

Durham E-Theses

*Individual Autonomy and Institutional Constraint:
Structural Sin in the Church of England through the
Lens of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual
Abuse.*

ELIZABETH ROSE ILLINGWORTH

How to cite:

ILLINGWORTH, ELIZABETH ROSE (2020) Individual Autonomy and Institutional Constraint: Structural Sin in the Church of England through the Lens of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/13863/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Elizabeth Rose Illingworth

Individual Autonomy and Institutional Constraint: Structural Sin in the Church of England through the Lens of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse.

In the last ten years social scientists have recognised that Child Sexual Abuse (CSA) is not simply an individual issue; instead, organisational and societal culture has a role in the perpetration of, detection of, and response to, abuse. This secular learning has not been fully integrated into the church's self-understanding, given the church's emphasis on the personal nature of sin and responsibility. This is further complexified by a flaw in the church's self-understanding which suggests that the presence of the Spirit in the church means that it is a unique organisation, which does not need to engage with secular learning, or even that it is incapable of sin. The presence of CSA within the church clearly shows this to be an inaccurate understanding.

I draw on Healy's Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology to suggest that the church is as capable of sin as the rest of the world, and that the Spirit works in the non-church world as well as the church, which means that it is appropriate for the church to draw on secular learning to shape its practice. Furthermore, I argue that the concept of structural sin, initially articulated by Liberation Theologians, offers a theological framework which enables the church to engage with both the individual and structural aspects of the abuse perpetrated within it. I do this by exploring the extent to which structural understandings of sin can be integrated with Palmer and Feldman's organisational theory of CSA and Hartill's social scientific approach to CSA. I test the validity of this integration by exploring the extent to which these theories have explanatory power for the abuse perpetrated by Peter Ball, and the church's response to the allegations made against him, as portrayed in the transcripts of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse.

Individual Autonomy and Institutional Constraint: Structural Sin in
the Church of England through the Lens of the Independent Inquiry
into Child Sexual Abuse.

Elizabeth Rose Illingworth

MA by Research

Department of Theology and Religion

Durham University

2020

Contents

Introduction.....	6
Chapter One - Setting the Scene.....	12
Child Sexual Abuse: An Introduction.....	12
A Crime of Pathological Individuals?.....	14
The Media’s Role in Shaping Society’s Understanding of CSA.....	17
CSA within the Church.....	21
Sharing Learning across Academic Disciplines.....	23
Palmer, Feldman, and Hartill’s Work.....	27
The Role of IICSA.....	29
Conclusion.....	34
Chapter 2 - Ecclesiology: Sin and the Church’s Self-Understanding.....	36
Can the Church be Sinful?.....	36
Issues with Blueprint Ecclesiologies.....	42
Healy’s Ecclesiology.....	44
Prophetic Critique of Church Practices.....	47
The Work of the Holy Spirit in Church and Society.....	50
Engaging with conflicting truth claims.....	54
Conclusion.....	59
Chapter 3 - Structural Sin as a Theological Driver.....	60
How does Structural Sin fit in with other concepts of Sin in Christian tradition?.....	60
Critiques of the Theology Behind Structural Sin.....	63
Social Sin, Structural Sin, and Structures of Sin.....	67
The Role of Group Leaders in Influencing Structural Sin.....	72
How is the Church to be understood as a Structure of Sin?.....	75
How Is Structural Sin Challenged?.....	79
Conclusion.....	83
Chapter 4 - Organisational and Sociological Approaches to CSA.....	85
Pierre Bourdieu: Field, Habitus, Capital.....	85
Donald Palmer and Valerie Feldman, <i>Comprehending the Incomprehensible</i>	89
The Development of Abusive Relationships.....	91
Institutional Processes.....	97
The Role of Power or Authority within an Organisation.....	102
Organisational Culture.....	107

Conclusion.....	111
Chapter 5 - Institutional Dynamics Visible within Abuse Perpetrated in the Church of England	113
The Development of an Abusive Relationship	114
Institutional Processes.....	118
Authority within the Field	126
Organisational Culture	130
Conclusion.....	137
Conclusion	138
Bibliography	144

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Introduction

Child Sexual Abuse (CSA) is presently understood as one of the gravest crimes that an individual can commit. Perpetrators are vilified, receive death threats, and when imprisoned must be held separately from other prisoners for their safety. They are perceived as the lowest of the low, having destroyed a child's innocence and abused their trust. Largely portrayed by the media as sick or evil, having acted in ways that are beyond what is socially acceptable, there is no concept that their context or culture may have influenced their offending. Instead, they are scapegoated and excluded from society.

The church¹ is an organisation that has, or had, a clear moral voice and responsibility for naming sinful behaviour in individuals or institutions.² Given this responsibility, the presence of sexually abusive clerics is a significant issue. Furthermore, leaders appear to react to abuse allegations by prioritising the wellbeing of the perpetrator and the reputation of the church over the wellbeing of the survivor³ and justice for all. Public opinion of the church's response to allegations of abuse is poor, and interest in cases is high and widely publicised by the media.

The media resists the idea, widely recognised in academic contexts such as Public Health or Sociology, that human behaviour including CSA is not freely chosen; instead, that it is influenced by organisational context or wider societal culture.⁴ This is also true within the church; in part influenced by ecclesiology which suggests the church is distinctive, both sociologically and theologically, and when truly itself, fundamentally free of sin.⁵ Furthermore, secular or 'non-

¹ I have largely chosen not to capitalise 'church', reflecting Healy's practice, unless citing work which does capitalise.

² I use 'institution' to refer to ways of structuring human life, such as capitalism or patriarchy, more broadly than organisations, which are groups of individuals working toward a common goal.

³ This thesis largely uses language of 'Survivor' rather than 'Victim' when referring to people who have been abused, to emphasise their agency and strength. I acknowledge that people use different language to define themselves, and someone can be both Victim and Survivor, even at the same time.

⁴ There are marked exceptions, particularly the Catholic Church, where clerical celibacy is portrayed as influential on individuals' abuse. I argue this is an extension of individual scapegoating, given the Catholic Church's minority status, particularly within the UK.

⁵ As noted and rejected by Healy. Nicholas Healy, *Church, World, and the Christian Life (Church)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.9-10.

churchly⁶ disciplines are not widely acknowledged or used by the church to deepen its self-understanding, given their lack of an overtly Christian worldview. Abusive priests' behaviour is still perceived as an individual sin rather than influenced by church context and culture. Although the church acknowledges that other organisations can be sinful and flawed, this is harder to recognise in itself.

This impoverishes the church's self-understanding. The church remains an institution inhabited and formed by humans, despite its orientation to Christ and its unique mission to make disciples. Learning from other disciplines, such as Palmer and Feldman's organisational theory⁷ and Hartill's sociology,⁸ can provide insight into the structures and dynamics of the church as an organisation, and the perpetration of, detection of, and response to CSA within it. I further argue that these theories have points of contact with theological theories, particularly Healy's ecclesiology, and understandings of Structural Sin originally articulated by Liberation Theologians. I will test the extent to which this synthesis has explicatory power for CSA within the church by analysing data from the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA), using transcripts from the Peter Ball case study from the Anglican Investigation.

By emphasising the links between churchly and non-churchly thinking regarding the interplay of individual choice and institutional constraint on perpetrators', survivors', and church leaders' behaviour, churchgoers and theologians may become more accepting of non-churchly theory. Non-churchly theory will enable a deeper understanding of the interplay of individual freedom and organisational constraint on behaviour, and how church dynamics and organisational structures shape the presence of and response to CSA within the church. This may provide ways to make the church safer.

⁶ Here and throughout the thesis, I am using a phrase of Healy's to avoid 'secular', which implies that God is not present in places other than the church. Similarly, I largely use 'churchly' as a synonym for 'theological'. In this I am seeking to avoid the value judgements and division that can be implied by 'theological' and 'secular'. Instead, they acknowledge the Spirit's presence and work within and beyond the church. Healy, *Church*, pp.68-69.

⁷ Donald Palmer and Valerie Feldman, *Comprehending the Incomprehensible (Comprehending)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

⁸ Michael Hartill, *Sexual Abuse in Youth Sport (Sport)* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017).

The first chapter sets out some of the required background. It defines CSA and explores its prevalence, both in wider society and the church, and begins to explore the interplay of individual freedom and organisational constraint in perpetrators' behaviour. The media's role in shaping discourse around CSA is examined. I address the distinctive nature of the church and the influence that has on perceptions of CSA within it. The possibility of learning from churchly and non-churchly disciplines is explored, based on shared understandings of truth and reality. Finally, the role of inquiries, particularly IICSA, is examined.

Chapter Two addresses ecclesiology, drawing on Nicholas Healy's work. It challenges the idea that the church is perfect and sinless. I connect this with concepts of structural sin, which suggest that organisations themselves can be sinful. I explore how Healy's ecclesiology addresses the contingent and flawed nature of the concrete church, in a way that 'blueprint' ecclesiologies do not. The interplay of individual and organisation in forming the church and offering prophetic critique of sinful church practices to orientate the church more closely to Christ is examined. This leads to addressing the way God works in both the churchly and non-churchly world. Finally, the challenge around engaging with conflicting truth claims and prioritising either marginalised or powerful voices is explored, and Healy's perspective is critiqued.

The third chapter examines structural sin in greater depth, which offers a theological means of understanding how an institution can be sinful, distinctive to the sinful actions of individuals, by shaping individuals' beliefs and actions. I situate structural sin within wider understandings of sin within Christian theology. I deepen the understanding of structural sin through the work of John Paul II (JP2) and other theologians, and the extent of the connections between it and Healy's work. The way that structures of sin are influenced by the interaction of group and leader, drawing on Reinhold Niebuhr's work, is explored. I examine how far smaller institutions, such as churches, can be understood as a structure of sin, rather than broader meta-institutions such as patriarchy or capitalism. Finally, means of challenging structural sin and what this might mean for church practice are considered.

Chapter Four turns to non-churchly work. I synthesise Hartill's social scientific approach, which draws heavily on Bourdieu's understanding of habitus, field and capital, with Palmer and Feldman's organisational theory. In turn, this is synthesised with the theological framework created in the previous chapters. It further strengthens the understanding of CSA within the church, acknowledging that individuals are free to act but also constrained by the organisations they are committed to and culture they inhabit. Hartill's analysis functions as a meta-theory within which Palmer and Feldman's theorisation of particular aspects of CSA within organisations fits. I particularly explore the development of abusive relationships, institutional processes and their influence on CSA, the role of holding power or authority within an organisation, and the influence of organisational culture.

The fifth chapter tests this framework against data from IICSA, examining the extent to which it offers a deeper understanding of the behaviour of perpetrators, survivors, and those who receive allegations of abuse. Given the breadth of IICSA, I have restricted the data to the Peter Ball case study within the Anglican Church investigation, and within that largely to three individuals' evidence. AN-A117, a survivor of Ball's abuse; George Carey, Archbishop of Canterbury when Ball was initially arrested and subsequently rehabilitated into ministry; and Ros Hunt, a former social worker and chaplain who received allegations of Ball's abuse from multiple survivors, including AN-A117. This framework illuminates the perpetrator's development of an abusive relationship, the survivor's response to abusive advances, and the conflict for those who receive allegations of abuse, regarding their self-understanding and that of the organisation in which they are invested.

Peter Ball was a charismatic and high-profile religious brother, then bishop. He ministered extensively in schools with young men, some of whom lived with him in community. The community was called 'The Scheme', with members called 'Schemers'. In 1992 an eighteen-year-old, Neil Todd, made a statement to the police that Ball had sexually abused him.⁹ This was corroborated by others

⁹ The age of consent for male homosexual sex at the time was twenty-one, and not equalised with heterosexual sex until 2000. Thus, Ball's abuse was mainly of minors, rather than adults.

who had spent time within Ball's community who also made statements to the police; and by other members of the public whose sons had also been approached by Ball in other contexts who wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury but not the police. In 1993, after a police investigation, Ball was given a caution and retired from active ministry. Over the next twenty years he was gradually rehabilitated into ministry, until being arrested again in 2012. In 2014 he was charged with misconduct in a public office, and four counts of indecent assault.¹⁰

It is important to note that I am not an impartial observer of the Church of England and the abuse that occurs within it. Hartill recognises that researchers' commitments to the contexts they write about can influence the way they approach their research and the conclusions that they draw.¹¹ Research not only 'captures' reality, but also 'constructs' it,¹² influenced by the researcher's position and interests. These commitments must be acknowledged to make objective our unconscious assumptions and biases which may impact on the data gathered and the inferences drawn.¹³

While 'Participant Objectification', as Bourdieu initially described it, requires greater depth than I can offer here, I note important aspects of my story briefly.¹⁴ This research was funded by the Church of England's Research Degrees Panel and completed as part of my training for ordained ministry within the church which has been my spiritual home for the last decade. While I would not call myself a survivor of abuse, I have experienced the 'shadow' side of the church, the presence of bullying clergy and the lack of care from the wider church for those left in harm's way, and the commitment to the organisation rather than its members. Friends have generously and courageously shared their experiences of abuse, both within and outside the

¹⁰ For a helpful chronology, see The Inquiry Panel, *The Anglican Church Case Studies: 1. The Diocese of Chichester. 2. The response to allegations against Peter Ball (Interim)* (London: Crown Copyright, 2019), pp.229-230. This interim report is the only one available, the final report scheduled for release in summer 2020 but delayed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

¹¹ Hartill, *Sport*, p.59.

¹² Kenneth Plummer, *Documents of Life 2* (London: Sage Publications, 2001), p.171.

¹³ Pierre Bourdieu, 'Participant Objectivation' in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 9:2 (2003), pp.281-294.

¹⁴ See Hartill, *Sport*, pp.59-60.

church, including one person who was on Ball's Scheme. I rarely have a conversation about the topic of my research that does not generate further stories of abuse. I long for the Church of England to be safer for vulnerable people, whether children or adults, and to do better when abuse is alleged, and support and justice sought. I hope that this thesis will contribute to this goal.

Chapter One - Setting the Scene

Before the argument proper, certain pieces of background information require setting out. This includes an introduction to CSA and the extent to which perpetrators' behaviour is abnormal and pathological, or influenced by their culture and context. The media's role in shaping perceptions of CSA is examined, and the distinctive nature of CSA within the church. I then begin to explore the rationale behind engaging with learning from non-churchly disciplines when exploring CSA within the church, based on the assumption of shared understandings of truth and the real. This chapter concludes with an exploration of the role of inquiries in the governance of the UK, their strengths and weaknesses, and the particular strengths and weaknesses of IICSA.

Child Sexual Abuse: An Introduction

CSA is defined by IICSA as

forcing or enticing a child or young person to take part in sexual activities. The activities may involve physical contact and non-contact activities, such as involving children in looking at, or in the production of, sexual images, watching sexual activities, encouraging children to behave in sexually inappropriate ways, or grooming a child in preparation for abuse including via the internet.¹⁵

The harm done to survivors of CSA has been increasingly recognised since the 1980s.¹⁶ The World Health Organisation recognises that experiencing CSA can lead to a number of physical and psychological health conditions, ranging from gastrointestinal, gynaecological, or somatization disorders, to PTSD-related symptoms, depression and anxiety, substance abuse, body image concerns, or inappropriate sexual behaviour.¹⁷

¹⁵ IICSA, 'Terms of Reference', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/terms-reference>> 04/11/2019. I use this definition because it reflects the breadth of what can be understood as CSA and matches current academic understanding.

¹⁶ Adrian Bingham, "'It would be better for the newspapers to call a spade a spade": The British Press and Child Sexual Abuse, c.1918-1990' ('Press'), *History Workshop Journal* 88 (2019), pp.89-110, at p.90.

¹⁷ World Health Organisation, *Guidelines for medico-legal care for victims of sexual violence* (Geneva: World Health Organisation, 2003), pp.80-81. Also Carol Berkowitz, 'Medical Consequences of Child Sexual Abuse', *Child Abuse and Neglect* 22:6 (1998), pp.541-550.

It is difficult to measure the prevalence of CSA accurately, as incidents are underreported, whether because of the survivor's embarrassment, not thinking they will be believed, or wishing to protect their abuser.¹⁸ However, IICSA's Rapid Evidence Assessment cites two pieces of research, which place the prevalence of CSA (being those who have experienced sexual abuse before the age of 16) in the population of England and Wales at 7-24%.¹⁹ Data for the prevalence of CSA within the Church of England and Church in Wales is not publicly available. This is noted by IICSA to be a significant evidence gap. The closest data available, while not comparable to the UK and not comparing like with like,²⁰ is research done into CSA in the Anglican Church in Australia, which suggests that less than 1% of clergy serving between 1990 and 2008 had allegations of CSA made against them.²¹

The harm done to survivors and the prevalence of CSA within England and Wales make this worthy of further exploration. It is only relatively recently that the reality of CSA has been acknowledged, whether by the media, legal establishment, or medical profession. Smart argues that, even with the increased recognition of CSA as something which needs to be prevented, "there are too many ways of refusing to acknowledge the abuse in individual instances".²² It is only with further research and education that new means of preventing CSA and responding well to both perpetrators and survivors will be found. This includes going beyond our current understanding of CSA as a crime committed by pathological individuals.

¹⁸ IICSA Research Team, *Child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches: a rapid evidence assessment (REA)*, p.15, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/3361/view/iicsa-rea-child-sexual-abuse-anglican-catholic-churches-nov-2017-.pdf>> 26/08/2020.

¹⁹ IICSA Research Team, *REA*, p.16. The breadth of the figures may be based on the different methodologies used in the research, or as above, the hidden nature of CSA.

²⁰ In that it enumerates the number of abusers rather than those abused.

²¹ Patrick Parkinson, Kim Oates, and Amanda Jayakody, 'Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia', *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 21:5 (2012), pp.553-570, at p.565. It does not mean that those who have not been the subjects of allegations of CSA are innocent of abuse, or that those who have had allegations made are guilty.

²² Carol Smart, 'Reconsidering the Recent History of Child Sexual Abuse, 1910-1960' ('Reconsidering'), *Journal of Social Policy* 29:1 (2000), pp.55-71, at p.56.

A Crime of Pathological Individuals?

Initial research into CSA framed the issue as the perpetrator or survivor's lack of morality. Sexual exploitation emerged from the perpetrator's evilness, or false allegations from the complainant's malicious character.²³ An alternative was the psychological model, which focused on offender behaviour. It labelled CSA as pathological, a sexual deviancy exhibited as a result of the perpetrator's dysfunctionality or vulnerability; a medical not a moral issue.²⁴ However, both models emphasise that the individual perpetrator is at fault: it is a *lack*, of morality or a healthy brain or pattern of relating, which influences their sexual offending. It also creates a sharp divide between those who are abusive and those who are not, which does not take into account the recognition that the difference between societally accepted sexual behaviour and that which is abusive is not clear cut.²⁵ By distancing 'normal' men from 'paedophiles', "the coercive sexual behaviours of a wider (unconvicted) group of men... are excluded and ignored".²⁶

Similarly, recent research recognises that the psychological profile of abusers is not necessarily distinct from non-abusers,²⁷ so to label all perpetrators as psychologically dysfunctional does not fit the evidence. Attempts to screen potential abusers from organisations are unlikely to succeed, and treatment based on this inaccuracy is likely to be ineffectual. A wider understanding of what can influence an individual to abuse is required. Therefore, more recent criminological research has acknowledged the impact that the immediate environment has on the instance of CSA. Recommendations for decreasing the

²³ William White, 'A Systems Perspective on Sexual Exploitation of Clients by Professional Helpers' ('Systems'), in J. Gonsiorek (ed.), *Breach of Trust: Sexual Exploitation by Health Care Professionals and Clergy* (London: Sage, 1994), pp.176-192, at p.177.

²⁴ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.10-11.

²⁵ Hartill, *Sport*, p.16-17.

²⁶ Malcolm Cowburn, 'Hegemony and discourse: reconstructing the male sex offender and sexual coercion by men', *Sexualities, Evolution and Gender* 7(3), pp.215-231, at p.221. I acknowledge that women also commit CSA.

²⁷ The research does not speak with one voice; while Amrom *et al.*'s research suggests that profiling is inaccurate, Plante *et al.*'s suggests that 'ovcontrolled hostility' may be more prevalent in abusive clerics. Aria Amrom, Cynthia Calkins, and Jamison Fargo, 'Between the Pew and the Pulpit: Can Personality Measures Help Identify Sexually Abusive Clergy', *Sexual Abuse* 31:6 (2019), pp.686-706. Thorns G. Plante, Gerdenio Manuel, and Curtis Bryant, 'Personality and Cognitive Functioning Among Hospitalized Sexual Offending Roman Catholic Priests', *Pastoral Psychology* 45:2 (1996), pp.129-139.

prevalence of CSA therefore focus on making the environment and wider culture safer.²⁸

While research into CSA has become increasingly nuanced, the emphasis largely remains on the perpetrator within the fields of Criminology, Public Health, and Social Work. They seek to understand perpetrator strategies in order to prevent abuse, though with different prior assumptions about human behaviour.

Criminologists tend to assume that all human behaviour is rational, and so focus on strategies and immediate environmental conditions that allow perpetrators to abuse. Public Health workers also consider wider societal risk factors that correlate with the occurrence of abuse, such as the wellbeing of the victim's family. Social workers build on work from both criminologists and Public Health researchers. All three professions assume that perpetrators of CSA are rational actors, who intend to abuse and freely make that choice.

However, sociologists recognise that there is a dialectic between an individual's personal autonomy and the constraints on their behaviour by their culture and context.²⁹ Without engaging with these influences on individuals' behaviour, the model for understanding CSA is incomplete, as it does not recognise wider contributing factors.³⁰ Palmer and Feldman recognise this limitation, and note that sociologists are free to explore CSA through different lenses than those of the professions discussed above. This has led to increasing awareness that CSA is influenced by wider societal factors, such as capitalism, gender roles, and the construction of childhood.³¹

Organisational structures are increasingly acknowledged to feature within the societal and cultural factors which influence CSA. Rather than the prevalence of CSA being influenced by individuals within an organisation, the structure of the organisation itself is acknowledged to shape the behaviour of individuals which

²⁸ R.V.G. Clarke, 'Situational crime prevention: Theory and practice', *British Journal of Criminology* 20:2 (1980), pp.136-147. See also J.D. Freilich and S.M. Chermak, 'Preventing deadly encounters between law enforcement and American far-rightists', *Crime Prevention Studies* 25:1 (2009), pp.141-172.

²⁹ Michael Grenfell and David James, *Bourdieu and Education (Education)* (London: Falmer Press, 2008), p.12.

³⁰ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.5-6.

³¹ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.15-28, 95-102. See also Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.31-34, for a brief exploration of the role of gender differences and the construction of childhood.

may make them more likely to perpetrate CSA. Palmer and Feldman apply theories of organisational misconduct to examples of CSA within organisations. Hartill uses Bourdieu's understanding of habitus, field, and capital to explore CSA in youth sport, in unstructured interviews with survivors.

Both approaches allow a wider appreciation of the societal and organisational factors which influence CSA. Hartill emphasises the strengths of feminist theory which "situates sexual violence within wider inequalities and gendered power relations and looks well beyond the individual motivations and proclivities of the male sex offender".³² Rather than CSA being an 'abnormal' expression of sexuality, it is merely one extreme of an increasingly dominative and predatory continuum of sexual behaviour.³³ If aggressive tendencies in males are desirable, CSA becomes a means of acting them out by dominating the victim. This can also mean that male survivors of CSA are unwilling to disclose abuse, as they were 'inappropriately' passive.³⁴ This offers a framework for understanding why CSA might be more prevalent in particular organisations, such as sports, as cultural expectations around behaviour and status make CSA appear acceptable. The church, until recently a largely masculine arena with high levels of authority vested in clergy, may be one such organisation.

However, feminist approaches to sexual violence are also critiqued, particularly because of their failure to explain why only some men are abusers. As in the psychological model, theorists fall back upon the perpetrator having a psychological weakness or flaw, which is unsatisfactory, as discussed previously.³⁵ Nevertheless, feminist perspectives on sexual violence were crucial in widening the understanding of CSA to being a societal rather than an individual problem. While not illuminating the full picture of why some people abuse, or why some organisations are more likely to enable abuse, it nevertheless begins a conversation around the way that realities wider than individual personalities can influence CSA. However, society's understanding of CSA is shaped not only by academic learning but also the media.

³² Hartill, *Sport*, p.14.

³³ Hartill, *Sport*, p.16-17.

³⁴ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.31-32.

³⁵ Hartill, *Sport*, p.19.

The Media's Role in Shaping Society's Understanding of CSA

Bingham *et al.* note that CSA “is a concept that has been discursively constructed across time in relation to shifting ideas about age, sexuality and gender”.³⁶ The media’s role in “publicising, defining and debating CSA”,³⁷ and thereby shaping society’s understanding of CSA and its presence in the church, is significant. The media’s representation has shifted significantly over the last century and a half. Initially only mentioned euphemistically, CSA is now a scandalous crime which, for high profile cases at least, is widely publicised and denounced. Exploring the history of the media’s representation will further illuminate the discourse around CSA.

While the understanding of CSA has changed significantly, conventional wisdom that there was silence on CSA prior to 1980 is incorrect.³⁸ Bingham and Settle argue that this is a simplification of people’s framing and acknowledging of what is now called CSA. The press had a significant role in publicising CSA even in 1885 with the publication of a campaign against child prostitution. It “deployed a shrewd combination of melodrama, titillation and moral seriousness to capture readers’ attention”. As a result of press interest, active campaign groups, and engaged politicians, it successfully raised the age of consent from thirteen to sixteen.³⁹

After 1918, Bingham suggests that the British press has had three distinct phases of engagement with CSA. The first, 1918-1940s, is of ‘inconspicuous visibility’: court reports were written up which acknowledged CSA but used legal language and euphemistic or discrete headlines which partially concealed what had happened. These were not widely publicised or given editorial comment. The second, 1940s-1970s, marked an increased ease in speaking about sex throughout British culture. Crime reporting became more sensational,

³⁶ Adrian Bingham, Lucy Delap, Louise Jackson and Louise Settle, ‘Historical child sexual abuse in England and Wales: the role of historians’ (‘Historians’), *History of Education* 45:4 (2016), pp.411-429, at p.413.

³⁷ Bingham, ‘Press’, p.90.

³⁸ Carol Smart, ‘Reconsidering’, p.56.

³⁹ Adrian Bingham and Louise Settle, ‘Scandals and Silences: The British Press and CSA’ (‘Scandals’), *History and Policy Online* (2015), accessed online at <<http://www.historyandpolicy.org/policy-papers/papers/scandals-and-silences-the-british-press-and-child-sexual-abuse>> 21/01/2020.

with greater use of medical or psychological, rather than legal, terminology. CSA was acknowledged but conflated with other forms of sexual 'deviancy', such as homosexuality. In the late 1970s, CSA was placed firmly on the public agenda. The term 'paedophile' was introduced, having previously been an unknown term, and became part of the vernacular. Child-adult sexual contact was construed as harmful rather than simply immoral. However, the press attention was restricted to particular manifestations of CSA, rather than engaging with the wider cultural and societal dynamics.⁴⁰ It was not until the 2010s that CSA began to be articulated by the press as a societal and institutional, rather than individual, issue.⁴¹

Delap argues that in the 1980s CSA was only understood as a serious social problem within narrow bounds of class and social standing. As with earlier in the century, allegations made by those with higher standing were more likely to be heard sympathetically than those from poorer or more marginalised backgrounds. Similarly, those with "class advantage and institutional power" were more able to defend themselves against abuse allegations.⁴² While the media portrayed itself as a "fearless crusader for truth", there were significant gaps and silences in the narrative they crafted for the public.⁴³ Bingham argues that journalists did not wish to rock the boat, and instead "prioritised particular political and social interpretations of the problem"⁴⁴ based on the immorality of the individual abuser or victim.⁴⁵ Increasingly the narrative became ahistorical, erasing previous decades' concerns around CSA, and therefore was increasingly distorted in a way which "marginalize[d] any sustained consideration of how abuse might be related to wider power relationships or social identities".⁴⁶

As late as 2015, Bingham and Settle argued that the press still largely traded on human interest stories emphasising the criminality and sexual transgressions of

⁴⁰ Bingham, 'Press', pp.92-93.

⁴¹ Lucy Delap, "Disgusting Details Which are Best Forgotten": Disclosures of Child Sexual Abuse in Twentieth Century Britain' ('Disclosures'), *Journal of British Studies* 57 (2018), pp.79-107, at p.107.

⁴² Delap, 'Disclosures', pp.84, 88.

⁴³ Bingham, 'Press', p.106.

⁴⁴ Bingham, 'Press', p.103.

⁴⁵ The perpetrator or victim morality model. White, 'Systems', p.177.

⁴⁶ Bingham, 'Press', p.106.

individuals, rather than considering “broader social, cultural, or policy issues”.⁴⁷ This is despite press recognition that CSA is influenced by organisational structures. The media emphasises particular cases and elides others, meaning that the public understanding of CSA is incomplete. This puts children at risk, as adults may not understand or believe that, for example, the bishop or priest is a threat in the same way as the stereotypical man waiting by a playground. This disbelief is particularly noticeable within the church and other organisations which have a position of trust within society. The press continues to fail to effectively frame and engage with CSA, and there is little critical scrutiny of conventional wisdom or accepted stereotypes.⁴⁸

IICSA focuses closely on the cultural and institutional influences of CSA within organisations, therefore offering an alternative narrative to that of the individual perpetrator. Significant press coverage of the hearings and findings of investigations suggests that there will be a deeper public understanding of how organisational structures and privilege can influence the perpetration of, detection of, and response to CSA. However, in-depth analysis of the media’s representation of IICSA has not yet been completed, and it is not yet clear whether the representation is accurate or uninfluenced by other societal biases.

By contrast, analysis of the media coverage of the Australian Royal Commission (ARC), suggests that the media prioritises particular stories of CSA. Waller *et al.* note that “the news economy awards priority to elite organisations and individuals and news values direct focus towards individual crimes or transgressions rather than structural violence or injustices”.⁴⁹ CSA which affected marginalised children and other learning around structural failures was less widely disseminated as it did not fit into the ‘scandal’ frame that emphasises powerful institutions and particular individuals.⁵⁰ Within the ARC,

⁴⁷ Bingham and Settle, ‘Scandals’, accessed 21/01/2020.

⁴⁸ Bingham and Settle, ‘Scandals’, accessed 21/01/2020. See also Jodi Death, *Governing Child Abuse, Voices and Victimisation (Governing)* (Routledge: Oxford, 2018), pp.65-73.

⁴⁹ Lisa Waller, Tanja Dreher, Kristy Hess, Kerry McCallum and Eli Skogerbø, ‘Media Hierarchies of Attention: News Values and Australia’s Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse’ (‘Hierarchies’), *Journalism Studies* (2019), pp.1-17, at p.13.

⁵⁰ Waller *et al.*, ‘Hierarchies’, p.13.

this meant the media prioritised reporting cases which related to the Catholic or Anglican churches.⁵¹

Beyond Australia, media interest in reporting church scandals greatly increased in the latter half of the twentieth century. However, Rashid and Barron note that CSA in other churches or religious organisations has been overshadowed by the reporting of CSA within the Catholic Church.⁵² Wayne Murdock, the detective on Peter Ball's case in 1993, acknowledged that at that time the Church of England was still perceived as "the rock, the bed of society".⁵³ Though the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) denies it, this may have influenced the CPS's choice to issue Ball with a caution, rather than charge him with gross indecency or actual bodily harm.⁵⁴ The desire to protect the church may have initially influenced the media's reporting of CSA committed within churches, but this is no longer the case. Instead, the press emphasises the hypocrisy of a morally responsible organisation having committed, or sheltered those who committed, such devastating moral failures. It is only partway through the inquiry that IICSA has announced an investigation into CSA in other religious organisations which are less high profile within Britain.⁵⁵

This relates to the consistent pattern of media reporting of CSA, which frames as 'scandal' the misconduct of a powerful individual or organisation. When the role of an organisation in concealing the CSA committed by an individual is acknowledged, the press analysis does not tend to go further than acknowledging the drive to protect the organisation's reputation. There is no

⁵¹ Waller *et al.*, 'Hierarchies', pp.8-9. See also Death, *Governing*, p.75.

⁵² Faisal Rashid and Ian Barron, 'Why the Focus of Clerical Child Sexual Abuse has Largely Remained on the Catholic Church amongst Other Non-Catholic Christian Denominations and Religions', *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 28:5 (2019), pp.564-585, at p.569. This may be because of anti-Catholic bias in largely Protestant countries, or how the organisational structure of the Catholic Church enables centralised data collection and for the scandal to affect a larger context, or to be concealed at the organisational level. See pp.574-576.

⁵³ Wayne Murdock, *IICSA Transcript 25/07/2018*, p.146, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6067/view/public-hearing-transcript-25-july-2018.pdf> 22/01/2020.

⁵⁴ Gregor McGill, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, pp.42-43, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6142/view/public-hearing-transcript-26-july-2018.pdf> 22/01/2020.

⁵⁵ IICSA, 'Inquiry announces new investigation into child protection in religious organisations and settings' ('Investigation'), 02/05/19, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/news/inquiry-announces-new-investigation-child-protection-religious-organisations-and-settings> 13/07/20.

analysis of the drivers within the organisation's culture which may have enabled the offending. This shapes how perpetrators are responded to and enables organisations to remain static rather than making changes to their policies and procedures. IICSA emphasises the need to explore organisational cultures, and how these distinctive patterns influence their response to CSA. It is only recently that the church has begun to acknowledge the need for culture change, with the media belatedly reinforcing this call.

CSA within the Church

Of those who shared their experience of CSA with the Truth Project,⁵⁶ 11% reported abuse within a religious organisation.⁵⁷ The previously noted unwillingness to acknowledge the existence of CSA in any context increases when CSA is discovered within religious institutions. Traditionally, religious institutions are framed as a force for good within people's lives, with religious leaders perceived as a source of moral guidance.⁵⁸ As noted above, the media and criminal justice system may have been influenced by this in their presentation of and response to cases of CSA in religious institutions, by minimising publicity or being lenient with punishment.⁵⁹

However, CSA within the Church of England and other churches has gained increasing media coverage over the last twenty years. Churches' attempts to minimise reputational damage and maintain their positions of trust within society by concealing CSA allegations have been viewed negatively by the media. Accusations of cover ups have been made against church leaders which may have caused greater reputational damage than acknowledging the abuse.

⁵⁶ IICSA enables survivors to share their accounts of abuse in two ways. The first is through public hearings, but the second is through the Truth Project. Survivors of CSA are invited to share their experience of abuse through a written account, by phone or in person interview. These accounts are written up and anonymised. Some are published on the Truth Project's website, or in reports, and the evidence feeds into the wider IICSA hearings. Truth Project, *Truth Project Experiences Shared* (Crown Copyright, 2018), accessed online at <<https://www.truthproject.org.uk/key-documents/5462/view/truth-project-experiences-shared-june-2018.pdf>> 10/12/2019.

⁵⁷ IICSA, 'Investigation', accessed online 20/01/2020.

⁵⁸ IICSA Research Team, *Child Sexual Abuse in the context of religious institutions (Religious)*, p.32, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/11687/view/truth-project-thematic-report%3A-child-sexual-abuse-context-religious-institutions-full-report.pdf>> 26/08/2020.

⁵⁹ For example, Peter Ball being cautioned in 1993 rather than charged.

Even when abusive clerics are named, the abuse they committed is framed as a personal moral or psychological failing, rather than situated in its wider framework of organisational structures and cultural beliefs about children and clerical power. This enables churches to distance themselves from abuse and avoid the responsibility of change to their structures.

For the survivor of CSA by a religious leader, their spiritual authority may make it harder for the individual to resist abuse, especially if the abuse is framed in religious terms. Julie MacFarlane was asked for oral sex by the priest she approached for spiritual guidance, who told her that “this was what God would want [her] to do”.⁶⁰ It adds spiritual damage to the harm done by CSA: the priest may be seen as a representative of God, and it can be too difficult to reconcile ongoing faith and participation in the religious community with abuse by one of the community’s leaders.⁶¹

Abuse committed within churches impacts the whole community. Discovering that a trusted spiritual leader is guilty of abuse, or of concealing the presence of abuse, can cause spiritual harm. They had the same representational role and spiritual authority to the whole congregation as well as the survivor. It can provoke a sense of cognitive dissonance, which may mean religious individuals are less likely to believe abuse allegations.⁶² This was recognised within IICSA, with the DSA of Chichester Diocese noting that “even after the conviction [of their priest for CSA]... by far the majority of the congregation... believed that the complainants were ne'er do wells and that Mr Howarth had been the victim of a miscarriage of justice”.⁶³

Furthermore, religious organisations often work with children and young people, relying on volunteer support, and can be perceived by perpetrators who

⁶⁰ Julie MacFarlane, *IICSA Transcript 13/03/2018*, p.104, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4415/view/13-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 20/01/2020.

