

Est.  
1841

YORK  
ST JOHN  
UNIVERSITY

Jarvis, Edward Thomas (2023) The Anglican Church in Southeast Asia: from Complicity in Colonialism to Contributing to its Downfall. Doctoral thesis, York St John University.

Downloaded from: <http://ray.yorksjs.ac.uk/id/eprint/8065/>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at [ray@yorksjs.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorksjs.ac.uk)

**THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN SOUTHEAST ASIA: FROM COMPLICITY IN  
COLONIALISM TO CONTRIBUTING TO ITS DOWNFALL**

Edward Thomas Jarvis

A critical review

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

York St John University

School of Humanities

February 2023

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is their own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material. Any reuse must comply with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 and any licence under which this copy is released.

© 2023 York St John University and Edward Thomas Jarvis

The right of Edward Thomas Jarvis to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

My submission for the PhD by published work is based on research leading to the publication of two peer-reviewed, specialist-edited, single-author monographs. These monographs examine multiple aspects of the Anglican Church's involvement in British imperial expansion in Southeast Asia, and the Church's engagement with the phenomena of, and issues arising from, colonialism, national independence struggles, and the emergence of postcolonial societies. The present document is my critical review of this work.

2021: *The Anglican Church in Burma: from Colonial Past to Global Future*. University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

ISBN 9780271091563

(226 pages, circa 85,000 words)

2022: *The Anglican Church in Malaysia: Evolving Concepts, Challenging Contexts, Emerging Subtexts*. Cham (Switzerland): Palgrave Macmillan.

ISBN 9783031115967

(204 pages, circa 75,000 words)

### Introduction

The aims of my research have been: a) to provide an original, focused, multidisciplinary appraisal of the Anglican Church's involvement in the establishment and development of British colonies in Southeast Asia; b) to assess and expose the nature, extent, and effects of the Church's engagement with colonial authorities and institutions, with ethnic and national independence movements, and with subsequent decolonising processes; and c) to evaluate the local Churches'

adaptation to newly independent states, following independence and decolonisation. The two chronological narratives follow the respective local Churches up to and including the present day, as their postcolonial roles have evolved, as new challenges have emerged, and as the Churches' voices, within regional and global networks, such as the Anglican Communion, have gradually been defined.

Previously existing works on these subjects were few and flawed, leaving widely acknowledged gaps in the scholarship. Some of those previous works were simply out of date, some took a narrow or overly "official" view of the subject, and some conformed to writing conventions that are incompatible with modern scholarship. Deficiencies in the literature were also due to a broader problem of stunted development in the field of colonial history, and specifically colonial Church history; I will outline these issues below. Being conscious of these and other difficulties involved in studying the colonial Church, especially the problem of the too-narrow scope of some previous writing on the subject, my chosen approach for this research has been multidisciplinary, taking into consideration ethno-religious, ethno-linguistic, and regional-political questions. It is hoped, thereby, that the results of this research may be of interest to academic readers, students, and scholars coming from a number of different disciplines, including Church history, colonial history, theology, religious studies, postcolonial studies, and Southeast Asian studies, among others.

As a graduate of York St John University (though working independently of any faculty or school during the period of my research) I was determined to adhere to high academic standards at all stages of the research and writing processes, with the goal of playing a valid part

in the public academic output of scholarship on these subjects. In 2019 I was elected Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (FRAS), and this honour allowed me to engage with a network of active academic researchers, to access exceptional resources, to gain valuable insights, and to participate in a range of relevant scholarly events. I was subsequently also elected Fellow of the Royal Historical Society (FRHistS), which has given me access to another significant pool of information, sources, and support. After reaching an advanced stage in my research, I began planning and structuring the manuscripts; I then entered the dedicated writing stage, in order to prepare clean, readable, properly organised and referenced first drafts to share with prospective publishers.

Both manuscripts were quickly accepted for publication; the first manuscript (on Burma) was accepted as part of a focused edited series of books on World Christianity (the series editors are Peter C. Phan and Dale T. Irvin) produced by a leading university press, and the second manuscript (on Malaysia) was accepted as a standalone publication (reviewed and critiqued by Kevin Ward) by a prominent global academic publisher. Both manuscripts passed through rigorous peer review and specialist editing processes, which have been very challenging, constructive, and instructive experiences for me as a scholar. For reasons including technical, structural, linguistic (switching from my native British English to American English) and house-style matters, both manuscripts required a significant amount of work from me before passing the second round of reviews. Most encouraging and gratifying for me, however, has been the consistent confirmation from scholars on different continents (Bong, 2022; Equina, 2021; Pum Za Mang, 2022; Walters, 2021 [2]; Ward, 2022) that the books constitute both an original and a useful contribution to the literature. This critical review will now outline the background,

methodology, and development of the research, and then summarise the rationale and broader relevance of the research, before drawing together the key points, themes, and observations arising from the publications, to identify and discuss this work's particular contribution.

#### Research outline: background, methodology, development

As mentioned above, the field of study of the Anglican Church's complex role in the British Empire has developed unevenly. When the first phase of decolonisation was still running its course, postcolonial studies emerged as an emphatically secular field, whose scholars tended to eschew anything that might resemble a denominational approach. Meanwhile, the traditionally strong field of British Church history failed to recognise, at first, that colonial mission was not merely an overseas extension of Victorian philanthropy. Critical approaches to imperial history also struggled, for some time, to interpret the Church's work as an active ingredient in colonialism, rather than a spiritual or social appendage of it. Concurrently, as the theological discipline of missiology evolved, the somewhat unsophisticated and outdated mission techniques of the old colonial Church fell outside of relevant understandings and definitions of mission. The resulting gap in scholarship became impossible to ignore; it has begun to be substantially addressed over the past two decades (by Jeffrey Cox, Steven S. Maughan, Andrew Porter, Brian Stanley, Rowan Strong, and others) with the effect that there is now an engaging available literature on the Church and the British Empire. This short summary of the development of the field of study is consistent with the assessment of these scholars themselves (Cox, 2008; Maughan, 2014; Porter, 2004; Strong, 2007) who have also discussed these issues in their own works.

These scholars have acknowledged that gaps in the literature persist, however, particularly because recent scholarship has, understandably, largely focused on the vast and important subjects of India and Africa. However, just as colonial mission was not simply an appendage of Victorian Church philanthropy, as had been assumed, the Churches of Southeast Asia, such as those in Burma and Malaysia, were not merely offshoots of the much larger Indian missions; these “niche” cases of Britain’s smaller Asian colonies demanded a handling of their own. Studying these small countries’ histories side-by-side reveals intriguing similarities and stark differences; both of them unfold in contexts of dominant majority religions (Buddhism in Burma and Islam in Malaysia) that have overwhelmingly influenced local perceptions of community and nationhood, of belonging and identity, and of faith and worship, with fascinating and sometimes catastrophic effects. As an example of a curious contrast, on the other hand, Malaysia’s independence from Britain brought a period of bloody armed conflict (the so-called Malayan Emergency) to an end, while Burma’s otherwise peaceful transition to independence ushered in a decades-long period of intense interethnic and interreligious violence. These complex regional scenarios of competing ideals and conflicting priorities, rather than stories of simple charitable missions, the above-mentioned scholars suggest, provide the true contexts for the history of the Anglican Church in Southeast Asia.

Driven initially by my personal interest in, first-hand knowledge of, and pastoral experience with the Anglican Churches of Burma and Malaysia, I enthusiastically devoted myself to this underresearched area. In accordance with my aim, mentioned above, to be multidisciplinary, I resolved to consider historical, theological, political, sociopolitical, and cultural aspects of these two-hundred-year-old cases; as my work progressed, I identified the



need to integrate insights from sociolinguistics, the politics of language, gender issues, minority issues, and human rights. I was especially determined to home in on themes such as prejudice, discrimination, inequality, and abuse on the basis of class, ethnicity, skin colour, and gender, which were largely omitted from the traditional Church histories of the region. Some other challenging themes were not omitted completely from older works, but they tended to be downplayed, such as the achievements of progressive Church leaders, including the so-called “atheists of empire,” who promoted autonomy for the local Church and pushed for the development and support of local Church leadership. The absence or near-absence of these important themes from older works constituted another significant flaw in the existing literature.

Around the turn of the millennium, some of these challenging themes were discussed in general works such as Daniel O’Connor’s (2000) global history of the United Society Partners in the Gospel (USPG), formerly the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG), and in more focused writing such as Brian Taylor’s (1998) and Elizabeth Koepping’s (2006) papers on rural communities in Borneo. I have sought to learn from these scholars’ work and pursue corresponding questions in the cases of Burma and Malaysia, including the matter of colonialism’s “unwanted” orphans, the roles and treatment of women, and some missionaries’ insistence on imposing religious exclusivism. I have exposed attitudes that may have gone unchallenged in older, denominationally oriented histories, and I have identified exclusivist approaches that survived, in some cases, long after the end of colonialism. I aim to be fair as well as critical, however, seeking out all available perspectives, and considering conflicts within faith groups as well as the challenges of interfaith dialogue and ecumenism. I try to allow each aspect

of my research to inform and illuminate other aspects, in order to construct a thorough and interconnected research framework.

