societies. The British churches established an organisation called Christian Reconstruction in Europe for collecting aid for the European churches. The CRE was ecumenical, but there was heavy Anglican involvement in its leadership: all the general secretaries of the period were Anglican.

At a time when the official ecumenical channels of the church remained too preoccupied to reply to Lehtonen's plea for closer church relations, the General Secretary of the CRE, Miss Eleanore Iredale, suggested that some of the funds reserved for Finland be used for furthering the bilateral relations between the churches through church visits. Lehtonen received the idea with gratitude. He had been planning to send Finnish theological students to study in England since the end of the war, and made enquiries among his old contacts on behalf of his son, the Rev. Samuel Lehtonen. Samuel received a scholarship to study for a year at Westcott House, Cambridge. He gained much experience of the Church of England, meeting a wide range of figures, including the Archbishop Fisher.

CRE aid was also used in Finland for theological literature and general reconstruction needs. The funds were used to bring home and send out Finnish Lutheran missionaries. The aid came almost exclusively from the Church of England and was allocated to both the Finnish Lutheran and Orthodox Churches. The effect of ecumenical politics on the aid was reflected not only in the exchange of personnel, but in the fact that the Finnish free churches were for the most part neglected, while the Orthodox share was disproportionately large when compared with their size. It must, however, be acknowledged that of all the Finnish churches they had suffered the most, as their heartland had been annexed by the Soviet Union.

Another avenue for contacts between the churches on the international scene was provided by Bible work, which was undertaken with new vigour after the war. The Director of the British and Foreign Bible Societies (BFBS) in Finland, Mr. Georg Pimenoff, although personally Finnish Orthodox, became influential because of his contacts with the Church of England. Embittered having been imprisoned for delivering information on the treatment of Soviet prisoners of war to the embassy of the USA during the

war, Pimenoff often gave negative impressions of Finnish society to British visitors. He wished to appear as a friend of the Allied cause, expressing his sympathy for the Soviet Union and allied co-operation.

His actions and their reception thus serve as a good indicator of the churches' transition from war to Cold War. When Waddams met him in December 1944, he found Pimenoff something of a breath of fresh air compared with the reserved and reactionary attitude of the Finns in general. Waddams assessed him as an able agent, proposing that Allied propaganda should be published and circulated by him. The Finnish Ecumenical Council, through the activities of its chairman, Gulin, and secretary, the Rev. Verner J. Aurola, also assisted in the circulation of English language material from 1945. Pimenoff's translations of some Ministry of Information war time books came into print in 1946.

By that time the situation had already changed completely, and the Rev. A. Cotter, who visited Finland in the summer of 1946, gave no particular value to Pimenoff's views. Cotter visited Finland as part of his Nordic tour, and sought to discover if there was a basis for closer co-operation between the Nordic and German churches. A result of the visit was a proposal, which ultimately came to nothing because of internal power struggles, that the Nordic Lutherans might join a British delegation to Germany led by Bishop Bell. Cotter also reported that, although Finland was doing fairly well, there were serious doubts about its future, and there was also fear of Soviet plans in the neighbouring Nordic countries and their churches. The Cold War was now a reality for the churches.

Bible work benefited from the relations of the churches in another way. The formation of the United Bible Societies (USB) in Elfinsward, England in the summer of 1946 gave Lehtonen an opportunity to visit England. The official reason for the visit was that Lehtonen represented the Finnish Bible Society, which joined the USB. He was thus able to meet with Bishop Eivind Berggrav of Oslo and make peace with him following the war-time schism between the churches. It also allowed Lehtonen to ask for a follow-up meeting to the 1930s negotiations with the Church of England, for which he gained agreement.

The meeting took place at the CFR's premises in Lambeth Palace. All those involved in the 1930s negotiations were invited, but only some could attend, and those who were absent were not replaced by similar ecumenical figures. The meeting was chaired by Dean Duncan-Jones and the only English bishop present was Bishop Batty of Fulham. The agenda was set

by Lehtonen who attempted to convince those present that the Church of Finland had implemented everything expected from it in the 1930s and was thus ready to proceed. The conference tried to revise the Canterbury Convocations decisions by recommending that the Archbishop of Canterbury should consider favourably a possible invitation to participate in a Finnish consecration and also to consider a reciprocal arrangement to invite Finnish bishops to English consecrations. In regard to the political situation, Lehtonen explained that the worst dangers were now over, but that the communists were seen as the greatest threat to Finnish society.

Hopes that the recommendation might be accepted were, however, slim, as the conference was from the outset considered unofficial, and was attended by the old guard of Church of England ecumenists, who had limited links with the new leadership. Apart from the conference, Lehtonen met with Archbishop Fisher and Bishop Bell, discussing church relations with both. In Finland, the follow-up meeting received no publicity, but Lehtonen publicly advocated closer relations with the Church of England in the reporting of the Bible conference.

The final outcome of deeper Bible co-operation was that the BFBS handed over all its work in Finland to the Finnish Bible Society. Pimehoff, however, continued to be paid by the BFBS, although he was now answerable to the Finnish Society. He continued to meet English visitors to Finland, and present them with his pro-Soviet agenda, but with little effect. Bishop Hunter, for example, could see some truth in his nationalistic complaints in 1947, but was left wondering why so able a man was in such a post, and whether this was a result of his personality.

Having returned to Finland, Lehtonen realised that in order to achieve something concrete with the Church of England he needed to find a prominent new advocate for the cause of reunion in the mould of Bishop Headlam. Lehtonen wanted to continue the process towards real reunion and tried to engage Bishop Bell in this by inviting him to Finland before the forthcoming 1948 Lambeth Conference, but in vain. Bell was too busy with the other Nordic Lutheran churches and with Germany, but promised to find someone else to visit Finland.

This was Bishop Leslie Hunter of Sheffield. Although at first disappointed not to get Bell, Lehtonen received Hunter with gratitude. Hunter came to Finland with Canon Alan Richardson, having attended the first post-war Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference in Denmark. Hunter visited Helsinki, with a short trip to meet the Bishop of Porvoo, and Turku.

In Helsinki, Hunter was guided by Bishop Gulin, to whose diocese the capital belonged. He met many political and church leaders, including all the Finnish Lutheran Bishops, the Finnish Orthodox Bishop Alexander and two Finnish Cabinet Ministers. In Turku, Hunter preached at the Cathedral and met President Paasikivi. The Finnish state also had an interest in good church relations.

Hunter used the opportunity to educate the British Embassy in Helsinki about the Finnish Church and put them in touch with Gulin, who was subsequently seen by them as a possible successor to Archbishop Lehtonen. Before this the only Finnish Bishop to appear in the British Foreign Office list of leading personalities had been Lehtonen. The promotion of good church relations coincided with the Foreign Office's agenda of assisting friendly cultural links and discouraging undue subordination to the Soviet Union.

During his visit, Hunter met the General Secretary of the CRE, Miss Iredale, and gave his opinion of the reconstruction work. Hunter credited the Finnish reconstruction committee and its chairman Gulin, but was critical of Iredale for spending too much time and resources on travel. Hunter wanted to entrust the distribution of aid to Gulin and his committee. The problems with Iredale's administration of the CRE had also become obvious to others, and her contract was not extended after 1947.

Hunter also noted that Lehtonen used reconstruction aid to support a younger generation of high church clergy to be sent to study in England. He was supportive of Lehtonen's attempt to draw the churches closer to each other, but wanted to broaden the range of people sent to include all strands and dioceses. Hunter understood Lehtonen's programme for closer relations, and agreed that in the years ahead there would be a good opportunity to promote closer relations with the Nordic churches for both theological and political reasons. He did not want the opportunity wasted in fussing about the mechanism of the historic episcopate.

Although Hunter became well disposed towards the Finns, he was never the patron of relations Lehtonen wanted. He continued to work with the Nordic churches as a long-serving Chairman of the Anglo-Scandinavian Theological Conference, but did not devote himself exclusively to the Finnish cause. The time for such patronage had passed with the retirement and death of Headlam.

In the Church of England, Lehtonen's goal of closer relations was acknowledged by the CFR as it struggled to come to terms with the transition from the war to the Cold War. Throughout the period, the Church of Fin-

land was seen as a national church in an ex-enemy state that was now in the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the intensifying Cold War meant that the Church of England, along with Great Britain, was moving away from the Soviet bloc. The precarious position of Finland between east and west affected every aspect of the Church of England's official decision making concerning and policy towards the Finns. Sometimes, it was seen as a good reason to maintain close ties; at other times, the Church of England was anxious about the consequences that any relationship it developed with the Finnish Church might have on Finland's situation with the Soviet Union.

The onset of the Cold War thus affected church relations. The Finnish reading of the situation, however, differed from the English. In Finnish historiography, the years between 1944 and 1948 have been called the years of danger. Finnish church leaders were anxious about the political situation at this time, when the threat of Soviet occupation was strongly felt. This was especially the case at the time of the communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the subsequent Soviet proposal for a defence treaty with Finland in early 1948. Unlike the Warsaw pact with the Soviet Union and its satellites, the Finnish Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance acknowledged that Finland "desired to remain outside the conflicting interests of the Great Powers". The treaty and the parliamentary elections that followed entrenched Finland's position as an independent western democracy, whose foreign policy was guided by a neutrality with an eastern bent.