⁶¹ IICSA Research Team, *Religious*, p.51.

⁶² Kiara Minto, Matthew Hornsey, Nicole Gillespie, Karen Healy, and Jolanda Jetten, ‘A Social Identity Approach to Understanding Responses to Child Sexual Abuse Allegations’ (‘Social Identity’), *PLoS ONE* 11:4 (2016), pp.1-15, at pp.12-13.

⁶³ Colin Perkins, *IICSA Transcript 16/03/2018*, p. 177, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4492/view/16-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 24/06/2019.

know that they want to abuse children as providing easy access to victims.⁶⁴ For churches, the activities that they offer are not necessarily ends in themselves. They are a means of mission and religious education, and the safety of the children in their care may be of lesser concern.⁶⁵ Their priorities upon discovering abuse may not be maintaining the children's safety, but minimising reputational damage to the church and therefore to the faith. This may influence the response to allegations, with those who receive disclosures encouraging individuals not to go to the statutory authorities with their claims, instead preferring to deal with allegations 'in house'. This can mean that the perpetrator is not dealt with as strictly as they should be.⁶⁶ This pattern is not unique to religious organisations, but also to other organisations to which individuals are highly committed, such as sports clubs.⁶⁷

Sharing Learning across Academic Disciplines

This shared pattern of disbelief and organisational protection across churchly and non-churchly organisations means sharing learning across the organisations to inform child protection practice is appropriate. This is sometimes contested by the church, who view it as a unique body, distinctive from other human organisations sociologically and theologically, because of its orientation to Christ and the Holy Spirit acting within it.⁶⁸ The extent to which it is possible to integrate learning from different organisations into the church's self-understanding and practice is widely debated, based on whether different

⁶⁴ Matthew Colton, Susan Roberts, and Maurice Vanstone, 'Sexual Abuse by Men Who Work with Children', *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 19:3 (2010), pp.345-364, at pp.351-352. Sandy K. Wurtele, 'Preventing the sexual exploitation of minors in youth-serving organizations', *Children and Youth Services Review* 34 (2012), pp.2442-2453, at p.2444.

⁶⁵ While I believe that the safety of children in their care is part of the church's mission, and this perception is more consistent across different church groups, safeguarding was initially perceived as an 'add-on' to the church's core activities. Christopher Cocksworth, 'Preface', in The Archbishops' Council, *The Gospel, Sexual Abuse and the Church* (London: Church House Publishing, 2016), pp.6-9, at p.6. Michael Hartill and Melanie Lang, "I Know People Think I'm a Complete Pain in the Neck": An Examination of the Introduction of Child Protection and "Safeguarding" in English Sport from the Perspective of National Governing Body Safeguarding Lead Officers' ('Pain'), *Social Sciences* 3 (2014), pp.606-627, at pp.611-615.

⁶⁶ IICSA Research Team, *Religious*, pp.39-40.

⁶⁷ Craig Harper and Colin Perkins, 'Reporting CSA within Religious Settings: Challenges and Future Directions' ('Reporting') in *Child Abuse Review* 27 (2018), pp.30-41, at p.34.

⁶⁸ Healy, *Church*, p.9. This research addresses CSA within the Church of England, but is influenced by work on the Catholic Church. Where I have not specified which church, I believe the point is transferrable. I cannot comment on its applicability to other religious organisations or churches.

world views have different standards of rationality, and whether there is access to one single truth.⁶⁹

This thesis seeks to synthesise theological understandings of the church and structural sin with non-churchly disciplines' perspectives on organisational influence on CSA. Before this, it is necessary to lay out the understanding of truth and rationality it is based on, which is largely influenced by Healy's work.

Healy argues that the church's theological understanding is partial and contingent, influenced by humanity's 'darkened understanding'.⁷⁰ As will be explored further in Chapter Three, sin negatively shapes humanity's ability to understand the world and access truth. Rather than the church having a perfect and complete understanding of God, the world, and their calling and practice in the world, Healy argues that the church must recognise the "tentative and conflictual nature of Christian existence".⁷¹ In this, Healy draws on the 'dramatic' understanding of knowledge and Christian faith, from Hans Urs von Balthasar's theodrama, which will be explored in greater depth in Chapter Two. Here, it is sufficient to recognise that Balthasar's 'dramatic' concept of Christian faith acknowledges the fallibility and incompleteness of human knowledge of the world and God.

The ongoing tensions present in different world views suggest that there is no one belief system which has proved itself to have greater explicatory power for the reality of the world. This suggests that human knowledge of the world is fallible and incomplete: "no single tradition or religion can possess the truth in epic form, for none has as yet subsumed all others into itself and so must still engage with them and learn from them".⁷² Healy draws on Augustine's *City of God* which emphasises the struggle for knowledge and wisdom inherent in the pilgrim church, noting that "our own resources provide no trustworthy basis for

⁶⁹ While particularly influenced by postmodernism, this is not a new question. Understandings of truth have been contested throughout human history. See David Jasper, 'The Origins of Truth in Philosophy, Theology and Theory' in David Jasper and Jenny Wright, *Truth and the Church in a Secular Age* (London: SCM Press, 2019), pp. 17-32. For Healy's rejection of pluralism and relativism, see Healy, *Church*, pp.73-128.

⁷⁰ Ephesians 4:18, *NRSV Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

⁷¹ Healy, *Church*, p.54.

⁷² Healy, *Church*, p.127.

constructing epic systems of belief and practice”.⁷³ He argues that the “human search for truth, even when it is undertaken within the church, will always go astray without the active presence of the Spirit”.⁷⁴ Healy recognises that the church does not always access the “active presence of the Spirit” in its searching for truth, which is how the church can be fallible and sinful despite its uniqueness.

Accordingly, learning from conflicting viewpoints and truth claims is crucial in enabling the church to follow Christ more closely. This is possible because Healy argues that different truth claims have a shared standard of rationality, and that “genuine opposition about the Real is possible”.⁷⁵ All inquiry is “guided by sets of assumptions and beliefs particular to a given tradition of inquiry”,⁷⁶ whether churchly or non-churchly. Conflict between beliefs is possible because “they have the same logical status”, based on their own traditions of inquiry.⁷⁷ All believe themselves to be speaking about the world as it exists, so beliefs can be proved true or false through dialogue with other belief systems. Healy therefore argues against relativity or pluralism, as these become totalising discourses, quashing debate as they suggest that truth claims are only true within the discourse that they are made in. This protects organisations and individuals from challenge, and therefore prevents their growth and change.

For a tradition’s claim to be true, it must be able to stand up to scrutiny and debate, have explanatory power for external events, and internal coherence within the tradition.⁷⁸ Claims to truth are therefore dependent on scrutiny and debate. Healy goes as far to argue that “difference and truth are thus mutually dependent; one cannot have one without the other”.⁷⁹ It is through debate that traditions, including Christian churches, are enabled to recognise that some of their beliefs may be incorrect as a result of their sin and finitude, and therefore

⁷³ Healy, *Church*, p.104.

⁷⁴ Healy, *Church*, p.113.

⁷⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.94.

⁷⁶ Healy, *Church*, p.95.

⁷⁷ Healy, *Church*, p.100.

⁷⁸ Healy, *Church*, pp.120-124.

⁷⁹ Healy, *Church*, p.125.

to reform their practices in a way that orientates them more closely to Christ, or the real.⁸⁰

From this perspective, the church's engagement with IICSA is a source of strength, showing that its participants believe it able to stand up to scrutiny and debate. From this can come acknowledgement of the church's failings and sinfulness in past safeguarding procedures and responses to disclosures of abuse. From this acknowledgement of past failure and sin can come a clearer understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of safeguarding procedure and disclosure reception and response in the present, which will enable reform and change. My argument that churchly and non-churchly theories about CSA both have explicatory power for the abuse examined in IICSA also suggests that there is a shared reality which both disciplines are articulating.

Theologically, the reason that other organisations or belief systems than the church can have access to truth is because Healy argues that the Spirit's presence and action is not confined to the church but is also at work in the non-church world. This is a result of the Incarnation, which brought the whole of creation into the theodrama, and means that all people's choices can be more or less oriented to Christ, not just church members.⁸¹ Similarly, "there is nowhere where God is not creatively and redemptively present".⁸² Divine and human agency are both at play in all aspects of human existence, leaving the possibility of both graced and sinful human action in any context. While Healy privileges the church as the place where the world and God are most clearly understood, he argues that the church should make use of secular learning, which may be orientated to Christ despite being non-churchly.⁸³ Thus we must "consider *all* religious and non-religious bodies to be constituted concretely by both kinds of agency, divine and human".⁸⁴

Consequently, the church can learn to follow Jesus more closely through the activities of non-church individuals or groups, because the Spirit can work in

⁸⁰ Healy, *Church*, pp.105-106.

⁸¹ Healy, *Church*, p.66.

⁸² Healy, *Church*, p.67.

⁸³ Healy, *Church*, p.69, 75.

⁸⁴ Healy, *Church*, p.67.

that context.⁸⁵ Healy argues that ecclesiology should “extend the parameters of its inquiry into the actions of the Spirit among those outside the church, too, and assess its significance for the concrete identity of the church”.⁸⁶ Therefore it is appropriate for the church to minister in a way that reflects the learning from safeguarding in non-church contexts, and that IICSA challenges and seeks to improve the practices of the church.

Palmer, Feldman, and Hartill’s Work

A general rationale for allowing non-churchly learning to influence the practices of the church has been articulated above. Here I begin to address the synthesis of Palmer and Feldman’s work with Hartill’s, and the theological or churchly drivers which I am using with the non-churchly theory. The basis of a shared rationality across different disciplines or worldviews, and the possibility of the Spirit giving access to truth outside of the church or theology, underpins this work.

Both Palmer and Feldman’s and Hartill’s work explore the role that organisational structure and culture has in the perpetration of, detection of, and response to CSA. They examine different disciplines’ models for understanding CSA, while asserting that they do not sufficiently acknowledge the environment’s role in the prevalence of CSA.⁸⁷ Both emphasise the role and responsibility of organisations in preventing CSA, but approach their analysis of organisations from different perspectives.

Hartill’s work, drawing on Bourdieu’s emphasis on ethnographical research shaped by the subjects’ words and actions, prioritises the survivor’s experience of CSA. He examines the extent to which it fits into Bourdieu’s framework of habitus, capital, and field. By beginning with interviews with survivors, Hartill seeks to privilege their experience above academic theory, allowing survivor voices to shape his academic work. By contrast, Palmer and Feldman start from theories of organisational misconduct, drawing on an eclectic range of models within business or institutional theory. They select examples of CSA which fit

⁸⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.64.

⁸⁶ Healy, *Church*, p.74.

⁸⁷ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.5-7. Hartill, *Sport*, p.7.

the theory to illustrate its outworking in reality. They do not engage directly with survivors but draw largely from news articles or legal proceedings.

I argue that there is a match between these two approaches to organisational impact on CSA, as both theories have explicatory power for aspects of the Peter Ball IICSA transcripts. This points to a shared truth, which both disciplines access from different angles. I work with Hartill's use of Bourdieu's concept of field, habitus and capital as a meta-theory, offering a broader understanding of the interplay of power, value, and marginalisation and its impact on CSA. Within this, Palmer and Feldman's organisational theory illuminates more specific aspects of practice within organisations. My approach, given that I am using previously transcribed interviews, lends itself more to Palmer' and Feldman's, but I do seek to prioritise the transcribed experience of the Church of England above the theory, as does Hartill. By synthesising the two pieces of work, I seek to build on the individual pieces' strengths, and ameliorate their weaknesses.

However, before synthesising these approaches and applying them to IICSA, I will explore the theological drivers which illuminate the influence that organisations have on CSA, being ecclesiology and structural sin. These theological themes may be useful for Christians who work within non-churchly organisations which also struggle to deal effectively with CSA committed with the organisation. For those within the church, the emphasis that theology has resources which can address the church's CSA is crucial. Not only as a further acknowledgement that safeguarding is part of the mission and ministry of the church, but also to make non-churchly learning about CSA within organisations accessible to the church. Graham Tilby, the Church of England's current National Safeguarding Advisor, noted during IICSA that "if you don't talk about the theology of safeguarding, you are not going to engage half the church, particularly those who are ordained".⁸⁸ I argue that theories of structural sin and Healy's ecclesiology have explicatory power for CSA within the church, as do Palmer and Feldman's and Hartill's work.

⁸⁸ Graham Tilby, *IICSA Transcript 20/03/2018*, p.106, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4697/view/20-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 23/01/2019.

This shared explicatory power further emphasises the shared truth which these disciplines are approaching, giving different perspectives on that truth and therefore a broader understanding. I hope this work will help to make secular learning about CSA more accessible to those within the Church, and therefore make the church a safer place for all. Whether survivors of abuse, perpetrators of abuse, and those who minister to both and may have been, or may become, either. Before turning to this, the final piece of background needed is the role of Inquiries in shaping the response to crimes or disasters, and particularly IICSA's methodology and the influence this has on the data gathered and recommendations made.

The Role of IICSA

A public inquiry's role is defined by Howe as "to investigate serious allegations of improper conduct in the public service; or to establish the cause of some major disaster and to learn lessons from it; or to consider some other matter of public concern, which requires thorough and impartial investigation and which may not be dealt with by ordinary civil or criminal processes".⁸⁹ Inquiries should be a source of impartial assessment of a disaster, which can bring certainty around responsibilities for what happened and therefore be a source of accountability,⁹⁰ bring closure to those harmed, and provide learning for the future.⁹¹ Inquiries happen in many different contexts, whether governmental or organisational, with distinct terms of reference and different powers to compel evidence. For the purposes of this piece I focus on statutory inquiries announced by the government, of which IICSA is one.

IICSA was set up, initially as a panel review, by the then Home Secretary Theresa May in 2014, in the wake of the Jimmy Savile scandal. While many different inquiries examined different organisations' responses to CSA after the

⁸⁹ Geoffrey Howe, 'The Management of Public Inquiries', *The Political Quarterly* 70:3 (1999), pp.294-304, at p.295.

⁹⁰ This is responsibility in the causal or factual sense, rather than the culpable or legal sense: Burgess notes that "should an accident occur, an intensely charged legalistic environment discourages the openness conducive to investigation". Adam Burgess, 'The Changing Character of Public Inquiries in the (Risk) Regulatory State' ('Character'), *British Politics* 6:1 (2011), pp.3-29, at p.20.

⁹¹ Raanan Sulitzeanu-Kenan, 'Reflection in the Shadow of Blame: When do Politicians Appoint Commissions of Inquiry?' ('Commissions'), *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (2010), pp.613-634, at p.613.

Savile story broke in 2012, in early June 2014 a group of cross-party MPs wrote to May calling for an overarching inquiry. Less than a month later, over 110 additional MPs had added their support.⁹² May announced IICSA as a panel review on 7 July 2014.⁹³ In February 2015 IICSA was reframed as a statutory inquiry with the power to compel witnesses to testify, after the resignation of the first two chairs, who were perceived by survivor groups to lack the necessary independence.⁹⁴

IICSA's terms of reference state that its purpose is

To consider the extent to which State and non-State institutions have failed in their duty of care to protect children from sexual abuse and exploitation; to consider the extent to which those failings have since been addressed; to identify further action needed to address any failings identified; to consider the steps which it is necessary for State and non-State institutions to take in order to protect children from such abuse in future; and to publish a report with recommendations.⁹⁵

The whole IICSA is wide ranging, holding both institution-specific and thematic hearings, examining councils, high profile individuals, religious groups, residential schools, and the internet, among others. The 'Anglican Church' investigation examined the Church of England and the Church in Wales rather than the whole Anglican communion. It was split into three hearings: a case study into the Diocese of Chichester, another case study into Peter Ball, and a wider-ranging examination of current safeguarding practices in the church.

The impartiality of an inquiry is crucial, and particularly clear in the multiple false starts of IICSA. The fourth and current chair Alexis Jay was appointed in

⁹² Robert Mendick and Eileen Fairweather, 'Jimmy Savile: pressure grows for full inquiry into historic child abuse', *The Daily Telegraph* 29/06/2014, accessed online at <<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/jimmy-savile/10933200/Jimmy-Savile-pressure-grows-for-full-inquiry-into-historic-child-abuse.html>> 20/01/2020.

⁹³ BBC News, 'Home Secretary Theresa May announces child abuse reviews' 07/06/2014, accessed online at <<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-politics-28201486/home-secretary-theresa-may-announces-child-abuse-reviews>> 20/01/2020.

⁹⁴ The Home Office, 'Home Secretary announces judge to lead statutory inquiry into historic child sexual abuse', 04/02/2015, accessed online at <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/home-secretary-announces-judge-to-lead-statutory-inquiry-into-historical-child-sexual-abuse>> 20/01/2020.

⁹⁵ IICSA, 'Terms of Reference', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/terms-reference>> 20/01/2020.

August 2016. The IICSA website itself frames the Anglican Investigation as having been encouraged by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Justin Welby.⁹⁶ While this may reflect positively on the church's willingness to engage freely, it can also be perceived as a reputationally focused attempt to get ahead of critique.

However, despite being framed as independent and impartial, inquiries are socially constructed. The decision to hold any inquiry is influenced not only by the seriousness of the harm done, but growing public opinion, media campaigning, and the government's desire to avoid blame for a disaster.⁹⁷ Decisions are made regarding which disasters are perceived worthy of inquiry, the inquiry's terms of reference, and the media's role in campaigning for and reporting on the inquiry.⁹⁸ Thus, Burgess notes the shift in the type of disasters which are perceived to be appropriate for an inquiry: moving from matters internal to the state, such as decisions to go to war, to more public concerns, such as child abuse, medical concerns, or train crashes.⁹⁹ Burgess argues that our society has become increasingly risk averse, due in part to the media's increased reporting of disasters, which means that the focus of inquiries is increasingly the minimisation of risk, regardless of the likelihood of harm. The increased reporting of child deaths or abuse in the media means that children are increasingly perceived to be at risk, despite there being an overall decline in violent childhood deaths since the 1980s.¹⁰⁰

Sulitzeanu-Kenan suggests that inquiry findings are only accepted by the public if their conclusions match that which the public has already reached following the media reporting.¹⁰¹ The extent to which the church's decisions or IICSA's conclusions will be accepted or rejected is largely dependent on the way

⁹⁶ IICSA, 'Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/investigations/investigation-into-failings-by-the-anglican-church>> 21/01/2020.

⁹⁷ Sulitzeanu-Kenan, 'Commissions', p.614.

⁹⁸ This social construction in part explains the delay in the IICSA being announced, from the initial outrage over the Savile case in 2012, to the first letter to May in 2014, followed by a groundswell of support by MPs before the Inquiry was announced in July 2014.

⁹⁹ Burgess, 'Character', p.4.

¹⁰⁰ Burgess, 'Character', p.16. This pattern may be the same within the Church of England, although the lack of data makes it impossible to prove this.

¹⁰¹ Raanan Sulitzeanu-Kenan, "If they get it right": An Experimental Test of the Effects of the Appointment and Reports of UK Public Inquiries', *Public Administration* 84:3 (2006), pp.623-653, at p.647.

in which they are reported. This further illuminates the role of the media's initial reporting and editorial comment in shaping public opinion, and emphasises the media's responsibility to report impartially. The framing most recently of the BBC's dramatization of Bishop Peter Ball's abuse and conviction, titled 'Exposed: The Church's Darkest Secret', is indicative of this.¹⁰² The emotive language of the media challenges inquiries' attempts at impartiality in their conclusions. More measured conclusions which recognise shades of grey in situations of abuse are harder to express and do not gain public traction or affirmation.¹⁰³

Therefore, the social construction of inquiries, the chair's independence, and the influence of the media on how the inquiry's conclusion is received, all challenge the independent and impartial role of inquiries. This is particularly important given my argument that understandings of CSA, and the perpetration of CSA, is also socially constructed.

Elliott and McGuinness note that inquiries are time-consuming, which means that there can be an extensive delay in the making and implementation of recommendations. By the time the recommendations are released, public interest can have died down, which therefore means that the pressure in ensuring that the recommendations are followed through can be lacking.¹⁰⁴

While the Church of England and Church in Wales have been continuing to improve their safeguarding policies and procedures while IICSA has been going on, the final report on the churches is delayed by the current Covid-19 pandemic,¹⁰⁵ despite this being over two years since the opening of the first main hearings in this investigation in March 2018.

Further issues noted with public inquiries by Elliott and McGuinness are that there is no requirement for the government to act on the recommendations

¹⁰² BBC, 'Exposed: The Church's Darkest Secret' 13/01/2020, accessed online at <<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m000dbjj>> 20/01/2020.

¹⁰³ Burgess, 'Character', p.19.

¹⁰⁴ Dominic Elliott and Martina McGuinness, 'Public Inquiry: Panacea or Placebo?' ('Panacea'), *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 10:1 (2002), pp.14-25, at p.19.

¹⁰⁵ Hattie Williams, 'Abolish right to remove children from sex-education classes, urges abuse survivor', *Church Times* 30/04/2020, accessed online at <<https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2020/1-may/news/uk/abolish-right-to-remove-children-from-sex-education-classes-urges-abuse-survivor>> 06/09/2020.

made;¹⁰⁶ and that inquiries do not allow for learning from success, only from failure.¹⁰⁷ While IICSA has also explored the church's good practice throughout the hearings, and particularly in the third hearing into current safeguarding, the emphasis remains on the church's failings. I add to these Burgess' recognition that it is impossible for something to simply be declared an accident, but must be regulated against in the future; and that the difficulties of implementing recommendations are excluded from the inquiries' concerns.¹⁰⁸ Many people interviewed by the inquiry have asked that mandatory reporting of abuse be implemented within the church, but there is not agreement regarding what form this would take, or at what point the duty to report becomes mandatory. IICSA acknowledges the complexity of this in the Interim Report, and has not currently made a recommendation, but this emphasises the difficulty of coming to conclusions after an inquiry which are feasible.¹⁰⁹

IICSA's decision not to engage with alleged or convicted perpetrators of CSA impacts the understanding of CSA within organisations which is reached. This ensures that the voices of survivors are prioritised, which is important given the extent to which CSA is dependent on the silencing of those abused. However, it also limits the learning gained from IICSA, as perpetrator voices which may offer another perspective will not be heard. IICSA does, nevertheless, engage in depth with key members of the Church of England and Church in Wales who are responsible for the church's response to allegations of CSA. As the focus of IICSA is organisational responses to CSA, this emphasis is a helpful one. However, by not engaging with perpetrator voices, the conclusions that can be drawn are limited. While it is impossible for one inquiry to cover all aspects of CSA in organisations, the absence must be acknowledged.

Furthermore, IICSA does not frame its investigation theologically. The inquiry is legal and historical, exploring what happened, its timeframes, and the responsibility that different individuals held. However, in explicitly acknowledging that the panel "is not wanting to engage too much in

¹⁰⁶ See also Death, *Governing*, pp.110-111.

¹⁰⁷ Elliott and McGuinness, 'Panacea', p.20.

¹⁰⁸ Burgess, 'Character', p.22.

¹⁰⁹ The Inquiry Panel, *Interim*, pp.96-98.

theology”,¹¹⁰ this may restrict the evidence they receive to those things which can be explained without reference to theological themes and beliefs. This may mean their understanding of the drivers of the perpetration of and response to CSA within the church is incomplete.

The danger of my choosing theological concepts such as structural sin and ecclesiology to analyse the IICSA evidence is that these may not be concepts that those giving evidence would have chosen. A more rigorous approach would be to re-interview those individuals specifically to explore their experiences through a theological lens. However, the complexity of this, held against the breadth and depth of evidence that is available because of IICSA means that as a first step, using the transcripts is justifiable.

Conclusion

This chapter has of necessity been an introduction to various concepts which need to be articulated before the main argument can begin. Beginning with a definition of CSA, its prevalence within the UK and acknowledging the lack of data regarding its prevalence within the church, offers a vantage-point for deeper engagement with the causes of CSA. The failings of the model of the abuse perpetrator as an independent, pathological criminal have been explored. Initial explorations of alternative ways of understanding the role of culture, society, and organisation through Palmer and Feldman’s and Hartill’s work have begun and will be extended later. The role of the media in shaping society’s understanding of CSA, and therefore shaping the response that people make to CSA within their organisation has been explored. While there are aspects shared with CSA that occurs within any organisation, CSA within the church is unique because of the spiritual quality of the relationship of trust that individuals, whether survivors or bystanders, have with the church.

Having acknowledged this uniqueness, I argue that learning about CSA from other disciplines illuminates aspects of church-based CSA, and that sharing learning across disciplines is appropriate, given that they have a shared

¹¹⁰ Nikita McNeill, *IICSA Transcript 08/03/2018*, p.13, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4385/view/8-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 18/07/2020.

understanding of truth and reality. While the particular worldview may not be shared across disciplines, both nevertheless agree that there is a single truth that can be perceived and understood, and that debate enables a greater understanding of the real. This is at odds to the strand of opinion within the church which suggests that the church's uniqueness, given the presence of the Spirit within it and its orientation to Christ, means that it cannot learn anything of value from non-churchly disciplines. However, because the Spirit works outside as well as inside the church, engaging with non-churchly learning enables the church to discern where the Spirit might be at work outside the church, and to integrate that Spirit-led learning into church practices.

Therefore, engaging with Palmer and Feldman's and Hartill's work on CSA within other organisations is important; there is insight there which is helpful for the church's understanding of its CSA. Given that I am drawing on evidence from IICSA to test their theories, the role of inquiries, their position within the governance of the UK, their strengths and weaknesses, and the role of the media in shaping the perceptions of their findings, is also helpful background.

Having begun to point toward aspects of theological thinking which can shape peoples' understanding of CSA or the appropriateness or otherwise of engaging with other disciplines, the next step is to engage in greater depth with ecclesiology and the church's self-understanding. If those within the church understand it as able to commit sin, there will be greater willingness to engage constructively with the CSA within it. I therefore turn to Healy's ecclesiology as a resource for reframing our understanding of the church.

Chapter 2 - Ecclesiology: Sin and the Church's Self-Understanding

Having set the scene for how CSA might be understood both inside and outside the church, the role of the media and inquiries, and the extent to which learning from different disciplines can be integrated, the church's self-understanding needs to be further interrogated and challenged. I draw on Healy's *Church, World and the Christian Life*, which challenges assumptions of the church's perfection and sinlessness. I introduce understandings of structural sin from Liberation Theology, which suggest that organisations themselves can be sinful without reference to their members. I explore the limitations of other ecclesiologies in offering a realistic understanding of the concrete church and propose Healy's ecclesiology as an alternative. Healy emphasises the role of individuals and other organisations in offering prophetic critiques of church practices to enable them to be more closely orientated to Christ, and I examine how God's work in the world is to be understood if this is possible. Finally, some of Healy's reticence concerning the complexity of engaging with conflicting truth claims is acknowledged and challenged.

I acknowledge that my thesis draws significantly on Catholic theology, despite addressing CSA within the Church of England. While the context differs, in that the church structures are different and aspects of Catholic ecclesiology distinctive, I do not think they are sufficiently distinctive that their conclusions cannot be applied to the Church of England. Where the difference is sufficiently distinctive that conclusions might not easily translate, I address it in the body of the argument.

Can the Church be Sinful?

Over the last fifty years, the idea that sin is not simply an individual issue has become more widely accepted within Christian theology. Sin also has a social dimension which "encompasses the unjust structures, distorted consciousness, and collective actions and inaction that facilitate injustice and dehumanisation".¹¹¹ However, this remains controversial when applied to the church. As noted previously, Healy argues this is because the Church is seen as a

¹¹¹ Kristin E. Heyer, 'Social Sin and Immigration: Good Fences Make Bad Neighbours' ('Neighbours') *Theological Studies* 71:2 (2010), pp.410-436, at p.413.

unique body, both sociologically and theologically, in its orientation to Christ and the Holy Spirit acting within it. This unique dependence on the Spirit and orientation to Christ has been interpreted to mean that the church is perfect, and therefore incapable of sin, particularly within the Catholic Church. Baum notes that “while official Catholic teaching always recognised that the church was a community of sinners, it always denied that the church itself was sinful. Thanks to the special presence of the Holy Spirit, the church as such was believed to remain holy”.¹¹²

Healy backs up his claim with reference to documents throughout the Catholic Church’s history, beginning with Boniface VIII’s Papal Bulls, *Clericis Laicos* and *Unam Sanctam*, which show the “failure of the church’s leadership to avoid the corruptions of power”.¹¹³ JP2’s apology for the Holocaust spoke only of the sins of individual Christians, rather than the church’s corporate failure to speak out.¹¹⁴ The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* still focuses on the sinfulness of its individual members and the church’s holiness despite individuals’ sin.¹¹⁵

Extreme versions of this view leave the church closed to any form of challenge. Anything the church does is perfect because it is guided by the presence of the Spirit, so any criticism is invalid. Less extreme versions suggest that while the church is capable of sin, it is only because it is failing to live up to the perfection it attains in the Spirit. Ultimately, ecclesial sin maintains “little theological significance”,¹¹⁶ as it is rendered secondary or even ignored.

By contrast to the Catholic Church, the Church of England does not have an ecclesiology which suggests that the church is incapable of sinning: “a true

¹¹² Gregory Baum, ‘Structures of Sin’ (‘Structures’) in Gregory Baum and Robert Ellsberg (eds), *The Logic of Solidarity* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1989), pp.110-126, at p.123. This is also noted by Regan, particularly considering clergy-perpetrated CSA. Ethna Regan, ‘Church, Culture and Credibility: A Perspective from Ireland’ (‘Credibility’), *New Blackfriars* 94 (2013), pp.160-176, at p.163.

¹¹³ Healy, *Church*, p.7.

¹¹⁴ Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, ‘We Remember: A Reflection on the “Shoah”’, *Origins* 27:40 (1998), pp.669-675.

¹¹⁵ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, (Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2003), §827, accessed online at <https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P29.HTM> 07/09/2020.

¹¹⁶ Healy, *Church*, p.10.

church is certainly not a perfect church, one with no shortcomings”.¹¹⁷ This extends to the recognition that “the Church, as an institution, can become the instrument of injustice and oppression, even to its own members”.¹¹⁸ This is unsurprising given the role of the Reformation in the formation of the Church of England as an independent denomination; its existence is predicated on the recognition that church structures can be damaging to the gospel.¹¹⁹

This corresponds to the Church of England’s recognition of its provisional nature. The Catholic and Orthodox churches understand themselves as the full expression of the catholicity of the Universal Church, to which all other Christians must return. However, the Church of England recognises that it, alongside all other churches, are incomplete and fallible reflections of the Universal, Spiritual, Church, which will only be recognised in perfection and full unity at the eschaton.¹²⁰ The Church of England’s ecclesiology acknowledges the church’s current imperfection and therefore allows for the presence of sin within the earthly church. The church’s eschatological perfection is not realised today.¹²¹

The question of the church’s perfection or the sin of its members or ministers is not a new issue in the face of the scandal of church-based CSA; instead, it was a source of contention in the first few centuries of the church’s life. Augustine’s *The City of God* was written in part to respond to the Donatists, challenging the assumption of the church’s perfection, whether as a group of individuals or an institution. The Donatists claimed that clerics who had sinned by handing over Bibles and sacred vessels to the Emperor Diocletian were no longer able to function as ministers.¹²² In the face of clerical apostasy, the Donatists argued that “the polluted... cannot purify, the soiled... cannot launder and absolve

¹¹⁷ Paul Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism (Identity)* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), p.100. See also Michael Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936), p.220.

¹¹⁸ Avis, *Identity*, p.163.

¹¹⁹ The Archbishop’s Council, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Abuse (Forgiveness)* (London: Church House Publishing, 2017), pp.60-61.

¹²⁰ Avis, *Identity*, pp.156-157

¹²¹ Doctrine Commission, *Doctrine in the Church of England* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938), p.104.

¹²² Henry Chadwick, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p.382.

others sins, the faithless cannot impart faith”.¹²³ Those who had sinned were no longer Christians, and were excluded from the church to maintain its perfection.

Augustine used the allegory of two cities, the earthly and heavenly, both found within every individual’s heart. The individual’s allegiance to a particular city depended on the direction of their desires,¹²⁴ whether focused to the earthly and imperfect, or heavenly and perfect, and their actions will reflect their allegiance.¹²⁵ The church contains people whose lives are oriented both to the heavenly and earthly city. The church on earth is the ‘pilgrim church’ rather than the Heavenly Church, holding sin within itself, and will not be perfect until the eschaton. Although the Spirit is perfect, the church must be *semper reformanda* or *semper purificanda*:¹²⁶ always seeking to acknowledge its imperfections and ensuring its desires and practices are oriented toward the heavenly city. This allegory allows Augustine to “retain the ‘unholy’ within the institutional Church without destroying the integrity of the City of God – the true unity of the Church being eschatological rather than empirical”.¹²⁷

While Augustine’s acknowledgement of individual sinfulness goes some way to recognising sin within the church, it is a step further to acknowledge that the church as an organisation is sinful. As acknowledged above, this has been a stumbling block particularly for Catholic theologians and church leaders, who are committed to its uniqueness and ultimate perfection.¹²⁸ While other human organisations may be sinful, the church cannot be. However, this is challenged by Baum and other Liberation Theologians, such as Boff and Boff. They argue that the church is a human institution like any other, despite the special presence of the Holy Spirit, and therefore is capable of being a sinful structure.

¹²³ Peter Iver Kaufman, ‘Augustine, Evil and Donatism: Sin and Sanctity Before the Pelagian Controversy’, *Theological Studies* 51:1 (1990), pp.115-126, at p.118.

¹²⁴ The role of desire will be explored further when engaging with structural sin, and the role of capital as drawn from Bourdieu.

¹²⁵ Trevor Rowe, *St Augustine (‘Augustine’)* (London: Epworth Press, 1974), p.116.

¹²⁶ Healy, *Church*, p.10.

¹²⁷ Rowe, *Augustine*, p.122.

¹²⁸ As noted above, this is not a formal theological stance for the Church of England. However, as will be explored in Chapter Three, there is still a practical expectation of moral behaviour on clergy and church.

For Baum, the hierarchical nature of the Catholic Church makes it sinful. He states that the exercise of ecclesial authority does not respect the subjectivity of its members; this is sinful within the church, just as it would be in any other organisation. The church's recent social teaching is disconnected from its actual practice because its hierarchical structures negate the voices of its members.¹²⁹ Instead, the church should become "the community of the faithful living in comradely relationships of sharing, love, and service",¹³⁰ encouraging the participation and critique of all its members, lay as well as ordained.

I disagree with Baum's reading of hierarchy as intrinsically sinful.

Administrative structures, which include oversight and the delineation and coordination of roles, are necessary if a large group of people are to work together toward the same goal.¹³¹ There is consistent scriptural evidence of the setting aside of particular individuals for different responsibilities, and the handing-on of particular responsibilities to others when the burden of them becomes too much and distracts from the role that the individual should be focused on.¹³²

Instead, hierarchy becomes problematic when leaders begin to exploit individuals and direct them to their own end rather than the group's original end. This might be when the continuation of the organisation becomes more important than the carrying-out of its mission.¹³³ For the church, this might look like the original mission being twisted from creating new disciples of Christ to creating new members of a particular denomination, and maintaining that

¹²⁹ Baum, 'Structures', pp.124-125.

¹³⁰ Leonardo Boff and Clodovis Boff, *Introducing Liberation Theology (Liberation)* (Kent: Burns and Oates, 1987), p.59. This is based on an interpretation of the Early Church as depicted in Acts: "the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common... There was not a needy person among them, for as many as owned lands or houses sold them and brought the proceeds of what was sold. They laid it at the apostles' feet, and it was distributed to each as any had need". Acts 4:32, 34-35.

¹³¹ Palmer and Feldman, *Incomprehensible*, p.17. However, they do also note that administrative structures can also play a role in CSA.