My Burma research draws on relevant original collections held at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) of the University of London, original Church records, historic memoirs, and personal recollections, both published and unpublished, produced throughout the colonial era. I also consulted official surveys, censuses, reports, newspaper articles, and other public or published contemporary sources. For my Malaysia research I draw on the National Archives of the UK, Malaysia, and Singapore, the SPG / USPG archives in Oxford, and original Church records now held at the National Archives and National Library of Singapore. Archive material in Southeast Asia has suffered enormously from systematic destruction (especially in Burma) and accidental destruction (especially in Malaysia), notably during the Second World War and in later violence. A persistent difficulty for all scholars engaging with colonial history, whether they focus on the Asian, African, or American continents, is the predictable dearth of local voices, especially in the early period; this is a sad impediment to a fuller understanding that we simply have to accept. These factors added to the challenge of marshalling a sufficient and balanced range of sources, but I feel that I dealt with this successfully. I began with reading secondary sources in order to build chronological, historical, political, and philosophical foundations, upon which my research could take shape. Alongside this, I built up a dedicated bibliography, collating contemporary published works, archive sources, and supplementary items. I also sought to directly consult scholars, practitioners, and locally involved individuals, in order to acquire local knowledge and to add current context, cultural insights, and linguistic

awareness; these steps helped me to more thoroughly and accurately interpret the older and archival sources, and position them within the research framework.

#### Contribution: rationale and relevance

As is often the case with religious questions, the story of the Church, colonialism, and postcolonialism is far from being merely a story of religion, missions, and conversions, just as the accompanying political history is not simply a matter of dates, deeds, and treaties. The Church's day-to-day significance in colonial society can be difficult to appreciate, when observed from the perspective of modern, diverse, and highly secularised societies, and we must guard against simplistic explanations or condemnations. Our appraisals of the Church's role must be free from bias, nostalgia, neocolonialist tropes, and false dichotomies (such as "lasting benefits Vs. brutal excesses") while also resisting anti-imperialist rhetoric (such as "you brought us bibles, now we want our land back" caricatures) which can trivialise and oversimplify the issues. Colonial history and colonial Church history must not become an exercise in vengeance or ridicule. The topics can understandably be highly emotive and they require considerate handling. Bearing these guidelines in mind, I feel that my research makes a positive, value-driven contribution that sensitively encourages further study in this field. I have argued for a balanced approach to these underexplored corners of colonial Church history, and a measured assessment of themes that have, in the past, been vulnerable to mischaracterisation, cliché, and stereotyping. I believe that my work complements and builds upon the recent scholarship in this field, outlined above, crucially by extending the geographical, historical, critical, and cultural reach of the available academic literature.

The time is in fact ripe to reappraise the Anglican Church's engagement with the British Empire and the phenomena of colonial to postcolonial Christianity, especially in Asia. Scholars in many and diverse fields seek a comprehensive understanding of all things Asian and global-south; meanwhile, global-north and Western societies strive to balance their uncomfortable colonial pasts with their modern, ethical self-understandings. The study of world religions and religion in Asia, and of world Christianity and Christianity in Asia are, in consequence, vibrant and expanding fields, especially as increasing interaction between Asian, African, American, and European academics enhances and internationalises the scholarly conversation. Meanwhile, some Christian organisations still struggle to break free from obsolete Eurocentric, Western, and global-north-centric frameworks and mindsets. Within these mindsets, outdated notions of a "normative" Christianity endure, and the idea that Asia or Africa may now be performing, within Christianity, the defining role once enjoyed by Europe, is often stubbornly resisted. Approaches that presume the existence of a "normative" Christianity tend to harbour expectations of values, of economic relations, and of what being "civilised" (or, the preferred euphemism, "developed") might mean, much as these approaches did in colonial times. In Europe and North America, Church leaders and Church members seek to comprehend and manage an intensifying north-south tension (or divide) in global Christianity; this comes with a growing realisation that the gap in understanding may be the unfortunate expression of a more persistent and political postcolonial dynamic, between former coloniser and former colonised. These themes have been the subject of warnings by Anglicanism scholars over the last two decades (Brittain and McKinnon, 2018; Goodhew, 2017; Ward, 2006, among others) in their analyses of today's Anglican Church.

Since I began to develop this research idea six years ago, it is clear that colonialism has re-emerged as a focus of national and international debate, as part of a broader phenomenon of societies dealing with difficult pasts. The debate over countries' uncomfortable histories has become, rightly or wrongly, hostile, with monuments and statues of colonial-era figures being contested, removed, and even destroyed in the United Kingdom; this mirrors concurrent campaigns to remove Confederate monuments in the United States, and the widespread destruction of Soviet-era monuments across Eastern Europe. Less violently, some nations, founded partly or wholly on slavery, have intensified their calls for reparations, drawing varying responses from individuals and organisations; the Church Commissioners of the Church of England recently established a one-hundred-million-pound compensation fund to atone for the Church's slavery links (Martin, 2023), while celebrity descendants of slave owners, such as Benedict Cumberbatch and Edward Norton, may have to face individual claims for compensation (Mendick, 2022). All of these recent developments strongly suggest that our societies have not yet achieved effective reconciliation with their colonial (in one manifestation or another) pasts. Many of us in the UK were taught at school about colonialism and slavery (of particular local relevance to someone like me, growing up in William Wilberforce's Hull) as if it was ancient history. In reality, even today, several decades since my schooldays, the trauma, the cross-generational sense of injustice, and the scars of colonialism and slavery, and of attitudes associated with them, are clearly still fresh for many individuals and communities.

Religion is clearly intertwined with these historical events and attitudes in multiple ways, from the personal faith(s) of colonialism's protagonists to the massive corporate involvement in the colonies of organisations such as England's Established Church. The context of this debate

today, for the Anglican Church, is one in which the Church finds itself fighting to assert its relevance, coherence, integrity, and authenticity as never before. Like all of the institutions concerned in the debate, especially those institutions that, like the Church, first predated and then outlived the colonial era, the Church must now demonstrate that it is mature enough to engage with the colonialism question, which will not simply go away. The maturity of the debate itself, of course, is not guaranteed simply by the fact that the debate is a valid and important one. As well as witnessing offensive elements of the past being dealt with destructively rather than constructively, as some might argue, we have also come to expect carefully crafted apologies, which we can then judge as being sufficiently heartfelt or not. Apologies may certainly have their place, but it can be a challenge to understand how they might be truly meaningful and effective; it may help to conceive of an apology as a righting of the record, rather than as an expression of regret. Moving towards a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of colonial and postcolonial relationships, religious or otherwise, requires fresh and frank re-readings of colonial-era institutions' involvement in the British Empire, including the Anglican Church.

#### Reflection: broader cultural considerations and significance

The Pakistani-born British actor Art Malik (1952–), who first made his name on TV and film playing young subjects of the British Empire, once said in an interview (with Riz Khan on “One on One” for *Al Jazeera*, 25 October, 2008) that through works such as Paul Scott’s *The Jewel in the Crown*, an appropriate apology for “the horrors of imperialism” (as Malik phrased it) had been given and accepted. This slightly surprising claim deserves a closer look; it reminds us that the word “apology” itself, like so many critically important words in daily usage, is at least

equivocal and more likely multivocal. The word “apology” comes from the Greek word “apologia,” whose different meaning led to modern English retaining the use of both forms, as separate words. From the same root, of course, we also have the word “apologetics.” Scholars and authors writing about colonialism must be mindful of these overlapping meanings, especially, perhaps, those scholars from the former imperial powers; could we, consciously or subconsciously, be providing an apologia or apologetics for colonialism, rather than an apology? There is a risk that any potentially serious and meaningful apology, in the form of studies that seek to confront past mistakes and provide a more accurate historical narrative, may be obfuscated by a deep-rooted cultural reflex to attempt mitigation.

It may be that colonial Church history, like its cousin, colonial history, has struggled to develop and establish itself, at least in part, because of lurking trepidation and fear that some scholars will work to excuse the errors of colonialism. The academic community generally views apparent attempts to rehabilitate or justify colonialism with great suspicion and alarm, as illustrated by the case of Nigel Biggar, former Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at the University of Oxford, and his controversial Ethics and Empire project (2017-2022). Biggar’s project sought to challenge popular assumptions that the final sum of the experience of British colonialism reaped no net benefit or a negative net benefit, but his effort was widely interpreted as a cunningly crafted defence of colonialism at best and an unadulterated apologia for colonialism at worst (Adams, 2017). The charges against Biggar were compounded by what scholars claimed was the project’s too-narrow participation, limited scope, and lack of academic rigour (Wilson, 2017). Biggar defended his project (Biggar, 2017) and was not without supporters; academia aside, he was appointed, appropriately (or ironically) perhaps, Commander

of the Order of the British Empire (CBE) in 2021. The academic community may not always reject such possible apologetics outright, but it certainly does vigorously seek to hold such work up to more intense public scrutiny, and it sets a very high (perhaps unfairly high) bar for suspected apologists to establish their work's legitimacy.