After this, the tension eased and Lehtonen felt free to travel to England to take part in the 1948 Lambeth Conference, having first ensured that the foreign visitors would not be expected to join in any pronouncements. This was a very necessary precaution, as the Anglican Communion in general and the Church of England in particular were moving in the opposite direction. The former Soviet allies were now enemies, and the Conference adopted an anti-communist stand that had international implications. Joining in any pronouncement on this would have been detrimental to the Finnish Church, which shared the national goal of remaining neutral in international politics.

The tension at time of the treaty with the Soviet Union caused much consternation in England among the friends of Finland, leading the Rev. C.B. Moss to establish the prayer circle for Finland. Moss attempted in vain to get prominent church leaders to join the circle. The circle ultimate-

ly amounted to about fifty people, including himself and Dean Duncan-Jones.

In Finland, Harjunpää and his Estonian wife found the tension too great, and emigrated to the USA. Harjunpää had already faced some difficulties. He had been replaced as secretary of the Reconstruction Committee, and his high church liturgical circle faced strong public criticism from pietistic leaders.

Lehtonen and Harjunpää's campaign for closer relations with the Church of England and an Anglican-inspired deepened liturgical life did not go unnoticed by friends and foes alike. Increased publicity brought with it strong criticism, although the person of the Archbishop was left out of the debate. The opposition was led by the Rev. Olavi Kares, the leader of the Awakening movement, supported by the Rev. Osmo Tiililä, who was Professor of Dogmatics at Helsinki University. Kares accused the circle of being influenced by Anglo-Catholic ideas which were alien to Finnish Lutherans. The Rev. Martti Parvio countered that the circle's programme grew from their own Lutheran confession and liturgical tradition. Parvio succeeded Harjunpää as the leader of the circle and had earlier been sent by Lehtonen to study English church life for three months.

The debate was heated but soon died away. However, it showed that evangelical catholic theology and liturgical revival were far from universally accepted in the Church of Finland. Pietistic circles remained especially suspicious of anything they considered high church. They saw unwanted high church tendencies as being linked with contacts with the Church of England. This led to the strange phenomenon that Anglicanism was accused of being too catholic on the one hand and too reformed on the other. This distorted picture arose from a comparison of Anglican standards and practice with the Lutheran confessions and their theology. It was propagated, among others, by Tiililä in his lectures and in his book on symbolism for a generation of Finnish Lutheran theologians.

Different problems appeared in the field of reconstruction. Besides promoting visits between the churches, the Finnish bishops needed cars to get around their dioceses. Iredale's leadership led to confusion and embarrassment concerning how these cars were allocated. Eventually Bishop Gulin managed to get his car with the assistance of the Rev. L.W. Harland, the new CRE General Secretary. Meanwhile, there was a rift in the relationship between Gulin and Lehtonen, who chose not to send Gulin to the inaugural meeting of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1948.

Lehtonen prioritised the 1948 Lambeth Conference, and attended it rather than the WCC meeting. Both decisions were widely criticised in private. The American Lutherans, for example, were concerned that their aid might be used to further relations with the Church of England.

The Nordic situation was discussed at the Lambeth Conference by an appointed discussion group, whose findings were brought to the conference itself. The discussion showed that all the Nordic Lutheran Churches related positively to the Anglican Communion. The Churches of Sweden and Finland had their agreements, while discussions with the Church of England and the other Lutheran churches were underway. When introducing the Finnish situation Lehtonen again expressed his wish to continue from the interim decision of the 1930s.

There was much discussion on the nature of the unity they sought and Bishop Bell, the group's chairman, explained the different church relationships. The discussion revealed the different motives underlying support for closer church relations. Duncan-Jones was motivated by the political need for unity. He wanted a common Christian front in the world against atheistic communism. Moss, on the other hand, argued for a unity based on catholicity and a shared inheritance as historic national churches. He spoke of what he had learned from Lehtonen and obtained the agreement of the Nordic leaders that this was how they saw themselves. The Nordic leaders were generally less interested in the mechanism and different levels of unity than their Anglican counterparts.

The Nordic visitors also took part to the opening ceremonies of the conference and held their own events in London. The conference received good publicity in Finland: the Archbishop and his wife had travelled to London with their son Samuel, who had succeeded Harjunpää as his chaplain and took care to inform the Finnish public without drawing any attention to the conference's anti-communist themes. The Finns learned about these only with the publication of the encyclical and subsequent news.

From an ecumenical perspective, the encyclical encouraged the churches to receive the 1930s negotiations between the Churches of England and Finland and their recommendations. This was soon done by the Scottish Episcopal Church, which approved the original recommendations. This meant that of all the Anglican churches the Scottish Church had the closest official relations with the Church of Finland.

Lehtonen failed to understand that monopolising the handling of Anglican relations by himself and those close to him did little to promote the

general reception of Anglican relations in Finland. Although he was not criticised in public, his approach to Anglican relations as almost a family business was open to criticism.

Bishop Colin Dunlop's visit to Finland in the autumn of 1948 revealed something of the actual significance of the 1930s agreement between the churches. Before his departure for Finland, Dunlop wanted to know what he should do if he were invited to receive Holy Communion. It proved impossible to receive a straightforward answer, even though Bell was consulted. Later, Archbishop Fisher ruled that as an official representative Dunlop should not communicate, but that as a private person he was free to do so if he wished. Dunlop should indicate his status by either robing and sitting in the sanctuary or sitting with the congregation.

This episode revealed that the actual level of relations and their practical meaning was hard even for experienced ecumenists and church leaders to fathom. Very few people in the Church of Finland ever understood this, because the Finnish language made no distinction between the terms 'inter-communion' and 'eucharistic hospitality'.

Dunlop's visit was also politically revealing. He had been advised by Moss to avoid reference to the Soviet Union, but found such avoidance unnecessary. On the contrary, he greatly enjoyed the Finnish criticism of Soviet Union.

Dunlop's schedule in Finland resembled that of Hunter's a year earlier. He was entertained in Helsinki by Gulin and the British Embassy and in Turku by Lehtonen. Dunlop installed the first Anglican chaplain in Helsinki after the war, the Rev. Sydney Linton, whom he considered an excellent choice for the position. Unlike Pohjanpirkka, who had succeeded Harjunpää in London, Linton was able to create close links with the local church. This was made easier by his MRA connections, which gave him a shared interest with Gulin, with whom he was on very friendly terms. Linton also forged close links with the Swedish speaking high church clergy in the capital area.

The formal reason for the visit was the 400th anniversary of the Finnish New Testament, for which Lehtonen had organised a great festival with representatives from the other Nordic churches and the American Lutherans. Dunlop studied the Finnish church and culture with great interest and was very impressed. His report was the complete antithesis of Waddams' four years earlier. Besides his praise for Finns generally, Dunlop noted that the opportunity for closer relations with the Finnish Church was likely to

disappear with Lehtonen as the other Finnish bishops did not share his enthusiasm. The English visitors had noted that Lehtonen's health was failing and began to prepare for his death and the change it would bring.

Waddams' reply on the matter was practical: he did not see any way to proceed without the establishment of full intercommunion, which was impossible until the apostolic succession of bishops had percolated the whole Finnish Church. The Finnish case was thus left to mature, and the CFR supported the strategy of achieving similar relations with all the Nordic churches rather than proceeding with the Finnish Church as a forerunner, which had been Lehtonen's suggestion on the lines of the plans of the 1930s.

The debate continued in the CFR. Moss suggested that even the established principle that English bishops should be sent to Finnish consecrations should not be pursued, for ecumenical and political reasons. Ecumenically, it would irritate the Orthodox while bringing nothing substantial to the Finnish Lutheran succession; politically, it might do more harm to Finnish-Soviet relations than it would do good for the churches. Moss' suggestion was for the most part debated in Church of England circles, but Gulin at least was consulted.

It is unlikely that the Finnish side would have shared either of Moss' concerns, as all their actions throughout the period indicate a positive view of inviting Church of England bishops to Finland. After some confusion, Fisher decided to leave the matter as it was and wait for an initiative from the Finnish Church. The decision seemed to be based both on the general British misconception that Finland lay behind the Iron Curtain and Fisher's ecumenical policy, which was not prepared to let ecumenism introduce changes in his own church's character.

At the same time, the CRE began to close down its extensive programme of Christian Reconstruction in Europe. The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland had benefited from all categories of the aid it had offered. If the total amount of CRE aid was relatively small when compared with American Lutheran reconstruction aid, its ecumenical importance and propaganda value was disproportionately large, because it was especially deployed for the furtherance of church relations. The CRE brought the Finnish visitors valuable first hand knowledge of the Church of England and vice versa. The Finnish visitors, however, noted that Britain had suffered greatly from the war and was struggling to recover from it herself, and emphasized this to their own people.