¹³² Moses and the 70 elders (Numbers 11:11-17, 24-25); the Apostles appointing deacon or stewards to organise the distribution of food (Acts 6:1-6); and Christ choosing the 12 disciples (Luke 6:6-13), taking three with him up the mountain for the transfiguration (Luke 9:28), and appointing 70 for mission ahead of him (Luke 11:1).

¹³³ See Jeffrey Pfeffer, 'Beyond Management and the Worker: The Institutional Function of Management' ('Beyond'), *The Academy of Management Review* 1:2 (1976), pp.36-46.

denomination's structure and societal position. This is a possibility for any church, whether a large denomination or an independent congregation.

By contrast to Baum and other theologians engaging with structural sin, Healy appears uncomfortable with the idea that an institution can be called sinful. Instead, he argues that the church is sinful because it is shaped by its context, which is both Christian and secular: its orientation is toward both the earthly and heavenly city. Healy defines the church's context as "everything that affects the life and work of the church, including its history and its present concrete form".¹³⁴ This includes the contexts of its members, who "live in the world, their actions informed as much by their place there as by their life in the church. World and church are therefore mixed and mutually constitutive in the concrete".¹³⁵ Members' actions are informed by contexts which are both sinful and graced. These actions contribute to the formation of the organisational church, and thereby its affirmation or rejection of particular ways of acting in the world.

Accordingly, Healy argues that structures can be made sinful solely by the actions of people within them. This reflects the Catholic Church's unease with calling anything other than people sinful. In JP2's engagement with 'structures of sin', he argued that they could only be called 'sin' analogically, because only individuals can sin and be morally accountable for the structures they inhabit.¹³⁶ However, Healy's recognition of sin within the church is extensive enough for him to argue that ecclesiology can only offer a helpful description of the church if it accurately reflects the concrete church and its context, which requires the reality of sin to be acknowledged.¹³⁷

I go further than Healy and JP2 and am influenced more by Baum' and others' exploration of the structural nature of sin, and consider it applicable to the church despite the church's uniqueness. This will be explored in more depth in

¹³⁴ Healy, *Church*, p.22.

¹³⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.70. As will become clear, this resonates with Bourdieu's recognition of the overlapping of different fields which all work on and shape individuals' habitus.

¹³⁶ Christine Firer Hinze, 'The Drama of Social Sin and the (Im)Possibility of Solidarity: Reinhold Niebuhr and Modern Catholic Social Teaching' ('Solidarity'), *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22:4 (2009), pp.442-460, at pp.445.

¹³⁷ Healy, *Church*, p.49.

Chapter Three; for the purposes of this chapter, it is sufficient to recognise that church members and ministers can be sinful, and indeed that the organisational structures of the church can also be sinful. This must also be reflected in our ecclesiology, but has been lacking in more recent ecclesiologies, which reflect an approach to the church which Healy calls 'blueprint' ecclesiologies.

Issues with Blueprint Ecclesiologies

Healy suggests blueprint ecclesiologies describe "the church's theoretical and essential identity, rather than its concrete and historical identity".¹³⁸ Five key methodological moves contribute to this. First, single words or phrases are used to encapsulate the church's most essential characteristic. This includes Rahner's understanding of church as 'sacrament', Küng's 'herald', 'institution' as within late-19th and early-20th century Catholicism, the Ecumenical movement's emphasis on 'Communion', and Barth's 'Body of Christ', among others.¹³⁹ Second, the church is construed as having a dual structure, the primary being its spiritual and invisible essence, and the secondary being its everyday empirical reality. Third, these are combined to create normative descriptions of the church. Fourth and fifth, the church is largely reflected on abstractly and in terms of perfection.¹⁴⁰

There are strengths to this approach: it provides a standard against which critique is possible, contributes to ecumenism (all churches reflect, however imperfectly, their participation in the Universal Church), and emphasises the church's uniqueness and superiority.¹⁴¹ However, it also undervalues "the theological significance of the genuine struggles of the church's membership to live as disciples within the less-than-perfect church and within societies that are often unwilling to overlook the church's flaws".¹⁴² Blueprints collapse the difference between the pilgrim and triumphant church, when in reality there are significant differences between the two, especially the imperfection and sin within the pilgrim church.

¹³⁸ Healy, *Church*, p.3.

¹³⁹ Avery Dulles, *Models of Church* (expanded edition) (New York: Doubleday, 1987).

¹⁴⁰ Healy, *Church*, p.26.

¹⁴¹ Healy, *Church*, p.30.

¹⁴² Healy, *Church*, p.37.

Blueprint ecclesiologies are also limited and limiting: no one model is beyond critique and with explicatory power for all churches. This is partially because these models are influenced by one's theological imagination, which is dependent on "scripture and tradition, construed within a particular horizon,... an interpretation of the history of the church, a construal of Christianity and the mode of God's presence to the faithful, and a construal of the present ecclesial context".¹⁴³ The model that an individual prefers is shaped by the overarching metanarrative by which one interprets and understands the world, which is made up both of Christian and non-Christian ideas.

Healy notes that within Scripture there are multiple ways to talk about the church and affirms Lash's assertion that these shifting perspectives all illuminate different aspects of being the church. Rather than any one model becoming primary, all require the "corrective pressure" of the other.¹⁴⁴ This reflects Healy's argument, noted in the previous chapter, that it is only through engaging in debate between alternative truth claims, that we are able to get closer to the truth. All our models of church are provisional, including Healy's. It is only through further thought and testing against the reality of church life in different contexts that a fuller understanding of the pilgrim church can be gained.

Accordingly, Healy argues that "ecclesiology is better thought of as more of a practical and prophetic discipline than a speculative and systematic one".¹⁴⁵ A more ethnographic approach to ecclesiology is required, which examines the concrete church. This is more than the empirical identity of the organisation as against its spiritual aspects, as Healy refuses to split the two.¹⁴⁶ Both its organisational or empirical form and the active presence of the Holy Spirit are

¹⁴³ Healy, *Church*, p.43.

¹⁴⁴ Nicholas Lash, *Believing Three Ways in One God* (London: SCM Press, 1992), p.93. The importance of the interplay of tension is also present in the Anglican theological method which emphasises the interplay of Scripture, Tradition, and Reason: "these do not run side by side, as it were, but are fused creatively, reacting upon one another, modifying one another and generating new combinations". Avis, *Identity*, p.29.

¹⁴⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.21.

¹⁴⁶ Here Healy argues that he resists modern ecclesiology's use of the bipartite structure; I am not convinced that he achieves this. He does, however, emphasise that both aspects of the church are of equal importance, which is to be celebrated.

constitutive of the concrete church.¹⁴⁷ Ecclesiology should “reflect on the church’s concrete response to its Lord”, both historically and in the present day, and examine how far the church is living up to its calling.¹⁴⁸ This requires the church to acknowledge its sin in a way that blueprint ecclesiologies omit.

Healy’s Ecclesiology

Healy then offers his own understanding of the church’s essence and call. He argues that the church is not just an organisation, teaching a theory or system of beliefs. Instead, it is “a distinctive way of life, made possible by the gracious action of the Holy Spirit, which orientates its adherents to the Father through Jesus Christ”.¹⁴⁹ The church’s identity is more about what it does rather than its being, as it is constituted by the activity of the Holy Spirit and the believers: “the identity of the concrete church is not simply given; it is constructed and ever reconstructed by the grace-enabled activities of its members as they embody the church’s practices, beliefs and valuations”.¹⁵⁰ The extent to which the concrete church reflects its participation in the Universal Church is dependent on the extent to which its activities are oriented to the Father through Christ by the Spirit. This orientation makes the church unique, rather than perfection in the Spirit.¹⁵¹

The church is “entrusted with the apostolic task”, which is to witness to Christ and salvation.¹⁵² The extent to which it achieves its task is dependent on the extent to which living a Christian life appears possible and appealing. Healy suggests that “it must be possible to show that one can speak the truth and live truthfully; that one can do so without hurting anyone; and that the more truthful one is, the more likely it is that one will acknowledge and support those who are different”.¹⁵³ This does not mean that the church must portray itself as sinless. Instead, sin is part of what it is to be human, and what matters is the

¹⁴⁷ Healy, *Church*, p.4.

¹⁴⁸ Healy, *Church*, p.168.

¹⁴⁹ Healy, *Church*, p.4.

¹⁵⁰ Healy, *Church*, p.5.

¹⁵¹ Healy, *Church*, p.17.

¹⁵² Healy, *Church*, p.6.

¹⁵³ Healy, *Church*, p.115.

extent to which church and individuals can confess their failures and need for forgiveness, and continually seek to reorient their lives to Christ.¹⁵⁴

Healy emphasises that the church “exists in a particular time and place, and is prone to error and sin as it struggles, often confusedly, on its way”.¹⁵⁵

Acknowledging the sinful nature of the church enables this reorientation to Christ to be made more consistently. Assuming the church to be perfect makes it more likely that Christians will glory in the church, rather than in Christ crucified.¹⁵⁶ This leads to ecclesial pride, an investment in the concrete church rather than the Christ to whom the church should be oriented.¹⁵⁷ By contrast, acknowledging the church’s sinful nature leaves individuals more free to confess its failings, and change that which contributes to the church becoming more sinful rather than more Christ-like.

Ecclesiology must therefore work deliberately against ecclesial pride. Healy argues that “by talking about the church in ways that acknowledge its failings, even drawing attention to them, what we say about God becomes less easily confused with what we say about ourselves”.¹⁵⁸ Acknowledging the church is a human, fallible organisation creates space for recognising that this is not true of God. This is an issue which has been noted by survivors of abuse.¹⁵⁹ When abusers spiritualise abuse, it negatively impacts the survivor’s faith going forward, and their ability to disclose the abuse. If the ecclesiology of the church acknowledged the extent to which sin mars the church, this may offer a way for survivors to continue to practice their faith despite their abuse by ministers.

This does not mean that lay people should take responsibility for the abuse perpetrated by its clerical leaders, as Ethna Regan noted in the response of the Vatican to the Irish Catholic abuse scandals.¹⁶⁰ Healy is careful to acknowledge

¹⁵⁴ Healy, *Church*, p.14.

¹⁵⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.37.

¹⁵⁶ Galatians 6:14.

¹⁵⁷ This reflects Palmer and Feldman’s use of Weber’s Old Institutionalism. Managers become invested in the continuation of the institution rather than the achievement of its original end. It also reflects Bourdieu’s recognition that holding capital within a field means individuals are invested in maintaining that capital and that field as it is, regardless of its flaws. Hartill, *Sport*, p.196.

¹⁵⁸ Healy, *Church*, p.13.

¹⁵⁹ IICSA Research Team, *Religious*, p.51.

¹⁶⁰ Regan, ‘Credibility’, pp. 173-174.

the difference between “an individual disciple confessing his sins; the church confessing its present communal sinfulness; and the church acknowledging the sinfulness of a past form of its concrete identity”.¹⁶¹

Healy distinguishes between the church’s present and historic sinfulness. The relation between historic and current CSA within the church and society as a whole is complex, with some church leaders suggesting that past actions should not be judged by present standards.¹⁶² They suggest that the church’s unjust actions are indications of the church’s finitude, rather than deliberate sinfulness. This finitude should absolve the church from guilt as it was done out of ignorance rather than malice, according to the context and practices of the time.

However, as Healy points out,

the church was often able, even when it was small and weak, to distance itself, sometimes at great cost, from a number of ‘worldly’ cultural practices that it recognised to be sinful. At other times the church was such a powerful moral force within society that it could reasonably be held responsible for at least some of the flaws of its concrete identity.¹⁶³

Within IICSA, survivors have acknowledged their expectations that the church should be a guardian of morality, with a prophetic voice which would challenge immoral behaviour. In the time of Peter Ball’s offending, they continued to challenge perceived sexual immorality, whether the liberalisation of society’s perception of LGBT+ people, the increased availability of divorce, or other sexual liberation, while remaining silent on church-based CSA.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Healy, *Church*, p.163.

¹⁶² For example, George Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.21-24, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6029/view/public-hearing-transcript-24-july-2018.pdf>> 18/05/2020.

¹⁶³ Healy, *Church*, p.8.

¹⁶⁴ *Issues in Human Sexuality*, published in 1991, set out the Church of England’s perspective on gender roles, the role of sex, ‘homophilic’ people, sexual ethics, friendship and expectations upon clergy. There is a brief mention of CSA in the context of a paragraph on ‘Disorder in sexuality’, but not within the church. This publication remains definitive of the Church of England’s expectations of their clergy’s sexual lives. The Archbishops’ Council, *Issues in Human Sexuality (Issues)* (London: Church House Publishing, 1991), 3.18.

Despite society being increasingly aware of the harm caused by CSA, the church was slow to denounce its presence within itself, whether through ignorance, pride in the church, or reputational concern. Cultural or contextual expectations do not absolve guilt for this failing. Our present ecclesiology or understanding of the concrete church must take into account these historic sins, to prevent the church's current identity being governed by "unexamined construals of its history".¹⁶⁵ This requires prophetic critique of sinful church practices, whether they are present or historic. It is only through acknowledging and critiquing failures that alternative practices that lead to justice can be found.

Prophetic Critique of Church Practices

Healy argues that prophetic critique¹⁶⁶ of sinful church practices is necessary to enable the church to live up to its orientation to Christ and, through Christ, to the triune God. Sin mars all human thinking and actions, which means that the orientation to Christ can be lost.¹⁶⁷ Prophetic critique is a gift which enables reorientation to Christ. Ecclesiology, for Healy, must "reflect theologically and therefore critically upon the church's concrete history in order to help it boast in its Lord, and boast only in its Lord".¹⁶⁸

This calling to engage in prophetic critique of the church is challenging; it is usually only hindsight that allows reforms of church practice to be judged appropriate or necessary. Healy notes that "the history of the church indicates that serene reflection is the perquisite of those in power. Reforms, like doctrinal agreements, are usually the result, not of serenity, but of struggle and eventual compromise".¹⁶⁹ This connects with Foucault's recognition of the correlation between knowledge, truth, and power, as it is those with power who define the truth: to have an alternative perspective recognised as truth requires conflict.¹⁷⁰ The struggle for theological and ecclesiological reform has similar challenges to oppressed people's struggle for liberation. Narrating what the church should be is a form of power, and as Bourdieu noted, those with power in the church as it

¹⁶⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.162.

¹⁶⁶ Healy, *Church*, p.46.

¹⁶⁷ Healy, *Church*, p.72.

¹⁶⁸ Healy, *Church*, p.46.

¹⁶⁹ Healy, *Church*, p.38.

¹⁷⁰ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* (trans. Alan Sheridan) (London: Penguin, 1991), p.27.

is currently structured have an interest in maintaining those current structures and resisting change.¹⁷¹

Healy recognises that “judgements about the Christian thing, the concrete church and the ecclesial context cannot be avoided; they are part of any ecclesiology, whether they are acknowledged or not”.¹⁷² He argues that they should be made consciously and explicitly, naming sin, the oppression and injustice that they seek to avoid, and the vision of orientation to Christ that guides the judgements made.

Explicitly making judgements about the ‘Christian thing’ will lead to conflict in the church regarding how best to be Christian and to fulfil the apostolic task. This is in part because of sin within the church, and the way that the church is formed by the world, or context, in which it finds itself, which can include formation by both anti-Christ and non-church elements. Here, Healy makes a careful distinction between aspects of the world which are “actively working against Christ and his church”, and must be rejected, and that “which does not work against its creator and redeemer”, and are an acceptable influence on the concrete church.¹⁷³

Healy’s acknowledgement of the necessity of conflict to enable reform within the church as it seeks to orientate its life to Christ may be more controversial within Catholic rather than Anglican ecclesiology. Avis argues that “the ‘normal’ state of the Christian Church is to be seething with argument and controversy”, and that this debate is a sign that it is seeking to follow Christ with authenticity.¹⁷⁴ He claims that “authority within Anglicanism can always be questioned”,¹⁷⁵ and free inquiry and debate is encouraged to avoid the danger of quenching the Spirit, who constantly makes all things new. To work within Christian tradition does not simply mean maintaining past practices unchanged. Instead, he argues that “tradition is not only the Church remembering, but also

¹⁷¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice (Logic)* (trans. R. Nice), Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), p.57. This will be explored in greater depth later.

¹⁷² Healy, *Church*, p.47.

¹⁷³ Healy, *Church*, p.68.

¹⁷⁴ Avis, *Identity*, p.153.

¹⁷⁵ Avis, *Identity*, p.155.

the Church interpreting”.¹⁷⁶ While continuity with Scripture and church tradition is essential, this stands in tension with the need to ensure that the concrete church (to use Healy’s term) is proclaiming the gospel in a way that connects with its context.

The Church of England prides itself on being firmly incarnational, responding to the particular needs and context in which it finds itself.¹⁷⁷ While some aspects of Christian belief are maintained over and against the current context, the structure of the church is not necessarily included, and therefore there is capacity for reform where required. This incarnational nature is a double-edged sword, as the church can be shaped negatively as well as positively by its context.¹⁷⁸ One negative shaping might be a desire to maintain or increase the power and resources of the church and its leaders. This shapes the procedures the church follows in responding to CSA, as it seeks to protect its reputation and therefore its power. By contrast, a positive shaping might be the church’s engagement with the Charities Commission and wider societal laws, which have expectations around reporting safeguarding concerns. I maintain that the openness to reform of church structures remains a strength in the context of a structure which can be abusive.

The prophetic challenge of practices and structures which are not oriented to Christ is not just the responsibility of church leaders.¹⁷⁹ Instead, challenge can come from individuals inside or outside the church, who “challenge certain ecclesial cultural patterns as embodying either hitherto unnoticed anti-Christ or presently unsuitable non-church elements”.¹⁸⁰ The individual is crucial in forming the church’s concrete identity, as individuals who witness to Christ in their everyday lives enable the church to fulfil its apostolic task. However, the church is also crucial in the individual’s identity as a disciple: it initially

¹⁷⁶ Avis, *Identity*, p.124; see pp.124-125.

¹⁷⁷ Avis, *Identity*, p.111.

¹⁷⁸ The extent to which the gospel can or should inculturate is a longstanding debate. For a classic exploration of the debate, see H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), particularly pp.39-44.

¹⁷⁹ As noted above, Bourdieu suggests that this may be impossible given the level of commitment leaders have to the continuation of their organisation. Niebuhr affirms this. See Firer Hinze, ‘Solidarity’, p.452.

¹⁸⁰ Healy, *Church*, p.71.

mediates Christ's call to salvation for individuals, and then forms the individual into a disciple of Christ through education and pastoral care.¹⁸¹

Reflecting Bourdieu, Healy articulates a dialectic between the individual and the group, the disciple and the church, both of which form each other. He argues that "the church is not the kind of collective that demands the individual give herself over to the group without remainder".¹⁸² Instead, the Spirit is the one who calls particular people to be Christian, as individuals, with their own role, gifts and tasks. The church is only the mediator of that individual's call. Thus he is able to say that "the courage displayed by any good disciple is a contributing factor in the tense relation between the individual and the church".¹⁸³ This is the role of the prophetic in Healy's ecclesiology: the individual challenges the presence of sin in the organisational structure or patterns of behaviour in the church.

While Healy speaks much more about the role of the prophetic individual, different organisations can also challenge each other's practices. As mentioned above, the Charities Commission has a significant role in the structures of churches. The Church of England remains part of the governance of the UK, and as such decisions made by its Synod need to be ratified in parliament.¹⁸⁴ IICSA's recommendations will also be influential on the church's practice going forward. All these organisations are non-churchly. The next step of Healy's argument sees the Spirit at work in the wider world as well as the church. It is therefore legitimate for the church to be shaped by these other organisations.

The Work of the Holy Spirit in Church and Society

Healy argues that non-churchly learning is helpful for the church because it can be orientated to Christ,¹⁸⁵ made possible because Healy acknowledges the Spirit's presence and work in the non-church world as well as the church. As a Catholic, Healy acknowledges his commitment to the church, but recognises

¹⁸¹ Healy, *Church*, pp.7, 64.

¹⁸² Healy, *Church*, p.179.

¹⁸³ Healy, *Church*, p.71.

¹⁸⁴ Parliament, 'Twentieth Century', *Living Heritage: Religion and Belief*, accessed online at <<https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/private-lives/religion/overview/twentiethcentury-/>> 22/07/2020.

¹⁸⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.69, 75.

that “God is the solution to the problems of the world, not the church. The church, although oriented to, and governed by, the solution, still remains part of the problem”.¹⁸⁶ He acknowledges that the church is marred by sin, so our theological conclusions must be tentative and preliminary this side of the eschaton; and that the Spirit freely works outside the church. Accordingly, non-church actions may be more oriented to Christ than church activities.

In his analysis of how God works in the world, Healy draws heavily on Hans Urs von Balthasar’s ‘theodramatic’ theory.¹⁸⁷ Balthasar conceived the different dynamics of the relationship between God, church, and world as perspectives on a play. Healy emphasises two perspectives, the epic and the dramatic.¹⁸⁸ Epic theology is written from the perspective of an audience member of the drama, and gives a full view, tending toward systematisation. While this is satisfying, it assumes that Christianity runs mechanistically, which means that new developments are not recognised. It tends to idealise or simplify, thus distorting the theological account; blueprint ecclesiologies may be an example of this. Alternatively, dramatic theology is written from the perspective of a participant in the drama, recognising the “tentative and conflictual nature of Christian existence”.¹⁸⁹ This perspective acknowledges the fallibility and incompleteness of human knowledge of the world and God, as reflected by the ongoing tensions present in differing experiences and world views.

Dramatic theology emphasises the struggle inherent in the pilgrim church, as “our own resources provide no trustworthy basis for constructing epic systems of belief and practice”.¹⁹⁰ Healy notes that the “human search for truth, even

¹⁸⁶ Healy, *Church*, p.12.

¹⁸⁷ My use of Balthasar’s theodramatic theory is somewhat controversial. As Beattie notes, the imagery Balthasar uses for Father, Son, Spirit, world, and church expresses a “violent rhetoric of sex, death and sacrifice”, with the relationship of creator and created being one of active, generative, pure ‘male’ over against the passive, receptive, unclean ‘female’, who can be violated and abused by the creator. This is particularly problematic in the context of a thesis examining CSA. My use of Balthasar’s theodramatic construction is not agreement with the rest of his imagery or theology. Tina Beattie, ‘Sex, Death and Melodrama: A Feminist Critique of Hans Urs von Balthasar’, *The Way* 44:4 (2005), pp.160-176, at p.161.

¹⁸⁸ Balthasar names a third, the lyric, which emphasises the individual, experiential aspect of faith. Healy acknowledges this aspect of Christian living, but does not build his ecclesiology upon it. Wesley Vander Lugt, *Living Theodrama* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2014), p.11.

¹⁸⁹ Healy, *Church*, p.54.

¹⁹⁰ Healy, *Church*, p.104.

when it is undertaken within the church, will always go astray without the active presence of the Spirit".¹⁹¹ Balthasar argues that Scripture portrays the faithful life as dramatic. It narrates the ways that God's people learnt more of God's character and purposes, the mistakes they made, and the consequences of human activity without the Spirit enlivening it. Scripture's dramatic narrative is capacious enough for both sinful and graced activity being present in one individual life.¹⁹² This perception of human life reflects that sketched above in Augustine's *City of God*.

Balthasar also argues that the 'earthly' theodrama is reflective of the primary, heavenly drama, authored by the Father, directed by the Spirit and acted primarily by the Son. The heavenly drama is of good versus evil, God versus sin and the devil. Christ's crucifixion and resurrection draws into the Godhead the human experience of alienation from God, but also enables participation in God's love. In the incarnation, Christ "makes it possible for us, both as individuals and as the church, to play our respective parts within the 'all-embracing drama'".¹⁹³

Balthasar emphasises that humans retain their freedom to act within the theodrama, and therefore that the struggle between good and evil continues even after Christ's resurrection. Our part is to follow Christ in gratitude, working toward bringing near the Kingdom of God. However, we do not know, and can choose not to follow, the heavenly 'script' of the drama. Therefore, the struggle waxes and wanes dependent on the decisions made every day by individuals, and the extent to which they play the part laid out for them. For Balthasar, "the more we give ourselves up to discipleship,... the more we become who we really are in Christ".¹⁹⁴ In becoming who we are in Christ our actions become increasingly aligned to the heavenly part of the theodrama.

Balthasar also argues that the Incarnation implies the whole of creation, rather than just the church, is brought into the theodrama, and that the struggle

¹⁹¹ Healy, *Church*, p.113.

¹⁹² Healy, *Church*, p.60.

¹⁹³ Healy, *Church*, p.62.

¹⁹⁴ Healy, *Church*, p.63.

between good and evil is at play in every person's choices.¹⁹⁵ Divine and human agency are both at play in all aspects of human existence, leaving the possibility of both graced and sinful human action in both churchly and non-churchly contexts. Hence, we "consider *all* religious and non-religious bodies to be constituted concretely by both kinds of agency, divine and human".¹⁹⁶

Accordingly, the church can learn to better follow Christ through the activities of non-church individuals or groups, because of the presence of the Spirit working in that context.¹⁹⁷ The church should watch for the Spirit's work outside the church, and actively seek to participate.¹⁹⁸ It is, for example, appropriate for secular safeguarding and organisational structures to shape the practice of the church, and for the church to engage openly with IICSA and allow it to challenge and seek to improve the church's practices.

While Balthasar and Healy agree that people can follow Christ through the prompting of the Spirit whether inside or outside of the church, they argue that being a member of the church gives a distinctive edge to the individual's work within the theodrama. Membership in the church gives individuals a deeper understanding of the drama in which they are living, giving them the opportunity to explicitly "adopt [Christ's] standpoint... and to receive the fullness of his power so that they can continue his work in the world".¹⁹⁹

However, as stated above, this is not to imply that the individual loses their subjectivity: it was as an individual that they were originally called by Christ. Membership of the church is an aid to Christian discipleship, its responsibility being to shape them further into active participants in the theodrama following Christ. As noted at the beginning of this section, the church remains 'part of the problem', not the solution, and the call on the individual remains key in enabling the church to point to Christ. Conflict, given the 'mutually constitutive' nature of church and world, remains. It is a mark of the dramatic rather than

¹⁹⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.66.

¹⁹⁶ Healy, *Church*, p.67.

¹⁹⁷ Healy, *Church*, p.64.

¹⁹⁸ Healy, *Church*, p.74.

¹⁹⁹ Hans Urs von Balthasar (trans. Graham Harrison), *Theo-Drama* vol.III (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), p.279.

epic nature of our view of the theodrama, and should be accepted and worked through to enable the church to make decisions which are more closely oriented to Christ.

I argue that appropriate safeguarding and compassionate and just responses to abuse allegations are integral to following Christ. In failing to protect vulnerable individuals from harm and in failing to ensure justice for survivors and perpetrators of abuse, the church fails in its call to proclaim Christ. It is through engaging with secular learning and government guidance, and being open to the prophetic critique which survivors and safeguarding professionals offer, that the church will be able to orient itself more closely to Christ.

Engaging with conflicting truth claims

As explored in the previous chapter, for Healy it is appropriate for the church to engage with different disciplines' learning on safeguarding and organisational structure because they have a shared understanding of rationality. Truth is something real which can be understood, and it is through challenge and debate that people's beliefs and theories get nearer to the truth. The emphasis on the necessity of debate for seeking truth relates to Balthasar's dramatic perspective: the presence of conflicting truth claims implies that no tradition possesses the truth in its epic form, so people from different traditions must engage with each other.²⁰⁰ The church's position within the theodrama provides a metanarrative to understand the church's sinfulness, while still privileging it as the place where the world and God is most clearly understood, and affirming God's presence and work within the world. It "permits us to bring the other within God's overarching play without harmful loss or occlusion of difference".²⁰¹

However, Healy does acknowledge that the quest for truth can still be dominative or sinful, especially if powerful voices drown out those with less power but which may be closer to the truth. This is particularly possible in the context of CSA within the church, when survivors find themselves silenced, marginalised, and ignored. For the truth to be found, debate needs to happen

²⁰⁰ Healy, *Church*, p.127.

²⁰¹ Healy, *Church*, p.146.

with humility and deep listening, in which less powerful voices are given space to speak and their words engaged with on the strength of what they say, not the power that stands behind their words.²⁰² In the context of abuse as a misuse of power, the danger is that the church's response to abuse survivors is re-abusive as it uses its own power to silence those attempting to speak truth to it.

Healy is careful not to argue that powerful voices are problematic. Power itself is not sinful. How it is used, to enable or stifle discussion or debate, is what makes it good or sinful. Similarly, he notes that structures or organisations are not intrinsically bad; instead, "the power of sin is active everywhere, not only in systems, but in those who seek to dissolve them".²⁰³ He notes that structures can be a force for good, a necessary means of enabling the flourishing of a community, and can enable individuals to follow Christ more closely.

Nevertheless, both power and organisational structures must be used carefully and be open to review and critique.²⁰⁴ This review should examine how far all those who engage with them are treated with respect due to their creation in the *Imago Dei*, with inherent dignity and worth.²⁰⁵

As the church seeks its flourishing and its further orientation to Christ, there will be debate, both within the church and with other organisations, about what this orientation might look like. Rather than avoiding this conflict, it should be embraced, though Healy does give guidelines for discerning the right orientation for the church. He emphasises that there are no 'impartial observers' of organisations, as people's perspectives and understanding of truth and flourishing are shaped by the communities of which they are a part, the things they value and the focus of their desires.²⁰⁶ Therefore Healy privileges the critiques of insiders, particularly academic theologians. He argues that their knowledge of the church and the theological resources of the tradition, and their commitment to seeking a closer orientation to Christ, will mean that they

²⁰² Healy, *Church*, p.125.

²⁰³ Healy, *Church*, p.114.

²⁰⁴ Healy, *Church*, p.71.

²⁰⁵ A theme drawn from Liberation Theology, and explored further in Chapter Three.

²⁰⁶ Or as Bourdieu would put it, the field they exist within, the habitus formed within them, and the capital that they desire.

are more likely to come to appropriate judgements about the concrete church that will enable effective reform.²⁰⁷

While it is important that voices with experience and expertise are given sufficient weight in decision-making, I challenge this claim. As noted previously, Bourdieu emphasises that it is powerful individuals with capital in a field who are likely to be committed to maintaining the status quo. The danger in Healy's assertion is that this further strengthens the voice of the powerful and therefore makes reform more difficult.

However, Healy does also emphasise the need to listen to marginalised voices, who may have a very different perspective on the church and its (lack of) justice: "laypeople, women, majorities and minorities of various kinds... may have clearer insights into its sinfulness and inadequacies, into the challenges it faces, and perhaps as to how it should be reformed".²⁰⁸ Despite emphasising the need to listen to marginalised voices, Healy does not explore how this can be done in conjunction with privileging the voices of insiders.

Though challenging, it is also important to note that the suggestions made by survivors may not be effective or feasible in the church context.²⁰⁹ Similarly, while the desire for children and vulnerable adults to be fully safe all the time is understandable, there is an element of risk to every aspect of life: risk can be minimised, but not fully removed. Nor are survivor or safeguarding professional voices monolithic; instead, there are a variety of perspectives, as can be seen in the questions around whether reporting safeguarding concerns to the police should be made mandatory under law.²¹⁰ Decisions do have to be made about how to weigh opposing views, and it may be that the voices that best know the church are best placed to weigh them.

However, Healy's prioritisation of inside voices is particularly difficult when survivors of abuse have deliberately left the church and do not wish to be

²⁰⁷ Healy, *Church*, pp.176-178.

²⁰⁸ Healy, *Church*, pp.177-178.

²⁰⁹ This reflects the issues with recommendations made after inquiries. Burgess, 'Character', p.22.

²¹⁰ As acknowledged by the Inquiry Panel in their interim report on the Anglican hearings. The Inquiry Panel, *Interim*, p.97-98.

associated further with it, but still desire reform. Their appropriate anger at the church means that church leaders respond defensively, and their lack of commitment to the church may mean that leaders are less likely to engage properly with the suggestions that survivors make. While the voices of insiders are valuable, I challenge Healy's conclusion that their perspective should be privileged; indeed, it already is, given that they are likely to have greater access to opportunities for their voice to be heard. Instead, the voices of outsiders – such as survivors or safeguarding professionals – are those unheard, and should therefore be privileged. Here I draw on Boff and Boff's interpretation of the inherent value and voice of every individual, and the framing of the church's calling as being "sign and instrument of liberation".²¹¹ Such an approach creates a space, missing in Healy's work, to listen to the voices of survivors of abuse and those non-churchly experts.

Healy also caveats his acknowledgement of the church's need to learn from 'worldly' authorities. He emphasises that sociological analysis of the church needs theological assessment and modification before it can be applied to the church, as it often comes from an atheist or agnostic perspective.²¹² He argues against indiscriminately forcing the structures of the church into a non-churchly organisational or structural framework: "Practical-Prophetic ecclesiology must deny – if it is to be truly prophetic – any proposal to change the concrete church made merely in order that it may better fit the norms of a non-Christian worldview or social context".²¹³ Here he argues against a liberal reading of Christianity which he correlates with practical theology, because it distorts "Christian theology by uncritically assimilating normative humanistic beliefs".²¹⁴

This is an unfortunate use of the term 'practical theology'. Healy himself recognises that his ecclesiology does have similarities to his depiction of practical theology, but articulates a difference based on theology critiquing

²¹¹ Liberation in a holistic sense that goes beyond the economic and includes salvation. Boff and Boff, *Liberation*, p. 59.

²¹² Healy, *Church*, pp.164-165.

²¹³ Healy, *Church*, p.50.

²¹⁴ Healy, *Church*, p.49.

secular learning. However, I argue that effective practical theology as practiced in an academic setting does emphasise that theology must critique secular learning as well as secular learning critiquing theology.²¹⁵ In defining practical theology, Pattison and Woodward state that the *dialogue* between religious belief and contemporary experiences is “mutually enriching, intellectually critical and practically transforming”.²¹⁶ I argue that this is precisely what Healy is seeking to achieve in his formation of Practical-Prophetic ecclesiology.

Healy’s critique of practical theology is based on the need for depictions of church history to acknowledge the work of God and the role of human sin in the history of the church. An agnostic or atheistic stance on church history “must bracket out the Director and key actor in the theodrama...; hardly a neutral or adequate approach to ecclesiology”.²¹⁷ This is a valid critique; to ignore the presence and work of God in an examination of the church or Christian history will be a partial and inadequate view. To purely examine the organisational structure of the church, as we might through Palmer and Feldman’s organisational theory, or the way that its patterns of belonging and behaving reflect Bourdieu’s framework of field, habitus, and capital, without acknowledging the influence of both God and sin, would be inadequate. Healy’s ecclesiology emphasises the need to understand God’s work in the church and the world.

However, Healy’s privileging of theological discourse and the danger of reductively describing the church according to non-churchly standpoints reduces the force of his argument that different knowledge bases share a system of rationality that can enable debate and mutual seeking after truth. While the church’s orientation to Christ does make it distinctive and should be taken into account, I argue that the organisational theory of Palmer and

²¹⁵ A significant practical theology methodology in the UK is the Pastoral Cycle, which begins with articulating the experience that is being examined, interpreting it in the light of secular learning, analysing that secular learning and experience against theological concepts, and then leading into a new way of acting. Paul Ballard and John Pritchard, *Practical Theology in Action* (London: SPCK, 2006), especially pp.85-86.

²¹⁶ Stephen Pattison and James Woodward, ‘An Introduction to Pastoral and Practical Theology’, in James Woodward and Stephen Pattison (eds), *The Blackwell Reader in Pastoral and Practical Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2000), pp.1-19, at p.7.

²¹⁷ Healy, *Church*, p.159.

Feldman and Hartill's sociological theory²¹⁸ do leave space for the presence and work of God when applied to the church. This thesis seeks to add the aspect of human existence which they do not mention, through Healy's ecclesiology and structural aspects of sin.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored how far the church can be understood as sinful by distinguishing the eschatological perfection of the Universal Church from the concrete church's present fallible and provisional nature. God's unique work in the church does not prevent the church and its members from being sinful. Instead, the work of God through the whole world has been articulated using Balthasar's theodramatic theory, leading to an understanding of the churchly and non-churchly world being both sinful and graced. Therefore all individuals have a responsibility to challenge sin within the church, as a means of enabling it to fully live out its mission. Likewise, the church can and should learn from non-churchly disciplines to enable the church to be oriented more closely to Christ, therefore fulfilling its task of proclaiming Christ's glory, and drawing people into the church.