If there is indeed scope for further improvement of the historical narrative, and if the goal is partly to right the wrongs of existing narratives, then the mechanics of previous apologies, through writing, for the "horrors" of colonialism, warrant some examination. There may be much to learn from authors of fiction like Paul Scott (1920-1978), creator of the *Raj Quartet*, of which *The Jewel in The Crown* (1966) is a part, who frequently turned to allegory in order to tell the story of the British Empire as they experienced it. The relationships between Scott's characters, including Art Malik's Hari Kumar and the doomed Daphne Manners, are in reality the relationships between Great Britain (with all the imprecision and pomposity that attenuate that name) and "her" British Empire (a similarly vague, forced, and grandiosely named construct). The role of religion was not missing from Scott's treatment; rather, it was a key feature of the imperial landscape he depicted. Scott personally had no particular religious perspective to impart, but his exposition would not have been complete without showing the essential contradictions and dilemmas of the religious agents of the British Empire.

Scott chose to open his entire ground-breaking Raj narrative, in fact, with the distinctly sympathetic (and pathetic) story of a missionary teacher, Edwina Crane. Through Crane's story, as told by Scott, the colonial Church emerges as failed, silly, complicit, but also, clearly and intriguingly, as the only British-run colonial institution in which progressive, liberal, and



contesting ideas about matters such as caste and class could possibly flourish. “Flourish” might sound like an overstatement, but the Church was truly the only colonial institution in which the social boundaries of ethnicity, skin colour, and gender roles were routinely, openly, and as a matter of course crossed, as Scott illustrated. The Church provided the sole arena in which practices that gradually eroded prejudices, such as mixed education, multi-ethnic congregations, and multilingual church services, could develop. This was no anti-colonialist plot; it was simply done out of dispassionate adherence to the literal gospel message. This raised some predictable concerns in official quarters; the gospel message, it was felt, clearly harboured potentially subversive ideas, such as casting down the mighty from their thrones while lifting up the lowly, and feeding the poor while sending the rich away empty, which are all explicitly laid out in the *Magnificat* (Luke 1:46). Missionaries in some places, as a consequence, were asked to make selective and cautious use of certain gospel passages.

A similar conclusion to Scott’s, but expressed with even greater cynicism about religion, emerges from the work of George Orwell (1903-1950), who, like Scott, placed religious questions at the centre of his analysis of colonialism. This is transparent in the title of Orwell’s first poem, about religion, written while he was stationed in Burma; *The Lesser Evil* (1924). Silly and flawed as it was, Orwell points out, the Church in colonial Southeast Asia was at the very least a lesser evil compared to its fellow imperial institutions (Faludy, 2020). The Church in Scott and Orwell’s work actively mitigated colonialism and softened its impact; actions which, paradoxically, invite accusations of perpetuating colonialism rather than accelerating its end. For Orwell, the British Empire was “a despotism with theft as its final object” (Orwell, 2009: 68) and the Church was deeply implicated in running it, supporting it, and justifying it. Perceived as

having sometimes subverted and sometimes endorsed colonialism, the Church then became the only colonial institution to survive decolonisation without being reformed beyond recognition. The Church may indeed have been guilty of glossing over the horrors of colonialism with the varnish of good works, but, as always, simplistic explanations must be guarded against. Orwell, like Scott, wrote in allegories, and *The Lesser Evil* can also be read as a reevaluation of empire in the 1920's and 1930's, an era in which new and unmitigated forms of authoritarianism and expansionism increasingly abandoned any pretence of being humanitarian or philanthropic. Orwell saw the two cornerstones of the world he grew up in, religion and empire, crumbling; they were both thoroughly flawed, but the prospect of what forces might replace them was deeply troubling.

It is no surprise that authors have sought to understand and communicate their experience of the British Empire through allegory, and that they have seen the Church's involvement in colonialism as being a key to understanding that experience. The colonial Church, while worthy of study in its own right, can also be seen as allegorical with colonialism, and as equally mired in contradictions and controversy. Right up to the end of the colonial era, the Anglican Church found itself implicated in a special way in some of Britain's darkest exploits, such as the notorious strategy of "winning hearts and minds." This phrase would later enter everyday usage, but it first gained currency at the start of the so-called Malayan Emergency (1948-1960), when the British government opted for a two-pronged military and psychological solution to bring Malaya under control, before peacefully handing it over to local rule. The background and rationale to this decision to "win hearts and minds" lay in a conflation of several ideas, visions, and kneejerk reactions; the out-going British in Malaya were loath to be saddled with shame

again, following the bungled Partition of India, but they were also conscious that their sudden withdrawal from Burma had left a power vacuum, leading to yet another spiral of interethnic violence. The “hearts and minds” plan harked back to the early days of the Southeast Asian colonies, and the projected Christianisation (presented as being synonymous with civilisation) of the local peoples; even if they would not adopt Christian religion, they should at least adapt to Christian values. The Church’s provision of healthcare, schooling, and social services, without actually obliging people to convert, was widely perceived as having brokered a lasting peace between disparate peoples, thus allowing civil, commercial, and military officials to get on with empire-building. This perception was, in essence if not in plain words, the broad conclusion of the previous generation of mission historians, such as Henry Paget Thompson in his history of the SPG (Thompson, 1951). The British wanted to replicate this process of brokering peace during the Malayan Emergency, utilising the influence of massed missionaries one last time before exiting Malaya.

Extracting a sort of contented compliance was, from the perspective of the British colonialists, the ideal way to manage local populations; the goal of British colonialism was never to have an empire of slaves, *stricto sensu*, and, to wildly varying extents, imperial administrators did believe their own gospel-inspired sales pitch about “lifting up” the lowly locals. Those who executed Britain’s handling of the Malayan Emergency, for their part, were described as devout Christians, and they gladly facilitated a considerable influx of missionaries; the idea was to purchase some control over Malaya’s “problem” marginalised populations, weaning them away from anti-imperialism and Marxism with the good news and good works of Christianity. Beyond the rhetoric, this was Britain’s last-ditch attempt, if not to save a bit of the empire then at least to

exit the empire with some dignity intact. In keeping with the international political environment of the late 1940's, the winning of hearts and minds was revealed to be an Orwellian euphemism and a misnomer; it really meant browbeating and menacing vulnerable people into compliance. These Malayan Emergency missions were not about building schools and hospitals but rather about providing minimal, token services to half a million detainees, whom the British had labelled as troublemakers and forcibly herded into camps. The missionaries were certainly not devoid of compassion, but, ultimately, the age of empire in Southeast Asia ended with this final act of complicity from the Anglican Church; some saw it as a golden opportunity for grassroots evangelism, while others saw only the shameless exploitation of a literally captive audience. Some colonialism scholars (Harper, 1999; Hood, 1991; Newsinger, 2013) mentioned these aspects of the Church's work in the last days of colonialism, including specifically Malaysian perspectives (Lee Kam Hing, 2013; Lim Hin Fui and Fong Tian Yong, 2005), but neither the impact nor the ideological background of these events, rooted in the Church's previous colonial commitment, were well-established in scholarship. I have sought to connect these events and reposition them in their essential context and continuum.

#### Published work: summary, key themes, and original perspective

In the following pages, I will offer an overview of each of the two books and summarise the key themes within them, explaining how these combine to offer an original perspective on the cases in question. I will seek to highlight the similarities and differences between the two cases, identifying points where they converge and contrast. I aim to demonstrate that these books present a consistent approach and a coherent body of work, both in terms of complementing each other as almost parallel histories, and also in terms of being cohesive with prior scholarship in

the field, while obviously moving the focus to the cases of the Churches in Burma and Malaysia. Another important aspect of this coherence, especially for me as a scholar, is to reflect on the future prospects for this research. My study of Malaysia partly addresses the Anglican Church in Singapore, but that Church's development, like the development of Singapore itself, followed a unique path both before and after the island nation became independent from Malaysia in 1965. Today, Singapore has one of the highest proportions of Christian citizens among the Asian nations, and the story of this success is interwoven with the wider story of this tiny yet global economic powerhouse. I see potential for an original, incisive, and useful study of the Anglican Church in Singapore, as a complement to the already published volumes. Looking further ahead, the history of the Anglican Church in Sri Lanka (formerly Ceylon) also presents comparisons and contrasts with the cases of Burma, Malaysia, and Singapore. The Sri Lankan Church has navigated multiple tensions, including the militancy of majority Buddhist believers, intense interethnic and interreligious violence, and complex social and political challenges, as the modern nation has emerged. All of these challenges have had to be managed in partnership with Sri Lanka's transition from British colonial rule, with the Anglican Church having to address and overcome public perceptions of being an anachronistic Church of Empire. I believe that the fascinating case of Sri Lanka provides another significant opportunity for original scholarship.

1) Published work (1 of 2): *The Anglican Church in Burma: from Colonial Past to Global Future*

“A seamless, engaging, and refreshing account (...) a definitive and masterful documentary history.”

— Pum Za Mang, *Church History* (CUP) (Pum Za Mang, 2022)

“[An] excellent case study (...).”

— William Jacob, *Church Times* (Jacob, 2023)

“A welcome addition to the scarce resources on the Asian history of Christianity and mission (...).”

— Limuel Equina, Association for Theological Education in South East Asia (ATESEA) (Equina, 2021)

“This kind of in-depth research into the Anglican Church in Burma has not been previously published, and the findings are an important and interesting new contribution to global Christianity.”