The end of CRE activities resulted in the loss of an important ecumenical machinery between the churches, which was impossible to compensate for through existing structures, such as the Finnish Seamen's Church in London, the Anglican Chaplaincy in Helsinki and Moss' prayer circle. The loss of this machinery brought, for example, a diminished role for Gulin in the churches' relations: his involvement had in the first place been motivated by a practical desire to help other Christians in need regardless of their church or churchmanship.

Moss visited Finland in 1949. He met Gulin and Lehtonen, continuing to Norway where he met Bishop Berggrav. Moss' journey revealed that the difference in understanding of the apostolic succession continued to dominate the discussion of unity. Gulin took a practical view of the succession, whereas Berggrav was offended by the Church of England discriminating practice in dealing with the Nordic churches. For the most part, Lehtonen kept out of the discussion, although he could not understand why the question was so hard for the Danes and the Norwegians theologically when they were so close to Britain politically.

The discussion continued in the CFR concerning the general policy with the whole Nordic area. Waddams stated his view of Church of England policy: as the Finnish negotiations had been concluded for the time being, and as it was desired not to bring the Swedish negotiations to the Convocations, it would be better to proceed with the negotiations with the Churches of Denmark, Norway and Iceland. This dialogue proved troublesome, ending in 1951 and achieving little.

Meanwhile, Lehtonen's health continued to decline. He continued to support Anglican relations and the high church revival in Finland, but without his previous urgency. This was a product of the changed circumstances. Lehtonen's endeavour for closer relations between the churches was motivated by both evangelical catholic theology and the political goal of bringing western good will to the Finnish church and nation. The political imperative became less important towards the end of his life, while the many Anglican visitors to Finland together with the 1948 Lambeth Conference recommendations promised a move towards real reunion in the future. The situation returned to the level of ordinary peace time contacts with the visit of the new Bishop of Fulham, Ingle in 1950. In any case, Lehtonen now lacked the energy to make an occasion of this visit.

The death of Archbishop Aleksii Lehtonen at Easter 1951 merely confirmed the end of the active period in the relations between the Churches

of England and Finland. The increased contacts and the quest for better relations were largely Lehtonen's own initiative, which he preserved strictly for himself and those close to him. They thus faded with his passing; there was no figure in the Finnish episcopate at the time of his death who could assume his mantle in this area.

The story of the relations between the Churches of England and Finland during the Archiepiscopate of Aleksii Lehtonen is thus essentially one of the importance of good personal relations and shared visions. In the 1930s, Lehtonen had both; after the Second World War, he was largely left with his visions, which were little shared either by his own people or the Church of England leaders. In essence, he ended up as too lonely a figure to bring about 'real reunion'. There was after his death something of a vacuum and backlash in the relations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland with the Anglican world, which was noted by Church of England visitors at the time.

Long decades of commonplace ecumenical politeness and a gradual development in ecumenical theology followed before anything significant happened in Anglican-Lutheran relations in Northern Europe. Only the end of the Cold War and the acceptance of the ordination of women in both traditions could bring 'real reunion' in the signing of the Porvoo Declaration. Even then, not all the Nordic Churches could sign, the paramount problem remaining the correct understanding of apostolic succession, which had become an identity question for both Anglicans in their insistence on the historic episcopate and for the Danes in their objection to it.

In a wider perspective, this story still has some relevance. Early twentieth century ecumenism was based more than anything else on good personal relations, which were founded on encounter and emerging friendships, first in mission and student societies, and later in ecumenical organisations. These produced church leaders with ecumenical experience and friendships across the denominational divides. However, in order to produce something out of these good relations there needed to be a shared vision within and between the churches. Without a large measure of consensus and practical adoption in church life, ecumenical agreements would amount to little more than fleshless bones.

If Archbishop Lehtonen lacked support, he did not lack vision. As Archbishop, he used the good relations with the Church of England in the political field to gain western friends in the early Cold War world as a means to counter the Soviet threat to Finland; in the field of church politics he ad-

vocated a high church liturgical revival with a natural Anglican – Lutheran cross-fertilisation of influences; and in the ecumenical field he was encouraged by the theology of evangelical catholicism to strive for real reunion between the churches.

Abbreviations

BCC	The British Council of Churches
BFBS	The British and Foreign Bible Society
CAC CRE	The Church Assembly Commission on Christian Reconstruction in Europe
CFR	The Church of England Council on Foreign Relations
CRE	Christian Reconstruction in Europe
CT	The Church Times
Ed.	Editorial, editor
Fsb	Församlingsbladet
Hjä	Herättäjä
IVF	The Inter-Varsity Fellowship
Kmaa	Kotimaa
KT	The Research Institute of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland.
KTA	The Research Institute of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland Publications series A.
LWF	The Lutheran World Federation
MP	Member of Parliament
SCM	Student Christian Movement
SDP	The Finnish Social Democratic Party
SENj	The Finnish Ecumenical Council Publications
SH	Studia Historica
SK	Suomen Kuvalehti
SKDL	The Finnish People's Democratic League
SKHS	The Finnish Society of Church History
SKHST	The Finnish Society of Church History Publications
SKHSV	The Finnish Society of Church History Yearbook
SKP	The Finnish Communist Party
SKS	The Finnish Literature Society

SPCK	The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
STKSJ	The Finnish Theological Literature Society Publications
TA	Teologinen aikakauskirja
UBS	The United Bible Societies
ULCA	The United Lutheran Church of America
UNRRA	The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration
USA	The United States of America
WA	The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches
WCC	The World Council of Churches
WSCF	The World Student Christian Federation
WSOY	Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö

Sources and literature

Archive sources

Cambridge

<i>Cambridge University Library</i>	CUL
Bible Society Archives	BSA
British and Foreign Bible Society	BFBS
Finland, General	D8/8/1

Chicago

<i>The Archives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America</i>	AELCA
National Lutheran Council	NLC

Helsinki

<i>The Finnish National Archives</i>	KA
The Collections of Aleksii Lehtonen	AL
The Collections of Elis Gulin	EG
The Finnish Clergy Union	SKPL
The Finnish Seamen's Mission Society	SMLS
The Finnish Security Police	EK-VALPO

<i>The Finnish Security Police Archives</i>	SUPO
Georg Pimenoff	

<i>Helsinki University Library</i>	HYK
Yrjö J.E. Alanen	COLL.7.
Martti Parvio	COLL.460.

<i>Helsinki University Department of Systematic Theology</i>	
Ecumenical Archives	EA
Finnish Ecumenical Council	SYKTA

<i>The Anglican Church in Finland Archives</i>	ACFA
Kew	
<i>Public Record Office</i>	PRO
Foreign Office	FO 371
	FO 473
Ministry of Information	INF 1
London	
<i>Lambeth Palace Library</i>	LPL
Council on Foreign Relations	CFR
Lutheran and Reformed Churches	LR
Orthodox Churches	OC
Documents	
Bell papers	
Douglas papers	
Fisher papers	
Headlam papers	
Sheffield	
<i>Sheffield Archives</i>	SA
Bishop Hunter Papers	BHP
Turku	
<i>Åbo Akademis Bibliotek Handskriftsavdelningen</i>	ÅAB
G.O. Rosenqvist	GOR
Max von Bonsdorff	MvB

At author's disposal

Linton to Pajunen sd. 2000.

Copy of the Rt Revd Colin Dunlop's diary entry on visit to Finland 1948.

Printed sources

Arkkipiispa Aleksi Lehtosen muisto

1951 Arkkipiispa Aleksi Lehtosen muisto. – Lähteiden maa. Turun arkkihiippakunnan vuosikirja 1952. Ed. Jaakko Haavio, et al. WSOY: Porvoo.

Arnold, John

1985 Salt, not Sugar: A Good European. – Strategist for the Spirit. Leslie Hunter, Bishop of Sheffield 1939-62. Ed. Gordon Hewitt. Becket Publications: Oxford.

Aurola, Verner J.

1951 Kirkkojenvälisessä yhteistyössä. – Näkyjen mies. Aleksi Lehtosen muistokirja. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon Nuoriso: Helsinki.

Bell, G.K.A.

1948a Christian Unity: the Anglican Position. Olaus Petri Lectures at Uppsala University. October, 1946. Hodder and Stoughton Limited: London.

1948b Documents on Christian Unity. Third Series. 1930-48. Oxford University Press: London.

Bibliography of the writings of Professor Harjunpää

1977 Bibliography of the writings of Professor Harjunpää. – Ecclesia. Leiturgia. Ministerium. Studia in honorem Toivo Harjunpää. Ed. Martti Parvio et al. Publications of the Luther-Agricola Society B 9: Helsinki.

Bring, Ragnar

1965 Anglo-Scandinavian Church Conferences, 1929-63. – Scandinavian Churches. A picture of the development and life of the Churches of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Ed. Leslie Stannard Hunter. Faber and Faber: London.