Healy draws back from fully engaging with the more radical conclusions of his argument. He emphasises the need for any thinking about the church to be fully theological, and to privilege the voices of insiders while also listening to the voices of the marginalised. This is a challenging line to walk, particularly as the voices of insiders are automatically privileged by their position. However, the overarching direction of his ecclesiology calls for engagement with voices such as those of survivors of abuse, safeguarding professionals, and experts in other disciplines. These can critique the church's failings and suggest how they can be ameliorated, and the church reoriented to Christ.

I now move to the next theological driver, structural sin, which is drawn from Liberation Theology. This will ensure that this analysis of the church's failings remains profoundly theological while acknowledging the role of the church's organisational structure in the abuse it has perpetrated.

²¹⁸ Explored in Chapter Four.

Chapter 3 - Structural Sin as a Theological Driver

After exploring the extent to which the church can be understood as holding sin within itself, and the way that it is formed by both churchly and non-churchly beliefs, I now turn to structural sin. This provides a means of understanding how an institution can be sinful beyond the sinful actions of individuals; and can shape individuals' beliefs and actions to make them more likely to be sinful. I begin by briefly exploring how structural sin relates to other concepts of sin within Christian tradition, before engaging with critiques of structural sin by theologians such as Healy who argue that it is not sufficiently theological. I then explore structural sin in greater depth, drawing on its role in Catholic social teaching and the work of JP2. Here I examine the extent to which there are connections between Healy's work with structural sin, and how this relates to the Church of England's practices as expressed within the IICSA transcripts. I draw on Reinhold Niebuhr's work to explore the group leader's influence on structures of sin. I examine how far the church can be understood as a structure of sin, given that Liberation Theology applies the concept to meta-institutions such as capitalist economic frameworks. Finally, I suggest ways of challenging structural sin which can be applied to church practices.

How does Structural Sin fit in with other concepts of Sin in Christian tradition?

Sin is a key concept with Christianity, but like many such concepts, is difficult to define precisely because its meaning has shifted throughout history and in different contexts.²¹⁹ McFadyen argues that "sin is an essentially relational language, speaking of pathology with an inbuilt and at least implicit reference to our relation to God"; and that "such pathology, however else it may be described and identified in nontheological languages, is theological: disruption of our proper relation to God".²²⁰ 'Sin' is an inherently theological way of articulating the 'pathology' that mars human-human and human-divine relationships. McFadyen argues that CSA is the example *par excellence* of the

²¹⁹ An example being the change in metaphors of sin through the Hebrew Bible from a weight to a debt, which was then taken up by the Early Church. Gary Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

²²⁰ Alistair McFadyen, *Bound to Sin (Bound)* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), pp.4-5.

distortion of human-human relationships and is so destructive of the child that it “cannot *adequately* be understood except with reference to the denial of and opposition to God which characterises sin”.²²¹

McFadyen argues that sin is a precondition of freedom, drawing on the concept of original sin, as originally developed by Augustine. All humans are capable of sin, due to the freedom that they have to not choose the good. This shapes all human interactions, as “we inherit... the *consequences* of a past history of freedom as they distort the conditions of communication and relation... in which we are situated”.²²² This ongoing distortion makes it increasingly difficult to not act sinfully.

Understanding sin as going beyond deliberately malicious acts raises questions about human freedom and responsibility, and whether individuals can be blamed for sinful actions which they cannot escape. This is distasteful because it “offends against the most fundamental, twin tenets of natural, rational and just moral order: that we are held to account only for our own free acts, what we have done (which are acts of our person) and that which we could have avoided doing”.²²³ The key precept of modernity, that the individual and his or her autonomy is primary, is challenged, as original sin “characterises the human situation in terms of bondage to sin, not of freedom”.²²⁴

Original sin was developed by Liberation Theologians into a particular aspect of sin, known variously as structural or social sin. Theologians such as Gustavo Gutierrez, Leonardo and Clodovis Boff, and Jon Sobrino, among others, argued that Jesus’ life was one of poverty, marginalisation, and working against the unjust structures of the Roman Empire and religion of his day. Within Liberation Theology, sin became understood as not simply an individual’s moral failing.²²⁵ Instead, sin also has a social dimension which “encompasses the

²²¹ McFadyen, *Bound*, p.54.

²²² McFadyen, *Bound*, p.36.

²²³ McFadyen, *Bound*, p.21.

²²⁴ McFadyen, *Bound*, p.27. Questions of freedom and constraint are also raised by Bourdieu’s work, and will be explored in Chapter Four.

²²⁵ This is not to minimise the recognition of personal sin within Liberation Theology: “sin is always *both* personal and social in nature”. It is primarily a break in relationship with God. Derek Nelson, *Sin: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2011), p.107.

unjust structures, distorted consciousness, and collective actions and inaction that facilitate injustice and dehumanisation”.²²⁶

Accordingly, Christian faith is not solely about spiritual salvation or liberation, but also physical liberation from unjust structures or systems of marginalisation: “the true form of faith is ‘political love’”.²²⁷ Practical, faith-based action must empower those whose ability to flourish is impaired by the structures or situations in which they live. One example of physical liberation is challenging the prevalence of ‘sinful’ socioeconomic structures, whether unjust governments, employment relationships, or meta-institutions such as colonialism, capitalism, or patriarchy.²²⁸ Liberation from unjust societal structures is not the only, or even most important, form of liberation or salvation. Instead, it is one part of a holistic salvation set within a framework of repentance, conversion and faith in Christ which incorporates individuals into the Body of Christ, and who then work to bring near the Kingdom of God. Thus “liberation theology... works on the question of social and historical liberation within the larger framework of integral – human and divine – liberation”.²²⁹

While the Church of England’s engagement with structural sin has not been as noticeable as that of the Catholic Church,²³⁰ the famous 1985 *Faith in the City* report recognised the structural nature of poverty and has been influential on the church’s ongoing social action and theology.²³¹ This may strengthen the Church of England’s ecclesiology which is more open to acknowledging the church’s capacity to sin, therefore making it more open to reform.

²²⁶ Heyer, ‘Neighbours’, p.413.

²²⁷ Boff and Boff, *Liberation*, p.39.

²²⁸ Baum, ‘Structures’, pp.111-112. See also Boff and Boff, *Liberation*, pp.1-9.

²²⁹ Boff and Boff, *Liberation*, p.91; see also pp.32-35.

²³⁰ Though this has not been without challenge; there has been significant tension between Magisterial teaching and Liberation Theologians regarding how far sin can be understood as an impersonal force independent of the actions of individuals. Conor M. Kelly, ‘The Nature and Operation of Structural Sin: Additional Insights from Theology and Moral Psychology’ (‘Operation’), *Theological Studies* 80:2 (2019), pp.293-327, at p.296.

²³¹ Archbishops’ Commission on Urban Priority Areas, *Faith in the City* (London: Church House Publishing, 1985). For a helpful overview of Anglican Social Theology, including the influence and shortcomings of Liberation Theology, see Malcolm Brown (ed.), *Anglican Social Theology* (London: Church House Publishing, 2014).

Critiques of the Theology Behind Structural Sin

McFadyen challenges the theological thinking behind structural sin, arguing that it is an attempt to re-engage with original sin, but by de-theologising it. It acknowledges the extent to which individuals' freedom is restricted, through a "thoroughgoing substitution of social categories for the ontological and metaphysical language through which the doctrine of original sin is traditionally expressed".²³² For McFadyen, it does not go far enough in returning the language of God's action in the world to the public sphere.²³³ I agree that it is possible to use the language of structural sin while ignoring its grounding in the profoundly theological liberation approach. However, this reading is an injustice to the wider framework which bases liberation on right relationship with God for both individuals and communities, which is intrinsically theological. Indeed, it is the concept's ability to straddle both churchly and non-churchly conversations which makes it particularly helpful for this thesis.

Healy has similar concerns regarding the lack of overt theology within Liberation Theology. He perceives a totalising discourse that tends to minimise the particular role of God and Christian church in the world's liberation. He suggests that in some of Boff's writing,²³⁴ the church's "primary function seems to be to provide religious motivation for liberative praxis... the specific practices and beliefs by which the primary, universal ecclesial core is realised in the visible church are of secondary importance compared with the question of their conformity to the universal norm of liberation".²³⁵ However, I still argue that Boff's understanding of liberation is profoundly theological; this practical liberation is part of a holistic understanding of liberation based on right relationship with God for individuals and communities. At the core is a theological anthropology which emphasises the inherent value of all people made in the *Imago Dei*. Just as human sinfulness is theological but has human impact, so too must salvation, redemption and liberation.

²³² McFadyen, *Bound*, p.36.

²³³ McFadyen, *Bound*, p.41.

²³⁴ Leonardo Boff, *Faith on the Edge* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989), p.190.

²³⁵ Healy, *Church*, p.142.

Healy does acknowledge this. Referencing Sykes, he notes “the language of sociology and the language of theology may be separate, but the reality of divine and human power is not. It is not parallel or merely coordinated; it is inevitably, and dangerously mixed”.²³⁶ His emphasis on both Spirit and sin being at work in church and world highlights that the orientation to Christ must be both theologically based and practically minded. Drawing sociological and organisational theories into conversation with the theological frameworks of structural sin, the inherent value of all humans made in the *Imago Dei*, and the eschatological hope for the flourishing and empowerment of all marginalised people,²³⁷ can provide insight into the structures and practices of the church as organisation and individuals. The presence of the Holy Spirit working in both world and church gives hope for change, both spiritual and physical salvation and liberation.

Given the lack of clarity for both McFadyen and Healy around the theology behind structural sin, I turn to explore it more closely. Baum argues that the “human vocation [is] to be a responsible agent or ‘subject’ of society and of all the institutions belonging to it”.²³⁸ Structural sin is classed as sin because organisations and the powerful individuals within them see other individuals as objects rather than subjects. This is sinful because a Christian theological anthropology recognises all individuals as made in the *Imago Dei*, of individual value and with free will and therefore agency. As part of being made in the image of a trinitarian, profoundly relational God, humans are made for relationship, both with God and each other, and flourish within community.²³⁹

In structural sin, individuals are seen as objects, not subjects, lacking in agency and to be exploited. An individual’s thirst for profit and power becomes absolute and sinful, as they objectify and exploit other people, no longer recognising their needs and inherent value.²⁴⁰ This dynamic can occur both in an individual and an organisation. As will be explored below, a capitalist

²³⁶ Stephen Sykes, *The Identity of Christianity* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press: 1984), p.207.

²³⁷ As will happen in Chapter Four.

²³⁸ Baum, ‘Structures’, p.116.

²³⁹ Daniel K. Finn, ‘What is a Sinful Social Structure?’ (‘Sinful’), *Theological Studies* 77:1 (2016), pp.136-164, at p.143.

²⁴⁰ Baum, ‘Structures’, p.117.

framework can influence the understanding of individuals as objects rather than subjects.

Objectifying individuals is influential on abuse: perpetrators use others as a source of status by means of asserting their power and control.²⁴¹ Palmer and Feldman note that workers within an organisation can be perceived purely as a labour source, rather than valued individuals with particular needs.²⁴² In the context of IICSA, this also relates to the way that victim-survivors are viewed by the church; rather than subjects deserving of care, as problems to be solved or ignored.²⁴³ Healy might frame this as people glorying in the church rather than in Christ, and not respecting the survivor's role in shaping and prophetically challenging the church.

A further theological question is the extent to which people are free to make choices or have their behaviour shaped, either by human institutions or by God's omniscience and omnipotence. McFadyen notes that the doctrine of original sin remains a significant source of tension. However, Finn argues that the presence of original sin which translates into social sin does not completely remove an individual's freedom: "People retain their freedom, even though that freedom is exercised within constraints that make some choices more costly than others".²⁴⁴ Healy recognises the costly tension between individual and church community when they speak out prophetically, to the extent that individuals may choose to stay silent when they see injustice, because they value their position and relationships in the church more highly.

In this vein, Finn notes that "Because resistance entails a price, most people most of the time make decisions that avoid significant costs and provide significant benefits. They 'go along' and sustain the existing social structure by

²⁴¹ Hartill, *Sport*, p.100.

²⁴² Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.25-26.

²⁴³ As Welby acknowledged: "We have not yet found the proper way of dealing properly with complainants and taking them seriously, listening to them, not telling them to shut up and go away, which is what we did for decades. Which was evil. It's more than just a wrong thing: it's a deeply evil act". Justin Welby, cited in Fraser Nelson, 'Justin Welby's Reformation', *The Spectator* 26/01/2019, accessed online at <<https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/justin-welby-s-reformation>> 29/04/2020.

²⁴⁴ Finn, 'Sinful', p.152.

their compliance”.²⁴⁵ He argues that change is generated by those who advocate for a better position for themselves within an organisation.²⁴⁶ While this is significant in beginning a conversation about change, I argue that this is often insufficient, as those in power within the organisation are unlikely to agree to changes which reduce their power or reward.²⁴⁷ Firer Hinze notes that this will lead to conflict between powerful and marginalised.²⁴⁸ While survivors and church members and leaders remain free to challenge structures of sin, doing so can be costly, particularly if they remain committed to the institution. The presence of original or structural sin does not remove an individual’s freedom to act justly but makes it more difficult to do so.

Finally, earthly liberation from injustice is not the end of God’s liberating action. Instead, earthly liberation is a historical grasping of an eschatological reality, in which “creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and will obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God”.²⁴⁹ God’s saving work is holistic; both physical and spiritual, for humans and for all creation. Spiritual salvation from sin is matched by the outworking of Christian discipleship; just as salvation restores an individual’s relationship with God, it should also restore the bonds of relationship between individuals.

This demands work toward ending situations of injustice, poverty and oppression, which conceal the dignity and interrelation of all those created in the *Imago Dei*. Jesus’ proclaimed at the beginning of his ministry, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour”.²⁵⁰ Within Liberation Theology, the ‘preferential option for the poor’ emphasises that “the living God sides with the oppressed against the pharaohs of this world”.²⁵¹ Historical liberation from situations of oppression in imitation

²⁴⁵ Finn, ‘Sinful’, p.153.

²⁴⁶ Finn, ‘Sinful’, p.153.

²⁴⁷ Noted in Chapter One, campaigning in the nineteenth century to lower the age of consent required media pressure, active campaign groups, and engaged politicians.

²⁴⁸ Firer Hinze, ‘Solidarity’, pp.447-448. A theme also picked up by Healy.

²⁴⁹ Romans 8:21.

²⁵⁰ Luke 4:18-19, referencing Isaiah 61:1-2.

²⁵¹ Boff and Boff, ‘Liberation’, p.50.

of Christ anticipates and incarnates the eternal liberation which will be made real at the eschaton.²⁵²

This anticipation of eschatological liberation is the driving force behind any work for freedom and justice in the present day. This might look like economic reform as Liberation Theologians originally perceived it, or work against other forms of injustice, including racism, sexism, homophobia, or the structural issues which influence church-based CSA. All are shaped by the presence of sin within organisations and human society. Only after acknowledging this social or structural sin can liberating action begin.

Social Sin, Structural Sin, and Structures of Sin

The difference between social sin, structural sin, and structures of sin is not clearly defined within the literature, with terms being used interchangeably or based on the author's personal preference. I draw on JP2's four depictions of social sin, while extending the work with Kelly's understanding of structures of sin, which are those aspects of sin which are more deeply influenced by the institutions or structures within which human life functions.

Firer Hinze notes four depictions of social sin within JP2's writing. First, being the effect of an individual's sins which ripple through relationships due to our interdependence: we are in a 'communion of sin' just as we are in a 'communion of saints'.²⁵³ This may illuminate the impact of abuse on a community, even for those who were not abused, because it breaks trust and raises questions for people about whether they should have known that abuse was occurring, or if they could have done anything, or even whether they believe the allegations.²⁵⁴ As noted in Chapter Two, the church's role is to make following Christ look feasible, and as if it is possible to do without hurting anybody; when abuse is discovered within a church, it places this into question.

Second, sin is social if an individual deliberately mistreats another, rejecting Christ's command to love one's neighbour.²⁵⁵ This reflects Ball's abusive

²⁵² Boff and Boff, 'Liberation', p.53.

²⁵³ Firer Hinze, 'Solidarity', p.444.

²⁵⁴ Colin Perkins, *IICSA Transcript 16/03/2018*, p. 177.

²⁵⁵ Firer Hinze, 'Solidarity', p.444.

behaviour; while cloaked in love and spiritual concern, his actions were damaging to those he abused. This is a failure to follow and glorify Christ.

Third, 'structures of sin' are created when unjust social dynamics become entrenched and perceived as impersonal forces. For JP2 these are only analogically 'sin', as only individuals can truly sin and remain morally accountable for the structures they live within and benefit from.²⁵⁶ Church procedures for dealing with abuse allegations are reflected within IICSA reports as structures of sin. Perceived as "severely retraumatizing"²⁵⁷ by survivors, their emphasis appears to be protecting the perpetrator and the church's reputation and power, rather than caring for the survivor. Another example is the perception of Carey's decisions being unchallengeable, partially because of his role and authority as Archbishop, but also because of the "archepiscopal explosions"²⁵⁸ which would be a result of challenges; both structure and individual are at play.

Fourth, sinful social structures are sinful of themselves without reference to their participants' intentions or benefits; this is rejected by Catholic teaching, as it removes personal culpability for the sin that occurs.²⁵⁹ I argue that this is visible when bishops claim they cannot demand appropriate safeguarding from their clergy, despite being responsible for everything that happens within their diocese.²⁶⁰ It is visible in the archbishops' lack of disciplinary power over their fellow-bishops,²⁶¹ and in the disciplinary procedures which are not effective in

²⁵⁶ Firer Hinze, 'Solidarity', pp.444-445.

²⁵⁷ 'V', cited in Andrew Graystone (ed.), 'We Asked for Bread but you gave us Stones', p.10, accessed online at <<http://abuselaw.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Stones-not-Bread.pdf>> 29/04/2020. Similar language is also used within IICSA.

²⁵⁸ Andrew Nunn, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, pp.106-108, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6142/view/public-hearing-transcript-26-july-2018.pdf>> 25/07/2020.

²⁵⁹ Firer Hinze, 'Solidarity', p.445.

²⁶⁰ As noted in the Diocese of Chichester, with Bishop John Hind unable to make the Dean of the Cathedral follow safeguarding guidance in the context of a review of abuse in the cathedral (Edna Carmi, *IICSA Transcript 20/03/18*, pp.33-34, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4697/view/20-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 04/08/2020), and a more general inability to monitor the conditions of a PTO (Wallace Benn, *IICSA Transcript 12/03/18*, pp.94-96, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4409/view/-12-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 04/08/20).

²⁶¹ In 1992, when Ball was arrested, there was no power to suspend a bishop on disciplinary grounds. However, as of 2016, the primate of the province now holds this authority. Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.8.

safeguarding complaints.²⁶² It appears that power is somehow disseminated within church structures, rather than resting with individuals.

The third and fourth are more stereotypically understood as structural sin within Liberation Theology; the personal nature of sin is less obvious as one goes down the list. It suggests there is a dialectic between personal and social sin: “structures are both consequential and causal in nature, and we are subjectively responsible for sinful situations yet remain subject to external influences”.²⁶³ Healy noted the interplay of individual and church community in shaping the church’s practice and doctrine, and thereby shaping individuals’ discipleship; the articulation of structural sin notes how sin is a personal choice, but one that is impacted by forces outside our control. Thus Faus’ tautological statement: “when human beings sin, they create structures of sin, which, in their turn, make human beings sin”.²⁶⁴

Kelly defines a ‘structure of sin’ as “an institution or collective practice that either socially idealises or economically incentivises actions seeking exclusive self-interest(s) at the expense of the common good”.²⁶⁵ I argue that the economic and social incentives which condition behaviour also shape the church. As people become increasingly committed to the church rather than Christ,²⁶⁶ decisions made about their individual actions and church policies are more likely to be influenced by the impact that they have on the organisational church continuing and flourishing, rather than the proclamation of Christ and flourishing of its members. Concealing abuse protects the church’s reputation in the short term, minimising negative impacts on the church’s mission and

²⁶² This was acknowledged by various witnesses, both lay and ordained, throughout the IICSA hearings, among them Justin Welby. Work to reform the CDM (Clergy Disciplinary Measure) is ongoing. Justin Welby, *IICSA Transcript 11/07/2019*, pp.208-210, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/12777/view/public-hearing-transcript-11-july-2019.pdf>> 04/08/2020.

²⁶³ Heyer, ‘Neighbours’, p.425.

²⁶⁴ José Ignacio González Faus, ‘Sin’, in Ignacio Ellacuriá and Jon Sobrino (eds), *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993), pp.532–542, at p.537. As will be explored in the next chapter, it also resonates with Bourdieu’s recognition that the Field of a community or organisation both shapes, and is shaped by, the Habitus of the individuals within it, as a “structured and structuring structure”. Pierre Bourdieu, *Masculine Domination (Masculine)* (trans. R. Nice) (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), p.84.

²⁶⁵ Kelly, ‘Operation’, p.301.

²⁶⁶ Or ‘glory’ in the church rather than Christ.

economic standing. Kelly suggests that sins are more likely to continue dependent on their profitability;²⁶⁷ concealment of CSA within the church is therefore likely to continue for as long as it remains a 'profitable' (whether financially or socially) response.

Similarly, Kelly's emphasis on self-interest being 'exclusive' is important, as self-interest can positively impact common good. One can have self-interest in building up social capital, which is necessary for community cohesion, but it benefits more than oneself. Other aspects of self-interest which are exclusive are sinful because they are opposed to the common good. Organisations or institutions are not, of necessity, sinful: generally neutral, the shape of particular organisations and how they relate to their context and influence the behaviour of those within it defines whether they are sinful. The church can serve the common good, in the ministry that it offers to the community; or it can be exploitative and serve its own self-interest.

Furthermore, an institution may initially have served the common good based on its original context. However, contexts change. Institutions which remain fixed may become a source of injustice rather than serve their contexts.²⁶⁸ Avis notes that the governance structures of the Church of England, despite the addition of synodical structures for lay as well as ordained members, is still relatively unchanged from the pre-reformation Catholic understanding of the diocese as the key structure of the church,²⁶⁹ which has influenced the CSA within the church. Structures, policies, and procedures must change over time in response to further learning so that the church's practices remain appropriate.

Kelly also notes the concept of emergence: "simple parts can combine to create a new whole with its own properties and its own reality that are not reducible to the sum of its component pieces".²⁷⁰ He uses a molecule of water, H₂O, as an example to note that two hydrogen molecules and a molecule of oxygen have different properties alone, to when they are combined. This concept has

²⁶⁷ Kelly, 'Operation', p.308.

²⁶⁸ Kelly, 'Operation', p.297.

²⁶⁹ Avis, *Identity*, p.159.

²⁷⁰ Kelly, 'Operation', p.297.

explanatory power for how decisions made within organisations can have unforeseen consequences, and that structures of sin can lead to consequences that are distinct from moral agents' intentions.²⁷¹ Taking out insurance against clergy being accused of CSA was meant to protect the church financially from the cost of reparations; however, it also means that responses to survivors are given a legal and financial framework, and that pastoral care or responsibility can be forgotten.²⁷² Similarly, concerns about whether safeguarding responsibilities should be removed from dioceses or the wider church acknowledge the danger of emergence; while greater independence for safeguarding may make the church more accountable, it may also leave safeguarding advisors detached from the contexts they are responsible for, reducing the sense of trust and knowledge they can build with individuals, parishes, and communities.²⁷³

Kelly suggests three understandings of how structural sin functions can be synthesised to create a thicker description of structural sin at work. These go beyond JP2's depictions of different forms of structural sin to explore how these structures shape people's understandings of the world and therefore their propensity to sin, in a similar way to original sin. First, structures of sin influence individuals through conscience formation, and actively skew individuals' perspectives around right and wrong.²⁷⁴ Those responsible for the church's teaching ministry should carefully consider the subtext of what they say or the expectations that they have around being respected. If a deferential culture is formed over one that enables prophetic critique or constructive criticism, abusers can more easily overcome an individual's resistance, and others within the congregation are less likely to speak out when they suspect abuse.

²⁷¹ Kelly, 'Operation', p.299. See also Finn, 'Sinful', p.151.

²⁷² Ian Elliott, *IICSA Transcript 02/07/2019*, p.22, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/12363/view/public-hearing-transcript-2-july-2019.pdf>> 05/08/2020.

²⁷³ Megg Munn, *IICSA Transcript 09/07/2019*, pp.141-143, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/12713/view/public-hearing-transcript-9-july-2019.pdf>> 27/08/2020.

²⁷⁴ Kelly, 'Operation', p.305.

Second, structures of sin can preserve moral ignorance, thereby passively concealing the immoral consequences of particular actions.²⁷⁵ Baum frames this as the “blindness produced in persons by the dominant culture, blindness that prevents them from recognising the evil dimension of their social reality. Exploitative institutions are successfully maintained because they are made to appear legitimate to their participants”.²⁷⁶ The church’s safeguarding practices were perceived as appropriate and legitimate by church leaders, despite survivors terming them ‘retraumatising’. Nominating a safeguarding team means church leaders can assign responsibility and therefore knowledge of safeguarding concerns to others, meaning their desire to change church structures because of knowing the harm they can do is minimised. Baum argues that instead a process of ‘conscientization’ needs to occur, when participants are made aware of the harm done.²⁷⁷

Third, structures condition the exercise of individuals’ free will to make their choices more likely to be sinful.²⁷⁸ Being part of a church may restrict the choices that an individual can make; if prophetic challenge is not encouraged, individuals may not speak out against harmful practices.²⁷⁹ This is reflected in bishops asking survivors not to testify.²⁸⁰ These aspects of how structural sin functions shape individuals’ behaviour and thereby influence the morality of their actions.

The Role of Group Leaders in Influencing Structural Sin

An organisation shapes its members’ behaviour by expecting them to act within shared norms. Healy has acknowledged that individuals must challenge sinful behaviour within their organisation; they must also challenge shared norms which contribute to the organisation being structurally sinful. The organisation’s leader has increased responsibility for the organisation’s culture.

²⁷⁵ Kelly, ‘Operation’, p.305.

²⁷⁶ Baum, ‘Structures’, p.113.

²⁷⁷ Baum, ‘Structures’, p.111.

²⁷⁸ Kelly, ‘Operation’, p.305.

²⁷⁹ Hartill suggests that people may remain free to speak out against abuse, but may decide that the cost of doing so is too high. Hartill, *Sport*, p.205.

²⁸⁰ Ros Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, pp.156-162, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6142/view/public-hearing-transcript-26-july-2018.pdf>> 04/08/2020.

However, as was acknowledged by Healy, and will be explored in greater depth in the next chapter, those who are deeply committed to an organisation may struggle to challenge its sinful actions or structures because their identity is bound up in the organisation. They may be blind to the sin, or recognise it but benefit from it, as those structures are what has enabled the organisation to gather power, which leaders benefit from. Baum argues that one's personal responsibility for structures of sin increases "in proportion to one's closeness to the decision-making elite".²⁸¹ Blindness to the sinful structures from which one benefits does not excuse inaction. However, action may be difficult for leaders, who may find themselves acting against their own habitus and organisational expectations.

Reinhold Niebuhr's analysis of group behaviour particularly speaks into leadership within structures of sin. While not using the term 'structural sin', he acknowledged that sinfulness is an inescapable human condition.²⁸² Niebuhr argues that groups are less morally responsible than individuals. He suggests that it is easier for an individual to consider others' viewpoints or act against their best interests.²⁸³ A group is "more arrogant, hypocritical, self-centred and more ruthless in the pursuit of its ends than the individual".²⁸⁴ The urge to self-preservation and power is strengthened in the 'collective egoism' of the group, as consensus forms more easily around selfish concerns for the group's flourishing, rather than considering those outside the group.²⁸⁵ Firer Hinze suggests that "groups themselves are incapable of self-sacrifice; leaders, obligated to advance their members' collective interests, never have warrant to altruistically override them".²⁸⁶

²⁸¹ Baum, 'Structures', p.119.

²⁸² Interestingly, Kelly notes that Protestant theologians are better placed to acknowledge the role of structural sin, as they have "historically, tended to focus more on sin as a condition... whereas Catholic theology has, historically, tended to focus more on sins as moral acts". Kelly, 'Operation', p.307.

²⁸³ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society (Immoral)* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), xi-xii.

²⁸⁴ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man, vol.1* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), p.208.

²⁸⁵ Niebuhr, *Immoral*, xxi, pp.35-38, 48.

²⁸⁶ Firer Hinze, 'Solidarity', p.452. This also links with Weber's 'Old Institutionalism', where the role of the leader is protecting the institution rather than individuals.

An example might be Ball continuing to minister despite rumours of inappropriate behaviour being known within the church.²⁸⁷ Those who disclosed abuse by Ball were not given support but excluded. If an individual within a group begins to challenge the group's actions, they may be excluded on the grounds that harm to an individual is counted less important than the continuation of the group. This leaves Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors (DSAs) in a difficult position, seeking to balance their continued presence in the diocese as an authoritative expert with the need to maintain good relationships with others in the diocese so that they follow the DSA's recommendations.²⁸⁸

Therefore, there is a dialectic between the leader and the group: while it would be satisfying to solely blame church leaders or individual abusers for sin committed by themselves or by their organisation, the whole organisation retains a wider responsibility. However, it is important to note that this responsibility is not shared equally. Regan notes the anger among lay Irish Catholics at clerical leadership which enabled and concealed abuse, and the Vatican's "undifferentiated apportioning of blame that is not matched with an inclusive apportioning of responsibility for reform and renewal".²⁸⁹ Baum suggests that for most church members, the appropriate spiritual response to increased awareness of structural sin is mourning, as part of the process of conversion and conscientisation of the way that we benefited from structures of sin.²⁹⁰ This then leads to action to challenge structures of sin and seek reform to ensure that these structures serve the common good, rather than their own ends.

This recognition of responsibility shared within the system as well as individuals relates to the Public Health approach, though the recognition of

²⁸⁷ The IICSA Panel, *Interim*, p.119.

²⁸⁸ The first DSA in Chichester, Janet Hind, noted that she "was coming in as a sort of new professional voice to a structure that had been working for centuries, and... none of us really recognised what effect that would have and that we needed some renegotiation of roles... I was viewed as an adviser rather than as somebody whose advice had to be taken". Janet Hind, *IICSA Transcript 09/03/2018*, p.56, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4389/view/9-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 03/02/2020. Similar things were said by other early safeguarding advisors within the church, though much less the case in the present day. It was also noted by Hartill in the context of safeguarding officers within sports clubs. Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', p.615.

²⁸⁹ Regan, 'Credibility', p.174.

²⁹⁰ Baum, 'Structures', p.119.

structural sin may only respond to abuse already committed rather than the Public Health approach which seeks to prevent CSA. This is based on further research into prevalence and risk factors, which results in policy and actions to reduce these risks, and further education through accurate media reporting to the public.²⁹¹ However, by becoming increasingly attuned to structures of sin, church members may be able to challenge unjust structures before they enable abuse.

How is the Church to be understood as a Structure of Sin?

As structural or social sin is a concept drawn from Liberation Theology, much of the work done focuses on how macro structures, such as economic systems, can be structures of sin. Boff and Boff suggest that the infrastructure of oppression is poverty, which is maintained by an unjust capitalist system. Within this, further discrimination on the grounds of race, culture, gender, and I add sexuality, compounds that original oppression.²⁹² This raises questions around how far smaller organisations, such as churches, denominations, schools or prisons, can be structures of sin.

I begin by defining an institution. As sociologists and organisational theorists note, the concept of family or marriage, the Christian church or an individual denomination or an individual church, or the education system or an individual school, can all be understood as an institution, which means that any work that does not set clear parameters lacks rigour. Kelly defines institutions as “the form connecting individuals around shared norms”.²⁹³ While this is a broad definition the emphasis on shared norms is helpful.²⁹⁴

²⁹¹ Elizabeth Letourneau *et al.*, ‘The Need for a Comprehensive Public Health Approach to Preventing Child Sexual Abuse’, *Public Health Reports* 129:3 (2014), pp.222-228, at pp.226-227.

²⁹² Boff and Boff, ‘Liberation’, pp.29, 47.

²⁹³ Kelly, ‘Operation’, p.302.

²⁹⁴ Kelly argues this is more helpful than the CDF’s definition of social structures as “the sets of institutions and practices which people find already existing or which they create, on the national and international level, and which orientate or organise economic, social and political life”. The CDF definition prioritises the macro, ignoring how smaller institutions, such as individual parishes, can also be structures of sin. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Instruction on Christian Freedom and Liberation” (22/03/86) 74, accessed online at <http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19860322_freedom-liberation_en.html> 16/04/2020. Kelly, ‘Operation’, p.301. It also corresponds more closely to Hartill’s use of Bourdieu’s sociology, and with Palmer and Feldman’s reliance on New Institutionalism. In New Institutionalism,

Accordingly, organisations such as schools, the judicial system, and churches can all be understood as institutions based on their formation around shared norms, and by the above definitions are therefore capable of being structures of sin. This definition also allows organisations which are smaller than systems, such as individual schools, religious communities, or churches, which are formed around shared norms, to be influenced by structural sin.

The previous chapter acknowledged that it was possible for the church to be sinful; this chapter acknowledges that this sin may be influenced by the structure of the organisation rather than solely the individuals within it. This may influence the prevalence of or response to CSA. In the context of the Church of England and Peter Ball's abuse, it allows for Ball's Scheme to be structurally sinful rather than just Ball himself, and that the Church of England's response to Ball's abuse was structurally sinful, rather than a result of individual failures. It creates a framework for understanding church structures as having shaped individuals' behaviour negatively, making it more likely to be sinful. Therefore, the responsibility for sin is held both by the individual and the structure they worked within and were influenced by.

As noted previously, Healy acknowledged that individuals function within and are shaped by churchly and non-churchly organisations.²⁹⁵ The capitalist framework which influences structural sin, and other frameworks or institutions,²⁹⁶ may also shape churchly behaviour. The church may be structured along capitalist lines, which may influence how church leaders think about and engage with church members.

Hartill and Baum frame capitalism as a means of instrumentalising human life. The rationality emphasised is instrumental reason, which reduces the world to

institutions are defined as "more-or-less taken-for-granted repetitive social behaviour that is underpinned by normative systems and cognitive understandings that give meaning to social exchange and thus enable self-reproducing social order". Royston Greenwood *et al*, 'Introduction' in Royston Greenwood *et al* (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Organisational Institutionalism* (London: Sage Publications, 2008), pp.1-46, at pp.4-5. However, I do not wish to imply that the impact of structural sin will be the same in all these institutions; a larger institution's structural sin will have a wider impact than one which is smaller.

²⁹⁵ This is heavily influenced by Bourdieu, and will be explored in Chapter Four.

²⁹⁶ Others include legal expectations from the government, the Charities Commission and its expectations about finances and safeguarding, or wider cultural assumptions around patriarchy.

“mere objects, and reason’s task is only to show how best to manipulate these objects, be they natural or human objects”.²⁹⁷ Hartill suggest that “an instrumentalist approach to life, where everything, including human beings, is commodified, works to install in the habitus the notion that other people, including children, are means-to-ends, tools, available to be exploited in the individualist, culturally legitimised pursuit of personal and organisational desires”.²⁹⁸ Within the church, as a result of capitalism those who may perpetrate CSA are already partially accustomed to viewing children as tools to satisfy their desires. Leaders who receive allegations of abuse have their response shaped by personal and organisational desires to protect their reputation and power. They may also instrumentalise the survivor, seeing them as an object hindering the organisation’s desires and power, and therefore respond exploitatively rather than with care.

This is particularly true when the perpetrator has significant power or authority within the organisation, as did Ball. Those with power shape the organisation, and the organisation is therefore dependent on them, and shaped to protect them. Ultimately, individuals’ desires are shaped to protect the church; or, to use Healy’s more theological language, to glory in the church rather than Christ. The organisation’s wellbeing and reputation becomes bound up with the wellbeing and reputation of those in authority, such as Ball. This meant when Ball’s abuse was disclosed, the church’s priority was to protect him in order to protect itself, rather than to care for Ball’s survivors.