— Albert Sundararaj Walters, author of *Knowing Our Neighbour: A Study of Islam for Christians in Malaysia* (Walters, 2021[2])

The cases of the Anglican Churches in Burma and Malaysia are predictably comparable with each other, to a significant degree, but with equally significant differences between them. Both histories began around two hundred years ago, in the 1820's; the presence of the Anglican Church in the region began in tandem with economic and military annexation by Britain. Both of these colonising incursions, in Burma and Malaysia, seized upon strategic political opportunities that had previously presented themselves, and they built upon tenuous pre-existing footholds of colonial outposts. Not only was the Church's involvement in these projects seen as culturally and commercially expedient, it was decreed as morally right by Parliament, but from that stage onwards the two stories unfolded quite differently. The colonisation of Malaysia and Singapore benefitted from the vision, foresight, and diplomatic skill of pioneers like Sir Stamford Raffles (1781-1826); it was a stealthy, generally peaceful, and highly lucrative takeover, in contrast to the seizure of Burma, which was violent, hurried, and extremely costly to Britain. Burma was primarily a military takeover, and the first Anglican clergy sent there, in fact, were military chaplains accompanying the invading army; it would take many more years to establish a regular Church presence in Burma.

At face value, the task of establishing the Church in Burma should have been easier than in other territories, such as the future Malaysia. Burma was, after all, one contiguous land mass, albeit divided into diverse states, while Malaysia was piecemeal, really consisting of three distinct regions, all divided by water. In both Burma and Malaysia, the Church came up against well-established local belief systems, which in time they would become quite adept at dealing with; Burma, dominated by traditionally peace-loving Buddhists, seemed to present a less complex challenge than Muslim-dominated Malaysia. In reality, however, Burma emerged as a vaster challenge than Malaysia, partly because the terrain, climate, and lack of infrastructure made most of Burma inaccessible, but also because relations with the locals were shaped by the hostile nature of the British arrival; the military character of the British presence would never fully dissipate in Burma. After the First Burma (or Anglo-Burmese) War (1824-26), the initial war of conquest that seized Rangoon, there came a Second (1852-53) and a Third (1885-87) Burma War, to complete the country's annexation, as well as a bloody guerrilla war to stamp out an anti-British rebellion (1930-32). Nothing directly comparable to these violent military campaigns took place in Malaysia. Malaysia may have been divided into a peninsula and islands, separated by seas and jungles, with multiple religions and ethnic groups vying for dominance, but this diversity forced the Church to distribute resources effectively and to employ and experiment with different strategies. Much of Burma, meanwhile, as well as many of its regional ethnic populations, would remain foreboding and largely unknown to the Church for many decades.

In both Burma and Malaysia, irrespective of the various challenges, planting the Church was considered a strategic priority for colonial government, not an add-on. As mentioned above,

it was expressly intended that British colonisation should have a religious dimension, both at the practical and philosophical levels, and this was enshrined in government policy. In an atmosphere of new impetus being given to colonial expansion, the Charter Act (also called the East India Company Act) of 1813 outlined, among other things, Britain's supposed sacred duty to provide Christian instruction to the non-Christian peoples who came under its control. This was in quite radical contrast to the previous official stance, which ruled-out concerted missionary activity and promoted religious neutrality in colonial territories, though the old policy was not explicitly abandoned overnight. The new policy was affirmed the following year with the establishment of the Diocese of Calcutta, belonging to the Church of England, covering all of South and Southeast Asia, and even Australia. Dissemination of the Christian religion now became explicit and central to the government's colonial vision, shaping what would later be viewed as the golden age of Victorian mission. Far more important than what were seen as fashionable and transitory eighteenth-century notions such as equality and fraternity, the British Empire would deliver nothing less than actual salvation, through "Christianisation" and its purported synonym, civilisation.

Thus, colonial chaplains were strategically placed around newly conquered Burma from 1826 onwards, and the first few parishes were established; these premature parishes were symbols of the British presence rather than indicators of a well-staffed and well-resourced local Church, however. The clergy in Burma longed for real, trained missionaries to be sent out to them, but it would be nearly three decades before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) arrived; the SPG's impact on the Burmese Church would be considerable. Parliament's general policy in that era was to appoint liberal bishops to lead the Church of



England, because they were seen as best placed to mediate between Anglicanism's opposing Catholic and Evangelical wings; the Church's main missionary societies, however, including the Anglo-Catholic SPG and the Evangelical-oriented Church Missionary Society (CMS), were each allied to one or other of the two opposing wings. The effect of this was that successful individual missionaries were very often not mainstream Anglicans; they tended to be unconventional, and they were sometimes quite eccentric. Anglo-Catholics in general were busy reviving rituals and practices that clashed with the Church's standardised liturgy, and this made Anglo-Catholic missionaries more accepting of local nuances in worship, more open to ethnic traditional influences, and ultimately more supportive of the development of indigenous Church identity and character. As Church leaders increasingly promoted local clergy development, similar forward-thinking attitudes began to gain ground in the lay world too.

The early in-country Anglican leadership, including, eventually, the first bishops, became convinced that the future of the Church in Burma depended on the development of a wholly local clergy. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the vast Diocese of Calcutta, to which all the territories of India, Burma, Malaysia, and beyond belonged, was ripe to be broken up and reorganised. New dioceses were gradually established, with the Diocese of Rangoon being founded in 1877. The Church in Burma came to accept the reality of majority-Buddhist indifference to the Christian message (though there were significant exceptions), and this motivated the Church to concentrate on education and social work, assisting impoverished men, vulnerable women, and orphans, without creedal discrimination, rather than focusing on direct evangelisation. The abundance of orphans actually shamed the Church, because many of them were the product of irresponsible or abusive liaisons between local girls and ostensibly Christian

colonial officials. “These are *our* orphans,” as one leading missionary phrased it, adding that if he were to reveal this state of affairs to his financial supporters back home in England, they would probably cut him off due to embarrassment (Marks, 1917: 136). The Church developed the ambitious goal of caring for, educating, and integrating these unofficial citizens.

Anglican education, especially in Burma’s cities, earned a reputation for quality, prestige, and exclusivity, but at the point of use it was a highly accessible service. Burma, unlike India, had no caste system as such, though a pecking order did develop between the many cohabiting ethnic groups. In colonial institutions, however, including Anglican schools, gradations of “nativeness” were not recognised, and while racist attitudes were certainly commonplace, no special distinctions between one locally born student and another were tolerated; this made education a leveller among the local people. More importantly, for the long term, Anglican schools were turning out literate, confident, and well-educated future administrators and functionaries, trained in British customs and conventions, and they were very useful to the colonial civil service and private businesses. The government badly needed such personnel, but they were unwilling to invest in educating them; the Church was more than welcome to do the job, and they did it well.

The result of all this may seem obvious, in retrospect; gradually and gently, colonialism was being subverted, because the running of the country, and indeed of the Church, was steadily passing into competent and confident local hands. This slow-motion revolution was a real, tangible effect of the Church’s efforts, while the Church also continued, in principle, to broadly support the colonial ideal and the British values that the empire, and its Church, were designed to

disseminate around the globe. The empire as such was not often contested from inside the Church, or at least not openly, while several of the Church's works, such as rescuing orphans, supporting abused women, and providing accessible education, turned the spotlight on the darkest sides of colonialism and highlighted its ambiguities and moral failings; thus, the Church adopted a critical role by accident. It almost goes without saying that, in both Malaysia and Burma, the graduates of Anglican Church schools, institutes, and colleges, comprising individuals of various faiths and ethnicities, were very well represented in the pro-independence and post-independence national political leaderships.

Church education and Church social support services not only performed a significant role in nurturing future leaders of postcolonial Burma and Southeast Asia, they suggested and demonstrated the values that those future societies would aspire to; values such as the importance of education and of providing access to it, the rightness of equitable and obtainable healthcare, and the dividends paid to the common good by assisting the disadvantaged, the orphaned, the widowed, the sick, and the destitute. The Church was a catalyst (albeit an imperfect one) in the development of embryonic postcolonial societies, but the Church itself was transformed by another important catalyst; the Second World War. The Japanese invasion and occupation of Burma forced most of the foreign (largely British) clergy, missionaries, and Church workers into exile; a few remained and were interned, while a very few remained at large but in hiding. Suddenly, therefore, the running of the Burmese Church was entirely in local hands. The Japanese initially stated that they had no grievance with Asian Christians, treating them as fellow Asians first and foremost, but Burmese Christians were soon recast by the Japanese as ideological agents of the British enemy. Facing enormous danger, local Church leaders, workers,

and teachers showed immense courage, dedication, and ingenuity, gaining worldwide acclaim; this experience further nurtured the talents, networks, and relationships that would shape the Church for decades to come and up to the present day.

After the disaster of Partition in India, the British exited Burma in a hurry in 1948, eager to avoid being associated with another interethnic bloodbath. The Anglican Church stayed and carried on operating in newly independent Burma; the Church would remain largely in foreign hands for some time yet, but the move to permanent local leadership was already underway and it began to accelerate. The comparatively peaceful transition to national independence in Burma did, as many feared, give way to lengthy, complex, and violent internal unrest. Christians were most numerous among the disadvantaged minority ethnic groups, while militant Buddhist-nationalist pseudo-socialism became the dominant political force in the country. Christians were once again depicted as enemy agents, with the new enemies being neo-colonialism, capitalism, and the West, and Christians were persecuted for it, just as had happened under the Japanese. For decades after 1948, the Church would be shaped by experiences of isolation, hostile politics, and interethnic conflict; the result is the Church we see in today's renamed Myanmar. It is a cautious, controversy-averse Church, accustomed to being persecuted, to being used as a scapegoat, and to seeing that religion, all religions, can be instrumentalised and weaponised for unscrupulous political ends. It is not a Church that is very vocal about injustice, knowing that it could actually be wiped out at any moment. Church leaders have understood at their great cost how thoughts, words, deeds, and gestures can be punished brutally and without proportion in military-ruled Myanmar.