Brittien kirkkokunnat sodan aikana

1946 Brittien kirkkokunnat sodan aikana. British Ministry of Information: Tampere.

C.A. 765A

1945 C.A. 765A. Church Assembly. Report of the Commission to Consider Aid to Christian Churches in Europe. SPCK: London.

C.A. 767

1945 C.A. 767. Church Assembly. Eleventh Report of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, 1944. SPCK: London.

C.A. 788

1945 C.A. 788. Church Assembly. First Report of the Commission for the Christian Reconstruction in Europe. (February 8th to September 30th, 1945). SPCK: London.

C.A. 848

1947 C.A. 848. Church Assembly. The Second Report of the Commission for the Christian Reconstruction in Europe. (October, 1945, to March, 1947). SPCK: London.

C.A. 894

1948 C.A. 894. Church Assembly. The Third Report of the Commission for the Christian Reconstruction in Europe. (*March, 1947 — April, 1948*). SPCK: London.

C.A. 915

1949 C.A. 915. Church Assembly. The Third Report of the Commission for the Christian Reconstruction in Europe. (*April — December 31st, 1948*). SPCK: London.

C.A. 950

1950 C.A. 950 Church Assembly. Council for Ecumenical Co-operation first annual report. SPCK: London.

C.A. 951

1950 C.A. 951 Church Assembly. Report of the Commission for Christian Reconstruction in Europe. SPCK: London.

CA 1945

1945 Church Assembly. Report of Proceedings. The Church Assembly: London.

CA 1947

1947 Church Assembly. Report of Proceedings. The Church Assembly: London.

CA 1949

1949 Church Assembly. Report of Proceedings. The Church Assembly: London.

CA 1950

1950 Church Assembly. Report of Proceedings. The Church Assembly: London.

Catholicity

1947 Catholicity; a study in the conflict of Christian traditions in the West; being a report presented to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. E.S. Abbott et al. Dacre Press: Westminster.

Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1888.

1888 <http://anglicansonline.org/basics/Chicago_Lambeth.html> Visited 15 September 2007.

Christian Counter-Attack

1943 Christian Counter-Attack: Europe's churches against Nazism. Hugh Martin, Douglas Newton, H.M. Waddams, R.R. Williams. SCM Press: London.

Church Life in Europe and the Near East 1947.

1947 Church Life in Europe and the Near East 1947. Some Aspects. (March, 1947). A survey presented with the Twelfth Report of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations and communicated to the Summer Session of the Church Assembly, 1947, on the instruction of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Church Assembly. SPCK: London.

Convocation of Canterbury. Resolution on Relations with the Church of Finland. June 6, 1935.

Convocation of Canterbury. Resolution on Relations with the Church of Finland. June 6, 1935. – Documents on Christian Unity. Third Series 1930-48. Ed. G.K.A. Bell. Oxford University Press: London. 1948.

Convocation of Canterbury: Upper House. Resolutions on Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference 1930. January 18, 1933.

Convocation of Canterbury: Upper House. Resolutions on Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference 1930. January 18, 1933. – Documents on Christian Unity. Third Series 1930-48. Ed. G.K.A. Bell. Oxford University Press: London. 1948.

Elfinsward

1946 Elfinsward. Conference of Bible Societies. Haywards Heath. England. May 6th-9th, 1946. BFBS: London.

Gulin, Eelis

1944 Elämän rikkaus Jumalan seurakunnassa. Kirjapaja: Helsinki.

1947 Elämän rikkaus Jumalan seurakunnassa. Second impression. Kirjapaja: Helsinki.

1951 Nuorisotyössä. – Näkyjen mies. Aleksi Lehtosen muistokirja. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon Nuoriso: Helsinki.

1952 Suuri johtajahahmo. – Kirkkokansan kalenteri 1952. Ed. Kusti Korhonen et al. Suomen kirkon sisälähetysseura: Pieksämäki.

1967 Elämän lahjat. Edellinen osa. 1893-1945. WSOY: Porvoo.

1968 Elämän lahjat. Jälkimmäinen osa. 1945-1966. WSOY: Porvoo.

Gummerus, Jaakko

1930 Englannin kirkon suhteet Ruotsin ja Suomen kirkkoihin ja niiden piispanvihkimykseen. – TA 1930.

Haavio, Martti

1978 Vierähtävät vuodet 1. 1945-1959. Kirjapaja: Pieksämäki.

Hebert, A. Gabriel

1965 An English View of some Swedish Theologians. – Scandinavian Churches. A picture of the development and life of the Churches of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Ed. Leslie Stannard Hunter. Faber and Faber: London.

Hunter, Leslie Stannard

1965 Introduction. – Scandinavian Churches. A picture of the development and life of the Churches of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Ed. Leslie Stannard Hunter. Faber and Faber: London.

Iredale, Eleanora

1947 Christian Reconstruction in Europe. Christian Reconstruction in Europe. General Committee Meeting. Address given by the General Secretary summarising some aspects of work during the year 1946-47. May, 1947. Bloomsbury Street W.C.1.

Jokipii, A.E.

1951 Suomen arkkipiispana. – Näkyjen mies. Alekski Lehtosen muistokirja. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon Nuoriso: Helsinki.

Joint Report with Introduction

1934 <http://www.anglicanhistory.org/lutherania/finland1934.html> Visited 27 March 2008. The document is also found without the Introduction from: Documents on Christian Unity. Third Series 1930-48. Ed. G.K.A. Bell. Oxford University Press: London. 1948.

Juva, Mikko

1994 Seurasin nuoruuteni näkyä. Muistettavaa vuosilta 1939-82. Otava: Helsinki.

Kristikunnan vastarinta

1946 Kristikunnan vastarinta. Euroopan kirkot natsismia vastaan. Hugh Martin, Douglas Newton, H.M. Waddams, R.R. Williams. Karisto: Hämeenlinna.

Kares, Olavi

1978 Myrskyä ja tyventä. Muistelmia vuosilta 1939-1952. WSOY: Porvoo.

Kurki-Suonio, Ensio

1951 Iäisyyden ovella. – Näkyjen mies. Alekski Lehtosen muistokirja. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon nuoriso: Helsinki.

Lambeth Conference 1948

1948 The Lambeth Conference 1948. The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports. SPCK: London.

Lehtonen, Alekski

1922 Evankelisen katolisuuden probleemi. – Vartija 1922.

1923a Katsaus Englannin kirkkoon. 1. – TA 1923. Porvoo.

1923b Katsaus Englannin kirkkoon. (Jatk.). – TA 1923. Porvoo.

1926 Käytännöllinen pappiskasvatus Englannissa. – TA 1925. Porvoo.

1925 Vesperale I. WSOY: Porvoo.

1937 Kirkon taistelurintamalta. WSOY: Porvoo.

1945 Paimenkirje 1945 Turun arkkiepiuskunnan papistolle ja seurakuntalaisille. WSOY: Porvoo.

1947 Hän pitää teistä huolen. WSOY: Porvoo.

1950 Rohkaistaa mielenne. WSOY: Porvoo.

Lehtonen, Samuel

1951 Omassa kodissaan. – Näkyjen mies. Aleksi Lehtosen muistokirja. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon nuoriso: Helsinki.

Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishop of Turku. April 30, 1936.

Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishop of Turku. April 30, 1936. – Documents on Christian Unity. Third Series 1930-48. Ed. G.K.A. Bell. Oxford University Press: London. 1948.

Letter from the Archbishop of Turku to the Archbishop of Canterbury. March 9, 1936.

Letter from the Archbishop of Turku to the Archbishop of Canterbury. March 9, 1936. – Documents on Christian Unity. Third Series 1930-48. Ed. G.K.A. Bell. Oxford University Press: London. 1948.

Magill, J.H.

1981 Tasavalta tulikokeessa. Muistelmia Suomesta kuuman ja kylmän sodan vuosilta. Ed. Jukka Tarkka. Weilin+Göös: Mikkeli.

Matchett, Freda

1985 The Ministry of Women. – Strategist for the Spiri. Leslie Hunter, Bishop of Sheffield 1939-62. Ed. Gordon Hewitt. Becket Publications: Oxford.

Martin, Hugh

1944 The British Churches in War Time. The Ministry of Information: London.

Negotiations

1935 The Church of England and the Church of Finland. A Summary of the Proceedings at the Conferences Held at Lambeth Palace, London, on October 5th and 6th, 1933, and at Brändö, Helsingfors, on July 17th and 18th, 1934. SPCK: London.

Nikolainen, Aimo

1990 Välähdyksiä. WSOY: Juva.

Nokkala, Armo

1951 Kirkkonäkemyksen hahmottelua. – Näkyjen mies. Aleksi Lehtosen muistokirja. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon Nuoriso: Helsinki.

Parvio, Martti

- 1977 *The Liturgical Brethren – a page in history of the post-war liturgical movement in Finland.* – Ecclesia. Leiturgia. Ministerium. Studia in honorem Toivo Harjunpää. Ed. Martti Parvio et al. Publications of the Luther-Agricola Society B 9: Helsinki.
- 1978 *Esipuhe. Ensimmäinen painos.* – Rukoileva kirkko. Ed. Matti Aaltonen. 1996. SLEY-kirjat: Pieksämäki.