This process of self-preservation is how institutions, including the church, become structures of sin. While church leaders may theologically recognise every person’s inherent value, being made in the *Imago Dei*, this may not influence their actions: instead, particular individuals are valued more highly based on their capital and what they offer to the organisation’s survival. The survival of the organisation in its current form becomes an absolute, an idol that must be maintained at all costs. Similarly, while church leaders may recognise theologically that individuals within it are capable of sin, and that its own

²⁹⁷ Alan How, *Critical Theory* (Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), p.117.

²⁹⁸ Hartill, *Sport*, p.103.

structures may be structures of sin, this may not influence their responses to abuse allegations.

Furthermore, while the Church of England's academic theology recognises the fallibility or even sinfulness of its ministers, the church's practical teaching is not unequivocal about this. Article XXVI states that "in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments",²⁹⁹ thereby recognising that clergy can be sinful. However, clergy are still held to a higher standard of morality than the laity: "people not only inside the church but outside it believe rightly that in the way of life of an ordained minister they ought to be able to see a pattern which the Church commends".³⁰⁰ By maintaining a (not necessarily false) assumption that clergy will behave morally, they nevertheless also obscure the possibility that they may behave sinfully.

Similarly, expectations of appropriate and moral behaviour from clergy are stronger than those expectations on leaders from other contexts because of the church's, and thereby the clergy's, position as a moral leader. As recognised in Chapter One, this makes abuse perpetrated by clergy deeply problematic. While some people within the church may have the theological training or personal experience to recognise that clergy are capable of sin, this is not always shared by those without extensive experience of the church.³⁰¹ This was acknowledged by Neil Todd's father in a recent documentary: "you think, if they're going to the church, there's no other safer space that they can be, especially when they're supposed to be this great bishop".³⁰²

²⁹⁹ The Archbishops' Council, Article XXVI, 'Articles of Religion', *The Book of Common Prayer*, accessed online at <<https://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-and-worship/worship-texts-and-resources/book-common-prayer/articles-religion#XIX>> 22/04/2020.

³⁰⁰ The Archbishops' Council, *Issues*, p.44.

³⁰¹ However, given the current abuse scandals and furore around human sexuality, I suspect that a high proportion of the population will now be deeply disillusioned with the church as a source of morality.

³⁰² Jim Todd, *Exposed: The Church's Darkest Secret*, BBC2, 13/1/2020. This belief was shared by many survivors and their families through IICSA.

Further work is required around conscientisation: to ensure that the assumptions around the church's and its clergy's perfection or sinfulness are accurate. The teaching ministry of the church must acknowledge the complexity of individual and institutional life, and the capacity for graced and sinful behaviour to coexist in the same individual or organisation. This may mean giving up some of the authority that the church is used to holding and opening itself to greater scrutiny from its congregations. Nevertheless, it will be an important part of the church beginning to challenge the extent that its own structures are sinful, and I examine this further below.

How Is Structural Sin Challenged?

Liberation Theologians argue that solidarity is the most effective means of challenging and converting structures of sin. The call to solidarity is based on human relatedness or interdependence, which means there is an "obligation to take appropriate responsibility for the relations in which one is enmeshed".³⁰³ All are responsible for ensuring that those to whom they relate can flourish and live free from oppression, and that social structures contribute to the common good.

As noted previously, Kelly argues that structures of sin are those which have a negative impact on the common good. He uses a definition of the common good from *Gaudium et Spes* as "the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfilment".³⁰⁴ This definition recognises that individuals are more able to flourish together than alone; that a collective can hold resources in common, whether tangible resources or skills, which offer individuals a better quality of life together than apart.

Seeking to work toward the common good through solidarity and transformation of structures of sin is not solely a human responsibility. Indeed, the presence of sin within human society and individuals means that this is

³⁰³ Firer Hinze, 'Solidarity', p.446.

³⁰⁴ Vatican Council, *Pastoral constitution on the Church in the modern world: Gaudium et Spes* (07/12/1965) 26, accessed online at <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html> 16/04/2020.

impossible on a human level. Instead, it is empowered by the presence of the Holy Spirit at work within the individual and society: “social sin has to be opposed by social grace, *fruit of God’s gift* and of human endeavour inspired by God”.³⁰⁵ This responsibility is not just for those within one’s social circle, but also those an individual is dependent on because they are connected by trade or service.³⁰⁶ This extends the bonds of responsibility beyond those we relate to on a regular basis to those who we may not personally be aware of.

Thus, Firer Hinze draws on Unger to note the “moral torpor” among rich Christians, who do not contribute to the alleviation of poverty in the way that their solidarity demands of them.³⁰⁷ Unger argues that this is because of geographical and social distance, informational ambiguity, and experiential indirectness.³⁰⁸ Firer Hinze notes particularly that “consumer culture fosters dispositions and practices - of having over being, individualism over community, and power- and security-seeking over open-handed and -hearted generosity - that oppose authentic fulfilment and breed injustice”.³⁰⁹ These dynamics work against the solidarity that Liberation Theology calls for as a means of ending oppression and injustice.

These dispositions and practices fostered by consumer culture are present within the church’s response to CSA: a prioritisation of maintaining financial resource and social standing over caring for those harmed by the church; a distancing of the church from the victim/survivors through a refusal to engage with them; and an emphasis on the individual responsibilities of abusive clergy rather than the re-abusive response of the whole church.

As noted previously, seeking solidarity between powerful and marginalised is challenging, as it “demands major changes of perspective and commitment”.³¹⁰ This change comes at a price for those who have previously benefitted from injustice, and therefore influences how far those in power are willing to change.

³⁰⁵ Boff and Boff, *Liberation*, p.62. My emphasis.

³⁰⁶ Particularly given Liberation Theology’s emphasis on economic oppression.

³⁰⁷ Firer Hinze, ‘Solidarity’, p.448.

³⁰⁸ Peter Unger, *Living High and Letting Die* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp.33-36.

³⁰⁹ Firer Hinze, ‘Solidarity’, p.449.

³¹⁰ Firer Hinze, ‘Solidarity’, p.447.

Survivors' perceptions of the church as being unwilling to listen to survivor voices, or to change its practices, or failing to provide appropriate pastoral care or financial support, are indicative of this conflict. Unger's recognition of the difficulty of social distance and experiential indirectness in encouraging appropriate moral responses to injustice or abuse emphasises the need for increased conscientisation as a resource for encouraging greater solidarity. It is only as church leaders are made aware of their relation to survivors, encouraged to hear their stories and their pain, that there will be an impetus for change and care.

This is not about changing the church's teaching about what an appropriate response to survivors of CSA at the hands of the church is, by prioritising experience over doctrine. Instead, it is about allowing individuals' experiences to point out the ways that church practice and policies which are not fixed aspects of the church have failed to reflect the Christian call to love of neighbour. Healy would frame this as responding to the prophetic call to become more closely oriented to Christ: it is recognising that some church practices gloried in the church rather than in Christ. It is an acknowledgement that the Spirit moves in places other than the church, and that the Spirit's judgement and call to repentance and change can be heard as survivors share their experiences.

As noted above, Niebuhr's 'collective ego' illuminates the difficulty that groups of people or institutions have in caring for the wellbeing of those outside their group. Niebuhr questions how the common good is defined, and whether it is possible for one group to define it for a whole society. Society is made up of a multitude of groups or institutions, all of whom will have a different perspective on what the common good is. What may appear good for one group may not be the common good. Similarly, the common good as currently defined may not be the best for a particular organisation. This leads to tension as different groups seek to make their own understanding of the common good definitive.³¹¹

³¹¹ Rowan Williams articulated the importance of ongoing engagement, challenge and open debate from all groups as society seeks to conclude what the common good looks like for them. He values the state as providing "the stable climate for all first-level communities to flourish and the means for settling, and enforcing, 'boundary disputes' between them". Rowan Williams,

Niebuhr argues that ensuring that different groups do not overstep their bounds and begin to cause harm to those outside their group requires different groups' power to be balanced against each other.³¹² Thus DSAs need sufficient power to challenge the church's previous practice and to insist on appropriate safeguarding responses.

It remains crucial in Niebuhr's thought that there continues to be a balance of power between different institutions: the church must remain able to critique the state, as the state does the church.³¹³ This is controversial in the context of such significant sin within the church, and the church appearing to view itself as above the law in the way it responded to CSA allegations. However, it is important to remember that the wider IICSA's evidence shows that CSA is not unique to the church, but also occurs within other religious organisations, online, in the family, for looked-after children, by councils, and custodial organisations, among others.³¹⁴ Those who have spoken out against CSA come from both religious and secular backgrounds, and it is important to balance both individual and organisational responsibility. All human structures are capable of being structures of sin, and all humans are equally capable of making prophetic critiques of sinful structures, whether churchgoers or not. Working against marginalisation and seeking solidarity is a task for all, whether churchly or non-churchly.

This seeking of solidarity with the marginalised and social change must be based on real engagement with the experience of those who are marginalised,

Faith in the Public Square (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), p.50. This also reflects Death's understanding of the state as a 'governing force'. Death, *Governing*, p.4.

³¹² Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man, vol.2* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), pp.256-268. Millbank challenges the perception that power is the key structuring principle of human society, pointing out that political power is always "mediated in a language which ruled and ruler hold in common". It makes a claim to legitimacy and seeks to persuade the ruled that their course of action is synonymous with serving the common good. Instead, Millbank suggests that ethics is the key structuring principle. See John Millbank, *The Word Made Strange* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1997), pp.233-254, at p.241.

³¹³ The extent to which this is possible for an established church is questionable. As was noted within IICSA, Ball, his supporters, and Carey made use of their links with police, royalty, and judiciary while attempting to influence the investigation of Ball's crimes. Church and State are intertwined, and to a certain extent dependent on each other, so the extent of the independence between the two is minimal. This will impact on the level of critique each gives the other.

³¹⁴ For a full list of the investigations, see IICSA, 'Investigations', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/Investigations>> 27/04/2020.

listening to their voices and allowing those perspectives to shape our responses and actions going forward. However, the difficulty is how marginalised voices, for example CSA survivors, are balanced with expert voices, both from the church and safeguarding professions. Liberation Theologians argue that the survivor voice must come first; this is reflected in the emphasis on survivor engagement within IICSA,³¹⁵ and the lack of engagement with perpetrator voices. As noted when discussing Healy's work, the balance between engaging with expert voices who already have significant power and authority within a field on account of their expertise, and survivors who are often marginalised, is difficult. Chichester Diocese has used the services of an Independent Domestic and Sexual Violence Advisor to offer independent advocacy to survivors, to ensure that their voices and perspectives are heard. This may be one way to redress the balance.³¹⁶

Conclusion

Structural sin is a helpful theological resource for understanding CSA within the church. It provides a theological language for understanding the way in which institutions can be sinful based on their organisational structures, rather than just individuals' actions. This is crucial in encouraging clergy and church leadership to engage with the learning of secular disciplines.

Structural sin theologically articulates the dialectic between personal freedom and responsibility, and organisational constraint, similarly to the social sciences which will be explored in Chapter Four. It names the harm that can be caused by organisational practices, and that this harm can go beyond that which was foreseen or intentional. It also recognises that the structures, ideas, and practices of the church can also cause harm; that the presence of the Spirit within the church does not make it blameless. It offers a theological rationale for organisational change within the church, based on the recognition that all individuals are made in the *Imago Dei*, and therefore worthy of dignity and care;

³¹⁵ Though this is not without challenge: various survivor groups dropped out of the inquiry because they perceived the IICSA to lack independence. Sandra Laville, 'Child abuse inquiry 'to continue' despite survivors' withdrawal', *The Guardian*, 18/11/2016, accessed online at <<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/nov/18/child-abuse-survivors-group-withdraws-from-contrived-uk-inquiry>> 05/08/2020.

³¹⁶ The Inquiry Panel, *Interim*, pp.84-85.

and that to value the church above God and individuals, as Healy suggested, is a form of idolatry.

I argue that the Church of England's structures are influential on the CSA within it. The perpetration of CSA and the responses to disclosures of CSA remain individuals' problems. I do not wish to absolve an abuser of the responsibility for their actions, nor those who responded to allegations of CSA of their responsibility to act in a way that reflected God's care for the inherent dignity and worth of the victim-survivors. Ball remains responsible for his actions, as does Carey for his.

However, the human, sinful desire for preservation of wealth and power, and the influence of collective egoism and structures of authority cannot be ignored as a contributing factor to abuse and the response to allegations. The way that Ball's sexuality was shaped in part by the church's theology, and the responsibility that Carey felt to maintain the reputation and power of the church also impacted on the choices that both made. To ignore this would be to have an incomplete picture of what is at play in the full story of CSA within the church, which continues before and beyond the sexual abuse and its disclosure. My hope is that this will encourage church leaders to think more carefully about the consequences of the church structures which they create and are created by, and thereby begin to reshape our churches in a way that can lead for greater justice for all its members, including those who have been abused.

The influence that institutions can have on the CSA that occurs within them has been explored in greater depth by organisational theorists such as Donald Palmer and Valerie Feldman, and sociologists such as Michael Hartill. Their non-churchly theories offer a closer framework for understanding the CSA within diverse organisations such as schools, sports clubs, residential homes, and churches. Their concepts also correspond to Healy's ecclesiology and to the structural sin, thereby linking non-churchly with churchly thinking. These theories deepen the understanding of the CSA within the church; using them in this way is appropriate and useful for the furthering of the church's mission. It is to them that I now turn.

Chapter 4 - Organisational and Sociological Approaches to CSA

Previous chapters in this work have approached CSA from a theological perspective. Chapter Two examined the way that ecclesiology can shape the perpetration of or response to CSA within an organisation, and the church's way of relating to and learning from other organisations and individuals. Chapter Three explored structural sin as a theological concept, and applied it to CSA within the church. This chapter turns to non-churchly work which draws similar conclusions to the theological framework already in place, regarding the interplay of individual and institution on the CSA committed within organisations. The synthesis of structural sin with Healy's ecclesiology in the previous chapter has already been fruitful, and further synthesis with the non-churchly learning of Hartill's social scientific approach, and Palmer and Feldman's organisational theoretical approach, will further strengthen the understanding of CSA within the church.

I begin by laying out Bourdieu's understanding of Field, Habitus, and Capital, which is used by Hartill in his exploration of CSA within sports. It identifies the relationship between individual and organisation as both free and constrained, and outlines the commitment that the individual has to the organisation they belong to. I then briefly explore Palmer and Feldman's organisational and institutional theory. I examine how far particular aspects of Palmer and Feldman's theorisation of CSA within organisations can be synthesised, not only with Hartill's use of Bourdieu, but also with the structural sin and ecclesiology which has been explored in the previous two chapters. These particular aspects are the process of development of an abusive relationship, institutional processes and how they might impact on CSA within an organisation, the impact of being in a position of power or authority within an organisation, and the influence of organisational culture. First, however, I turn to Bourdieu.

Pierre Bourdieu: Field, Habitus, Capital

As both Healy's ecclesiology and structural sin have suggested, human behaviour is shaped both by individual beliefs and choices and the structures within which individuals act. This is also true in the perpetration of and response to CSA: the perpetrator and organisational leader who responds to

disclosures of CSA are free to act however they choose, but are also shaped by their beliefs and commitments to the organisation. Bourdieu was one of the first to challenge the binary between individual choice and organisational constraint, and his work is helpful as it “seeks to bridge the gap between individualistic and structural theories of human behaviour”.³¹⁷

Bourdieu argues that social actors do not act without reason, although the reasons for their actions may not be rational in the strictest sense. Instead, he argues that their behaviour will always be *explicable*, though not necessarily always shaped by “mechanical causes or conscious ends”.³¹⁸ Instead, the actor is in a “continual dialectic between objectivity and subjectivity”;³¹⁹ between actions chosen out of the free will of the actor, while working within a culture which shapes and structures the actions available. Bourdieu names the internal world of the actor the ‘habitus’, which is formed by the fields they act within; the ‘field’ is the sub-culture within which the individual’s habitus acts; and ‘capital’ is that which is valued within the field and its actors.³²⁰

As implied above, habitus and field are interrelated, and the relationship or relative fit between the two forms a regular pattern of actions. How to act is embodied within the individual, due to their conditioning within the field they live within. Thus Bourdieu calls the habitus a “structured and structuring structure”.³²¹ The sense of the individual’s habitus and the sense of the field must both be understood to understand social action; their interplay is integral. This socialisation to act in particular ways means that fields are often reproduced in their entirety, as those within the field encourage new members to shape their habitus to fit the new field that they are within.³²² Agency is understood as ‘regulated improvisation’: “the dialectic of freedom and constraint in subjectification permits the emergence of a concept of agency understood through ‘regulated liberties’”.³²³ This reflects Finn’ and Kelly’s

³¹⁷ Elise Paradis, ‘Boxers, Briefs or Bras? Bodies, Gender and Change in the Boxing Gym’, *Body and Society* (18:2) 2012, pp.82-109, at p.83.

³¹⁸ Bourdieu, *Logic*, p.50.

³¹⁹ Grenfell and James, *Education*, p.12.

³²⁰ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.41, 44, 48.

³²¹ Bourdieu, *Masculine*, p.84.

³²² Hartill, *Sport*, pp.41-43.

³²³ Lois McNay, *Gender and Agency* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), p.26.

acknowledgements in the previous chapter that while individuals are free to act as they choose, their choosing is constrained by ignorance of their actions' consequences, and their balancing of positive and negative consequences for themselves and those they value.³²⁴

The habitus of the individual is formed by, and goes on to form, the fields they act within. Fields come in institutional, sub-institutional, and meta-institutional forms; thus sport as a whole is a field, but it has sub-fields for individual sports, and for individual clubs, and these clubs may all be influenced by the meta-fields of patriarchy or capitalism. Similarly, an individual church is a sub-field of a deanery and a diocese, and a diocese a sub-field of the national Church of England, which is also influenced by the meta-fields of patriarchy and capitalism. This is reflected in Healy's work, as he recognises that the church is shaped by churchly and non-churchly beliefs, and that this can be either positive or negative. Individual fields, and therefore individuals within the field, name different things as capital, or valuable. This influences people's actions as they seek to build the capital they desire.

As an individual spends more time in a particular field, they will increasingly gain a 'feel for the game', an understanding of the regularities which govern behaviour in this field:³²⁵ they understand its 'doxa', or "taken-for-granted assumptions".³²⁶ Thus Bourdieu called the priest the "church made flesh",³²⁷ as they are fully formed in their habitus by the church's field. There is likely to be a strong coherence between habitus and field in stable social conditions, which will increase the level of inertia in a field or habitus.

However, in situations of abrupt social change, where different fields may begin to interact, or people formed largely by different habitus enter a new field, there will be a mismatch between field or habitus. This is due to different fields valuing different capital, and therefore acting in different ways to gain a

³²⁴ Finn, 'Sinful', p.152. Kelly, 'Operation', p.305.

³²⁵ Karl Maton, 'Habitus', in Michael Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2008), pp.49-65, at p.54.

³²⁶ Cécile Deer, 'Doxa', in Michael Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2008), pp.119-130, at p.120.

³²⁷ Bourdieu, *Logic*, p.57.

different capital to that which is valued in the field they have moved into.³²⁸ An individual may feel ill at ease in a situation, as though they do not know the 'rules' of the game. They are in 'hysteresis', as their habitus does not match the field.³²⁹ Thus DSAs, entering the church field from social work or policing, were told they did not understand how the church worked, and struggled to get clergy to value or invest in safeguarding policies and procedures.³³⁰ Healy might frame this as the church being shaped by non-churchly beliefs or practices.

This does, however, mean that Bourdieu's theory is not deterministic: there is room for development and change of fields and individuals as fields are shaped by individuals' habitus. As people move from one field to another, those different habitus can mean that what is perceived as capital can shift. While there is significant inertia and resistance to change in most institutions,³³¹ if a sufficient number of habitus value different capital the field will shift and therefore begin to reshape the habitus of those who were previously at ease in the field. Consequently, those from the field of child protection can enter the sports or church field and work to change the field and the habitus formed. As DSAs and safeguarding become more established in those new fields, their work changes the surrounding habitus and capital, which also has a positive impact on the field.³³²

Finally, 'capital' is that which holds value in a field or habitus. It exists in three states: embodied capital is durable cognitive and corporeal dispositions, such as ways of thinking about the world or speaking or moving; objectified capital is physical items such as books or equipment; and institutionalised capital is qualifications or titles that an individual can hold within a field which are valued. Within a church context, knowing the liturgy might be embodied capital;

³²⁸ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.44-46.

³²⁹ Maton, 'Habitus', pp.59-60.

³³⁰ Comments made by multiple early DSAs, including Shirley Hosgood, *Witness Statement of Shirley Hosgood*, pp.13-14, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4345/view/ANG000213.pdf>> 03/02/2020.

³³¹ Hartill, *Sport*, p.43.

³³² Patricia Thompson, 'Field' in Michael Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2008), pp.67-81, at pp.70-71.

objectified capital might be a clerical collar, a vicarage, or theological books; and institutionalised capital might be being called 'Reverend' or 'Father'.

Holding capital within a field gives individuals power and therefore a voice; those without are excluded.³³³ The danger here is that the voices of clergy or those of authority within the church can be prioritised above those who make allegations of abuse. Healy acknowledges this in his recognition that prophetic voices often come from those on the margins of the church, but struggles to balance this with his desire to prioritise the voices of theologians and those with academic knowledge and internal experience of the church. As noted in the previous chapter, Liberation Theologians suggest that listening to the voices of the marginalised is how the church and world will be able to change its actions and organisations to enable flourishing for all.

Donald Palmer and Valerie Feldman, *Comprehending the Incomprehensible*

The next step in this synthesis of theory is to briefly explore Palmer and Feldman's work, before situating it within the wider theoretical context of field, habitus, and capital. Palmer and Feldman locate their research within Organisation Theory and offer a model which identifies how individual predispositions and organisational membership interact to produce organisational misconduct. This is through the hiring of individuals with a propensity to misconduct, allowing individuals to discover deviant predispositions, and allowing them to develop these predispositions.³³⁴ Their recognition of the interaction between individual and organisation in shaping behaviour reflects Bourdieu's analysis of the interplay between objectivity and subjectivity; Healy's understanding of the interplay between individual and church, churchly and non-churchly beliefs; and the theory of structural sin's emphasis on the role of organisations in shaping individuals' understanding of what behaviour is acceptable.

Palmer and Feldman begin by defining the organisations they examine. They are considering 'formal organisations': "collections of people engaged in sustained social interaction governed by at least a rudimentary horizontal and

³³³ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.47-48.

³³⁴ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.67.

vertical division of labour into quasi-independent subunits, and a set of integrative mechanisms that coordinate activity across and within these subunits”.³³⁵ They argue that organisations are ‘strong situations’, which “consist of structures that can override individual predispositions and shape member attitudes and behaviour”.³³⁶

More particularly, they examine ‘youth-serving organisations’ (YSOs), which are organisations which count children among their members, whether their purpose is specifically to care for children, or whether the care they provide children is tangential to their primary purpose.³³⁷ Hartill does not use this language, but he acknowledges that “children are integral to the practice of contemporary sport”.³³⁸ The Church of England understands flourishing churches to be those who are actively engaging with children and young people.³³⁹

It is also important to clarify Palmer and Feldman’s use of the terms ‘organisation’ and ‘institution’. While commonly used synonymously, this does not reflect its technical usage within organisation theory.³⁴⁰ Palmer and Feldman themselves draw on Weber’s Old Institutionalism to define institutions as that which organisations become when the continuation of the organization becomes an end in itself.³⁴¹ Kelly’s definition used in the previous chapter, as “the form connecting individuals around shared norms”,³⁴² is reflective of Organisational Theory’s emphasis on normative systems which shape social behaviour.³⁴³ These social behaviours are not actively enforced, and exist on the level of the individual, the organisation, the field, and society; thus comparable to the role of habitus and field in Bourdieu. For the purposes of this work, and has already been noted in the discussion of whether the church can be called an

³³⁵ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.4.

³³⁶ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.7.

³³⁷ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.4.

³³⁸ Hartill, *Sport*, p.82.

³³⁹ The Archbishops’ Council, ‘Engaging Children and Young Adults’, accessed online at <<http://www.fromevidencetoaction.org.uk/factors/engaging-children-young-adults>> 27/01/2020.

³⁴⁰ Greenwood *et al*, ‘Introduction’, p.4.

³⁴¹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.43.

³⁴² Kelly, ‘Operation’, p.302.

³⁴³ Greenwood *et al*, ‘Introduction’, pp.4-5.

institution for the purposes of understanding it as a structure of sin, Kelly's definition is helpfully broad. It covers both meta-institutions such as capitalism or patriarchy, organisations such as a denomination or a diocese, or even individual churches or religious communities.

With this broad understanding of both Palmer and Feldman's organisational theory and Hartill's Bourdieuan analysis, the next step is to move to examining particular aspects of their work which correlate with both Healy and the structural sin analysis of human actions and decision making. The first of these is the extent to which abusive relationships develop progressively, influenced by situation and opportunity as well as deliberate choice.

The Development of Abusive Relationships

Palmer and Feldman use Finkelhor's 'Four Preconditions Model' to understand the process of committing CSA. This was one of the first models which engaged with both individual psychological and institutional sociological factors in the perpetration of CSA.³⁴⁴ Finkelhor suggests that perpetrators must develop the internal motivation to commit CSA, overcome internal inhibitors, overcome external inhibitors, and finally overcome the child's resistance before committing CSA.³⁴⁵ He argues that overcoming each precondition is influenced by both psychological and social factors, which means that some perpetrators can be termed 'situational' rather than 'preferential' abusers: their abuse is not because of a psychological defect, but being in a situation which shapes their understanding of the morality of, and provides the opportunity to, abuse.³⁴⁶ This acknowledges the interrelation of habitus and field in shaping human behaviour, and reflects the understanding of sin being influenced by an

³⁴⁴ Tony Ward and Stephen Hudson, 'Finkelhor's Precondition Model of Child Sexual Abuse: A Critique', *Psychology, Crime & Law* (7:1-4), pp.291-307, at p.294. The same article offers a deeper understanding of Finkelhor's model regarding the factors that influence each step of the model, and also several critiques, one of which is that it draws on psychological theories from different traditions, which leads to dangers of internal inconsistency or incoherency. Another is that it does not analyse the extent to which CSA is "congruent with normative masculine sexual practices". Anne Coussins, *Masculinities, Sexualities, and Child Sexual Abuse* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2000), p.74.

³⁴⁵ David Finkelhor, *Child Sexual Abuse: New theory and research (CSA)* (New York: The Free Press, 1984), p.14.

³⁴⁶ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.8-9.

individual's understanding of the morality of their actions because of their context, whether organisational or societal culture.

Palmer and Feldman draw on research by Lanning and Dietz to argue that some perpetrators deliberately enter YSOs knowing about their motivation to abuse and having overcome internal inhibitions. Organisational structures enable the perpetrator's access to children and leave children unable to resist. Others are unaware of their motivation to abuse until entering the organisation, and it is the organisation which influences the likelihood that they discover the motivation. Finally, others do not develop the motivation to abuse until after they join the organisation: the organisation develops the motivation.³⁴⁷

The process through which CSA occurs can differ. Some abuse is deliberate but with little prior social interaction; force may be used, or the perpetrator may frame the behaviour in such a way that the child feels they must comply. Alternatively, deliberate abuse may come after a long period of grooming of both victims and their guardians to gain their trust and frame the abusive relationship as normative.³⁴⁸ Other abusive relationships can develop in a 'crescive' fashion; the perpetrator does not deliberately set out to abuse, but forms relationships with children which gradually become abusive, partially because their role may require them to engage intimately with children. This also contributes to the 'grooming' of the victim, and the perpetrator's development of the motivation to abuse.

Palmer and Feldman draw on three psychological mechanisms which facilitate the incremental increase in willingness to abuse: engaging in 'minor' forms of misconduct for a sustained period of time desensitises the individual from guilt; they may engage in post-hoc rationalisations of wrongdoing; and evaluate the ethicality of their behaviour relative to their previous behaviour rather than in absolute terms. This suggests that minor ethical misconduct can lead to worse misconduct in the future. They argue that it is likely that the frequency with

³⁴⁷ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.9-10. See also Kenneth Lanning and Park Dietz, 'Acquaintance Molestation and Youth-Serving Organisations', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 29:15 (2014), pp.2815-2838.

³⁴⁸ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.11-12.

which CSA evolves crecively is underestimated.³⁴⁹ This connects with the suggestion in the theory of structural sin that people's behaviour is shaped gradually to become more sinful, because they are gradually desensitised to the costs, and more invested in the benefits. Perpetrators may know that their behaviour is sinful, but to continue abusing remains beneficial, so they continue. These psychological mechanisms which incrementally increase the willingness to abuse can be influenced by the perpetrator's institution. Palmer and Feldman introduce Nadler and Lawler's 'expectancy theory' to complexify Finkelhor's theory, and make institutional influence clearer.³⁵⁰ Expectancy theory suggests that employees are motivated to pursue particular behaviours if they care about the related sanctions ('outcome valence'); believe they are capable of performing them ('effort-performance expectancy'); and expect that they will be rewarded appropriately ('performance-outcome expectancy').³⁵¹ This model suggests that motivation to enact a behaviour can be increased if the individual believes that they can enact the behaviour and will receive a reward, or avoid punishment, for doing so.

Finkelhor originally understood the preconditions to CSA to be linked linearly; instead, Palmer and Feldman suggest that they are interrelated. This can explain how the motivation to abuse can arise crecively.³⁵² One example is that a perpetrator may have the opportunity to commit CSA ('overcome external inhibitors') before developing the desire to do so. This opportunity is influenced by the perpetrator believing that they are unlikely to be caught, which is shaped by the level of oversight that the organisation has over its members. Within the Church of England, clergy were described as "part of your family, as the

³⁴⁹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.12-13.

³⁵⁰ Palmer and Feldman's use of expectancy theory is not without critique; it assumes that all decisions are made rationally and freely, whereas Palmer and Feldman have noted that the decision to abuse may arise crecively and without deliberate intent. Similarly, Hartill's exploration of habitus and field suggests that the individual is less free than Nadler and Lawler imply, instead being influenced by organisational culture. Nevertheless, this theory does suggest some of the reasons why clergy may find themselves with, or create, an environment within which they can abuse. D.A. Nadler and E.E. Lawler, 'Motivation: A Diagnostic Approach' ('Motivation') in Harold J. Leavitt, Louis R. Pondy, and David M. Boje (eds), *Readings in Managerial Psychology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp.3-19, at p.8.

³⁵¹ Nadler and Lawler, 'Motivation', at pp.5-6.

³⁵² Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.16.

bishop”.³⁵³ The high levels of loyalty that clergy expected from their bishop or diocese and the minimal oversight that they received, may have impacted on their consideration of sanctions for sexual offending, and their willingness to risk punishment. Within Bourdieu’s framework, the loyalty that clergy expected from their bishops is due to the capital that clergy have in their field.

Palmer and Feldman’s suggestion that the proportion of CSA that evolves in a crevice fashion is underrepresented resonates with Hartill’s recognition that models for understanding CSA are preferred which view sexual offending as distinctive to normal masculine sexual behaviour. As noted previously, this allows people to draw a line between their sexual behaviour and that which is defined as illegal.³⁵⁴ The pattern when CSA has been uncovered within any context has largely been to pathologize the individual perpetrator(s); to argue that they were an outlier, and not representative of the other people, whether sports coaches or priests, with whom they worked. This is understandable, as organisations seek to protect their own reputation and those of the others who work within it, and noticeable within the Catholic and Anglican Churches’ response to CSA. The sharp divide drawn between coercive sexual behaviour which remains legal and that which is ‘abusive’ and illegal conceals the way that sexual behaviour can be abusive without being illegal.

This divide can mean that organisations including churches do not acknowledge the way that the motivation to abuse can arise crevically, partially because of the organisational structure within which people work. As people’s habitus are formed by continued engagement within the field, anyone, including any cleric, can become abusive. By ignoring the organisation’s influence on the abusive behaviour within it, the drive to work to change the field is negated. More people within those fields may form habitus based around domination, leaving them in a position where they might commit CSA.

In order to avoid suggesting that domination, or abusive behaviour, is at the heart of what it means to be male, Hartill cites Brittan’s suggestion that

³⁵³ Nicholas Reade, *IICSA Transcript 15/03/2018*, p.50, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4433/view/15-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 29/01/2020.

³⁵⁴ Hartill, *Sport*, p.37.

masculinism is an ideology which “sanctions the political and dominant role of men in the public and private spheres”.³⁵⁵ This concept means that there is space within the concept of masculinity in general which acknowledges that not all men are abusive.³⁵⁶ Masculinism is an ideology within masculinity, and can act as a meta-field, shaping the way that men, women and children interact across multiple fields.

The assumption is that to be male is to subordinate the other, regardless of whether that is through the man as controller or protector. Bourdieu notes that “the most important effect of the rite is the one which attracts the least attention: by treating men and women differently, the rite *consecrates* the difference, institutes it”.³⁵⁷ Although not all men perform behaviours which are constructed as crimes, they may still be acting within a framework which assumes that to be manly is to be dominant, and therefore it is possible that they would commit CSA.³⁵⁸

This is also influenced by our capitalist means of organising society. Capitalism as a means of organising society can leave individuals instrumentalised, perceived as objects which can produce or be a drain on capital, and manipulated to work toward the ends of those in power.³⁵⁹ Hartill suggests that the athletic field disciplines children to function within this social order, in which the aim is to gain capital by dominating others who are objectified, because of a multitude of identity markers, such as sexuality, ability, gender, or lack of capital.³⁶⁰ Within a capitalist framework, individuals are perceived by those with power or capital as objects, rather than subjects. In sport, child athletes are constantly under surveillance as they train to see if they will produce the desired outcome: dominating their opposition.

³⁵⁵ Arthur Brittan, ‘Masculinities and Masculinism’ in Stephen Whitehead and Frank Barrett, *The Masculinities Reader* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001), pp.51-55, at p.53.

³⁵⁶ Keenan offers a helpful overview of the increasing complexity of concepts of gender and masculinity in feminist discourse, which acknowledges that relationships of power and domination are not fixed along gender lines, or indeed any other lines. Instead, power and human relationships, are fluid, as Foucault emphasised. Marie Keenan, *Child Sexual Abuse and the Catholic Church (Catholic)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp.115-125.

³⁵⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), p.118.

³⁵⁸ Hartill, *Sport*, p.94.

³⁵⁹ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.99-103.

³⁶⁰ Which is, alongside patriarchy, a meta-field.

Chomsky argues that “the ideal is to have individuals who are totally disassociated from one another, who don’t care about anyone else”.³⁶¹ Children are taught to objectify others, and as coaches were formed in that habitus as children, they also objectify their trainees. Thus the adult may prioritise their desire for domination over the welfare of the child, and justify abuse.³⁶² This drive to dominate as a result of masculinist ideology can lead to athletes and coaches dominating in contexts other than the relatively safe space of a match, such as by being sexually abusive to the children in their care as a means of asserting their control. The influence of masculinist ideology is not acknowledged within the field of sports, but justified with scientific discourse.³⁶³

That the church can be influenced by other institutions has been acknowledged by Healy. His recognition that the church is shaped by the individuals within it, who are influenced by both churchly and non-churchly beliefs, suggests that the church may also be formed by capitalist or masculinist beliefs. These beliefs are justified with theological rather than scientific discourse.

Rowan Williams noted “that parts of the Church of England suffered from a systemic disparagement of women’s spiritual and professional standing... I would see it as part of a wider mindset in which the authority of the ordained ministry was thought of as beyond criticism, and in which a close-knit male body of clergy tended to be protective of each other’s dignity and authority. Abusive behaviour is one extreme symptom of this mindset”.³⁶⁴ Within the Catholic Church, Keenan argues that the clerical hierarchy within which parish clergy operate, in conjunction with the ‘ontological change’ at ordination, means offending priests are unaware of their power and instead focus almost entirely

³⁶¹ Noam Chomsky, ‘Interview with Noam Chomsky, 24/10/2000’, in Joel Bakan, *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power* (London: Constable and Robinson, 2004), pp.169-196, at p.174.

³⁶² This links to Palmer and Feldman’s exploration of Sykes’ and Matza’s ‘Techniques of Neutralisation’, in which the ‘denial of victim’ and ‘denial of harm’ are at play in this context. Palmer Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.59.