Isolation, caution, and aversion to controversy have also made the Burmese Church a broadly conservative Church, but in a way that defies simplistic readings. The ordination of women, still a subject of ongoing debate among conservative Anglicans worldwide, was actually approved in principle by the Burmese Church in 1973, but in practice all of the Church's instincts repel any kind of innovation. Conservatism among Burma's Christians finds parallels across Southeast Asia, across all denominations and theological traditions, whether Pentecostal, Evangelical, Low Church, middle-of-the-road, or Catholic. It is clearly not the idea of change per se that creates a cultural obstacle, however; all across Asia, people continue to embrace Christianity with surprising vigour and creativity, often in novel forms that subsequently evolve and adapt. Change and adaptation appear to be features of all religious practice in Asia, but the values that underpin religious affiliation may be more constant; family, social, personal, and economic aspirations seem to transcend current or past theologies and pervade the whole spiritual landscape. It is not that religious practice or religious identity is regarded as transitory or trivial in Asia; these values are respected in principle and taken very seriously, but they have been arrived at through unspoken processes of negotiation and adaptation, both internally (within a community or Church, interfacing with missionaries and co-believers) and externally (relating to other faiths and the wider community). Christians in Asia are wary of adopting or endorsing practices, such as women's leadership or same-sex relationships, which represent complex challenges for civil society, often with legal implications, and which might make the Church a pariah in the face of other faiths.

2) Published work (2 of 2): *The Anglican Church in Malaysia: Evolving Concepts, Challenging Contexts, Emerging Subtexts*

“A most welcome addition to the study of worldwide Anglicanism. Jarvis offers a useful critique of British colonialism.”

— Keith Ward, University of Leeds (Ward, 2022)

“A cogent postcolonial analysis of an under-researched topic (...). The subject is treated with much cultural and gender-sensitivity, foregrounding the role and contribution of women.”

— Sharon A. Bong, Monash University Malaysia (Bong, 2022)

Britain’s establishment of control over the disparate lands of the future Malaysia (the Straits Settlements of the Malay Peninsula, the island of Singapore, and the northern third of the island of Borneo) contrasted with the seizure of Burma; the colonisation of Malaysia owed more to diplomatic wrangling and commercial enterprise than to violent military conquest. Innovative pioneers such as Sir James Brooke (the so-called White Rajah) and Sir Stamford Raffles unequivocally prioritised trade, but, being nominal Christians themselves, they were praised for supposedly bringing Christian civilisation to Southeast Asia. The inclusion of the Church of England’s envoys in the colonial plans of Brooke and Raffles was just as shrewdly calculated as it was in Burma, at least at the highest levels; this does not mean that it was not carried out with authentic dedication on the ground. The Church was regarded as a useful tool to facilitate commercial colonisation, and Christianity’s subjugation to the priority of trade was enshrined in the Church’s subordinate relationship with the British East India Company (EIC). Malaysia’s vibrant trading stations already had centuries of history behind them when the British took control, and the masters of trade, the EIC, retained immense influence. It was the EIC that appointed the chaplains for the Straits Settlements, not Parliament or the Church, and the EIC

made the rules, strictly limiting missionary work for fear of offending potential trading partners. This sort of arrangement hampered the development of the Church in both Burma and Malaysia, until the EIC lost Parliament's favour after the 1850's, eventually being driven out of Southeast Asia in the 1860's and abolished altogether in 1874. Only then could a real local Church in all parts of Malaysia develop more fully.

Church development in Malaysia suffered more interference and interruption than the Church in Burma, as a consequence of the EIC's power, but, conversely, the economy and society of Malaysia would develop faster than Burma's. Burma had not even been fully conquered, in fact, when Singapore and Malaysia began to grow exponentially, foreshadowing their future status as a centre of global trade. Malaysia's long history of major demographic shifts began, as workers of many ethnicities, especially the various Chinese ethnicities, swelled the population. Some of these arrivals were prompted by unrest, famine, or war in their homeland, in a process that would be replicated throughout Malaysian (and Chinese) history; other arrivals were actually orchestrated by the colonising British, who shipped in clerks, labourers, and servants from China and India, to staff their burgeoning empire. Christians and/or potential Christian converts were present among all of the newly arrived ethnic communities, providing the Church in Malaysia with an increasingly complex linguistic challenge and a fluctuating and mobile membership. In the same period, by contrast, the comparative demographic stability of Burma allowed the development of fixed local leadership and local clergy, significantly earlier than Malaysia's Church, which was busy adapting to constant changes. These would become long-lasting features of the respective Churches. In both countries, a commitment to the future Church being fully local-led steadily gained traction, and

missionaries became adept at spotting talent among the local communities. As in Burma, local leadership in Malaysia would eventually face its major test, and prove its mettle, during the Second World War.

In both Malaysia and Burma, individual foreign missionaries went to extraordinary lengths, with minimal resources, to master multiple languages and dialects, and to introduce writing and transliteration, while in many cases personally adopting local customs and traditions as well. The way in which missionaries engaged with local religions in Malaysia, however, is another area of contrast to the Burma story. In Burma, the Church's emissaries had quickly learned that they faced, in Buddhism, a single, fairly consistent, widely diffused, and deeply entrenched local religious system; it was also pervasive, impinging on every aspect of daily life and social matters. Buddhism in Burma had, over the centuries, demonstrated just enough flexibility to accommodate some enduring pre-Buddhist practices and beliefs; some ethnic groups' attachment to Buddhism, furthermore, was looser than others, but on the whole Buddhism dominated the Burmese religious, social, and, eventually, political scene. Buddhism was also, crucially, seen by both sides as highly incompatible with Christianity.

The religious landscape was not so clear-cut in Malaysia, and the situations on the Malay Peninsula and the island of Borneo were also distinct from one another, as well as being complex in the ensemble. Local religions in Borneo initially puzzled the incoming missionaries; they identified, or thought that they identified, elements of Hinduism, or Hindu influence, as well as more predictable Animist elements, but practices also varied significantly from village to village. These local religions were not impenetrable or unknowable, however, and there was no great



hostility towards, or marked incompatibility with, Christian teaching either; in fact, missionaries found much to laud and applaud in local religious customs and values, such as monogamy, hospitality, transparent dealings, and confession of sins. Borneo would become the flagship of Christian missionary work and Church expansion in Malaysia and the wider region. On the whole, the introduction of the Anglican Church to Malaysia was done with greater sensitivity than in Burma; mission in Malaysia did not begin as an adjunct of military conquest, and there was no rush to impose a parish structure as a symbol of control. The Malaysian Church was in the hands of dedicated missionary societies, as well as some (apparently rather lacklustre) EIC-appointed chaplains, rather than government-appointed colonial chaplains, as in Burma. The watchful presence of the EIC, and the ordered nature of society under the Sultans, ensured that the establishment of the Church in Malaysia was carried out gently, and with considerable care and respect, both for trade and for Islam.

Scholars acknowledge that relations with Islam have understandably tended to dominate the discussion of Christianity in Malaysia (Walters, 2007; 2021[1]; Wei Fun Goh, 2021). Simmering tensions between the two faith groups continue to draw attention from outside observers, and there is a widely recognised need to explore this topic further. The question of Christian-Muslim relations is both ongoing and complex, but the situation has, thankfully, never deteriorated from tension into widespread violence, arbitrary arrests, or systematic state-mandated hostility. Christian citizens have faced very significant and well-documented disadvantages in postcolonial, independent, Muslim-ruled Malaysia, certainly, but this standoff has not been the defining relationship or the defining experience, neither for Malaysian Muslims nor for the Anglican Church and other Christians. When the Church's emissaries first arrived on

the Malay Peninsula in organised fashion, the situation looked quite promising, as it did in Borneo. Just as the locally dominant religions in Borneo had displayed a certain openness and accommodation to Christianity, the Islam of the Peninsula, at that time, demonstrated a degree of flexibility and toleration of other beliefs. Missionaries initially perceived a rather undogmatic form of Islam; mixed marriages (and mixed families), especially Malay-Chinese, were fairly common, and Muslim conversions to Christianity (or other religions) were not unheard of. It became clear on the Peninsula, however, as in Borneo, that no significant wave of Muslim conversions was ever going to come. Just like the situation in Burma, where the Buddhist majority proved immune to Christian teaching, the dominant religion in Malaysia was too completely and effectively integrated and interwoven with local life, society, customs, and values to be seriously competed against. The Church in Malaysia, as in Burma, accepted a role of active but somewhat neutral witness, through social works, healthcare, and education, with only modest evangelistic ambitions.