Pirjola, Kosti

- 1951 *Opintiellä.* – Näkyjen mies. Aleksis Lehtosen muistokirja. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon Nuoriso: Helsinki.

The Porvoo Common Statement 1992

- 1996 *Together in Mission and Ministry. The Porvoo Common Statement with Essays on Church and Ministry in Northern Europe.* Church House Publishing: London.

Pulla, Armas J.

- 1992 *Ryhmy ja Romppainen.* Karisto Oy: Hämeenlinna.

Rinne, Wilho

- 1949 *Relationerna mellan Finlands kyrka och the Church of England.* – Kristen Gemenskap. Ed. Nils Karlström. Svenska Ekumeniska Föreningen: Uppsala.

Salomies, Ilmari

- 1951 *Aleksis Lehtonen ja kirkko.* – Lähteiden maa. Turun arkkihiippakunnan vuosikirja 1952. Ed. Jaakko Haavio, et al. WSOY: Porvoo

Simojoki, Aili

- 1995 *Veljeni Martti.* Herättäjä-Yhdistys ry: Jyväskylä.

Tiililä, Osmo

- 1945 *Kristilliset kirkot ja lahkot.* WSOY: Helsinki.

Virtanen, Lasse

- 2003 *Bysantin luottomies. Metropoliitta Johanneksen kolme vuosikymmentä ortodoksisen kirkon piispana ja arkkipiispana.* Ajatus kirjat: Helsinki.

Waddams, Herbert

1946 *The Swedish Church*. SPCK: London.

1968 *The Church and Man's Struggle for Unity*. Blandford Press: London.

Winter, Helmer

1951 *Uudestakaupungista Helsinkiin. – Näkyjen mies. Aleksi Lehtosen muistokirja*. Ed. Armo Nokkala. Kirkon Nuorisio: Helsinki.

Yöluke

1947 *Yöluke*. (Mikael Agricolan Rukouskirjan mukaan.) Uuden Auran Osakeyhtiön kirjapaino: Turku.

Newspapers and Magazines

Kotimaa	1944, 1945-1951
Herättäjä	1944, 1945-1951
Församlingsbladet	1944, 1945-1951
Suomen Kuvalehti	1945-1947
The Church Times	1944-1951
The Church of England Newspaper (The Record)	1944-1951
The Spiritual Issues of the War.	1945

Interviews

The Interview of Mrs Agnes Pimenoff 8.5.2000.

The Interview of the Rt Revd Samuel Lehtonen 11.5.2000.

The Interview of the Revd Risto Lehtonen 2.9.2002.

The Interview of the Very Revd John Arnold 7.12.2006.

The Interview of Metropolitan Elder John of Nicaea 10.3.2008.

Websites

<http://clutch.open.ac.uk/schools/willen99/w_religion/ssm/ssm_home.html>
 Visited 9 March 2008.

<http://www.stat.fi/tup/suoluk/suoluk_vaesto.html>
 Visited 15 April 2008.

Literature

Ahola, Minna

- 1996 Ihanteena yhteys. Aarne Siirala, Seurakuntaopiston kiistelty johtaja. Kirjaneliö: Jyväskylä.
- 2001 Finland: Den lutherska folkkyrkan och teologisk nyorientering. - Nordiske Folkekirker i opbrud. National identitet og international nyorientering efter 1945. Ed. Jens Holger Schjørring. Aarhus Universitetsforlag: Århus.

Avis, Paul

- 2000 The Anglican Understanding of the Church. An Introduction. SPCK: London.

Brodd, Sven-Erik

- 1982 Evagelisk Katolicitet. Ett Studium av innehåll och function under 1800- och 1900-talen. Bibliotheca Theologiae Practicae 39. Diss. Uppsala. CWK Gleerup: Lund.
- 1993 The Swedish Archbishop and European Catholicism 1914-1931: Confrontation and Co-Existence between Evangelical Catholicity and Roman Catholicism in Nathan Söderblom's Theology. Tro & Tanke. 1993:7. Ed. Sam Dahlgren. Church of Sweden Research Department: Uppsala.

Busch Nielsen, Kirsten

- 2002 Apostolicity and Succession in the Porvoo Common Statement: Without Confusion, Without Separation. - Apostolicity and Unity. Essays on the Porvoo Common Statement. Ed. Ola Tjørhom. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Carpenter, Edward

- 1991 Archbishop Fisher – His Life and Times. The Canterbury Press: Norwich.

Carpenter, S.C.

- 1956 Duncan-Jones of Chichester. A.R. Mowbray & Co. Limited: London.

Chadwick, Owen

1991 Michael Ramsey. *A Life*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Chapman, Mark

2006 *Anglicanism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Crockett, William R.

1999 *Holy Communion. – The Study of Anglicanism*. Ed. Stephen Sykes et al. Revised edition. Second impression. SPCK: London.

Evans, Helena P.

2006 *British Involvement in the Finnish Peace: The Paris Peace Treaty, 1947 – A Mere Formality. – From War to Cold War. Anglo-Finnish Relations in the 20th Century*. Ed. Juhana Aunesluoma. SKS: Helsinki. 2005. SH 72.

From Malines to ARCIC

1997 *From Malines to ARCIC. The Malines Conversations Commemorated*. Ed. A. Denaux in collaboration with J. Dick. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CXXX*. Leuven University Press: Leuven.

Gady & Webber

2001 *Lutherans and Episcopalians together. A guide to understanding*. G. Scott Gady and Christopher L. Webber. Cowley Publications: Cambridge.

Gritsch, Eric W.

2002 *A History of Lutheranism*. Fortress Press: Minneapolis.

Hanski, Jari

2006 *Juutalaisviha Suomessa 1918-1944*. Ajatus: Helsinki.

Hastings, Adrian

1998 *History of English Christianity 1920-1990*. Third impression. SCM Press: London.

Heiene, Gunnar

1992 *Eivind Berggrav. En biografi*. Universitetsforlaget: Oslo.

2005 *Theology and Spirituality. – Nordic Folk Churches. A Contemporary Church History*. Ed. Ryman et al. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Heikkilä, Hannu

- 1988 The British Foreign Office and the Churches in Finland and the Soviet Union, 1939-1944. – Yearbook of the Finnish Society of Church History (SKHSV) 1988. SKHS: Helsinki.

Helle, Konsta

- 2007 'That they all may be one': The Church of England and the Ecumenical Discussions with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland 1933-1934. Unpublished thesis for the Honour School of Modern History. Oxford University.
- 2008 Ecumenism and Foreign Policy: England, Finland, Estonia, and Latvia 1930-1939. Unpublished thesis for Master of Studies in Historical Research. Oxford University.

Hentilä, Seppo

- 1999 Part II. From Independence to the End of the Continuation War. 1917-1944. – From Grand Duchy to a Modern State. A Political History of Finland since 1809. Osmo Jussila & Seppo Hentilä & Jukka Nevakivi. Hurst & Company: London.

Hill, Charles

- 1993 Existing agreements between our churches. – Together in Mission and Ministry. The Porvoo Common Statement with Essays on Church and Ministry in Northern Europe. Church House Publishing for the Council for Christian Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England: London. Third impression 1996.

Hytönen, Maarit

- 1997 Ykseys rakkaudessa. Friedrich Heilerin evankeliskatolinen ohjelma. STKSJ 210. Diss. Helsinki. STKS: Helsinki.

Jakobson, Max

- 2001 Pelon ja toivon aika. 20. vuosisadan tilinpäätös II. Otava: Helsinki.

Jasper, Ronald

- 1960 Arthur Cayley Headlam. Life and Letters of a Bishop. Faith Press: London.
- 1967 George Bell. Bishop of Chichester. Oxford University Press: London.

Junkkaala, Timo

- 2004 Osmo Tiililä – protestantti. PerusSanoma: Kauniainen.

Jussila, Osmo

- 1999 Part I. Finland as a Grand Duchy. 1809–1917. – From Grand Duchy to a Modern State. A Political History of Finland since 1809. Osmo Jussila & Seppo Hentilä & Jukka Nevakivi. Hurst & Company: London.

Jutikkala, Eino

- 2003 A History of Finland. Eino Jutikkala – Kauko Pirinen. Sixth, revised edition. WS Bookwell Oy: Juva.

Kansanaho, Erkki

- 1983 Kirkko ja merenkulkijat. Sata vuotta Suomen Merimieslähetyksen työtä. Kirjapaja: Saarijärvi.

Kantala, Pirjo

- 2003 Suomen evankelis-luterilaisen kirkon harjoittaman ekumeenisen toiminnan järjestäminen ja painopisteet toisen maailmansodan jälkeen 1945–1953. Unpublished Licentiate thesis. The Helsinki University Theological Faculty Library.