³⁶³ Hartill, *Sport*, p.88.

³⁶⁴ Rowan Williams, *First Witness Statement of Lord Rowan Douglas Williams*, pp.6-7, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6289/view/ACE026001.pdf>> 16/12/2019.

on the obedience they owe their superiors.³⁶⁵ Up until the recent past, the clerical class in the Church of England was entirely masculine, with women first ordained priest in 1994. Women are still not ordained within the Catholic Church. Accordingly, the role of the masculinist habitus within both churches has the potential to be strong, and to influence individuals' understanding of the acceptability of perpetrating CSA.

Similarly, Liberation Theologians understand structural sin to be influenced by economic or capitalist drivers focussed around domination and exploitation of weaker individuals to create wealth. This valuing of wealth and power could influence the church's actions. It is only through acknowledging all the drivers which shape the perpetration of CSA, whether personal, organisational, or institutional, that risk factors can be recognised and ameliorated. Other key factors in influencing CSA within an organisation are its administrative or institutional processes.

Institutional Processes

Palmer and Feldman suggest that institutional processes themselves have an impact on CSA within organisations. Here they define an organisation distinct from an institution, drawing on Weber's understanding of formal, and especially bureaucratic organisations, as "devices for transforming substantive problems into technical ones".³⁶⁶ Administrative systems coordinate behaviour in organisations, by dividing labour between subunits, delineating preferred practices and routines, and setting procedures for monitoring and enforcing participants' compliance.³⁶⁷

Palmer and Feldman suggest four ways that administrative or bureaucratic systems can influence CSA. First, inadequate job applicant screening processes, such as failing to take up references or make a DBS check, can enable those predisposed to abuse to enter organisations. Second, poor employee and volunteer behaviour guidelines can provide opportunities for people to act on their predispositions, normalise potentially abusive behaviour, or allow

³⁶⁵ Keenan, *Catholic*, pp.235-239.

³⁶⁶ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.40.

³⁶⁷ J.G. March and H. Simon, *Organizations* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958). This framing of bureaucracy seems to have been influential in Foucault's understanding of discipline.

opportunities for a motivation to abuse to develop. Third, the subdivision of labour may mean that fewer people are aware of the need to watch for signs of abuse, ineffective communication channels may inhibit the sharing of information which might give a full picture of abuse, or ineffective policies regarding responding to CSA might undermine an effective response.³⁶⁸ Fourth, divisions of labour and standard operating procedures diminish participants' feelings of moral responsibility by ensuring that they focus only on the fulfilment of their particular task, rather than its merits. This may inhibit the detection of, and the response to, CSA, as participants do not consider its detection to be part of their responsibilities, and their reactions to CSA are purely based on following the rules which may be insufficient to enable an effective response.³⁶⁹

Administrative systems effectively make people into machines. They restrict people's responsibilities, just giving them tasks to complete, and meaning that they are measured against their ability to complete their given task, rather than being recognised as a unique individual, with rights and needs. The resonance with the role of structural sin, in terms of people being perceived as objects rather than subjects, is clear.

Palmer and Feldman also argue that misconduct can be normalised, as minor deviations from safe operating procedure do not have ill effects and are gradually incorporated into standard operating procedure, due to resource constraints and effectiveness considerations.³⁷⁰ Ultimately, they become part of

³⁶⁸ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.18-19.

³⁶⁹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.40-41. Hannah Arendt, among others, recognises the dangers of bureaucracy, calling it "rule by nobody", and arguing that it becomes difficult to hold anyone responsible for what is done in the bureaucracy's name. Hannah Arendt, 'Communicative Power', in Stephen Lukes (ed), *Power* (New York: NYU Press, 1986), pp.59-74, at p.61. Similarly, McFadyen argues that the role of bureaucracy was crucial to diminish feelings of moral responsibility in the Holocaust. McFadyen, *Bound*, p.104.

³⁷⁰ This is a development of Ashforth and Anand's exploration of the normalisation of misconduct: the culture of an organisation can socialise employees into accepting misconduct. (See Blake Ashforth and Vikas Anand, 'The Normalisation of Misconduct in Organizations', *Research in Organizational Behaviour* 25 (2003), pp.1-52.) Here, the deviation from standard operating procedure is a means of increasing efficiency, to meet the organisation's goal more efficiently, rather than the individual seeking to corrupt the organisation. Henrich Greve, Donald Palmer, and Jo-Ellen Pozner, 'Organizations Gone Wild: The Causes, Processes, and Consequences of Organizational Misconduct', *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4:1 (2010), pp.53-107, at pp.73-74.

the organisation's assumptions, values, beliefs, and norms. This enables CSA through deviation from child-safe procedures. The normalisation of misconduct may also mean that grooming behaviours become an accepted part of the organisation.³⁷¹ This may be influenced by the continuation of the organisation being perceived as more important than the protection of the children in their care. This is enabled by the false perception that the organisation is acting as it should; it is likely to require external correction, as those within the organisation have been socialised (as in structural sin, or Hartill's formation of habitus) to believe their actions appropriate.

Weber developed an analytic framework known as 'Old Institutionalism', which suggested that the top management of an organisation was chiefly responsible for positive external relationships.³⁷² This leads to conflict between the protection of the organisation's public image, and the interests of workers, clients and other stakeholders. Thus the leaders can see disclosures of CSA as "threats to manage rather than problems to address".³⁷³ This is compounded by the process of 'institutionalisation' of organisations, in which the continuation of the organisation becomes an end in itself, rather than the advancement of its original end.³⁷⁴ Participants begin to identify themselves with the organisation, and experience a threat to the organisation as a threat to them personally, so defence against criticism becomes more important than reform.³⁷⁵

Organisations choose to conceal instances of CSA to prevent reputational damage, rather than disclosing them to statutory authorities. A similar dynamic is reflected in Hartill's recognition that allegations of CSA within sports are often ignored, have their veracity denied, or ignorance of the perpetrator or their actions is claimed.³⁷⁶

The same is true within the church, which is the very definition of Healy's glorying in the church rather than Christ. In concealing sin within the church,

³⁷¹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.47-48.

³⁷² See Pfeffer, 'Beyond', pp.36-46.

³⁷³ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.42.

³⁷⁴ Philip Selznick, *TVA and the Grass Roots* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949), p.256.

³⁷⁵ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.43-44. See also Harper and Perkins, 'Reporting', pp.30-41.

³⁷⁶ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.2, 172-3.

leaders act in ways which imply that being Christian means acceding to sinful and harmful practices,³⁷⁷ rather than encouraging individuals' flourishing and working toward the eschatological liberation that Christ will bring. In concealing abusive practices to maintain the church's reputation and therefore power, the church has failed in its calling. Instead, as Healy notes, the church's practices must change to orientate it more closely to Christ.

Hartill suggests the denial of allegations is a result of the habitus of those with authority within a field having been formed within that field; as such, their chief end is to ensure the continuation of the field. It leaves them unable to recognise CSA, especially by people they know and trust. To report abuse challenges the viability of the organisation that those reporting CSA are committed to.³⁷⁸

Bourdieu acknowledges that "what is valid at the lay level is true to the *nth* degree for the level of the clerics who are always in the logic of self-deception".³⁷⁹ This denial and misrecognition is not a cynical act; those whose habitus are closely aligned to the field within which they work may indeed not recognise what is going on.³⁸⁰ Furthermore, "when 'the game' sustains livelihoods (as well as identities), it might be argued that there can be little or no room afforded to genuine reflection or fundamental criticism".³⁸¹

Hartill also notes that those who speak out against misconduct within organisations are marginalised or ignored. To retain membership within the field, individuals must abide by the rules of the game. If they choose to speak out, they are excommunicated, and therefore find themselves without capital in the field they used to participate in.³⁸² This exclusion increases the cost of speaking out for those invested in a field, as they may no longer be able to define themselves in relation to it.³⁸³

³⁷⁷ Healy p.115.

³⁷⁸ Harper and Perkins, 'Reporting', p.34.

³⁷⁹ Pierre Bourdieu, *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action (Reason)* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), p.119.

³⁸⁰ Hartill, *Sport*, p.193.

³⁸¹ Hartill, *Sport*, p.196.

³⁸² Hartill, *Sport*, pp.49, 195, 197.

³⁸³ Hartill, *Sport*, p.205.

For an organisation to be structurally sinful, people within the organisation either must not recognise the sin being committed, or value the organisation above the individuals who are being harmed. In the context of the church, when clerics have had their habitus formed by sustained attendance at church as lay people, in their training at seminary or theological college,³⁸⁴ and then in their working life, there is likely to be little disconnect between habitus and field, and therefore little space for critical reflection. By speaking out against organisational misconduct they are acknowledging that an organisation in which they are deeply invested is fallible, and may put their livelihood at risk. It may mean that they must acknowledge the ways that their behaviour may have contributed to negative outcomes for children or adult survivors in their care. Furthermore, Healy notes that prophetic voices are likely to be ignored or marginalised even when they do speak out, given that they challenge the commitment to the organisation that others have.

Finally, Palmer and Feldman explore the 'Institutional Logics Perspective', which suggests that 'institutions' (defined as family, religion, state, market, professions, and corporation)³⁸⁵ vary according to their logics, which are "principles according to which the social world is assumed to operate".³⁸⁶ In the context of this, religious organisations are ceded exceptional trust because they advance values of benevolence towards others and strong morality, which can enable the perpetration and impede the detection of CSA.³⁸⁷ Hartill similarly recognises that children's engagement in sports is seen as entirely positive, or that a childhood is incomplete without engagement in sport.³⁸⁸ Negative aspects

³⁸⁴ Which overtly emphasises the process of formation into the clerical vocation. This training is part of the 'embodied' cultural capital. Hartill, *Sport*, p.48.

³⁸⁵ Patricia Thornton, William Ocasio, and Michael Lounsbury, 'The Institutional Logics Perspective', in Robert Scott and Stephen Kosslyn (eds), *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioural Sciences* (John Wiley and Sons, 2015), pp.1-22, at p.4, accessed online at <<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118900772.etrds0187>>.

³⁸⁶ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.46.

³⁸⁷ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.45-46. For a more thorough exploration of the role of trust in enabling grooming and thereby CSA, see also Anne-Marie McAlinden, "'Setting 'em up': Personal, Familial and Institutional Grooming in the Sexual Abuse of Children' in *Social and Legal Studies* 15(3), 2006, pp.339-362.

³⁸⁸ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.82, 87.

of sport, such as the aggression and the encouragement for one child to dominate another, are ignored, or reframed positively.³⁸⁹

This ties in to Hartill's and Perkins' recognition above that those within an organisation may find it difficult to believe that those they know may be guilty of abuse, but is also noticeable in the trust that the families of those who were abused ceded to the clerics, as was noted in Chapters One and Three. This emphasises the importance of an organisation's reputation: by concealing CSA, people will continue to believe that children are always safe in the organisation, therefore reducing their vigilance, giving perpetrators more opportunities to abuse, and making it more difficult for them to believe allegations of abuse in the future. The level of trust ceded to individuals is also likely to increase dependent on their position within the organisation, therefore making it easier for them to perpetrate abuse and avoid detection.

The Role of Power or Authority within an Organisation

A power differential between perpetrator and victim is a defining feature of CSA.³⁹⁰ Palmer and Feldman paraphrase Weber's definition of power, as "the capacity to get what one wants over the resistance of others",³⁹¹ and distinguish between formal authority and informal power. Formal authority is "derived from one's position in the chain of command",³⁹² and gives the individual authority to the extent that others in the organisation perceive the authority as legitimate. Legitimacy can be derived from charismatic, traditional, and rational logics. Holding legitimate formal authority means that the norm of obedience to the authority is strong and can override subordinates' own desires. This may

³⁸⁹ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.95-96.

³⁹⁰ This is also noted by the IICSA and the Church of England. Fiona Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 11/07/2019*, p.144, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/12777/view/public-hearing-transcript-11-july-2019.pdf>> 13/11/2019; and The Archbishops' Council, *The Gospel, Sexual Abuse and the Church (Gospel)* (London: Church House Publishing, 2016), p.36.

³⁹¹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.20, from Max Weber, *Essays in Sociology* (eds and trans H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills) (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p.180. This definition is sufficient for a basic understanding of power, particularly given Weber's work on bureaucratic power, and when considering abuse, but as Lukes notes, power is a multivalent concept. Weber's definition does not engage in depth with the complexity of consent. Steven Lukes, 'Introduction', in Steven Lukes (ed.), *Power* (New York: NYU Press, 1986), pp.1-18, at p.4.

³⁹² Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.20.

provide perpetrators with more opportunities to commit CSA, and to deny allegations made against them.³⁹³

This can enable abuse as victims feel unable to resist, or know that resistance will be punished; it can suppress victim reports of abuse; or third party observers of abuse may not report it because they fear retribution, or believe that their reports will be ignored.³⁹⁴ Palmer and Feldman also note that particular forms of authority can influence CSA: those with charismatic or traditional authority may have wider control over their subordinates than those with rational authority, and therefore make wider commands over their behaviour. I add spiritual authority to this list, as addressed in Chapter One and Three; it is likely to give even greater control over subordinates.

Palmer and Feldman suggest that organisations with a unitary chain of command, in which subordinates report to a single superior are likely to be less safe than 'matrix' structures, in which subordinates report to multiple superiors.³⁹⁵ This may be because there are not sufficiently independent people within the organisation to receive and respond to allegations of CSA.

Theoretically the Church of England does have more of a matrix authority structure, in that subordinates can report concerns to multiple superiors. However, this Diocesan matrix is headed by the Bishop, who has ultimate control over their diocese. Furthermore, a matrix can cause additional issues which Palmer and Feldman do not address. Different superiors believe that their peers will be responding to concerns of CSA, thereby meaning that concerns can slip through the net as people do not take responsibility.³⁹⁶ If a matrix authority structure is to work, every member needs to know that reporting concerns of CSA is always their responsibility.

Palmer and Feldman then explore the role of informal power in facilitating CSA. They frame informal power as derived from the control of resources. Resources can be many things, including rewards, expertise, and relationship.³⁹⁷ If people

³⁹³ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.27-28.

³⁹⁴ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.20-21.

³⁹⁵ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.63-64.

³⁹⁶ For an example, see The Inquiry Panel, *Interim*, pp.80-81.

³⁹⁷ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.23.

within an organisation desire the resource which an individual holds, that individual has power over them as they seek to influence the individual to give them the resource they desire.³⁹⁸ This corresponds to Bourdieu's understanding of the different types of capital in a field, and the way that having capital in a field provides an individual with power and a voice.³⁹⁹ Those who do not have standing, or capital, within the field are excluded or ignored; as is noted by Firer Hinze, the field or status quo is maintained and the harm done by it continued.⁴⁰⁰ As noted in Chapter Two, Healy struggles to break out of this dynamic in his ecclesiology, continuing to prioritise voices which already hold capital within the church.

While the above does illuminate some aspects of how organisational authority can influence the CSA that occurs within an organisation, it is also open to significant critique. It ignores Foucault's recognition of the nebulous nature of power. It implies that there are hierarchies of power: those that have formal power, those that have informal power, and those that have none. However, all people have power,⁴⁰¹ including those who are abused, and ignoring this negates survivors' agency. Hartill's recognition that survivors still had a choice about how they responded to the abuse is a helpful corrective.

In saying this, I do not imply that it is the child's responsibility to resist abusive advances from adults. It is always the perpetrator's responsibility to not abuse. Others within the organisation must be watchful and report concerns. Hartill acknowledges that a child's habitus may have been formed to expect obedience and self-discipline from children toward the adult, which makes resisting CSA exceptionally difficult.⁴⁰² Particularly within sport, Hartill notes this is because the office of 'coach' is constructed as a voluntary role that offers the gift of sport to the child. As a gift, it can be withdrawn unless the child recognises and

³⁹⁸ French and Raven define power bases as the reason why an individual has power over another. Five key aspects of power are reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power. J.R.P. French and Bertram Raven, 'The Bases of Social Power' in D. Cartwright (ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (Ann Arbor: Michigan, 1959), pp.150-167, pp.155-156. They do not, as Palmer and Feldman imply, state openly that power is a result of resource control.

³⁹⁹ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.49, 195, 197.

⁴⁰⁰ Firer Hinze, 'Solidarity', p.448.

⁴⁰¹ Michel Foucault, 'Disciplinary Power and Subjection' in Steven Lukes (ed.), *Power* (New York: NYU Press, 1986), pp.229-242, at p.229.

⁴⁰² Hartill, *Sport*, pp.179-181.

acknowledges its value by responding with gratitude and obedience to the coach.⁴⁰³ Additionally, the child's habitus has been formed to value the capital which they gain by engaging in the field, which may mean that the child believes that their abuse is worth their continued presence in the field.⁴⁰⁴ A similar dynamic may also be present in the church, given that the priest was often constructed as being the representative of Christ. To continue to engage with church, faith and even God, it may have seemed necessary to submit to the perpetrator.

This is in part due to the right those in authority have to define the rules of engagement in a field. It is further illuminated by Kelly's definition of structural sin, referenced above, as "an institution or collective practice that either socially idealises or economically incentivises actions seeking exclusive self-interest(s) at the expense of the common good".⁴⁰⁵ It suggests that the church, or abusive clerics or those who receive abuse allegations, have 'socially idealised', or made equivalent being Christian (or 'glorying in Christ' in Healy's terms) with submitting to abusive practices for the sake of remaining in the church and protecting it by not speaking out (which Healy would frame as 'glorying in the church'). Healy's recognition that prophetic critique is required to challenge these assumptions of power and control is key, but this is challenging for those in authority. Their position means they can exclude those who critique from the church. Those who have been abused are then left with a choice⁴⁰⁶ about whether to remain in the church, or to leave.

A further aspect of power research which Palmer and Feldman examine is the extent to which power possession can mean power holders treat subordinates unethically. Power holders may view themselves as morally superior and therefore worthy of ethical license, and their subordinates as morally inferior and unworthy of ethical treatment, and become desensitised to social

⁴⁰³ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.176-179.

⁴⁰⁴ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.180, 186. This is important to emphasise, to acknowledge the agency that survivors of CSA recognise that they had. Rather than survivors being perceived as entirely passive, their voice and strength can be acknowledged in a way that does not minimise their victimhood.

⁴⁰⁵ Kelly, 'Operation', p.301.

⁴⁰⁶ A bad, unfair, and even sinful one, given Kelly's framing that structural sin restricts the choices open to people, but still a choice.

disapproval upon behaving unethically. Subordinates may also be viewed by power holders as less distinct and therefore with less distinct rights. This could relate to the role of domination in capitalist and masculinist world views, and therefore may increase a person's motivation to perpetrate CSA. However, as Palmer and Feldman acknowledge, none of the studies upon which they base this section have been able to tell whether the relation of power to unethical behaviour is correlative or causative.⁴⁰⁷

Against this simplistic understanding of the negative impact of power possession, I note Overbeck and Park's study, which argues that "although a given power context—specifically, one that requires attention to other organizational responsibilities—may minimize individuation, power in and of itself does not appear to uniformly cause undifferentiated responding".⁴⁰⁸ Their research suggests it is the need to balance the competing demands of subordinates and organisation which influences supervisors' behaviour. This corresponds with Weber's Old Institutionalism, which understands the issue of power holding being the tension between one's responsibility for maintaining the institution and caring for its people.

Overbeck and Park also suggest that this is impacted by the work the organisation does; in manufacturing companies, subordinates may be more like cogs in a machine, but in a caring or teaching profession, greater individuation of subordinates may be required. Given that theologians locate the root of structural sin in a failure to value individuals as made in the *Imago Dei*, the connections with this understanding of the consequences of holding authority are evident. Potentially the Church of England, as an organisation which seeks to serve and care for people, could rely on greater individuation of clergy by bishops and laity by parish clergy, and therefore its power-holders might be less likely to abuse their power. While this may be a safeguard in the context of a parish, when other leaders in a diocese receive abuse allegations, they are

⁴⁰⁷ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.25-26.

⁴⁰⁸ Jennifer Overbeck and Bernadette Park, 'When Power Does Not Corrupt: Superior Individuation Processes among Powerful Perceivers', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81:4 (2001), pp.549-565, at p.563.

more likely to know the cleric who is accused of abuse, and therefore to favour them rather than the individual making the allegation.

The final aspect of power relations which Palmer and Feldman note, and which have explicatory power for CSA within the Church of England, is interorganisational power relations and elite social networks. Organisations also have power in the wider networks of which they are a part, rather than just within their organisation. These networks may work to advance the interests of the individuals and organisations within them. In the context of organisations responding to CSA, this may offer a means of protection from external scrutiny, by using connections with different organisations.⁴⁰⁹ This might be a way to avoid Healy's prophetic critique; or, in Kelly's words, to serve the individual or organisations' self-interest, rather than the common good. This includes both survivors of abuse, and those who are otherwise marginalised by policies and procedures which favour those already privileged in those contexts. As an established church, the Church of England has significant connections with other people of prominence in government and the judiciary, which may have influenced the reaction to CSA within the church.

Organisational Culture

Palmer and Feldman then explore the role of culture. They acknowledge that there is not a single agreed definition of culture, but use Giorgi, Lockwood, and Glynn's five conceptualisations of culture.⁴¹⁰ Culture can be understood as values, stories, frames, toolkits, and categories. Values are the things people prefer and desire; stories convey meaning by narratives with causally linked sequences of events; frames are filters which delimit what we pay attention to; toolkits are sets of stories, frames, categories, and practices that people draw

⁴⁰⁹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.26-27.

⁴¹⁰ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.29-30. They synthesise what in the original work is five different ways of understanding culture. This synthesis draws together concepts and research from many different fields, which may mean that the different models do not function as a unified whole. While Palmer and Feldman argue this is not the case, the research that they draw on to back up their claims about the interrelated nature of culture, identity, institutions and practices is not conclusive. Further research is required around the interrelation of these concepts. Simona Giorgi, Christi Lockwood and Mary Ann Glynn, 'The Many Faces of Culture: Making Sense of 30 Years of Research on Culture in Organization Studies' ('Culture'), *Academy of Management Annals* 9:1 (2015), pp.1-54, at p.23.

upon to make meaning; and categories are social constructions that define the conceptual distinctions between objects, people and practices.⁴¹¹

Palmer and Feldman suggest that many things can influence and form culture, both intentionally and unintentionally.⁴¹² Culture is not purely formed from the top-down: while executive culture setting is important, those on the ground of an organisation have a significant role in shaping the organisation's culture, particularly in a dispersed and relatively independent organisation, such as the Church of England. For example, bishops may be more effective in setting a culture which values safeguarding in one parish than in another, dependent on the opinions of the parish or its clergy. Bourdieu notes that all the habitus of people working within a field interact to shape the field and thereby the habitus going forward. Structural sin notes that forming people's understanding of morality is essential in shaping their behaviour. Similarly, the extent to which the church's culture values people as made in the *Imago Dei*, of equal worth, is dependent on the reinforcement of that at all levels of the church.

Here, Hartill's work is particularly helpful in framing safeguarding or abusive culture in the Church of England, in a way that Palmer and Feldman's is not. I argue that the structure of the sports sector and the church have more similarities than Palmer and Feldman's formal institutions.

The sports sector is a largely voluntary sector, traditionally autonomous from the government or other statutory agencies.⁴¹³ Financial resources for safeguarding and child protection depend on the financial health of the particular sporting body,⁴¹⁴ which receives some funding from Sport England but none which is ring-fenced for safeguarding. The role of Safeguarding Lead Officer (SLO) is sometimes only part of a person's employment, so they may find the different expectations of their roles difficult to juggle.⁴¹⁵ This resonates with the comments made by those working in safeguarding in the Church of England at IICSA. Resources for safeguarding in their dioceses are dependent on the

⁴¹¹ Giorgi, Lockwood and Glyn, 'Culture', pp.5-7.

⁴¹² Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.30.

⁴¹³ Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', p.607.

⁴¹⁴ Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', p.612.

⁴¹⁵ Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', p.613.

'buy-in' of those with capital within the field, and upon the diocese's financial health. While there is now greater investment in safeguarding, initially budgets were small and people were employed on a part-time basis.⁴¹⁶

Similarly, particular sporting bodies will be engaging with many clubs based in different areas of the country, with an overarching sporting body SLO relating to club-level Child Protection Officers.⁴¹⁷ This structure is similar to the Church of England, where the National Church Institutions (Sport England) relates to dioceses (particular sporting bodies), and the diocese relates to multiple parishes (individual clubs).⁴¹⁸ Organisational resistance to safeguarding appears due to lack of top-level support, and buy-in can be because of business or reputational risk rather than an appreciation of children's rights or acceptance of the wider safeguarding agenda.⁴¹⁹ The SLO's position within the organisation matters in how their expertise is received: they can be positioned as outsiders, and as the bearers of bad news, rather than as an integral part of the organisation and part of aiding it to fulfil its mission effectively.⁴²⁰

This emphasis on reputational risk is also present within the church, with the National Safeguarding Team reporting to the Archbishops' Council regarding risk, and to the House of Bishops regarding church oversight and strategic leadership.⁴²¹ While the habitus of those within the church has shifted to value safeguarding much more highly, particularly within parishes, historically safeguarding was almost resented and poorly engaged with. As lay people rather than ordained, and formed by a different habitus to the rest of the field, initially DSAs were perceived as outsiders who did not fully understand the church, similarly to SLOs in sports clubs.⁴²² The support DSAs received from the

⁴¹⁶ Edna Carmi, *IICSA Transcript 20/03/2018*, p.49, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4697/view/20-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 28/08/2020.

⁴¹⁷ Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', pp.607-608, 621.

⁴¹⁸ The Archbishops' Council, 'Leadership and Governance', accessed online at <<https://www.churchofengland.org/about/leadership-and-governance>> 16/12/2019.

⁴¹⁹ Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', pp.613-615.

⁴²⁰ Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', p.615.

⁴²¹ Graham Tilby, *IICSA Transcript 19/03/2019*, p.122, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4656/view/19-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf> 20/08/2020.

⁴²² Elizabeth Hall, the Church of England's second National Safeguarding Advisor, noted that DSAs were unable to challenge their bishops regarding safeguarding concerns. In the context of

bishops influenced how they were perceived within the diocese, and therefore shaped their efficacy. However, in the present day there has been a shift in culture, with safeguarding and the DSA's expertise valued more highly.

Palmer and Feldman's exploration of culture helpfully notes that different beliefs held or expressed within a culture can influence CSA. Understandings of gender difference, such as patriarchal expectations, macho culture, and even rape content, may shape perpetrators' perceptions of the acceptability of abuse, survivors' beliefs that disclosing abuse is a sign of weakness, or that allegations of abuse are less believable dependent on the relative statuses of perpetrator and survivor.⁴²³ As Hartill emphasises, beliefs around gender or capitalism shape how individuals are valued, and thereby how they are cared for or used.

Theology is also crucial in shaping the culture of the church, and clerical authority because of their position and expertise is influential here. The understanding of forgiveness plays a key role in the response to perpetrators of CSA.⁴²⁴ A focus on the forgiveness of perpetrators is a consistent pattern when CSA is unjustly responded to within religious organisations.⁴²⁵ However, when forgiveness is understood to mean that punishment is not required or that the offence can be forgotten, this twists the biblical understanding of forgiveness.⁴²⁶

Finally, Palmer and Feldman recognise the importance of who defines reality in their exploration of Total Institutions (TIs). In TIs, staff members seek to transform inmates from undesirable to desirable.⁴²⁷ Staff begin to see inmates as inferior objects, less worthy of their rights and needs being respected. These increasing boundary violations may lead staff toward the perpetration of CSA,

the Past Cases Review, multiple safeguarding concerns were not passed on to the national church. Elizabeth Hall, *IICSA Transcript 20/03/2018*, pp.199-201, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4697/view/20-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 31/08/2020.

⁴²³ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.31-33.

⁴²⁴ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.57-58.

⁴²⁵ IICSA Research Team, *Religious*, p.44.

⁴²⁶ Anthony Bash has written widely on the scriptural nature of forgiveness; an introduction is Anthony Bash, 'Forgiveness: A Reappraisal' in *Studies in Christian Ethics* 24:2 (2011), pp.133-146.

⁴²⁷ The belief that a human's identity or nature is open to change can also influence perpetrators' treatment. They can be moved to a different context having apologised and given promises of good behaviour, but reoffend. Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.57-58.

or a decision not to report CSA.⁴²⁸ Similarly, staff members may engage in ‘techniques of neutralisation’, in which the cultural content stipulates extenuating circumstances in which abuse is acceptable, and all of which may immunise the perpetrator from guilt.⁴²⁹ This resonates strongly with the recognition within structural sin theory that organisations fail to value the individuals within as subjects, instead seeing them as resources to manipulate, either for financial or social gain; likewise with Healy’s recognition that sin within the church is glorying in the church rather than Christ. Hartill’s recognition that the perpetrator may see abuse as an extension of the domination that is expected within sports or masculinism, or that the child may value their continuation in the field of sport sufficiently to bear the abuse also reflects how defining reality is influential on CSA.⁴³⁰

Conclusion

In this chapter I have drawn out some of the ways that Palmer’ and Feldman’s and Hartill’s work on CSA correlates with the learning from ecclesiology and structural sin, as explored in the previous two chapters. These correlations strengthen Healy’s suggestion, originally explored in Chapter One, that different disciplines are seeking to depict a single shared reality, and that it is therefore possible to learn from disciplines or organisations which do not share the same world view. Given the increasing requirement for the church to understand its

⁴²⁸ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.46-57.

⁴²⁹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.59-60. The evidence which Palmer and Feldman draw on to back up their claims regarding techniques of neutralisation comes from examples of employees abusing their employers: the relatively powerless individual is taking advantage of the powerful. However, Palmer and Feldman are applying these findings to an opposite power dynamic, in which the powerful are taking advantage of the powerless. While these techniques of neutralisation may indeed be present in CSA, further research would be valuable to ensure that the comparison is defensible. Vikas Anand, Blake E. Ashforth and Mahendra Joshi, ‘Business as Usual: The Acceptance and Perpetuation of Corruption in Organizations’, *The Academy of Management Executive* 19:4 (2005), pp.9-23. It also resonates with the examination above of the extent to which the severity of wrongdoing increases over time.

⁴³⁰ The concept of the TI is particularly helpful for understanding the dynamics of abuse within Ball’s Scheme, but some abuse within the happens within the parish, which cannot be termed a TI. Instead, Lewis Coser’s ‘Greedy Institutions’ may be more helpful; it recognises that the church does not have people’s full loyalty to its institution because of the limited resources of time that people have. Nevertheless, they want it, and begin to place increasing demands on people’s time and energy so that people are left feeling unable to resist, partially because of that the church offers to them. See Lewis Coser, ‘Greedy Institutions’, *European Journal of Sociology* 8:2 (1967), pp.196-215.

organisation as a human organisation marred by sin in the same way as others, despite the presence of the Spirit within it, the resources for doing so will become increasingly important.

Drawing out links between churchly and non-churchly learning increases the likelihood that those with responsibility and authority within the church will engage with the learning. This may lead to greater understanding of the risks inherent in any organisation, including the church. This may then lead to changes in church policy and practice to make it a safer institution, which also orientates it more closely to Christ and more likely to fulfil its mission of glorying in him. Thus far I have not closely applied this theoretical framework; the final step is to examine how far it has explicatory power for the IICSA transcripts.

Chapter 5 - Institutional Dynamics Visible within Abuse Perpetrated in the Church of England

The previous chapters laid out the framework which I argue has explicatory power for the CSA within the Church of England. The final step is to test these frameworks against the data from IICSA and examine the extent to which they illuminate the dynamics of the abuse and the church's response. I argue that the synthesis of structural sin, Healy's ecclesiology, Palmer and Feldman's organisational theory, and Hartill's sociology will offer a deeper understanding of the examples of CSA which are explored in this chapter, which may then offer more helpful ideas of how the church can become a safer place for children and vulnerable adults, and therefore be more closely oriented to Christ and live out its mission and calling more effectively.

There is an enormous amount of data from IICSA, even within the Anglican Church investigation. The investigation has three strands, each of which had several days of hearings, along with associated witness statements and other documents. Rather than a surface-level exploration of the whole investigation, I am restricting my data to that generated as part of the Peter Ball case study, and within that to three key individuals whose evidence illuminates distinctive aspects of the CSA that occurs within the church. The first is AN-A117, a survivor of abuse by Ball. The second is George Carey, Archbishop of Canterbury at the time of Ball's initial arrest and caution, and subsequent return to ministry. The third is Ros Hunt, a chaplain who supported some of Ball's survivors as they gave evidence to the police and the church.

These testimonies illuminate different angles of the impact that the organisational nature of the church had on the CSA within it. AN-A117's testimony speaks into his desire to remain in the church, and the position of authority Ball held; Carey's speaks into the commitment leaders might feel to the continuation of the organisation; Hunt's speaks into the response that prophets, or those who challenge an organisation's practice, might receive. For each, I will draw out the ways in which their testimony illuminates the structural nature of the sin of CSA within the church, how this relates to Healy's

ecclesiology, and the extent to which Palmer and Feldman’s and Hartill’s work explain the choices that church leaders and officials made. I will structure this using the frameworks from the previous chapter, as appropriate to the case study: the development of an abusive relationship, institutional processes, the role of power or authority, and the influence of organisational culture. In the final section, on the influence of organisational culture, I will also draw on data from Peter Ball’s witness statements.⁴³¹

The Development of an Abusive Relationship

This section largely focuses on AN-A117’s testimony to explore some of the ways that the abuse AN-A117 suffered developed progressively. AN-A117 was the last young person to attend Ball’s Scheme, attending at the age of 18 after the scheme had officially ended. At the time he was struggling with the relationship between his Christian faith and his sexuality, recognising himself to be gay and having grown up in a homophobic family.⁴³²

AN-A117 was groomed to feel as though he was in Ball’s debt for allowing him to join the Scheme. Ball emphasised that it had essentially ended, but that he would “make an exception” to allow AN-A117 to attend.⁴³³ In initial conversations, Ball spoke to AN-117 about naked prayer, cold showers, and St Francis, who stripped himself of his clothes in front of the people of his town. AN-A117 thought that this was Ball “instilling the idea that it was a normal thing to do”.⁴³⁴ Gradually, AN-A117 was asked to engage in more abusive acts, saying ‘penitential psalms’⁴³⁵ together naked and then embracing,⁴³⁶ beating each

⁴³¹ In drawing in Ball’s witness statement, I acknowledge that I am giving a voice to a perpetrator, in a way that IICSA does not. The statements acknowledge that Ball’s health and memory were failing when they were written, and were largely drafted by Ball’s solicitors from previous court hearings, reports, and documents. The extent to which they are a reliable source of evidence is questionable, particularly given the commitment to maintaining their own reputation that all people have. Nevertheless, with these caveats in mind, I believe they offer helpful insights into the role the church’s understanding of sexuality played in Ball’s abuse.

⁴³² AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.112, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/5977/view/23-july-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 17/02/2020.

⁴³³ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.117.

⁴³⁴ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, pp.114-115.

⁴³⁵ These were psalms Ball selected which “were about unworthiness and seeking forgiveness”. AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.131.

⁴³⁶ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, pp.131-132.

other, masturbating each other,⁴³⁷ and being in bed together naked.⁴³⁸ These were normalised by Ball giving them theological justification,⁴³⁹ saying he had done them with other Schemers, and implying that AN-A117 would be a failure were he unwilling to engage: “he'd said... along the lines of,... ‘ if you are not ready to be a saint, other people will be able to step in’, and to help him enter into his suffering with Christ”.⁴⁴⁰

Hartill’s work particularly speaks into this, with the recognition that the habitus formed within children in the field of sport instils an expectation of obedience and self-discipline from children toward their coaches in the training context. This can form a habitus which can leave the child unable or unwilling to resist CSA.⁴⁴¹ Particularly at the time, AN-A117 had joined the scheme to come to terms with his sexuality and to explore ministry within the church, and Ball’s expectations were framed in such a way that to refuse appeared impossible:

Q: For you, you thought this was something that was necessary in order for you to pursue your religious calling?