The Church in Malaysia experienced a less aggressive confrontation with the local population, compared to the Church in Burma, where the invasive military dimension of colonisation never faded away; social and economic gains in Burma were never quite widespread enough and impactful enough to endear the Church to the bulk of the populace, as arguably did occur in Malaysia. Anglicans in Malaysia successfully engaged with the challenge of ethnic diversity, and the Church became avowedly multilingual and multi-ethnic, but the really outstanding area of growth, throughout the colonial era, both in terms of Church membership and Malaysian society in general, was among the ethnic-Chinese community. Speculation as to the reasons for this, or the “secret” of the Church’s success among ethnic-Chinese people, is still a

subject for debate among Malaysian Christians. Being careful to avoid unhelpful stereotyping, a few clear factors do emerge, which may help us to understand the high profile of this community in the life of the Anglican Church. A certain proportion of ethnic-Chinese immigrants, at each stage in the history of colonial Malaysia, were already Christian before their arrival, so no conversion was necessary; they could be easily integrated into the fledgling Malaysian Church, and they could encourage other, non-Christian Chinese immigrants to join too. Both Christian and non-Christian Chinese would most likely find a Church congregation that spoke their dialect, and this would facilitate their integration. Then, considering the Church's emphasis on schools, the immigrants were likely to find their aspirations for their children, and the value that they traditionally placed on education, mirrored in the values of the Church.

The "offer" of the Church could certainly be seen as helpful to, and compatible with, the aspirations and needs of new immigrants, but there was another important factor; whether Christian or not, most arriving Chinese were unwilling to completely abandon beliefs, customs, and rituals of their original folk religions, and the Church, by and large, was ready and able to make allowances for this. To a certain extent this is still true today, but the more important factor by far remains the matter of shared values and aspirations. (Languages, incidentally, especially the many and varied Chinese dialects, are no longer as significant a factor in dividing or uniting communities as they once were). Shared values and aspirations, such as family, education, home, and business, have evolved a little since colonial times; a world-class school for the children, a luxury home, foreign holidays, and a prestige car would more likely be the immediate goals of modern Malaysians, and the traditional family business is not valued as much as social mobility and a solid profession. The underpinning drive and ambition, however, do not appear to have

fundamentally changed, and these aspirations are now seen as reflecting “conservative” values rather than happy-go-lucky immigrant values or traditional Chinese ones. These values still find resonance in the teaching and worldview of the Church, of course, and, unsurprisingly, the many Christian denominations in the region are overwhelmingly considered conservative. The tendency to conservatism among Malaysian Anglicans is, as in Burma, both a regional cultural reality and also a legacy of the Church’s SPG, Anglo-Catholic, missionary past. This conservative character has seen both the Malaysian and the Burmese Church located on the “anti-progressive” side of major debates in Anglicanism. While these strong stances show the fully fledged local Church asserting itself and its identity, they do nothing to bridge existing gaps in understanding; they reveal, instead, the extent of the cultural divide between global-north and global-south Christians, while highlighting, once again, the unresolved grievances between former coloniser and former colonised.

#### Conclusion: cases of complicity in colonialism or contributions to its downfall?

As with so many aspects of this topic, the central question ultimately defies an “either/or” binary analysis; with good reason, scholars warn against taking a “balance sheet” approach to evaluating colonialism (Wilson, 2017). The Anglican Church’s involvement in Britain’s imperial conquests in Southeast Asia constituted both complicity in colonialism, with all that it entails, and also a substantial contribution to colonialism’s undoing. As an institution within the colonial system, the Church’s complicity may have afforded it the best of the imperial experience; influence, legality, resources, safety, and the freedom and confidence to operate, but these very conditions and characteristics, ironically, created an environment in which the empire itself could be contested. Local populations were usually unreceptive to Christian teaching but rarely

actively hostile to the Church's efforts; Church leaders and missionaries accepted that achieving swathes of conversions was never going to be their main occupation. Instead, the Church became an agent of social change, through education and opportunity, empowering cohorts of local people whose personal development and community cohesion would gradually enable them to better work towards national independence. The charge of complicity against the Church absolutely stands, but it must be seen principally as a corporate charge pointing to institutional dysfunction, not to individual malice. The Church officially supported the colonial plan, though not always without reservation, and, all the while, individuals working within Church structures were constantly at odds with official policy; this is the essential context of the corporate charge of complicity, made against the Church as an institution and as a function of colonial government. The life of the individual missionary, incidentally, was not easy, luxurious, or even safe, for most of the colonial era; the appeal, for them and for many expatriate clergy, lay in their own individual sense of calling, their ecclesial vision, and in some cases their eccentricities, all of which they were free to express and experiment with, in the Petri dish of the colonial Church.

A greater understanding of the real impact and legacy of the colonial Church, at ground level, can be gleaned by looking at the deeds of individuals of particular industriousness and insight. From the writings of colonial-era missionaries in Southeast Asia, it is clear that they rarely lost sleep over the low numbers of conversions achieved. John Ebenezer Marks (1832-1915), a pioneering education missionary in Burma, always stressed that his mission schools taught about Christianity but did not proselytise. Marks' schools drew together as many as ten different regional ethnic groups, representing several religions between them. He carefully warned parents of prospective pupils that their children would receive Christian instruction, but

that they would never be pressured to convert; none of the parents, to Marks' recollection, were ever thus dissuaded from pursuing a modern, Western-style education for their children. Incidentally, this promotion of modern educational standards did not imply unfettered adulation of all things Western. In Malaysia, Charlotte Elizabeth Ferguson-Davie (1880-1943) was one of several prominent missionaries who vigorously opposed the idea that "Western" equates to "Christian" or that it should be regarded as intrinsically superior. Rejecting the criticism that educating local people amounted to helping them to steal jobs from Europeans, Ferguson-Davie explained that the world's economic fortunes actually depended on the work of local populations across the then-colonies, and not on the handful of tennis-playing expats who ostensibly ran those colonies.

Burma's first Anglican bishops insisted that the future Burmese Church would be entirely local-led, and the immediate task, as they saw it, was to hasten the arrival of that future. In any other sector of colonial society, such an attitude would have been considered, at best, fantastical, fanatical, eccentric, excessively liberal, and, at worst, unpatriotic, potentially subversive, and possibly treacherous. These individuals were not revolutionaries, subversives, or anti-imperialists, however, and, crucially, they were not exceptions; they were Anglican Church people (Appleton, 1946; Ferguson-Davie, 1921; Hayter and Bennitt, n.d.; Marks, 1917; Titcomb, 1880; West, 1945) in Burma and Malaysia, who looked around themselves and saw host peoples rather than conquered ones, and potential equals rather than potential servants. Bishop George West (1893-1980) of Rangoon described his vision of the Church as being a crossroads for all nations and faiths, meeting on the same level, while West's archdeacon, George Appleton (1902-1993), later Archbishop of Perth, Australia, and then Archbishop of Jerusalem, urged the clergy

to learn about Buddhism in an open, receptive way, and to incorporate what they learned into their ministry. In Malaysia, Bishop Henry Baines (1905-1972) echoed Appleton, promoting the study of Islam and the Malay (Muslim majority) language as a vital task for Christians, especially the clergy.

The old colonial histories, along with various works of fiction, and even some of the earlier Church documents, tended to characterise the colonial clergy as good-natured but ineffectual, forever bewailing their failure to win converts, while generally accepting, uncritically and unquestioningly, the rightness of colonialism. The reality was evidently not so simple or so pathetic. It is perhaps thanks to that old tendency to dismiss missionaries, and even missionary bishops, as ineffectual cranks with fanciful ideas, that spared these visionaries from more serious official scrutiny for adopting such unconventional and fundamentally anticolonial stances in favour of equality and diversity. The Church, clearly, was far from solely invested in fanciful ideas or lofty and unrealistic evangelistic goals, and the concrete pursuits of education, healthcare, and social assistance became the Church's real daily business. The elite Anglican schools were considered exclusive, but, as a general principle, mission education catered to all, and missionary organisations made a special effort to reach underserved groups; girls, the poor, and the disabled. Some white European families may have chosen to keep their children apart, but mission schools themselves did not segregate on the basis of ethnicity.

This school situation was in keeping with a curious and unsubtle practice, in wider colonial society, of discriminating between so-called "races" but not within them. Whites, all whites, were generally considered superior, and in the face of the "natives" or "blacks" the

“whites” formed a united front. White was white, and social class differences among the whites, while not completely ignored, were less of an obstacle than they were at home in Britain at that time; this assessment of the situation is found across a variety of first-hand testimonies (Burgess, 2012; Orwell, 1980, and others). Among the so-called natives, as mentioned above, degrees of “nativeness” were not entertained; local students could be, and indeed had to be, all instructed together. Taboos, castes, superstitions, and all kinds of divisions between faiths and cultures were unceremoniously disregarded and transcended in the mission classroom, and thus, diverse populations, who would eventually be free to run their own countries, saw that it was possible to sit and work together. Mission education became, quite literally, a school for cooperation between the ethnic groups, for the greater future good. The Second World War further boosted interethnic cooperation, not only by making it possible and necessary for true local leadership (including within the Church) to flourish, but, perhaps even more impactfully, by accelerating the development of a national psyche, with its own self-understanding, vision, and expectations. The fall of Singapore and the rest of Southeast Asia to the Japanese exposed the British Empire’s invincibility as a myth, and the people doing the exposing were tanned, small-framed Asians, whose values and way of life were recognisable and relatable to Malaysian and Burmese people. The physical stature, ebullience, and ostentatiousness of the domineering British colonisers no longer cast a magic spell over Southeast Asian people. The Japanese, of course, offered only a new and even more brutal brand of colonialism, but the big takeaway from the war was that colonialism, as one of the most militant Malaysian anticolonial activists (Chin Peng, 2003: 10) phrased it, was definitely past its expiry date.