Kemp, Eric

- 1998 Lambeth 1920 and Christian unity. – Community – Unity – Communion. Essays in Honour of Mary Tanner. Ed. Colin Podmore. Church House Publishing: London.

Kemppainen, Kati

- 1998 Suomalaisen lähetysten suhteet anglikaaneihin ja katolilaisiin Lounais-Afrikassa 1919–1937. SKHST 180. Diss. Helsinki. SKHS: Helsinki. (With an English Summary.)

Ketola, Hanna-Maija

- 1997 "Oikeiden" asenteiden opettajana – The Rev. Herbert M. Waddams Ruotsissa ja Suomessa syystalvella 1944. – Yearbook of the Finnish Society of Church History (SKHSV) 1996. SKHS: Helsinki.
- 2004 Teaching 'Correct' Attitudes: an Anglican Emissary to Sweden and Finland in 1944. – Journal of Ecclesiastical History. Vol.55. No.1.

Kilström, Bengt Ingmar

- 1990 Högkyrkligheten i Sverige och Finland under 1900-talet. Bokförlaget Åsak, Sahlin & Dahlström Ab: Johannesberg.

Kirby, David

2006 *A Concise History of Finland*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
The University of Hull Press: Hull.

Kirby, Dianne

1990 *The Anglican Church in the period of the Cold War: 1945-1955*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Hull. British Library.

1999 *Church, State and Propaganda – The Archbishop of York and International Relations, A Political Study of Cyril Forster Garbett, 1942-1955*. The University of Hull Press: Hull.

Krapu, Jenni

2007 *Ekumeenikko E.G. Gulin 1893-1975*. Unpublished Licentiate thesis. The Helsinki University Theological Faculty Library.

Laine, Tuija

2000 *Ylösherätys suruttomille. Englantilaisperäinen hartauskirjallisuus Suomessa Ruotsin vallan aikana*. SKS 775. Diss. Helsinki. SKS: Helsinki.

Lauha, Aila

1990 *Suomen kirkon ulkomaansuhteet ja ekumeeninen osallistuminen 1917-1922*. SKHST 150. Diss. Helsinki. SKHS: Helsinki.

1993a *Suomen kirkon kansainväliset suhteet 1923-1925*. SKHST 159. SKHS: Helsinki.

1993b *Nathan Söderblom and the Nordic Countries and Churches from a Finnish Point of View*. Tro & Tanke. 1993:7. Ed. Sam Dahlgren. Church of Sweden Research Department: Uppsala.

1999 *"Syyttömyyden" taakka. Suomen luterilainen kirkko ja sotasyllisyys*. – TA.

2005 *Finnish Christianity since 1940. – Nordic Folk Churches. A Contemporary Church History*. Ed. Ryman et al. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Love's Redeeming Work.

2003 *Love's Redeeming Work. The Anglican Quest for Holiness*. Geoffrey Rowell, Kenneth Stevenson and Rowan Williams. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Malkavaara, Mikko

1993 *Luterilaisten yhteyttä rautaesiripun laskeutuessa. Luterilainen yhteysliike ja Itä-Euroopan luterilaiset vähemmistökirkot 1945-1950*. SKHST 164. Diss. Helsinki. SKHS: Helsinki.

- 1997 Suomen luterilainen kirkko ulkomaisen avun vastaanottajana (1945-1952). – Kansainvälisen vastuun oppivuodet. Kirkon Ulkomaanavun kehityslinjoja. Kirkon Ulkomaanavun 50-vuotishistoriikki. Ed. Yrjö Höysniemi. Kirkon Ulkomaanapu: Forssa.
- Manninen, Ohto
- 2006 War between Friends: Britain and Finland, 1941–1944. – From War to Cold War. Anglo-Finnish Relations in the 20th Century. Ed. Juhana Aunesluoma. SKS: Helsinki.
- Murtorinne, Eino
- 1972 Risti hakaristin varjossa. Saksan ja Pohjoismaiden kirkkojen suhteet Komannen valtakunnan aikana 1933-1940. Kirjayhtymä: Helsinki.
- 1975 Veljeyttä viimeiseen saakka. SKHST 94. SKHS: Helsinki.
- 1995 Suomen kirkon historia. Osa 4. Sortovuosista nykypäiviin, 1900-1990. WSOY: Porvoo.
- 1997 Viisi vuosikymmentä kirkon keskushallintoa. Kirkon keskushallin-non synty ja kehitys vuoteen 1994. Kirkkohallitus: Saarijärvi.
- 2006 Lennart heljas. Kansainvälisesti suuntautunut poliitikko ja kirkonmies. Historiallisia Tutkimuksia 231. SKS: Helsinki.
- Mäkeläinen, Pertti
- 1972 Jaakko Gummerus ja kirkon ekumeeniset suhteet. – SKHSV 1970-1971. Ed. Pentti Lempiäinen. SKHS: Helsinki.
- Mäkinen, Joonas
- 2008 Sivustaseuraajasta kansankirkon toimijaksi. SDP:n kirkkopoliitiikka vuosina 1977–1987. Master thesis. The Helsinki University Theological Faculty Library. <<http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe200804111232>> Visited 17 April 2008.
- Nevakivi, Jukka
- 1995 Zdanov Suomessa. Miksi meitä ei neuvostoliittolaistettu? Otava: Helsinki.
- 1999 Part III From the Continuation War to the Present. 1944–1999. – From Grand Duchy to a Modern State. A Political History of Finland since 1809. Jussila, Osmo et al. Hurst & Company: London.
- 2006 Finnish Perceptions of Britain's Role during the War. – From War to Cold War. Anglo-Finnish Relations in the 20th Century. Ed. Juhana Aunesluoma. SKS: Helsinki.

Norris, Richard A.

1999 *Episcopacy. – The Study of Anglicanism*. Ed. Stephen Sykes et al. Revised Edition. SPCK: London.

Paasivirta, Juhani

1992 *Suomi ja Eurooppa 1939-1956. Sotien ja murrosten ajanjakso*. Kirjayhtymä: Helsinki.

Pajunen, Mika K T

2004 *Suomen evankelis-luterilaisen kirkon suhde Englannin kirkkoon Aleksii Lehtosen arkkipiispakaudella 1945-1951. – Yearbook of the Finnish Society of Church History (SKHSV) 2003*. SKHS: Helsinki.

2006 *The Onset of the Cold War and the Churches Response, 1944–48. – From War to Cold War. Anglo-Finnish Relations in the 20th Century*. Ed. Juhana Aunesluoma. SKS: Helsinki.

Palmer, Alan

2006 *Northern Shores. A History of the Baltic Sea and its Peoples*. John Murray: London.

Pekkarinen, Jussi

2008 *Rautaesiripun takana? – Idän etuvartio? Suomi-kuva 1945-1981*. Pekka Lähteenkorva & Jussi Pekkarinen. WS Bookwell Oy: Juva.

Repo, Matti

2006 *Ykseyden ja jatkuvuuden merkki. Piispanvirka luterilais-anglikaanisissa sopimuksissa. – Signum unitatis – Ykseyden merkki. Piispa Juha Pihkalan juhlakirja*. Ed. Ari Hukari. Tampereen hiippakunnan vuosikirja 2007. Kirjapaja: Helsinki.

Ripatti, Jaakko

1990 *Suomen kirkon ulkomaansuhteet ja kansainvälinen politiikka 1944-1946*. Publications of the Finnish Society of Church History (SKHST) 149. Diss. Helsinki. SKHS: Helsinki.

Rusama, Jaakko

1999 *Kohti ykseyttä. Suomen Ekumeenisen Neuvoston synty ja toiminta 1917-1997*. KTA 75. SENj LXI. KT: Jyväskylä.

Ryman, Björn

2005a Church of Sweden, 1940-2000. – Nordic Folk Churches. A Contemporary Church History. Ed. Ryman et al. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan.

2005b Into the Ecumenical World. – Nordic Folk Churches. A Contemporary Church History. Ed. Ryman et al. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Robertson, Edwin H.

1996 Taking the Word to the World. 50 Years of the United Bible Societies. Thomas Nelson Publishers: Nashville.

Seppinen, Jukka

2008 Vaaran vuodet? Suomen selviytymisstrategia 1944-1950. Minerva: Helsinki.

Seppo, Juha

2001 Finland: Folkkyrka i ett alltmer pluralistiskt samhälle. – Nordiske Folkekirker i opbrud. National identitet og international nyorientering efter 1945. Ed. Jens Holger Schjørring. Aarhus Universitetsforlag: Århus.

Singleton, Fred

2006 A Short History of Finland. Revised and updated by A.F. Upton. Seventh printing. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Tjørhom, Ola

2002 Apostolicity and Apostolic Succession in the Porvoo Statement – Necessary or a Mere "Optional Extra" in the Church's Life? – Apostolicity and Unity. Essays on the Porvoo Common Statement. Ed. Ola Tjørhom. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Toon, Peter

1999 The Articles and Homilies. – The Study of Anglicanism. Ed. Stephen Sykes et al. Revised Edition. SPCK: London.

Upton, Anthony

2006 Finland, Great Britain and the Cold War, 1944-55. – From War to Cold War. Anglo-Finnish Relations in the 20th Century. Ed. Juhana Aunesluoma. SKS: Helsinki. 2005. SH 72.