AN-A117: Yes.⁴⁴²

Within sport, the coach’s role is voluntary, with sport offered as a gift to the child. This gift can be withdrawn unless the child recognises and acknowledges its value by responding with gratitude and obedience to the coach.⁴⁴³ Ball’s emphasis on making an exception to allow AN-A117 onto the scheme is indicative of the way that AN-A117 was made to feel beholden to Ball, through the ‘gift’ of being able to engage with the scheme. The gradual increase of the abusive nature of the acts, and Ball’s comparison of AN-A117 with other Schemers, would have made it more difficult to refuse. Given his commitment to the field, and the associated desire to gain capital and remain within it, the norm of obedience to Ball would have been strong. This also reflects Healy’s acknowledgement that remaining within the church may be of such value to an

⁴³⁷ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.124.

⁴³⁸ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, pp.132-133.

⁴³⁹ “It was all part of the fog of the spiritual idea of humiliation, of entering into the suffering of Christ”. AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.125.

⁴⁴⁰ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.128.

⁴⁴¹ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.179-181.

⁴⁴² AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.119.

⁴⁴³ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.176-179.

individual that they go along with sinful practices which are not reflective of the church's true orientation to Christ, because they are too committed to their position.

AN-A117's submission to Ball's demands may also have been influenced by his understanding of the extent to which the church or individuals within it could be understood as being sinful. As explored previously, there was a broad societal assumption that those within the church would not do anything sinful. This assumption would have made it more difficult for AN-A117 to refuse abuse. This also ties into the structural nature of the sin. Ball essentially defined the abuse as moral, and this was given extra weight because the church and clerics were widely understood to be moral. This meant that abusive acts were harder to recognise as such. The structures of the church and its role in defining morality, made it easier for abusive relationships to develop, as it was easier to overcome the child's resistance.⁴⁴⁴

Even once AN-A117 had decided that he did not have a religious vocation, his loyalty to Ball remained. This further indicates the depth of influence that a habitus has on the behaviour of the person holding it, even when they move into a different field. Ball wrote letters to AN-A117 after he had left the scheme in such a way that "you were made to feel sort of incredibly special, that this very senior person was writing to you in this way".⁴⁴⁵ This sense of being special and valued continued even when AN-117 was considering speaking to the police about Ball's abuse after Neil Todd's abuse had been disclosed. Ball rang AN-A117, telling him what he could and could not say to the police. AN-A117 remembers "feeling very conflicted about loyalty to Peter and not wanting him to get into any trouble", and that this sense of loyalty remained during the later court case in 2013/14.⁴⁴⁶

Hunt also noted how far AN-A117 and other ex-Schemers remained loyal to Ball, when Todd initially made his statement to the police. Hunt perceived them as still believing that Ball

⁴⁴⁴ Finkelhor, *CSA*, p.14.

⁴⁴⁵ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.136.

⁴⁴⁶ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, pp.140, 144.

was a very holy person and that he shouldn't have done these things and it was a mistake and they didn't really want to, as it were, get him; what they wanted was for Neil to be believed. I would say, if I may, my view was that they were also still, having been manipulated by him, still enthralled to him in that sense, that they would, you know, listen to what he said seriously... And if somebody has groomed young people in that way, then that's what's going to happen.⁴⁴⁷

Hunt agreed that this remained the case, at least for AN-A117, in 2012 when Ball was arrested for the second time.⁴⁴⁸ Again, this shows the impact of grooming and the difficulty of changing a person's habitus. If habitus have been formed by a field which is structurally sinful, which I argue is true of aspects of the Church of England, it will take consistent work to learn new patterns of behaving. It implies that making changes to people's habitus within the church, in terms of making them more committed to effective safeguarding procedures, may be a long process.

The extent to which Ball was aware of his desire to abuse young men before beginning the Scheme, or whether it arose crecively due to the intimacy of living together, is unclear. However, the Scheme clearly contributed to his ability to access young men unsupervised, which reflects the individual's role in developing an abusive relationship. However, it also reflects the inadequacy of the Church of England's safeguarding processes at the time, which speaks more to the role of the institution in forming one's understanding of appropriate behaviour. Ball's defence of his behaviour at the time was that he believed it to be consensual. This clearly plays into the role of power and capital within an organisation, in terms of Ball's survivors feeling unable to reject his advances, but also into the understanding of what appropriate sexuality looks like, in terms of dominating others. The extent to which the church's, and therefore individuals', difficulty in accepting homosexuality played into this domination and abusive practice will be explored further below.

⁴⁴⁷ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, p.155.

⁴⁴⁸ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, p.156.

Institutional Processes

The institutional processes of the Church of England were also influential on Ball's abuse of AN-A117, and the church's response to the allegations of abuse made by AN-A117, Neil Todd, and others. The lack of supervision of the Scheme from the Church of England⁴⁴⁹ and associated isolation of the Schemers meant that there was no easily accessible alternative space for survivors to report abuse to. While AN-A117 recognises the church's lack of awareness of safeguarding in the 1990s,⁴⁵⁰ this unawareness was at odds with the increasing pressure in society to protect children from abuse.⁴⁵¹ George Carey acknowledged that the church was "behind the curve at times" in terms of its child protection policies, blaming this in part on the church's governance structures.⁴⁵²

The lack of effective administrative system within the church directly impacted on its ability to keep vulnerable people safe: at the time there was no real screening of applicants for child protection concerns, there were no concrete guidelines around what was appropriate behaviour with young people, and there was a lack of communication channels to share relevant information, or concrete policies, within the Church of England about responding to CSA. Others within the church were aware that Ball's relationships with young people may be inappropriate or abusive, but nothing was done to protect the vulnerable people on the Scheme.⁴⁵³ Again, this shows concern for the church and its reputation, rather than its members; a reflection of people's false orientation, glorying in the church rather than Christ.

When Ball was arrested in 1993, and AN-A117 was asked with others to corroborate Neil Todd's account of the abuse, there was pressure from the wider church not to testify, with bishops phoning Hunt and warning her and the

⁴⁴⁹ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.121.

⁴⁵⁰ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.145.

⁴⁵¹ Marcus Erooga (ed.), *Creating Safer Organisations* (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2012), p.47. See also, The IICSA Panel, *Interim*, p.12.

⁴⁵² Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.15-16.

⁴⁵³ Peter Ball, *Witness Statement of Bishop Peter Ball*, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6253/view/ANG000209_1.pdf> 11/08/2020.

Schemers against giving a statement.⁴⁵⁴ Church leaders' actions seemed to prioritise the church's reputation, rather than being truthful about the extent of Ball's offending. One of several letters sent to Carey after Todd's allegations were made public accused Ball of propositioning their son, but the police had not been told because it "would have embarrassed the bishop himself who had acted charitably towards us".⁴⁵⁵ The church did not share it with the police until 2012. Carey argued that by the standards of the time the allegations made in this and other letters should not have been disclosed to the police, to respect the confidentiality of the individuals involved.⁴⁵⁶ However, ultimately Carey acknowledged in his evidence that "We have been fobbing people off".⁴⁵⁷ The allegations were not followed up by the church, nor allowed to influence the line Carey took in engaging with the CPS, where he argued that the allegations made by Todd were "quite unrepresentative of [Ball's] style",⁴⁵⁸ despite multiple correspondents making similar allegations.

In engaging with Ball, the decisions made about his legal representation and his retirement were made with public opinion in mind. Some of his legal costs were covered by the church, because it was "important to limit any damage there might be to the church".⁴⁵⁹ When Michael Ball was encouraging Carey to reinstate his brother in ministry, Carey notes that this desire has to be balanced with "the credibility of the church in the eyes of the public".⁴⁶⁰ This further reflects the commitment to the church's reputation.

There are clear links here with Weber's 'Old Institutionalism', with those in authority in the organisation being more committed to the organisation's continued flourishing, than that of the individuals within it. It correlates with Healy's understanding of the church being sinful when it glories in the church rather than in Christ, which is visible in the commitment to the organisation rather than individuals. Furthermore, the commitment to Ball and the church

⁴⁵⁴ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.141. See also Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, pp.156-162.

⁴⁵⁵ Letter cited by Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.69.

⁴⁵⁶ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.72, 75, 84, 94-95.

⁴⁵⁷ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.100.

⁴⁵⁸ Letter by Carey cited by Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.151.

⁴⁵⁹ Memorandum cited by Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.135.

⁴⁶⁰ Letter by Carey cited by Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.161.

meant leaders protected their own power and reputation rather than caring for the survivors of abuse, which is reflective of the dynamics of structural sin.

The way that authority was held and delegated within the church also meant that appropriate decisions were not made about Ball's conduct. The Bishop of Lambeth, John Yates, was Carey's representative with the House of Bishops, and therefore was meant to pass information between them. Instead, he did not inform Carey that Mr and Mrs Moss, staff of Ball's, came to him in October 1992 with allegations of abuse against Todd by Ball. Nor was Carey informed by the Bishop of Southwark or the Bishop of Chichester of the allegations until 11 December 1992, despite them having known about them for at least a couple of weeks.⁴⁶¹

Palmer and Feldman recognise the difficulty of allegations of CSA being blocked between different levels of authority within organisations, which is why they suggest a matrix structure as a means of preventing this blockage.⁴⁶² While authority is dispersed at lower levels of the Church of England and therefore it can be argued that there is more of a matrix structure, Podmore argues that the church is ultimately still hierarchical, particularly in its higher levels,⁴⁶³ which means that this remains an issue.⁴⁶⁴ This clearly reflects the way that organisations' leadership structures and delegation patterns can enable sinful behaviour to continue. Those with capital, Ball and Carey, were valued over the survivors, which is reflective of the dynamics of structural sin.

As part of Carey's commitment to the field and capital he valued, extensive pastoral care was offered to Ball. Carey's initial meeting with Ball in December 1992 after his arrest was a pastoral rather than a disciplinary meeting, as a means to understand the allegations made and to offer support.⁴⁶⁵ Throughout

⁴⁶¹ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.51-54.

⁴⁶² Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.63-64.

⁴⁶³ Colin Podmore, 'A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of the Episcopal Church and the Church of England Compared' ('Churches'), *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 10:1 (2008), pp.34-70, at pp.53, 69. This may be influenced by the capital of those in positions of leadership, and therefore their control over the structures.

⁴⁶⁴ As also noted by Andrew Nunn, who found himself unable to challenge Carey's decisions around Ball's rehabilitation because of the "archepiscopal explosions". Andrew Nunn, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, p.106.

⁴⁶⁵ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.57.

Carey's evidence to IICSA, he appears torn between appropriate punishment for Ball's crimes, and recognition of the strengths of his ministry and seeking to offer a means of Ball contributing further to the church. He notes that Ball "was actually a deeply respected person in the church at that time, charismatic. I did want to keep him on the episcopal bench. I saw him as a man with many gifts".⁴⁶⁶ Significant in the survivor's perception of the church's priorities was the statement given by Carey to the Diocese of Gloucester:

We hope and pray that investigations will clear his name and that he will be restored to his great work of Christian ministry. Bishop Peter has always given unstintingly to the service of Christ. Aware of the devastating effect that any such accusation has on those accused, the archbishop asks that people continue to remember Bishop Peter in their prayers.⁴⁶⁷

While it is proper that Carey offered pastoral support to the diocese, the lack of acknowledgment of the survivors, and the language of clearing Ball's name makes it clear where Carey's sympathies lay. The desire was for Ball to be innocent, and as such Todd was painted within Lambeth as a "disturbed young man" who was unfairly ending Ball's ministry.⁴⁶⁸

The request by Hunt for Ball's ministry to be properly curtailed, and for appropriate pastoral care to be offered to the survivors, was denied, with the comment by Carey that "we resist such demands".⁴⁶⁹ Scolding points out that Carey was "able to be bullied by the people who were perceived by yourself as having more influence, but not able to be bullied by those who had less influence".⁴⁷⁰ Carey acknowledges this, and the church's unwillingness to give support to survivors as noted by those who gave evidence to IICSA⁴⁷¹ is indicative that this was not an issue unique to Ball's case. Again, this is indicative of the dynamics of structural sin, and of Niebuhr's acknowledgement of the difficulty that group leaders have in challenging group processes.

⁴⁶⁶ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.60-61.

⁴⁶⁷ Diocese of Gloucester, *Press Release 31/12/1992*, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/5988/view/ACE000255_001.pdf> 20/08/2020.

⁴⁶⁸ John Yates, cited in *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.122.

⁴⁶⁹ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.180.

⁴⁷⁰ Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.181-182.

⁴⁷¹ IICSA Panel, *Interim*, vii.

Kelly notes that structures of sin also preserve individuals' moral ignorance.⁴⁷² Carey claimed "very little knowledge" in 1992 of what Ball had done,⁴⁷³ despite acknowledging that he had previously understood what a caution was.⁴⁷⁴ He acknowledged that he "couldn't believe that a bishop in the church of God could do such evil things".⁴⁷⁵ As part of that, he argues that "what has changed over the last 25 years is our understanding of how institutions and individuals can be corrupted",⁴⁷⁶ alongside the extent to which power can be abused. In the Gordon report which was made when Ball was arrested in 1992, there was a sense that he had simply acted 'naively', rather than with criminal intent.⁴⁷⁷

However, in the memorandum written by Nunn and Llewelin, it is recognised that "again and again, we see those in the church guilty of misconduct revising history to cast themselves in the role of victims. We believe it to be so in this case".⁴⁷⁸ Hartill argues against leaders of organisations being allowed to cast themselves as naively tricked into believing the protestations of innocence made by those accused of abuse. Given the church's emphasis on individuals' capacity to sin, Carey's suggestion that he could not believe Ball capable of CSA appears naïve.

The desire for the accused to be innocent, particularly if they are people of capital within the field,⁴⁷⁹ is reflected here. Furthermore, Palmer and Feldman recognise that people of high status within an organisation, such as Bishop Ball, are more likely to make truth claims that are believed.⁴⁸⁰ Hartill notes that those with capital and authority within a field are likely to have habitus which are closely connected to the field they are working within, and are therefore deeply invested in the field's continuation.⁴⁸¹ Participants begin to identify themselves with the organisation, so experience a threat to the organisation as

⁴⁷² Kelly, 'Operation', p.305.

⁴⁷³ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.62.

⁴⁷⁴ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.13.

⁴⁷⁵ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.24. See also pp.138-139.

⁴⁷⁶ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.23.

⁴⁷⁷ Gordon report, referenced by Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp. 126-127.

⁴⁷⁸ Memorandum referenced by Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.184.

⁴⁷⁹ Michael Hartill, 'Concealment of Child Sexual Abuse in Sports', *Quest* 65:2 (2013), pp.241-254, at pp.241, 245, 248, 250. Also acknowledged by Colin Perkins, *IICSA Transcript 16/03/2018*, p. 177. See also Harper and Perkins, 'Reporting', p.34.

⁴⁸⁰ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.27-29.

⁴⁸¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *Reason*, p.119.

a threat to them personally, which means that defence against criticism can become more important than reform.⁴⁸²

Hartill suggests the 'self-deception' by those whose habitus is closely formed by the field means that they may be unable to recognise abuse committed by people that they know, which may be indicative of Carey's inability to believe the allegations made against Ball. This offers an alternative to the understanding of "naïve, 'culturally dopey' adults" being groomed by perpetrators to not recognise abuse.⁴⁸³ To acknowledge that someone with a great deal of capital within the church could be sinful would be destructive of Carey's own self-understanding.⁴⁸⁴ As Minto points out, those who are more likely to receive abuse allegations and have to respond to them appropriately are most likely to disbelieve them.⁴⁸⁵

This implies that leaders will find it difficult to speak out against abuse for fear of damaging the field which gives them their identity.⁴⁸⁶ In the context of the church, there is likely to be very little disconnect between clerical habitus and church field, and therefore very little space for prophetic critique, or even for recognition of the church's flaws. Hunt's ability to speak out despite her clerical role may have been influenced by her previous roles in social work. However, a habitus formed by prior experience in other fields is not guaranteed among clergy. This inability to speak out also reflects Healy's warning about the prevalence and danger of glorying in the church, and how far it can be ameliorated by listening to and being influenced by voices outside the church. It further speaks into the extent to which it can be difficult to reshape organisations which have become structurally sinful when reliant solely on internal influence, and that external support may be required; for example, IICSA or legislation.

⁴⁸² Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.43-44. See also Harper and Perkins, 'Reporting', pp.30-41.

⁴⁸³ Hartill, *Sport*, p.172.

⁴⁸⁴ Hartill, *Sport*, p.196.

⁴⁸⁵ Minto *et al.*, 'Social Identity', pp.12-13.

⁴⁸⁶ Hartill, *Sport*, p.205.

Carey's decision to resist the request for an apology from the Church to those who were abused by Ball reflects the lack of value that can be placed on those who are outside of one's field, or lacking in capital.⁴⁸⁷ Hunt noted significant anxiety in the survivors of Ball's abuse who were deciding whether to testify against him, on the grounds of their continued participation in the church. They were aware of the insecurity of their position, and the extent to which it was dependent on those with power (or capital) within the field allowing them to remain involved. This was a particular issue for those who were ordinands, for whom it would raise questions about their sexuality, and therefore their suitability for ordination: "in much the same way as before the law legalising homosexuality, those men who were homosexual were liable to being blackmailed and generally manipulated, these young men within the church were in an analogous position".⁴⁸⁸ Patterns of structural sin, which value those of capital or with power who can improve the organisation's position, remains visible in this dynamic.

After Ball's caution, the lack of church discipline was noticeable. His retirement meant that Carey believed the church could not impose discipline,⁴⁸⁹ but no further discipline was imposed after Ball's gradual return to ministry. While initially Ball's Permission to Officiate (PTO) as a priest was limited to two parishes, in reality there was no capacity to monitor that the restrictions were being observed.⁴⁹⁰ The bishop of the diocese is responsible for ensuring the restrictions were enforced; in Ball's case, this was his twin brother, who could hardly be expected to be impartial.

This lack of independence was also present in the church's initial internal inquiry into Ball's offending: they looked for a "senior trusted person... eminent enough to receive embarrassing details of episcopal (alleged) indiscretions".⁴⁹¹ They chose a retired bishop, rather than a lawyer or other independent person. While I do not pass judgement on the quality of the report, it raises questions

⁴⁸⁷ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.197, 205.

⁴⁸⁸ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, pp.171-172, at p.171.

⁴⁸⁹ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.101.

⁴⁹⁰ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.171. Tilby acknowledged that this was an issue across the Church of England. Tilby, *IICSA Transcript 19/03/2018*, pp.152-157.

⁴⁹¹ Memorandum, cited by Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.110-111.

around how far the church was willing to open itself to external scrutiny. In contrast, while aware of the Tyler report,⁴⁹² Carey did not ask for a copy, because he “saw this as somebody else handling this. It had nothing to do with Lambeth... I didn’t think it was the church’s responsibility to start doing detective work”.⁴⁹³ This points toward the particular separation between dioceses and province, which can mean that information is not shared fully, and therefore that abuse is not fully understood and therefore not dealt with. It implies a deliberate avoidance of knowing the full truth, indicative of the way that structural sin can shape understandings of truth and morality.

In considering Ball’s punishment, Carey noted that Ball “wasn't raping anybody, there was no penetrative sex. I think our weakness was actually to put it as the lowest of the low instead of seeing that, whatever it is, it's conduct unbecoming of a bishop or clergyman”.⁴⁹⁴ The issue with Carey’s statement here is that the only means of disciplining a cleric is through accusing them of conduct unbecoming; to not acknowledge this as such is therefore excusing Ball from discipline, rather than recognising it as ‘the lowest of the low’. The lack of clarity around the ability to discipline clergy who were not in active ministry also enabled Ball to evade punishment. It is sinful on the part of the church to not hold people such as Ball to account for their crimes; the failure to do so gives the message to those abused that their suffering is irrelevant, ignoring their inherent dignity as those made in the *Imago Dei*, objectifying them rather than treating them as subjects. Failing to use available church discipline creates an expectation of leniency which then makes it more likely that discipline will not be enforced in the future if the same or another cleric perpetrates abuse, thereby further enabling abuse and making the church’s structures more sinful.

The lack of church discipline and marginalising those who speak out against abuse within the church maintains the field’s stability as it is.⁴⁹⁵ Healy’s recognition of the church’s marginalisation of those making prophetic critiques is also reflective of the structural sin which holds people of power, status, or

⁴⁹² Written for the then Bishop of Chichester in 1992-1993 about Ball’s offending.

⁴⁹³ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.142-143.

⁴⁹⁴ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.146.

⁴⁹⁵ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.49, 195, 197.

capital within the field as more important than those without. Attempting to make a field or organisation less structurally sinful, and therefore offer greater flourishing to those who are marginalised or exploited by the organisation, will lead to conflict.⁴⁹⁶ In the context of church-based CSA, this is because the church's flourishing is perceived to require the maintenance of its status and power, which is partially dependent on a good reputation. However, Healy notes the flourishing of the church is dependent on the closeness of its orientation to Christ and its making disciples. To do so effectively means acknowledging every person and institution's capacity to sin and seeking justice in these situations. The church has failed to do this in the context of abuse, partially because of its sinful structures and institutional processes which influence how it responds to allegations of abuse.

Authority within the Field

Ball's authority within the field also adversely impacted on AN-A117's ability to refuse abusive acts, particularly as Ball emphasised that authority to him. Ball had legitimate formal authority, as a bishop within the Church of England, and was widely recognised to be charismatic, with his power over AN-A117's life being total. Furthermore, AN-A117 was isolated, which made it difficult for him to find somewhere to disclose the abuse; the beating only stopped because a boyfriend saw the bruising and said it was unacceptable.⁴⁹⁷ It took several months before AN-A117 felt able to disclose the abuse to Ros Hunt.⁴⁹⁸ The dominative nature of the abuse AN-A117 experienced may also link to Hartill's emphasis on masculinism requiring the domination of the other to enact one's masculinity.

Palmer and Feldman recognise that a perpetrator's power within an organisation can enable abuse: survivors do not feel that they can resist, or know that their resistance will be punished, or choose not to report abuse.⁴⁹⁹ Similarly, particular forms of authority, such as charismatic or traditional authority, mean that the holder may have wider control over their subordinates

⁴⁹⁶ Finn, 'Sinful', p.153.

⁴⁹⁷ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.134.

⁴⁹⁸ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.138.

⁴⁹⁹ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, pp.20-21.

than those with rational authority, and therefore make wider demands over their behaviour.⁵⁰⁰ Furthermore, they recognise the dangers of hierarchical structures⁵⁰¹ with a unitary chain of command, as they mean that there is no alternative space to report CSA concerns to.⁵⁰² All of these may have influenced AN-A117, as Ball had total control: AN-A117 lived alone with Ball, with no oversight or official means of accessing support from elsewhere in the church, and was influenced by Ball's legitimate, charismatic, and spiritual authority.

AN-A117 was essentially in one of Goffman's TIs: a "place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life",⁵⁰³ which seeks to transform inmates from socially undesirable to desirable.⁵⁰⁴ AN-A117 was the only person on the Scheme at the time, and the way of life was not particularly 'formal'. Nevertheless, he was isolated from external support, and was on the Scheme to seek to change his life, thereby giving Ball huge power over him. TIs also construct their own moral world, which is seen in Ball's acknowledgement that the mainstream church would not agree with his practices, and is also reflective of how structurally sinful organisations shape individuals' understandings of morality.

Hartill's exploration of the way that habitus are formed when the individual moves into a new field has explicatory power for how Ball gained control over AN-A117. AN-A117 was in 'hysteresis', not knowing the rules of the game, as his habitus did not match the field that he found himself in.⁵⁰⁵ There was no one else AN-A117 could check with to see whether what he was being asked to do

⁵⁰⁰ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.22.

⁵⁰¹ N. Spröber, T. Schneider, M. Rassenhofer *et al.*, 'Child sexual abuse in religiously affiliated and secular institutions: a retrospective descriptive analysis of data provided by victims in a government-sponsored reappraisal program in Germany', *BMC Public Health* 14, 282 (2014) accessed online at <<https://bmcpublihealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-14-282>> 14/11/2019. Also Karen Staller, 'Missing Pieces, Repetitive Practices: Child Sexual Exploitation and Institutional Settings' in *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies* 12:4 (2012), pp.274-278.

⁵⁰² Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.22.

⁵⁰³ Erving Goffman, *Asylums* (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1968), p.11.

⁵⁰⁴ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.49.

⁵⁰⁵ Maton, 'Habitus', pp.59-60. An inability to talk freely about sexuality, instead being restricted to what is appropriate within church teaching, may also contribute to this hysteresis and therefore vulnerability.

was normal. Actively seeking to change his habitus to match the field of church, Ball's emphasis on normalising what he was asking AN-A117 and pressurising him with comparison to other Schemers was powerful. Hartill recognises within sport that this pressure may leave children believing that abuse is worth enduring if it means that they continue to gain capital within the field;⁵⁰⁶ this may also have been true for AN-A117.

The way these dynamics play into structural sin and ecclesiology are similar to those noted above. Those in authority define the rules of engagement in the field; challenging abuse breaks the rules of engagement, so those who do so are marginalised and excluded. How far the survivor desires the field's capital will influence their desire to resist or report abuse. When ecclesiology emphasises obedience to people with spiritual authority, and the abuser uses theology to justify their abuse, this will be strengthened, and is a particular issue for church-based abuse.

Hunt noted that "clergy often, and the church in general often, were not aware of the level of power which they wielded... by the very fact of being an ordained person".⁵⁰⁷ Speaking here of the authority an ordained person has over a lay person, Hunt also acknowledged the extensive authority bishops and archbishops have over deacons and priests: "As a good Anglo Catholic, clergy obey the bishops".⁵⁰⁸ Hunt was asked by Michael Ball, Peter Ball's twin and Bishop of Truro, and at least one other bishop, to persuade the Schemers not to speak to the police about Peter Ball's offending. She was sufficiently conflicted about her responsibilities to the Schemers and to the bishops to phone Rowan Williams, then Bishop of Monmouth and a personal friend to get his advice, whose response was "you are required to obey your bishops in all things lawful and honest... what they are asking you to do is neither lawful nor honest".⁵⁰⁹

⁵⁰⁶ Hartill, *Sport*, pp.180, 186. This is important to emphasise to acknowledge CSA survivors' agency. Rather than survivors being perceived as entirely passive, their voice and strength can be acknowledged in a way that does not minimise their victimhood.

⁵⁰⁷ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, p.137.

⁵⁰⁸ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, p.161.

⁵⁰⁹ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, p.161.

Carey himself acknowledged that the Ball brothers' seniority made it difficult for him to resist their assertions of Peter Ball's innocence, despite his position as Archbishop of Canterbury: "to have one diocesan bishop confronting me on this is bad enough, but the brothers are identical twins. They stood together. They... said with one voice that, "Peter has not done anything wrong" ... it's the level of seniority; it's the very fact that two bishops making one statement".⁵¹⁰ Ball made use of his relationships with other people of capital such as the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Donald Coggan, to influence Carey's decisions about whether to allow Ball to return to ministry.⁵¹¹

Carey argued that his resignation had "removed him from a power base where he could exploit vulnerable people",⁵¹² but this was challenged by Scolding, who noted that he did still have a power base in his relationships with people of prominence; not only with Coggan, but the Prince of Wales, and Lord Lloyd of Berwick.⁵¹³ She suggested that this influenced Carey's decision to allow Ball to return to ministry; partially because Carey did not know how to communicate to Ball's supporters the extent of the crimes that had been committed, which Carey acknowledged as influential.⁵¹⁴

Despite Ball's police caution and retirement in March 1993, by March 1995 he was given PTO as a priest in two parishes in Cornwall. By 1996, he was exercising episcopal ministry by confirming boys in two schools, and by January 1997, Carey gave advice to the House of Bishops that he could "be regarded in the same way as any other retired bishop".⁵¹⁵ The pressure on Carey by the Ball brothers and Ball's supporters, those whom Carey respected as wise and influential people within their fields,⁵¹⁶ meant that in reality Ball did not bear the original 'punishment' of retirement and the ending of his ministry.

⁵¹⁰ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.31-32.

⁵¹¹ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.164.

⁵¹² Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.165.

⁵¹³ Scolding, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.165.

⁵¹⁴ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.166-167.

⁵¹⁵ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.174.

⁵¹⁶ Including the psychiatrist who was caring for Ball after his arrest. Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.124.

This emphasises the role that people of capital have in maintaining the structure of a field, and the extent to which interorganisational power relations can also be influential on other organisations. Carey wrote to the CPS giving a character reference for Ball, and acknowledged that this was meant to impact the CPS, though he argued that this was an attempt to be pastoral rather than to influence the investigation.⁵¹⁷

Not only was Carey influenced by Ball's supporters outside the church in his decisions regarding Ball's rehabilitation, but he also attempted to use his position to influence others outside the church. This reflects the interrelation of all human society, both churchly and non-churchly institutions. The church does not stand alone; instead, aspects of sin which mar other institutions can also mar the church. The emphasis on deferring to those who already have power and further marginalising those who do not reflects the structurally sinful nature of the organisations which are interrelated in our society.

Organisational Culture

Roger Singleton, at the time of IICSA Interim Director of Safeguarding for the Church of England, recognises the need for culture change in "the way the church, as an institution, and individuals within it think, feel and act, particularly towards safeguarding".⁵¹⁸ Theology particularly shapes church culture, including understandings of clericalism, safeguarding, forgiveness and repentance, and sexuality. Hartill acknowledges that the shaping of culture is dependent both on individual freedom but also societal or organisational constraint, in a similar way to liberation theologians acknowledging the role of structural sin in shaping individuals' freedom.

One of IICSA's areas of interest is the extent to which there was a culture of clericalism within the Church of England. They define this as "Church structures in which control is largely or entirely vested in the clergy. The consequence of this is the absence of accountability, and the creation of a climate in which clergy may consider themselves superior to laity".⁵¹⁹ Clericalism has been

⁵¹⁷ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.152-153.

⁵¹⁸ Roger Singleton, *IICSA Transcript 16/03/2018*, pp.142.

⁵¹⁹ Inquiry Panel, *Interim*, vii.

present in the dynamics of Ball's offending and the church's response to allegations as explored above. The trust ceded to Ball by the Schemers and the extent to which Ball's innocence was believed were all influenced by clericalism. The absence of accountability given the minimal disciplinary proceedings that the church had for clerics, and the sense of superiority that comes from being a leader in one's organisation, may have created a sense of safety for Ball as he believed that his abuse would not be challenged. All these aspects influenced the abuse and the church's response to abuse allegations.

The church's understanding of safeguarding was also influential. The safeguarding training that clergy received was minimal until the very recent past, with Hunt acknowledging that "The idea of any kind of safeguarding... hadn't really been raised".⁵²⁰ It was in part her previous roles as a social worker, on the Manchester Rape Crisis line, and Woman's Aid, that gave her the expertise that enabled her to respond well to the allegations made by AN-A117 and others about Ball.⁵²¹

Carey acknowledged that the men chosen to investigate Ball's abuse were "both from a generation to whom notions of safeguarding or child protection were, if anything, even more alien than they were to me. To be clear, none of us would even have conceived of these allegations amounting to child sexual abuse".⁵²² It wasn't until after Ball's arrest, cautioning and retirement that there was an awareness of the need for child protection or safeguarding in the church, and not until 1995 that there was a national safeguarding policy. Carey defended the church by arguing that the church should be understood as part of society, responding to new safeguarding learning at the same pace as other parts of society, rather than a distinct body which should have been further ahead.⁵²³

This reflects the difficulty that Hartill acknowledged in the context of youth sports in encouraging greater engagement with safeguarding in a robust and central way, rather than as an add-on in order to protect the club's reputation,

⁵²⁰ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, p.137.

⁵²¹ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, pp.135-136.

⁵²² Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.114.

⁵²³ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, pp.9-19.

which takes up resources which could be better used elsewhere.⁵²⁴ The dynamic in the church again is one which understands the emphasis on safeguarding as taking away from their call to make new disciples, particularly to participate in the church as it currently is, maintaining its status and power. Within sports, and analogically within the church, it reflects a short-sighted emphasis on the organisation's continuation through the creation of effective child athletes who will win competitions, and then as adults will invest in a new generation of child athletes, rather than on the health and wellbeing of those currently in their care. Healy could frame this as a failure to be orientated to Christ.

The church's theology was also influential on the response it made to abuse allegations, to the extent that it can be understood as sin-inducing, or at least sin-enabling. Carey acknowledged that "in the gospels, some of the fiercest condemnation by the Lord is about people who mistreat children. So we were very conscious that our gospel commands us to care for the most vulnerable of people".⁵²⁵ While this may be true of the gospel, Carey acknowledges that the church was unclear on how they would express this in a theologically robust way, particularly in relation to the emphasis on forgiveness and restoration. This emphasis, made several times by Carey in his evidence to IICSA, enabled Ball's return to ministry.⁵²⁶ By conflating forgiveness with restoration, Carey enabled Ball ultimately to escape meaningful punishment, as he was able to continue in his episcopal ministry.

Therefore, work to ensure that there is a greater depth of understanding around the theology of safeguarding is crucial. As previously noted, Tilby acknowledged that "if you don't talk about the theology of safeguarding, you are not going to engage half the church, particularly those who are ordained".⁵²⁷ While the church has done more work in recent years on the theology of safeguarding, this has largely been in relation to abuse committed by those outside the church, a noticeable exception being *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*

⁵²⁴ Hartill and Lang, 'Pain', pp.607, 612-613.

⁵²⁵ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.17.

⁵²⁶ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.136, 162.

⁵²⁷ Tilby, *IICSA Transcript 20/03/2018*, p.106.

in the Aftermath of Abuse.⁵²⁸ This resource needs to be further disseminated and more deeply engaged with.

Understandings of gender identity also influence the church's response to abuse. Hunt's work on abuse within the church written in 1992 noted that "women... experienced abuse within the church; that the church's attitude to women encouraged that... And thus it was very easy for women to be abused and have nowhere to take that... Women are asking for justice but you're not hearing us". In her evidence she extended that to all who are marginalised or 'othered' by the church, including survivors of CSA.⁵²⁹ Given that all the Church of England's clerics were men until 1994, Hartill's definition of the masculinist habitus has the potential to be strong within the churches. It could shape clerical actions towards domination, 'doing to' rather than listening to and enabling the other. The dynamics of structural sin around exploitation will be strengthened by this masculinist perspective. Hartill notes that the masculinist drive for domination is not just focused on women, but also on other men who might be perceived as 'weaker'. Hunt noted that Ball's abuse of particular Schemers was not only based on their 'prettiness', but also their vulnerability, which left them less able to reject his advances.⁵³⁰ Younger and with no positional power, the Schemers were particularly vulnerable.

The church's perception of homosexuality may also have influenced Ball's abuse and the church's response to it. Frédéric Martel suggests that the suppression of homosexuality within the Catholic Church creates a culture of secrecy which enables the concealment of CSA.⁵³¹ Furthermore, the confusion and self-hatred experienced by some who are aware of their homosexuality but are unable to reconcile it with church teaching, may mean that they engage in masochistic

⁵²⁸ The Archbishops' Council, *Forgiveness*, especially pp.54-64.

⁵²⁹ Hunt, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, pp.142-145.

⁵³⁰ Hunt, *26/07/2018*, p.153.

⁵³¹ Frédéric Martel, *In the Closet of the Vatican (Closet)* (Trans. Shaun Whiteside) (London: Bloomsbury Continuum, 2019), xiii. See also Keenan, *Catholic*, pp.152-153, and A.W. Richard Sipe, *Celibacy in Crisis: A Secret World Revisited* (Hove: Brunner-Routledge, 2003). This line of inquiry is not meant to imply that there is a correlation between being gay and being sexually attracted to children; this is an outdated and false perspective. Instead, that a culture of secrecy and shame around any sexuality can enable misconduct and sin.

practices in an attempt to punish themselves, or as penitence for their unacceptable thoughts or actions.⁵³²

It is possible that Peter Ball was one such person. Although Ball's sexuality is unknown, he recognises that he "did not have the courage to be as forthright as [he] should have been in terms of sexuality".⁵³³ Brought up before the decriminalisation of homosexuality for men over the age of 21 in 1967, and ministering at a time when the church began to articulate a theology of sexuality which viewed homosexual orientation and relationships at the very least as less than God's best for people,⁵³⁴ and at worst an 'abomination',⁵³⁵ he may have been unable to come to terms with his own sexuality. Given that Anglican clergy could marry, Ball's attraction to the monastic life may have been a way to escape society's expectations. Consumed by self-hatred, his ascetic practices such as cold showers, praying naked, and beatings, may have been an attempt at self-mortification.