The Anglican Church was tangled up in the running of the colonies in numerous, unique, and complex ways; imagining the course of British colonial history without the involvement of the Church is impossible. The Church was entrenched in and intertwined with local society in Southeast Asia at many levels, and it was unsurprising that the Church survived the transition to independent postcolonial nations. If, in a parallel universe, the countries of Southeast Asia had reached independence at roughly the same time as they really did, but without the Church's involvement, or with minimal Church involvement, then their stage of social development and their degree of social cohesion would have had to be influenced by some other institutional experience; what this alternative experience might have been, and whether people would have been better off or worse off as a result, is impossible to say. The complexity of the Church's involvement, its activity as a motor of social change, and its very presence in the colonies, prompted fundamental questions to be raised; thanks to the Church, therefore, discussions about the empire, its values, its rationale, and its future were not solely the preserve of colonial administrators, politicians, and generals. Church leaders diplomatically pointed out that no system of government is intrinsically good or bad per se, and it all depends on how the system unfolds in practice, in the social relationships that people conduct.

Several scholars (Cox, 2008; Koepping, 2006; O'Connor, 2000; Taylor, 1998) have challenged the representation of women's roles found in conventional mission histories, which generally omitted to mention that most missionaries were women, and failed to describe many women's rise to positions of responsibility in Church organisations, in clear disproportion to their civil counterparts. This does not mean that the colonial Church always championed or even valued women; it did not always do so, but on gender equality it easily outperformed the civil

colonial administration and often local society as well. The same might be said of the promotion of ethnic minorities; there was some resistance to it at all levels in the Church, in fact, but, enabled by certain pioneering missionaries, educators, archdeacons, and bishops, the ethnic minorities progressed regardless, and in disproportion to their counterparts outside of Church circles. Taking impetus from the scholars mentioned above and aiming to build upon the existing scholarship, I have been especially committed to exploring and highlighting these crucial themes, applying them to the cases of Burma and Malaysia.

The advancement of local people within the clergy may have seemed like a mixed blessing to the local people themselves, given that missionary life was hardly easy, comfortable, or particularly conducive to health. It carried very real risks, which only increased with events like the Second World War and the widespread unrest and conflict that followed it. The extent of the sacrifice and struggle to keep the Church going, throughout all this, may have helped to create a somewhat fixed and inflexible mindset, which has arguably become a feature of Southeast Asian Christianity. Consequently, it can be challenging to reconcile the history of the convention-breaking colonial Church with the present-day reality of a highly conservative postcolonial global-south Church, but the Church is, after all, not the only social dimension in which Christians' views are formed. The list of today's hot-button issues around gender, sexuality, and marriage, when viewed dispassionately, can look like a threat to an unspoken Asian social contract that has taken millennia to negotiate. The colonial-era description of the "unchanging East" is still a heartfelt reality in Southeast Asia; the region's generally peaceful and tolerant way of life and the considerable success of its multifaith societies, according to this outlook, are so sacred to Southeast Asia that nothing must be allowed to subvert them.

Regional conservatism may seem to be contradicted by the fact that some Southeast Asian societies are famous havens for progressive attitudes to sex, sexuality, and gender identity, but this openness is never directly linked to religious views; it is not intended as an affront to any particular religion, and it does not mean to overturn the basic norms and values of the social contract. Christianity has gained much ground in Asia thanks to its own capacity to honour that delicate social balance and not to disrupt it, so when “progressive” Christianity appears on the northern horizon, local Christians instinctively and strategically stand their ground. Progressive or liberal Christianity’s appearance, like supposed enlightenment from the global north, is also loaded with neo-colonialist overtones; whenever religious values, ideas, or innovations emanate from the self-perceived “true” or “default” Christianity of the global north and west, they must, and they will, be received with caution in postcolonial Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the worldwide Anglican Communion, anything even vaguely resembling an edict or a decree from Canterbury will absolutely be questioned thoroughly, then contested, and probably resisted. History almost demands that this be the case.

There is little doubt that the worldwide Anglican Church still has work to do in managing the uncomfortable legacy of its colonial past; fairly or unfairly, the spectres of colonial-era discrimination and exploitation still haunt the Church. Discord at the ten-yearly Lambeth conference is frequently and bitterly blamed on the surviving vestiges of imperialist and neo-imperialist attitudes, emanating from the Church of the global north and west. Concerns about the persistence of deep-rooted colonial-era prejudices may in fact be more frequently raised in the debates and disputes of the Anglican Communion (AC) than in any other modern-day institution. It would be a mistake to brush these conflicts aside as in-house Church trivia,

furthermore; the AC is far from inconsequential, constituting the world's third-largest Christian denomination, with the bulk of its membership in the developing world, where Anglicans and others face a bewildering array of challenges. The colonial systems as such may be gone, but there is still much to understand about how the two "sides" of the colonial debate continue to interact; this is true of religious questions of sexuality and gender, but it also impinges on crucial questions of resources, climate, debt, violence, human rights, and the mechanics of postcolonial relationships themselves. As mentioned above, our current times are witnessing a surge in popular, critical engagement with the colonialism debate and the broader question of societies with "uncomfortable" histories. It is fair to say that a significant portion of the crisis in the AC is not actually about religion, while themes of theology and liturgy do also have their place in the broader colonialism debate; theology and liturgy are often key to expressing and elucidating conceptions of family, identity, and community, not to mention perceptions of social justice, liberation, and salvation.

With regard to the Anglican Communion, this situation is rightly referred to as a crisis (Brittain and McKinnon, 2018) because the organisation is effectively already split; significant, dissenting, national and regional Anglican Churches already operate outside of the official structures of the AC, in Australasia, North America, and South America, with growing groups in other regions as well. These dissenting Churches have their own rival college of bishops, with ten-yearly international conferences, like Lambeth. While the disagreements behind this rupture (same-sex relationships, women's ordination, family, lifestyle, and sexuality) might be thought of as modern problems, the geographical parameters of the split in the AC follow the fault-lines left behind by the previous historical-political configuration of the globe. The colonial Churches

survived the postcolonial reconfiguration of the world, but at what cost and with what lasting wounds? The modern-day relationships that connect member countries of the “Anglican world” are undeniably the inheritors of the former, colonial-era relationships; indeed, the modern relationships grew out of the old, deeply problematic ones. The idea that unresolved colonial relationship issues are the underlying cause of worldwide Anglican discord is supported by the fact that not all of the dissenting Anglican Churches do agree, among themselves, on specific issues such as women’s ordination, and even less so on churchmanship and ecclesiology. The crisis in the AC must also be seen as part of the wider seismic shift taking place in global Christianity, and, as such, Anglican discord may have a slightly longer history than many people think.

For several decades, the southward shift of geographical emphasis in global Christianity has been greeted with a combination of concern and denial; both reactions being largely due to the fact that the conversation has been dominated by Western theologians. A few clear-sighted observers, however, saw the shift for what it is; a revolution, in which “a protean indigenous [global south] Christianity has emerged indifferent to the agenda of the Western theological intelligentsia” (Martin, 1996: 26). The revolution does not always necessarily reject the contents of the West’s theological agenda, but it does reject the West’s default privilege of setting that agenda. Within the AC, resistance to the agenda of Canterbury-led Christianity does not merely echo the rejection of colonialism; it is, in itself, the outright rejection of the faintest whiff of colonialism, consciously or unconsciously betrayed in the manner and language of delivery and communication. It could be argued that no-one ever operates entirely freely of their inherited worldview (recalling Max Planck’s theorising of the *Weltanschauung*; Planck, 1953); many

current Church of England leaders have familial or personal links to colonialism, and their background, education, and values may differ surprisingly little from those of their colonial-era predecessors. This argument is, of course, a deliberately rather crude insinuation, which, like parallel assumptions about African and Asian leaders' values, may be vigorously refuted; no individual, from any side of the debate, should have to accept a predefined position at the table based on assumptions. Once again, simplifying the debate does not seem to help; critics and supporters alike have talked of the Archbishop of Canterbury having to “walk a tightrope” between progressives and conservatives, which only leaves onlookers wondering whether this effort is to be lauded or reviled. In terms of potentially doing reconciliation, a similar task seems to face all concerned; they must recognise that all Churches, whether global-north or global-south, are adaptations embedded in highly contrasting contexts, with a shared goal of witnessing the gospel, the implications of which have always varied in different settings (Jacob, 2023).

It remains to be seen exactly how the demise of the late Queen Elizabeth II will affect these questions, but we have undoubtedly passed a landmark moment. The Second Elizabethan age spanned the eras of unmitigated colonialism and tumultuous decolonisation; her reign witnessed not only the breakup of the empire but also the appearance of major cracks in the increasingly contested and ineffectual Commonwealth. The Church of England, for its part, still proves capable of playing to type, and it offered a highly conventional response to the changeover of monarchs. The Church's profile was temporarily heightened quite considerably, as the populace generally accepted the reaffirmation of the Church's traditional and constitutional roles. King Charles III also reciprocated, professing his Anglican faith in his first address and first Christmas speech, unequivocally acknowledging the Church's status and role.