Varsori, Antonio

2004 *Reflections on the Origins of the Cold War. – Reviewing the Cold War. Approaches, Interpretations, Theory.* Ed. Odd Arne Westad. Nobel Symposium 107. Cass Series: Cold War History. Frank Cass: London.

Visuri, Pekka

2006 *The Making of the Parish Peace Treaty: Military Strategy and British Policy towards Finland, 1944-47. – From War to Cold War. Anglo-Finnish Relations in the 20th Century.* Ed. Juhana Aunesluoma. SKS: Helsinki. 2005. SH 72.

Österlin, Lars

1995 *Churches of Northern Europe in Profile. A Thousand Years of Anglo-Nordic relations.* Norwich. The Canterbury Press: Norwich.

Index of names

A

Adell, Arthur 351
Agricola, Mikael 99, 178, 180, 183,
300, 315, 317, 319, 320, 324, 351
Ahtola, A.A. 72, 79, 81, 178, 183
St Aidan 290
Alaja, Osmo 180
Alanen, Yrjö J.E. 201, 226, 248, 263
Alexander, Finnish Orthodox Bishop
(Aleksanteri Karpin) 54, 222-223,
240, 361, 390
Alexandrov, Miss 309
Alho, A. 347
Allen, Ronald E.T. 128-129, 138
St Anskar 290
Arnold, John 18, 240, 242, 309, 368
Asmussen, Hans 161
St Augustine 82, 290
Aulén, Gustaf 280-281, 287-288
Auranen, Ahti 218, 233-234, 245-
246
Aurola, Verner J. 54, 60, 118, 248,
346, 388

B

Barnes, E.B. 298
Barron, Colonel 335
Batty, Basil Staunton 28, 73, 78, 80,

85-89, 119, 121, 141, 151-152, 165,
205, 295, 385-386, 388

Beguín, Olivier 330

Bell, George Kennedy Allen 17, 19,
27, 38, 51-52, 71, 81, 120-122, 124,
133-134, 136, 143-145, 156-160,
162-164, 167-169, 172-173-174,
193, 202, 204-209, 234-235, 238,
240-241, 267, 280-283, 286-290,
292, 295, 300, 305-306, 316-317,
325, 339, 341, 364, 366-367, 369-
374, 384, 386, 388-389, 393-394

Berggrav, Eivind 146, 148-150, 160,
163, 167-169, 174, 280, 286, 316-
317, 359, 362-366, 370, 388, 396

Bishop of Damaraland 347

Bishop of Kalmar (Tottie, Henry Wil-
liam) 289

Björklund, Johannes 312

Block, Carl 150

Block, Karl Morgan 285

Bonsdorff, Max von 33, 52, 54, 166,
221-223, 225-226, 315, 333, 341,
346, 389

Boys, John 346-347

Bredersen, Paul 163

Brilioth, Yngve 25, 174, 378

Bring, Ragnar 52, 212, 225

Brodd, Sven-Erik 20

Burden, Thomas William 355
 Burgen, Edvard J. 357

C

Cant, Reginald 367, 372
 Carpenter, Edward 19
 Churchill, Winston 47, 50, 72, 316-317
 Cobben, Gulielmus SCJ 312
 Cockburn, James Hutchison 127, 244, 246
 Cockburn, Norman T. 185, 198, 252-253, 268, 369
 Cooke, William 239
 Cotter, A. 89, 161-169, 207, 388
 St Cuthbert 105

D

Davidson, Randall Thomas 26, 122
 Dean of Chichester 151
 Dix, Gregory 250
 Dodd, C.H. 186
 Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz von 291
 Don, Alan 112
 Douglas, C.E. 38-39
 Douglas, J.A. 17, 44, 47, 72-73, 78-81, 89, 113-115, 120, 124, 162, 165, 382-384
 Duncan-Jones, A.S. 28, 37, 39, 45, 75-78, 83, 126, 136-137, 141, 146, 152-153, 251, 267-268, 270, 285, 292, 295, 328, 340, 382, 384, 388, 392-393
 Dunlop, Colin 18, 302-326, 333, 343-344, 350, 394
 Dunlop, Mary 316

E

Eden, Anthony 175
 Eidem, Erling 52, 81, 86-87, 162, 164, 166-168, 305-306, 363
 Enckell, C.J.A. 216-217, 223, 312, 320
 Engstrom, S.E. 277, 316
 St Erik 314
 St Eskil 290

F

Findlow, John 271-272, 332, 334
 Fisher, Geoffrey Francis 17, 51, 71-74, 78, 80-82, 85, 112-115, 140-142, 146-147, 151-152, 156-158, 187-188, 198, 202, 205-206, 208-210, 221-223, 240, 275-276, 278, 294, 300-307, 329-330, 350-351, 362-363, 367, 376-380, 385, 387, 389, 394-395
 Fjellbu, Arne 84
 Fox, Adam 313
 Franzén, Sven 180
 Fry, Franklin Clark 275
 Fuglsang-Damgaard, Hans 280, 283-285, 287-288, 316, 359, 365

G

Garbett, Cyril Forster 54-55, 62, 65, 73, 229
 George VI, King 82, 199
 Gezelius, Johannes 100
 Giertz, Bo 378
 Glückert, Edgar (Ernamo) 43
 Gore, Charles 24, 94
 Graham-Brown, George Francis 291
 Granfelt, Axel Fredrik 31
 Greer, William D.L. 130, 187-188, 195

- Grundy, J.B.C. 312
- Gulin, Eelis Gideon 17, 19, 33, 43, 52-54, 56, 69, 84, 120, 131-137, 142, 146, 150, 165, 201, 203, 212-214, 218-219, 221-223, 225, 228, 233, 235-236, 238-240, 244-249, 251-253, 267, 272-274, 276, 284, 309-312, 315, 319, 323, 328, 340-341, 343-346, 348-351, 354, 357-360, 368, 374, 379, 380-381, 384, 386-388, 390, 392, 394-396
- Gulin, Helmi 52, 165, 219, 247
- Gummerus, Jaakko 23, 25, 27-28, 31, 33
- ## H
- Haakon VII, King 85
- Haapanen, A. 316
- Haavio, Jaakko 109, 183, 258
- Haig, A.L. 165
- Hallesby, Ole 191
- Harjunpää, Toivo 51-52, 72, 79, 81, 85, 89, 111-120, 123-124, 126, 128-129, 131, 145, 149, 151-153, 155, 160, 165, 171, 178, 180-184, 191-194, 197, 199, 201, 210-211, 214, 216, 218, 222-223, 230, 232-235, 248, 256-257, 259, 262-264, 270-275, 348, 385-386, 392-394
- Harland, L.W. 238, 246-247, 267, 295, 303, 327-329, 341, 358, 392
- Haselmayer, L.A. 271
- Hauge, Henrik 163, 167
- Headlam, Arthur Cayley 17, 19, 25-30, 32, 35-39, 42-43, 45-47, 50, 58, 73-74, 76-78, 115, 120-124, 141, 154, 157-158, 160-161, 174-175, 205, 207-211, 240, 242, 289, 384, 389-390
- Hebert, Arthur Gabriel 190, 250
- Heckel, Theodor 45
- Heikkinen, Jacob W. 247, 277-280
- Heiler, Friedrich 91-92
- Heljas, Lennart Albert 217, 221, 223
- Helle, Konsta 20
- Henley, Miss 309
- St Henry 105, 156, 178-180, 183, 224, 251, 268, 290, 293, 314, 319
- Herman, Finnish Orthodox Bishop (Herman Aav) 197, 245, 310, 323, 377
- Hickinbotham, J.P. 290
- Hitler, Adolf 52, 63-64, 133
- Hodgson, Leonard 295
- Hohler, H.A.F. 310
- Hooker, Richard 288
- Howie, R.M. 89
- Hunter, Leslie Stannard 17, 188, 206-209, 211, 213-246, 251-253, 267, 285, 295-297, 302-303, 305, 313, 324-325, 339, 341-342, 365, 368, 374-376, 382, 389-390, 394
- ## I
- Ingle, George 376-380, 396
- Ingman, Lauri 27-28, 33, 38
- Iredale, Eleanor 126, 138-139, 187, 192, 194, 199-201, 214, 233-238, 244-247, 387, 390, 392
- St Irenaeus 363
- Isacsson, Fredrik 178
- ## J
- Jasper, Ronald 19
- Jesus Christ 29, 75, 82, 85, 91-93, 95-96, 98, 104, 122, 124, 131, 133, 137, 179, 184, 222, 231-232, 247, 251, 279, 294, 297, 301, 311, 313, 321, 347, 356

Johansson, Gustaf 22, 25-27, 122-123, 248
 John, Metropolitan Elder of Nicaea (Wilho Rinne) 18, 184, 254-256, 270, 331-339, 345
 Johnson, Hewlett 202, 352
 Jones, C.H. 69, 86, 88-89, 132, 164-165, 170-171, 266-267, 343-344
 Jonzon, Bengt 316, 320
 Josephson, C.E. 341
 Juva, Mikko 186-187
 Jørgensen, Alfred 162-163, 168

K

Kahra, Eljas 248
 Kaila, Erkki 17, 25, 38, 41-42, 46, 50, 55, 71, 77, 152, 160, 173, 261, 299
 Kallio, Kyösti 45
 Kankaanpää, Pentti 355
 Kansanaho, Erkki 180
 Kantala, Pirjo 19
 Kares, Olavi 257-264, 392
 Kastari, Paavo 307-308
 Kelly, P.D. 89
 Ketola, Hanna-Maija 19
 Kingston, George Frederick 294
 Kirby, Dianne 19
 Koskenniemi, A.E. 183
 Krapu, Jenni 19

L

Lang, William Cosmo Gordon 27-28, 32-33, 35, 38-39, 41-42, 46-47, 50, 52, 55, 152, 160, 383
 Lauha, Aila 18
 Ledward, R. 214, 216-217, 221, 223, 227, 239
 Lehtonen, Aleks Emanuel 15-18, 23-25, 28, 30-31, 33, 35, 38-39, 42-43,

45-47, 52-56, 69, 71-72, 77, 81-86, 89-113, 115, 118-124, 128-132, 136, 138-162, 165-169, 173-175, 177-191, 195, 197, 199-201, 203-211, 213-216, 218-222, 225-226, 228-235, 237-238, 240-242, 244, 248-260, 263, 267, 270-282, 285, 290-291, 293-305, 312-317, 319-325, 327-329, 331, 333, 337-338, 344-346, 348-354, 357-358, 360-362, 364, 366, 372-384, 386-398
 Lehtonen, Margaretha 145, 149-151, 157-158, 184, 194, 221-223, 233, 240, 276-277, 295, 300, 314, 377, 393
 Lehtonen, Mikael 380
 Lehtonen, Risto 184, 215, 234, 254-256, 331-332, 377
 Lehtonen, Samuel 94, 130, 140, 143, 166, 183-184, 186-195, 202, 211, 213, 215, 229-230, 234, 255-256, 259, 262, 264, 270, 276-277, 293-295, 298-302, 313-315, 319, 321, 323, 330, 345-346, 374-377, 380, 387, 393
 Lenin, V.I. 312
 Lilje, Hans (Johannes Ernst Richard) 149
 Linton, Karin 308-309, 343
 Linton, Sydney 308-309, 322, 343-346, 377, 379, 394
 Lundén, Jorma 256
 Luther, Martin 27, 98, 100-102, 149, 288, 311
 Luy, John 304-307

M

Macartney, W.H. 346, 368, 383
 Macdonald, A.J. 126, 152, 286

- Mackenzie, Mr 308
 Mackie, C. 341
 Mackie, Robert 130
 Magill, J.H. 49, 89, 312
 Malmivaara, Väinö 200, 222, 233,
 236, 244, 257-258
 Mannerheim, C.G.E. 49-50, 63, 81,
 86-87, 89, 143, 233, 242-243, 386
 Mannermaa, J. 33
 Martin, Hugh 135-136
 Matthews, W.R. 28, 33, 141, 152
 Menuhin, Yehudi 310
 Michelfelder, S.C. 316
 Milner-White, Eric 252
 Molland, Einar 363
 Morehouse, Clifford 271
 Moreton, Rupert 20
 Moss, Claude Beaufort 28, 30, 32, 34,
 37, 44, 83, 141, 151, 188, 267-268,
 284, 289-291, 295, 308, 326-327,
 343-344, 346, 348, 358-366, 382,
 384, 391-396
 Mott, John R. 249
 Murtorinne, Eino 18
- N**
- Neill, Stephen 187-188, 208-209, 286,
 288, 292, 295, 303, 362, 378
 Nicolay, Paul 104, 381
 Niinivaara, Erkki 180, 264
 Nikolainen, Aimo T. 180, 225, 240,
 248, 348-349, 375
 Nilsson, Eric 180
 Nivari, Risto 256, 258
 Nokkala, Armo 381-382
 Nyman, Valdemar 185, 252-254
 Nyqvist, Alvar 345
 Nysted, Olle 148
- O**
- St Olaf 290
 St Olav 314
 Orädd, Daniel 115
- P**
- Paasikivi, Alli 232-233
 Paasikivi, J.K. 68, 86-87, 144, 154,
 232-234, 265-266, 302, 319-320,
 324, 390
 Palmgren, S.J.F. 54
 Parsons, Richard Godfrey 44, 367
 Parvio, Martti 184, 230, 235, 249-
 252, 256-258, 260-263, 270, 272,
 314, 319, 321, 323, 348-350, 361,
 392
 Paterson, John 251
 Paunu, Uno 28, 31-32
 St Paul 101, 347
 Pennell, T.E.N. 44
 Peters, Knut 351
 Pimenoff, Agnes 18, 55, 169-170
 Pimenoff, Georg G. 18, 54-55, 60,
 140, 144-145, 149-151, 165-167,
 169-172, 220, 242, 387-389
 Pohjanpirkka, Oiva 193-194, 268-
 269, 276, 294, 329, 346, 394
 Porter, J.R. 281, 295
 Prentice, George T.S. 198
 Prenter, Regin 212
 Prestige, G.L. 326, 328-329, 334-335,
 369
 Pulla, Armas J. 51
 Pusey, Edward B. 381
 Puukko, A.F. 319

Q

Quickswood, Lord (Gascoyne-Cecil,
Hugh Richard Heathcote) 77

R

Ramsey, Arthur Michael 250, 335-
336, 338, 368, 375

Raven, Charles E. 28, 32, 141, 187,
267, 295

Rawlinson, A.E. John 33, 37, 91, 119-
120, 136, 141, 147, 155, 188, 210,
267, 295, 368

Renvall, Torsten Thure 31

Richardson, Alan 211, 213, 215, 225-
226, 228, 305, 324, 375, 389

Rinne, Wilho *see* John, Metropolitan
Elder of Nicaea

Ripatti, Jaakko 18-19

Rodhe, Edward 26

Roper, Mr 226-227

Rosendal, Gunnar 185, 258, 261-262

Rosenqvist, Arne 355

Rosenqvist, G.O. 69, 229, 248

Runeberg, Johan Ludvig 225

Rusama, Jaakko 19

Ryti, Risto 52

S

Salomies, Ilmari 81, 248, 272, 274,
317, 348-349, 381

Schauman, F.L. 32

Seaton, J.B. 28, 33, 37-38, 204

Sentzke, G. 316

Serenius, Sigtrygg 345

Shepherd, Francis 60, 62-67, 87-89,
176-177, 213-214, 385

SibeliuS, Jean 221

Siebel, Arthur 133-134

Sigurdsson, Sigurgeir 280, 284, 287,
359

Siirala, Aarne 198-199, 348

Simojoki, Martti 186-187, 274

Sirenius, Sigfrid 226-227

Sormunen, Eino 72, 200, 322

Sparrow Simpson, W.J. 38

Stalin, Josif 48, 52, 63, 265, 267, 312,
320

Stone, Darwell 38

Storr, Sir Ronald 350

Swan, Bessie M. 268

Synge, F.C. 112

Söderblom, Nathan 22, 24-26, 91, 94,
97, 102, 185-186, 386

T

Takki, Uuno 54

Tarkkanen, Matti 33, 36

Tatlow, Tissington 383

Temple, John R. 112, 130, 140, 145-
146, 148-149, 188, 193, 220

Temple, William 24, 37-38, 55, 70-
71, 82, 112, 334-336, 338

Thomas, Bishop 251

St Thorlak 290

Tiililä, Osmo 100, 191-192, 202-204,
226, 240, 260, 263-264, 349, 354,
392

Tomkins, O.S. 295

U

Usher, Philip 28, 44

V

Virkkunen, Heimer 219-220

Virkkunen, Paavo 72, 220-221, 223,
345

Visser 't Hooft, Willem Adolph 349

W

Waddams, Herbert Montague 16-17,
19, 44, 53-71, 73-75, 78, 80-84, 89,
109-110, 118-120, 123-124, 128-
130, 133, 135-137, 141-147, 155,
167, 169-173, 193-194, 201, 214,
241, 270-271, 274-275, 281, 294-
295, 303-305, 316, 324-326, 328,
335, 337, 344, 346-347, 367-374,
384-386, 388, 394-396

Wahlström, Lydia 185

Wainio, Haakon 261, 355-357

Warren, Avra M. 310

Westerlund, Bruno 345

Weyde, Kjell 280, 284-285

Williams, R.R. 126, 334-335

Winter, Toivo 192, 198, 313

Wuori, Eero A. 276, 294

Z

Zhdanov, Andrei 63-68, 87, 385

Ö

Österlin, Lars 19