Nothing has changed, then, except that those colossally consequential colonial legacies still have to be dealt with. Whatever the rights or wrongs may be of toppling statues of slavers, the public discussion of these issues has clearly intensified; this seems more belated than timely, given that it coincides with accelerating desovietisation in the Baltic states, only thirty years after the collapse of the USSR. For the Anglican Communion, time is of the essence, and a clear solution is urgently needed. Whether the AC's disagreements are viewed as part of the wider colonialism debate or not, the insistence on maintaining Anglicanism's legendary broadness may end up being what condemns it; or saves it. During the colonial era, the Church was determined to contain all debate, division, and contradiction within it, and it did so quite effectively. As a result of this feat of containment, the Anglican Church, even though it was as bound-up with colonialism as it could be, also nourished the forces within colonialism that would eventually dismantle it.

Two of the main takeaways from this research must be a deeper appreciation of the complexity of the issues and wariness of the risk of oversimplifying those issues. The full impact of colonialism, of the institutions of colonialism, and of their contribution, whether they are perceived as positive or negative, will probably never be calculated, especially not by adding up the columns of a balance sheet. The abusive aspects of colonialism, like the benign aspects of colonialism, must stand alone and be assessed on their merits; they cannot be offset one against the other. The selflessness, sacrifice, and compassion of the individual do not cancel out the crimes of any regime; in the same way, the barbarism and despotism of the regime cannot impeach the individual's attempts to do good in the midst of evil. We must not make the mistake of laying partial blame for the horrors of a regime at the feet of those who worked to counteract

that regime, those who strove to undermine it, or even those whose equivocal actions, carried out in good faith, contributed to changing the course of history for the better. I would argue, therefore, for the continued study of Church and colonialism, not in order to answer black and white questions or to make final calculations, but in order to more fully comprehend the complexity of the subject and its context. We may take inspiration from the fact that constructive change really can come out of destructive circumstances, and that we can actually benefit, today and tomorrow, from the hardest of lessons learnt by those who have gone before us. George Orwell encapsulated the inherent contradictions of colonialism when he described the British Empire as a despotism; “benevolent, no doubt, but still a despotism” (Orwell, 2009: 68). The benevolent part was, overwhelmingly, thanks to the Church.

### Bibliography

- Adams, Richard. “Oxford University accused of backing apologists of British colonialism.” *The Guardian*. 22 December 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/dec/22/oxford-university-accused-of-backing-apologists-of-british-colonialism> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Appleton, George. *The War and After: Burma*. Westminster: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1946.
- Biggar, Nigel. “Don’t feel guilty about our colonial history.” *The Times*. 30 November 2017. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/don-t-feel-guilty-about-our-colonial-history-ghvstdhmj> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Bong, Sharon A. “Endorsement: The Anglican Church in Malaysia: Evolving Concepts, Challenging Contexts, Emerging Subtexts” Springer Nature, 2022. <https://link.springer>.



- [com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-11597-4#about-this-book](https://www.amazon.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-11597-4#about-this-book) [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Brittain, Christopher Craig and Andrew McKinnon. *The Anglican Communion at a Crossroads: The Crises of a Global Church*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2018.
- Burgess, Anthony. *Little Wilson and Big God*. London: Vintage (Random House), 2012.
- Chin Peng. *My Side of History*. Singapore: Media Masters, 2003.
- Cox, Jeffrey. *The British Missionary Enterprise since 1700*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Equina, Limuel. "Review: The Anglican Church in Burma: from Colonial Past to Global Future." PSUP. 2021. <https://www.psupress.org/books/titles/978-0-271-09156-3.html> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Faludy, Alexander. "Orwell: The Pull of a 'Lesser Evil.'" *Church Times*. 24 January 2020. <https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2020/24-january/features/features/orwell-the-pull-of-a-lesser-evil> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Ferguson-Davie, Charlotte Elizabeth (editor). *In Rubber Lands: An Account of the Work of the Church in Malaya*. London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1921.
- Goodhew, David (editor). *Growth and Decline in the Anglican Communion, 1980 to the Present*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Harper, T. N. [Timothy Norman] *The End of Empire and the Making of Malaya*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Hayter, John and Jack Bennitt. *The War and After: Singapore*. London: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, n.d. [c. 1947].
- Hood, George. *Neither Bang nor Whimper: The End of a Missionary Era in China*. Singapore: Presbyterian Church of Singapore, 1991.

- Jacob, William. "Books." *Church Times*. 6 January 2023. <https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2023/6-january/books-arts/book-reviews/the-anglican-church-in-burma-from-colonial-past-to-global-future-by-edward-jarvis> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Khan, Riz. "One on One." *Al Jazeera*, 25 October 2008. <https://youtu.be/t-1zdB3RpNc> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Koepping, Elizabeth. "Hunting with the Head: Borneo Villagers Negotiating Exclusivist Religion." *Studies in World Christianity* 12, no. 1 (2006); Edinburgh University Press [59–78].
- Lee Kam Hing, "A Neglected Story: Christian Missionaries, Chinese New Villagers, and Communists in the Battle for the 'Hearts and Minds' in Malaya, 1948–1960." *Modern Asian Studies* 47, no. 6 (November 2013). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1977–2006].
- Lim Hin Fui and Fong Tian Yong. *The New Villages in Malaysia: The Journey Ahead*. Kuala Lumpur: Institute of Strategic and Policy Research, 2005.
- Marks, John Ebenezer (edited by W.C.B. Purser). *Forty Years in Burma*. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1917.
- Martin, David. *Forbidden Revolutions*. London: SPCK, 1996.
- Martin, Francis. "Church Commissioners to set aside £100 million to compensate for slave-trade links." *Church Times*. 10 January 2023. <https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2023/13-january/news/uk/church-commissioners-to-set-aside-100-million-to-compensate-for-slave-trade-links> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Maughan, Steven S. *Mighty England Do Good: Culture, Faith, Empire, and World in the Foreign Missions of the Church of England, 1850-1915*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B.

- Eerdmans, 2014.
- Mendick, Robert. “Barbados turns sights on Benedict Cumberbatch in slave-owning families’ reparation row.” *Telegraph*. 30 December 2022. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2022/12/30/barbados-turns-sights-benedict-cumberbatch-slave-owning-families/> [accessed 10 February 2023].
- Newsinger, John. *The Blood Never Dried: A People’s History of the British Empire*. London: Bookmarks, 2013.
- O’Connor, Daniel, et al. *Three Centuries of Mission: The United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1701–2000*. London: Continuum, 2000.
- Orwell, George. *Burmese Days*. London: Penguin, 2009.
- . *The Road to Wigan Pier*. London: Secker and Warburg / Octopus, 1980.
- Planck, Max. *Die Physik im Kampf um die Weltanschauung*. Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth, 1953.
- Porter, Andrew. *Religion Versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1700-1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Pum Za Mang. “Book Review: The Anglican Church in Burma: from Colonial Past to Global Future.” *Church History* 2, Vol. 91. June 2022. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [447-449].
- Stanley, Brian. *Christianity in the Twentieth Century: A World History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.
- Strong, Rowan. *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c.1700–1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Taylor, Brian. “Gender in Sarawak: Mission and Reception.” *Studies in Church History* 34

(1998). [461–473].

Thompson, Henry Paget. *Into All Lands: The History of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701–1950*. London: SPCK, 1951.

Titcomb, Jonathan H. *Personal Recollections of British Burma and its Church Mission Work*. London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1880.

Walters, Albert Sundararaj. “Christian-Muslim Relations in New Malaysia: Overcoming Barriers, Building Bridges.” In *From Malaysia to the Ends of the Earth: Southeast Asian and Diasporic Contributions to Biblical and Theological Studies*, edited by Wei-Fun Goh et al, 159–194. Claremont, CA: Claremont Press, 2021 [1].

———. *Knowing Our Neighbour: A Study of Islam for Christians in Malaysia*. Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia: Council of Churches of Malaysia, 2007.

———. “Review: The Anglican Church in Burma: from Colonial Past to Global Future.” PSUP, 2021 [2]. <https://www.psupress.org/books/titles/978-0-271-09156-3.html> [accessed 10 February 2023].

Ward, Kevin. *A History of Global Anglicanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

———. “Endorsement: The Anglican Church in Malaysia: Evolving Concepts, Challenging Contexts, Emerging Subtexts” Springer Nature, 2022. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-11597-4#about-this-book> [accessed 10 February 2023].

Wei-Fun Goh, Elaine, Kah-Jin Jeffrey Kuan, Jonathan Yun-Ka Tan, and Amos Wai-Ming Yong (editors). *From Malaysia to the Ends of the Earth: Southeast Asian and Diasporic Contributions to Biblical and Theological Studies*. Claremont, CA: Claremont Press, 2021.

West, George A. *The World That Works*. London: Blandford Press, 1945.

Wilson, Jon. "A Collective statement on 'Ethics and Empire.'" Medium.com 21 December 2017.

<https://medium.com/oxfordempireletter/a-collective-statement-on-ethics-and-empire-19c2477871a0> [accessed 10 February 2023].