One understanding of Ball's sexual offending is that he was fully aware of his desire to abuse, and deliberately began the Scheme to access young men. However, another is that the drive to perpetrate CSA may have arisen crecscively.⁵³⁶ Having started the Scheme innocently, Ball may have gradually been unable to resist the presence of young men whom he found sexually attractive, and thereby fallen into the abuse that he committed.⁵³⁷ The self-hatred that he felt around his sexuality, particularly as he began to abuse the young men on the scheme, may have influenced his resort to physical abuse to himself and to the young men as a form of penance or as an expression of that hatred. Here I return to the central question which is present throughout considerations of abuse and general participation within institutions: the extent to which individual freedom and institutional constraint shape behaviour. As

⁵³² Martel, *Closet*, pp.375, 412, 533-534.

⁵³³ Peter Ball, *Second Witness Statement of Bishop Peter Ball ('Second')*, p.81, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6248/view/ANG000301_0.pdf> 19/08/2020.

⁵³⁴ The Archbishops' Council, *Issues*, p.40.

⁵³⁵ Leviticus 18:22.

⁵³⁶ Palmer and Feldman, *Comprehending*, p.12.

⁵³⁷ Again, here, I am not excusing Ball of the responsibility he had to not abuse, but simply acknowledging that other factors may have been influential in the abuse.

structural sin suggests, while humans retain responsibility for their actions, these are not entirely free.

Having grown up in a homophobic environment, AN-A117 repressed thoughts and feelings around his sexuality, became filled with self-hatred, and turned to Christianity “consciously as a way of seeking an ideology that would justify my own repression”.⁵³⁸ This use of Christian teaching is noted by Martel in the Catholic Church, as the expectation of priestly celibacy meant that one’s sexuality could be repressed in a socially acceptable way.⁵³⁹ Martel argues that “sublimated, if not repressed, homosexuality is often translated into the choice of celibacy and chastity, and, even more often, into an internalised homophobia”.⁵⁴⁰

Martel also spoke to homosexual priests who would use “flagellations, self-punishment or physical mistreatment” to cope with their homosexuality.⁵⁴¹ This is reflected in AN-A117’s testimony:

Because of my shame about – and repression of being gay, I had begun to self-harm at home of cutting my fingers while I was praying. So by the time I’d got to Peter’s, I was perhaps in a condition to understand that if you did punish your body, if you did suffer, if you did do things that humiliated you, then it would crush your diabolical desires, it would crush your sense of – all the bad things about yourself.⁵⁴²

This belief may also have been reflected in Ball’s abuse.

As noted above, some Schemers were concerned that making allegations against Ball would out them as gay, and therefore disqualify them from ministry;⁵⁴³ a concern that seems justified given Carey’s statement that he “would never have allowed anyone to go forward for a diocesan job who had any question about his sexuality”.⁵⁴⁴ Ball notes that the church’s ongoing discomfort in engaging

⁵³⁸ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, p.112.

⁵³⁹ Martel, *Closet*, p.8.

⁵⁴⁰ Martel, *Closet*, p.168.

⁵⁴¹ Martel, *Closet*, p.412.

⁵⁴² AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, pp.116-117.

⁵⁴³ Martel recognises this pattern in the Catholic Church, with homosexuality being a means of blackmail. Martel, *Closet*, p.524.

⁵⁴⁴ Carey, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/2018*, p.39.

with homosexuality may have meant that there was “some desire on the part of the Church to deal with those matters as quickly and as privately as possible”, but that he did not feel that the homosexual nature of his offending was seen as an issue distinct from CSA.⁵⁴⁵ The church’s inability to engage well with questions around sexuality reflects the prioritisation of doctrine or institution over those individuals who are nevertheless made in the *Imago Dei*, and that remaining present in the church is dependent on fitting in. Choosing to ignore controversial and complex issues rather than engaging in discussion and debate is a refusal to seek after truth, which Healy and Avis suggest is only found through healthy argument.

The final aspect of cultural influence on Ball’s offending is how Ball was able to define reality for the Schemers, given their isolation within the community. There are clear links with Goffman’s TIs, which seek to transform inmates from socially undesirable to desirable, or as Bourdieu would put it, making their habitus reflect the field more closely. AN-A117’s sense of isolation and desire to change his sexuality and become more embedded in the church made him particularly open to being formed, and therefore vulnerable to abuse. Goffman’s suggestion that staff members do not respect inmates may have been further influenced by masculinist patterns of domination, thereby making Ball’s abuse more possible. An-A117 was made to feel that “I was letting him down or being... odd by not agreeing to something that he had done with people that were better Schemers... and closer to God, because clearly I still had some reservations about giving up my pride if I didn't agree to these things”.⁵⁴⁶ The isolation from external support meant that he was not in a position to check with others whether what he was being asked to do was appropriate. Again, this reflects a closing-down of debate and therefore refusal to seek after the truth, and within structural sin is reflective of the way that those structures define what is moral, sometimes falsely.

⁵⁴⁵ Ball, *Second*, p.80.

⁵⁴⁶ AN-A117, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, pp.122-123.

Conclusion

The theological resources from Healy's exploration of ecclesiology, and structural sin, along with the synthesis of Palmer and Feldman's and Hartill's non-churchly work has created a framework for IICSA data which is able to draw out the conflict between individual freedom and organisational constraint which is inherent in understanding CSA within institutions. The work done in these different contexts is also applicable to CSA within the church. This therefore offers further insight into the problem, and therefore a greater hope that solutions can be found which do not merely blame individual perpetrators, but also recognise the role of the institution. It is only in accurately acknowledging the complexity of church-based CSA that the church can be made a safer place. This will be through both interventions for individuals and a broader reshaping of church culture and structures.

Conclusion

This thesis has explored whether there are churchly and non-churchly resources which can illuminate some of the dynamics of the abuse that occurs within the Church of England. I have sought to offer a framework which prioritises the theological worldview which Church of England congregations, clergy, leaders and academics hold by beginning with theological resources, and therefore making the learning from other disciplines more accessible.

After laying out my understanding of CSA, and the role of the media and inquiries, I began with Healy's Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology. Healy argues that the church's call is to be oriented to Christ in its practices and to make disciples. Healy emphasises the work and presence of God and the human capacity to sin in all the world, both churchly and non-churchly. This offers a framework for understanding the validity of engaging with the learning from non-churchly academic disciplines as a means of more deeply understanding the church.

Healy emphasises that church members shape church practices, policies, and structures, which means that it is possible for church structures and practices to be sinful. This sin must be challenged, by people both within and outside the church, to enable the church to reflect its orientation to Christ more effectively. Healy acknowledges the commitment that people have to their faith communities and their desire to remain within them, and that this influences their ability to rigorously critique their own community. However, he still prioritises the voices of academic theologians and church leaders in this critique, voices which are already prioritised by nature of their role. This further marginalises those who are already marginalised by church structures, thereby blunting the critique that they could offer to the church which could reorient it toward Christ.

Consequently, the understanding of structural sin, which developed out of Liberation Theology, is helpful. It emphasises listening to marginalised voices and using them to shape the decisions and actions of powerful people and organisations to lead to all people's flourishing, rather than those who are

already privileged by their education, status, or wealth. It also expands on Healy's recognition of the presence of sin within the church.

Structural sin draws out the ways that any sin, not just CSA, and not just external to the church, is not simply an individual issue. Instead, it can colonise human organisations and institutions in a way that not only makes the processes of the organisation more likely to be sinful but also shape the behaviour of the individuals within it. Both structural sin and Healy's ecclesiology point to ways that individuals are not entirely free to choose, but that their actions are constrained by the effect of sin on their beliefs, and by their commitment to the organisations they belong to.

The interplay between individual freedom and institutional constraint, which both Healy's ecclesiology and the structural sin analysis have articulated, is further strengthened by the synthesis of Palmer and Feldman's and Hartill's work. Hartill's Bourdieuan analysis of the field, habitus and capital of youth sports effectively shows the influence that commitment to a field or an organisation has on people's ability to resist or disclose abuse. It also illuminates the difficulty that those within the field have in responding to concerns or allegations of abuse in ways that work toward the flourishing of the survivor rather than the organisation. Palmer and Feldman's work offers a closer understanding of organisational dynamics which influence the perpetration of, detection of, and response to, CSA. These dynamics are institutional or administrative processes, holding power or authority, and cultures and beliefs.

Finally, these frameworks were brought into conversation with case studies from IICSA to explore the extent to which they had explanatory power for abuse perpetrated within the church, and the response made by church leaders to allegations. I argue that the frameworks do indeed offer a deeper understanding of the CSA committed within the Church of England. AN-A117's testimony illuminates the development of an abusive relationship, and the tension between the survivor seeking to remain within the field and gain the capital which is valued there, or resisting and disclosing the abuse. Carey's testimony illustrates the dynamics for leaders of a field who are committed to its

continuation: the conflict between protecting the organisation's reputation and allowing it to continue as it is, and seeking to make it a safer place for all its members. The challenge of speaking up, and the extent to which this is made easier by previous formation in another field (social work) which prioritises safeguarding and care for the vulnerable, is illuminated by Hunt's testimony.

An obvious critique of my framework is the extent to which it is based on Catholic theology and ecclesiology but addresses CSA within the Church of England. This is, in part, influenced by the fact that the Catholic Church has done more work on the CSA that occurs within it. However, Healy's work is also useful because it acknowledges far more openly the impact that the organisational and hierarchical structure of the church has on its theology and practice. By contrast, the Church of England emphasises the independence of diocese and parish in a way that conceals some of the organisational dynamics and therefore means that structural issues are not clearly understood or addressed. While structural sin was originally articulated by Catholic theologians, it has been taken up by Anglican theologians, particularly in the shaping of Anglican social theology. A partial exception to the Anglican engagement with the organisational dynamics is McFadyen's *Bound to Sin*, which acknowledges the pathological distortion to human patterns of relating as a result of original sin,⁵⁴⁷ and the extent to which this distortion can colonise organisations. However, this is not applied to the church; instead, McFadyen draws on the example of those who participated in the Holocaust.

Despite the theological distinctiveness of the Church of England and Catholic Church, the dynamics of CSA within organisations are far more similar, given the easy synthesis of examples from youth sports, schools, and the church. Furthermore, both argue that they are true churches, tracing their heritage back to Christ and the Apostles, drawing on Scripture and tradition to mould their doctrine.⁵⁴⁸ Consequently, I argue that there is sufficient shared theology to make Catholic thinking about the church helpful in the Church of England context. I also believe that this framework, despite being formed as a response

⁵⁴⁷ McFadyen, *Bound*, pp.36-37.

⁵⁴⁸ Avis, *Identity*, p.157.

to CSA within the Church of England, may have explanatory power for the CSA that occurs within the Catholic, and other, churches.

Another possible critique of my testing of the framework is in my reliance on IICSA transcripts. While it is useful data available in the public domain, I am using the data for a different purpose than originally intended. My questions may be more usefully answered by primary research and interviews with participants in the church and with survivors. Indeed, further research which tested the framework against the opinions of survivors and church leaders would be helpful. The case studies I have used engage with abuse committed in the early 1990s, nearly thirty years ago. Further testing of the framework against the dynamics of more recent or even present-day abuse and responses to allegations, which explored the extent to which it remains a helpful means of understanding the dynamics of abuse and the church's response, would be valuable.

I am also aware that while I have critiqued aspects of the church's institutional structure and challenged the desire that church leaders have to protect the organisation, I have not suggested ways forward. It is far easier to tear down than to build up. I therefore offer the following thoughts as the beginnings of possible ways forward.

The church's safeguarding training must acknowledge that abuse is not only an individual issue but is also shaped by organisational structures and culture. Naming the reality within training will make people more aware of its influence and more able to challenge practices which might enable abuse.

The acknowledgement from Healy that the Spirit can work in all people and all contexts, whether inside or outside the church, means that there should be an increased commitment to dialogue. This must include seeking out and listening to the voices of those who are marginalised by their educational status, age, position within or without the church, sexuality, gender, or any of the other characteristics by which humans tend to judge and exclude people. It must also include those saying things that the church does not want to hear, such as

naming the church's complicity in sin, and those who are seeking justice or recompense from the church, whether through church structures or the courts.

This commitment to listening is based on the appreciation that all people are made in the *Imago Dei*, with inherent dignity which means that they must be treated as subjects rather than objects, worthy of care and protection rather than abuse and exploitation. Listening alone is insufficient; action must be taken to ensure that the structures and assumptions that contributed to people's abuse or marginalisation do not continue. Structures and procedures for having these conversations will have to be created, and they are likely to come from secular contexts and be trauma-informed.

An example of this may be 'Turning Pain Into Power', a survivor-led charter explaining "how organisations can engage positively with survivors of abuse".⁵⁴⁹ It emphasises that any engagement with survivors of abuse must be safe, empowering, accountable and transparent, liberating, creative and joyful, must amplify the voice of survivors, and promote self-care. Clear, regular, and consistent communication is important, as is clarity on policies and procedures and the time frames within which the church will engage with survivors' complaints, suggestions, and requests.

It is widely acknowledged that the Clergy Discipline Measure is not fit for purpose, particularly when it is used in the context of safeguarding concerns.⁵⁵⁰ Work is being done on its replacement, and survivor voices must be invited to contribute, and then be heard and be influential. In enabling survivors to claim their agency and make their voices heard, the church's response may go some way to creating space for the redemption which it believes is possible for all in the power of the Spirit.⁵⁵¹

It is also important to note that this framework of structural sin and practical-prophetic ecclesiology can helpfully address other aspects of injustice and sin

⁵⁴⁹ C. Perôt, J. Chevoux & Survivors' Voices Research Group, 'Turning Pain Into Power', p.1, accessed online at <<https://survivorsvoices.org/charter/>> 19/05/2020.

⁵⁵⁰ Pat Ashworth, "'Toxic' CDM leaves clergy suicidal, research finds', *Church Times* 16/07/2020, accessed online at <<https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2020/17-july/news/uk/toxic-cdm-leaves-clergy-suicidal-research-finds>> 24/08/2020.

⁵⁵¹ Shelly Rambo, *Spirit and Trauma* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), pp.161-163.

within the church, as well as CSA. The church has acknowledged its complicity with racist practices, and is increasingly challenged on its engagement with the LGBT+ community, women, disabled people, and those who are economically or educationally disadvantaged. The marginalisation and exclusion of people who do not look like the current church may have similar drivers to the silencing of survivors' voices. These organisational and theological frameworks which emphasise the drive to maintain the institution as it is rather than welcoming the diverse voices of all people can also speak into how the church can acknowledge its failings in these areas and seek to do better.

In his book, Hartill acknowledges that "the goal of prevention requires all contexts, or fields, to critically examine their own cultures, principles and processes for the antecedents of sexual violence".⁵⁵² This work has sought to acknowledge the 'antecedents of sexual violence' in the culture and organisation of the church. It is in acknowledging them that these antecedents can be challenged, and therefore the abuse and its deep and long-lasting effects may be prevented.

Part of the drive to conceal the abuse perpetrated by clergy was an attempt to protect the church's reputation. The revelation of the concealment of abuse has done far more damage to the church's reputation than the open acknowledgement of the church' and its clerics' sin would have done. Sometimes atonement for the sins of the past, in terms of proper apologies that are received as such by the survivors to whom they are offered⁵⁵³ and sacrificial giving towards counselling or whatever is thought necessary to enable the survivor's flourishing, is an investment in the future of the church. It is only in the flourishing of all God's children that the church can also truly flourish. This flourishing is dependent on the church being ever more closely oriented to Christ, which is seen in the care which it has for all those made in the *Imago Dei*. This commitment to all people as subjects worthy of care will enable the church to fulfil its mission to worship Christ and make disciples.

⁵⁵² Hartill, *Sport*, p.5.

⁵⁵³ As opposed to, for example, that offered to Matthew Ineson. Justin Welby, *IICSA Transcript 11/07/2019*, p.226.

Bibliography

- Amrom, Aria, Calkins, Cynthia, and Fargo, Jamison, 'Between the Pew and the Pulpit: Can Personality Measures Help Identify Sexually Abusive Clergy', *Sexual Abuse* 31:6 (2019), pp.686-706.
- Anand, Vikas, Ashforth, Blake E., and Joshi, Mahendra, 'Business as Usual: The Acceptance and Perpetuation of Corruption in Organizations', *The Academy of Management Executive* 19:4 (2005), pp.9-23.
- Anderson, Gary, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
- Archbishops' Commission on Urban Priority Areas, *Faith in the City* (London: Church House Publishing, 1985).
- Arendt, Hannah, 'Communicative Power', in Stephen Lukes (ed), *Power* (New York: NYU Press, 1986), pp.59-74.
- Ashforth, Blake, and Anand, Vikas, 'The Normalisation of Misconduct in Organizations', *Research in Organizational Behaviour* 25 (2003), pp.1-52.
- Ashworth, Pat, "'Toxic" CDM leaves clergy suicidal, research finds', *Church Times* 16/07/2020, accessed online at <<https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2020/17-july/news/uk/toxic-cdm-leaves-clergy-suicidal-research-finds>> 24/08/2020.
- Avis, Paul, *The Identity of Anglicanism* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).
- Ball, Peter, *Witness Statement of Bishop Peter Ball*, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6253/view/ANG000209_1.pdf> 11/08/2020.
- Ball, Peter, *Second Witness Statement of Bishop Peter Ball*, p.81, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6248/view/ANG000301_0.pdf> 19/08/2020.
- Ballard, Paul, and Pritchard, John, *Practical Theology in Action* (London: SPCK, 2006).
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von, *Theo-Drama* vol.III (trans. Graham Harrison) (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993).
- Bash, Anthony, 'Forgiveness: A Reappraisal' in *Studies in Christian Ethics* 24:2 (2011), pp.133-146.
- Baum, Gregory, 'Structures of Sin' in Gregory Baum and Robert Ellsberg (eds), *The Logic of Solidarity* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1989), pp.110-126.
- BBC News, 'Home Secretary Theresa May announces child abuse reviews' 07/06/2014, accessed online at <<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/av/uk-politics-28201486/home-secretary-theresa-may-announces-child-abuse-reviews>> 20/01/2020.
- BBC, 'Exposed: The Church's Darkest Secret' 13/01/2020, accessed online at <<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m000dbjj>> 20/01/2020.

- Beattie, Tina, 'Sex, Death and Melodrama: A Feminist Critique of Hans Urs von Balthasar', *The Way* 44:4 (2005), pp.160-176.
- Bingham, Adrian, "It would be better for the newspapers to call a spade a spade": The British Press and Child Sexual Abuse, c.1918-1990', *History Workshop Journal* 88 (2019), pp.89-110.
- Bingham, Adrian, and Settle, Louise, 'Scandals and Silences: The British Press and CSA', *History and Policy Online* (2015), accessed online at <<http://www.historyandpolicy.org/policy-papers/papers/scandals-and-silences-the-british-press-and-child-sexual-abuse>> 21/01/2020.
- Bingham, Adrian, Delap, Lucy, Jackson, Louise, and Settle, Louise, 'Historical child sexual abuse in England and Wales: the role of historians', *History of Education* 45:4 (2016), pp.411-429.
- Boff, Leonardo, and Boff, Clodovis, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (Kent: Burns and Oates, 1987).
- Boff, Leonardo, *Faith on the Edge* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 'Participant Objectivation', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 9:2 (2003), pp. 281-294.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Masculine Domination* (trans. R. Nice) (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *The Logic of Practice* (trans. R. Nice) Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990).
- Brittan, Arthur, 'Masculinities and Masculinism' in Stephen Whitehead and Frank Barrett, *The Masculinities Reader* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001), pp.51-55.
- Brown, Malcolm (ed.), *Anglican Social Theology* (London: Church House Publishing, 2014).
- Burgess, Adam, 'The Changing Character of Public Inquiries in the (Risk) Regulatory State', *British Politics* 6:1 (2011), pp.3-29.
- Berkowitz, Carol, 'Medical Consequences of Child Sexual Abuse', *Child Abuse and Neglect* 22:6 (1998), pp.541-550.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*, (Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2003), §827, accessed online at <https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P29.HTM> 07/09/2020.
- Chadwick, Henry, *The Church in Ancient Society: From Galilee to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

- Chomsky, Noam, 'Interview with Noam Chomsky, 24/10/2000', in Joel Bakan, *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power* (London: Constable and Robinson, 2004), pp.169-196.
- Clarke, R.V.G., 'Situational crime prevention: Theory and practice', *British Journal of Criminology* 20:2 (1980), pp.136-147.
- Colton, Matthew, Roberts, Susan, and Vanstone, Maurice, 'Sexual Abuse by Men Who Work with Children', *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 19:3 (2010), pp.345-364.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "Instruction on Christian Freedom and Liberation" (22/03/86) 74, accessed online at <http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19860322_freedom-liberation_en.html> 16/04/2020.
- Coser, Lewis, 'Greedy Institutions', *European Journal of Sociology* 8:2 (1967), pp.196-215.
- Coussins, Anne, *Masculinities, Sexualities, and Child Sexual Abuse* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2000).
- Cowburn, Malcolm, 'Hegemony and discourse: reconstructing the male sex offender and sexual coercion by men', *Sexualities, Evolution and Gender* 7(3), pp.215-231.
- Harper, Craig, and Perkins, Colin, 'Reporting CSA within Religious Settings: Challenges and Future Directions' in *Child Abuse Review* 27 (2018), pp.30-41.
- Death, Jodi, *Governing Child Abuse, Voices and Victimisation* (Routledge: Oxford, 2018).
- Deer, Cécile, 'Doxa', in Grenfell, Michael, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2008), pp.119-130.
- Delap, Lucy, "'Disgusting Details Which are Best Forgotten": Disclosures of Child Sexual Abuse in Twentieth Century Britain', *Journal of British Studies* 57 (2018), pp.79-107.
- Diocese of Gloucester, *Press Release 31/12/1992*, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/5988/view/ACE000255_001.pdf> 20/08/2020.
- Doctrine Commission, *Doctrine in the Church of England* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938).
- Dulles, Avery, *Models of Church* (expanded edition) (New York: Doubleday, 1987).
- Elliott, Dominic, and McGuinness, Martina, 'Public Inquiry: Panacea or Placebo?', *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 10:1 (2002), pp.14-25.
- Erooga, Marcus (ed.), *Creating Safer Organisations* (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2012).

- Faus, José Ignacio González, 'Sin', in Ignacio Ellacuriá and Jon Sobrino (eds), *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993), pp.532–542.
- Finkelhor, David, *Child Sexual Abuse: New theory and research* (New York: The Free Press, 1984).
- Finn, Daniel K., 'What is a Sinful Social Structure?', *Theological Studies* 77:1 (2016), pp.136-164.
- Firer Hinze, Christine, 'The Drama of Social Sin and the (Im)Possibility of Solidarity: Reinhold Niebuhr and Modern Catholic Social Teaching', *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22:4 (2009), pp.442-460.
- Foucault, Michel, 'Disciplinary Power and Subjection' in Lukes, Steven (ed.), *Power* (New York: NYU Press, 1986), pp.229-242.
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish* (trans. Alan Sheridan) (London: Penguin, 1991).
- Freilich, J.D., and Chermak, S.M., 'Preventing deadly encounters between law enforcement and American far-rightists', *Crime Prevention Studies* 25:1 (2009), pp.141–172.
- French, J.R.P., and Raven, Bertram, 'The Bases of Social Power' in Cartwright, D. (ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (Ann Arbor: Michigan, 1959), pp.150-167.
- Giorgi, Simona, Lockwood, Christi, and Glynn, Mary Ann, 'The Many Faces of Culture: Making Sense of 30 Years of Research on Culture in Organization Studies' ('Culture'), *Academy of Management Annals* 9:1 (2015), pp.1-54.
- Goffman, Erving, *Asylums* (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1968).
- Graystone, Andrew (ed.), 'We Asked for Bread but you gave us Stones', accessed online at <<http://abuselaw.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Stones-not-Bread.pdf>> 29/04/2020.
- Greenwood, Royston *et al*, 'Introduction' in Royston Greenwood *et al* (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Organisational Institutionalism* (London: Sage Publications, 2008), pp.1-46.
- Grenfell, Michael, and James, David, *Bourdieu and Education* (London: Falmer Press, 2008).
- Greve, Henrich, Palmer, Donald, and Pozner, Jo-Ellen, 'Organizations Gone Wild: The Causes, Processes, and Consequences of Organizational Misconduct', *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4:1 (2010), pp.53-107.
- Harper, Craig, and Perkins, Colin, 'Reporting CSA within Religious Settings: Challenges and Future Directions' in *Child Abuse Review* 27 (2018), pp.30-41.
- Hartill, Michael, 'Concealment of Child Sexual Abuse in Sports', *Quest* 65:2 (2013), pp.241-254.
- Hartill, Michael, *Sexual Abuse in Youth Sport* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017).

Hartill, Michael, and Lang, Melanie, "I Know People Think I'm a Complete Pain in the Neck": An Examination of the Introduction of Child Protection and "Safeguarding" in English Sport from the Perspective of National Governing Body Safeguarding Lead Officers', *Social Sciences* 3 (2014), pp.606-627.

Healy, Nicholas, *Church, World, and the Christian Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Heyer, Kristin E., 'Social Sin and Immigration: Good Fences Make Bad Neighbours', *Theological Studies* 71:2 (2010), pp.410-436.

Hosgood, Shirley, *Witness Statement of Shirley Hosgood*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4345/view/ANG000213.pdf>> 03/02/2020.

How, Alan, *Critical Theory* (Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003).

Howe, Geoffrey, 'The Management of Public Inquiries', *The Political Quarterly* 70:3 (1999), pp.294-304.

IICSA Research Team, *Child Sexual Abuse in the context of religious institutions*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/11687/view/truth-project-thematic-report%3A-child-sexual-abuse-context-religious-institutions-full-report.pdf>> 26/08/2020.

IICSA Research Team, *Child sexual abuse within the Catholic and Anglican Churches: a rapid evidence assessment*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/3361/view/iicsa-rea-child-sexual-abuse-anglican-catholic-churches-nov-2017-.pdf>> 26/08/2020.

IICSA, 'Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/investigations/investigation-into-failings-by-the-anglican-church>> 21/01/2020.

IICSA, 'Inquiry announces new investigation into child protection in religious organisations and settings', 02/05/19, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/news/inquiry-announces-new-investigation-child-protection-religious-organisations-and-settings>> 13/07/20.

IICSA, 'Investigations', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/Investigations>> 27/04/2020.

IICSA, 'Terms of Reference', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/terms-reference>> 20/01/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 08/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4385/view/8-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 18/07/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 09/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4389/view/9-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 03/02/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 12/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4409/view/-12-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 04/08/20.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 13/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4415/view/13-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 20/01/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 15/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4433/view/15-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 29/01/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 16/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4492/view/16-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 29/04/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 19/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4656/view/19-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 20/08/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 20/03/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/4697/view/20-march-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 28/08/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 23/07/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/5977/view/23-july-2018-anglican-public-hearing-transcript.pdf>> 17/02/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 24/07/18*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6029/view/public-hearing-transcript-24-july-2018.pdf>> 04/08/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 25/07/2018*, accessed online at <https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6067/view/public-hearing-transcript-25-july-2018.pdf> 22/01/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 26/07/2018*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6142/view/public-hearing-transcript-26-july-2018.pdf>> 04/08/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 02/07/2019*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/12363/view/public-hearing-transcript-2-july-2019.pdf>> 05/08/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 09/07/2019*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/12713/view/public-hearing-transcript-9-july-2019.pdf>> 27/08/2020.

IICSA, *IICSA Transcript 11/07/2019*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/12777/view/public-hearing-transcript-11-july-2019.pdf>> 24/08/2020.

IICSA, 'Terms of Reference', accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/terms-reference>> 04/11/2019.

- Jasper, David, 'The Origins of Truth in Philosophy, Theology and Theory' in Jasper, David, and Wright, Jenny, *Truth and the Church in a Secular Age* (London: SCM Press, 2019), pp. 17-32.
- Kaufman, Peter Iver, 'Augustine, Evil and Donatism: Sin and Sanctity Before the Pelagian Controversy', *Theological Studies* 51:1 (1990), pp.115-126.
- Keenan, Marie, *Child Sexual Abuse and the Catholic Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- Kelly, Conor M., 'The Nature and Operation of Structural Sin: Additional Insights from Theology and Moral Psychology', *Theological Studies* 80:2 (2019), pp.293-327.
- Lanning, Kenneth, and Dietz, Park, 'Acquaintance Molestation and Youth-Serving Organisations', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 29:15 (2014), pp.2815-2838.
- Lash, Nicholas, *Believing Three Ways in One God* (London: SCM Press, 1992).
- Laville, Sandra, 'Child abuse inquiry 'to continue' despite survivors' withdrawal', *The Guardian*, 18/11/2016, accessed online at <<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/nov/18/child-abuse-survivors-group-withdraws-from-contrived-uk-inquiry>> 05/08/2020.
- Letourneau, Elizabeth *et al.*, 'The Need for a Comprehensive Public Health Approach to Preventing Child Sexual Abuse', *Public Health Reports* 129:3 (2014), pp.222-228.
- Lugt, Wesley Vander, *Living Theodrama* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2014).
- Lukes, Steven, 'Introduction', in Lukes, Steven (ed.), *Power* (New York: NYU Press, 1986), pp.1-18.
- March, J.G., and Simon, H., *Organizations* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958).
- Martel, Frédéric, *In the Closet of the Vatican* (Shaun Whiteside trans.) (London: Bloomsbury Continuum, 2019).
- Maton, Karl, 'Habitus', in Grenfell, Michael, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2008), pp.49-65.
- McAlinden, Anne-Marie, "'Setting 'em up": Personal, Familial and Institutional Grooming in the Sexual Abuse of Children' in *Social and Legal Studies* 15(3), 2006, pp.339-362.
- McFadyen, Alistair, *Bound to Sin* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000).
- McNay, Lois, *Gender and Agency* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000).
- Mendick, Robert, and Fairweather, Eileen, 'Jimmy Savile: pressure grows for full inquiry into historic child abuse', *The Daily Telegraph* 29/06/2014, accessed online at <<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/crime/jimmy->

savile/10933200/Jimmy-Savile-pressure-grows-for-full-inquiry-into-historic-child-abuse.html> 20/01/2020.

Millbank, John, *The Word Made Strange* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1997).

Minto, Kiara, Hornsey, Matthew, Gillespie, Nicole, Healy, Karen, and Jetten, Jolanda, 'A Social Identity Approach to Understanding Responses to Child Sexual Abuse Allegations', *PLoS ONE* 11:4 (2016), pp.1-15.

Nadler, D.A., and Lawler, E.E., 'Motivation: A Diagnostic Approach' in Harold J. Leavitt, Louis R. Pondy, and David M. Boje (eds), *Readings in Managerial Psychology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp.3-19

Nelson, Derek, *Sin: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2011).

Nelson, Fraser, 'Justin Welby's Reformation', *The Spectator* 26/01/2019, accessed online at <<https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/justin-welby-s-reformation>> 29/04/2020.

Niebuhr, H. Richard, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1951).

Niebuhr, Reinhold, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932).

Niebuhr, Reinhold, *The Nature and Destiny of Man, vol.1* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996).

Niebuhr, Reinhold, *The Nature and Destiny of Man, vol.2* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943).

NRSV Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

Overbeck, Jennifer, and Park, Bernadette, 'When Power Does Not Corrupt: Superior Individuation Processes among Powerful Perceivers', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81:4 (2001), pp.549-565.

Palmer, Donald, and Feldman, Valerie, *Comprehending the Incomprehensible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

Paradis, Elise, 'Boxers, Briefs or Bras? Bodies, Gender and Change in the Boxing Gym', *Body and Society* (18:2) 2012, pp.82-109.

Parkinson, Patrick, Oates, Kim, and Jayakody, Amanda, 'Child Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia', *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 21:5 (2012), pp.553-570.

Parliament, 'Twentieth Century', *Living Heritage: Religion and Belief*, accessed online at <<https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/private-lives/religion/overview/twentiethcentury-/>> 22/07/2020.

Pattison, Stephen, and Woodward, James, 'An Introduction to Pastoral and Practical Theology', in James Woodward and Stephen Pattison (eds), *The*

- Blackwell Reader in Pastoral and Practical Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2000), pp.1-19.
- Perôt, C., Chevoux, J., & Survivors' Voices Research Group, 'Turning Pain Into Power', accessed online at <<https://survivorsvoices.org/charter/>> 19/05/2020.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey, 'Beyond Management and the Worker: The Institutional Function of Management', *The Academy of Management Review* 1:2 (1976), pp.36-46.
- Plante, Thorns G., Manuel, Gerdenio, and Bryant, Curtis, 'Personality and Cognitive Functioning Among Hospitalized Sexual Offending Roman Catholic Priests', *Pastoral Psychology* 45:2 (1996), pp.129-139.
- Plummer, Kenneth, *Documents of Life 2* (London: Sage Publications, 2001).
- Podmore, Colin, 'A Tale of Two Churches: The Ecclesiologies of the Episcopal Church and the Church of England Compared' ('Churches'), *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 10:1 (2008), pp.34-70.
- Rambo, Shelly, *Spirit and Trauma* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010).
- Ramsey, Michael, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936).
- Rashid, Faisal, and Barron, Ian, 'Why the Focus of Clerical Child Sexual Abuse has Largely Remained on the Catholic Church amongst Other Non-Catholic Christian Denominations and Religions', *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 28:5 (2019), pp.564-585.
- Regan, Ethna, 'Church, Culture and Credibility: A Perspective from Ireland', *New Blackfriars* 94 (2013), pp.160-176.
- Rowe, Trevor, *St Augustine* (London: Epworth Press, 1974).
- Selznick, Philip, *TVA and the Grass Roots* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949).
- Sipe, A.W. Richard, *Celibacy in Crisis: A Secret World Revisited* (Hove: Brunner-Routledge, 2003).
- Smart, Carol, 'Reconsidering the Recent History of Child Sexual Abuse, 1910-1960', *Journal of Social Policy* 29:1 (2000), pp.55-71.
- Spröber, N., Schneider, T., Rassenhofer, M. *et al.*, 'Child sexual abuse in religiously affiliated and secular institutions: a retrospective descriptive analysis of data provided by victims in a government-sponsored reappraisal program in Germany', *BMC Public Health* 14:282 (2014) accessed online at <<https://bmcpublikealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-14-282>> 14/11/2019.

Staller, Karen, 'Missing Pieces, Repetitive Practices: Child Sexual Exploitation and Institutional Settings' in *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies* 12:4 (2012), pp.274-278.

Sulitzeanu-Kenan, Raanan, "'If they get it right": An Experimental Test of the Effects of the Appointment and Reports of UK Public Inquiries', *Public Administration* 84:3 (2006), pp.623-653.

Sulitzeanu-Kenan, Raanan, 'Reflection in the Shadow of Blame: When do Politicians Appoint Commissions of Inquiry?', *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (2010), pp.613-634.

Sykes, Stephen, *The Identity of Christianity* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press: 1984).

The Archbishops' Council, 'Articles of Religion', *The Book of Common Prayer*, accessed online at <<https://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-and-worship/worship-texts-and-resources/book-common-prayer/articles-religion#XIX>> 22/04/2020.

The Archbishops' Council, 'Engaging Children and Young Adults', accessed online at <<http://www.fromevidencetoaction.org.uk/factors/engaging-children-young-adults>> 27/01/2020.

The Archbishops' Council, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Abuse* (London: Church House Publishing, 2017).

The Archbishops' Council, *Issues in Human Sexuality* (London: Church House Publishing, 1991).

The Archbishops' Council, 'Leadership and Governance', accessed online at <<https://www.churchofengland.org/about/leadership-and-governance>> 16/12/2019.

The Archbishops' Council, *The Gospel, Sexual Abuse and the Church* (London: Church House Publishing, 2016).

The Home Office, 'Home Secretary announces judge to lead statutory inquiry into historic child sexual abuse', 04/02/2015, accessed online at <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/home-secretary-announces-judge-to-lead-statutory-inquiry-into-historical-child-sexual-abuse>> 20/01/2020.

The Inquiry Panel, *The Anglican Church Case Studies: 1. The Diocese of Chichester. 2. The response to allegations against Peter Ball* (London: Crown Copyright, 2019).

Thompson, Patricia, 'Field' in Grenfell, Michael, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2008), pp.67-81.

Thornton, Patricia, Ocasio, William, and Lounsbury, Michael, 'The Institutional Logics Perspective', in Scott, Robert, and Kosslyn, Stephen (eds), *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioural Sciences* (John Wiley and Sons, 2015), pp.1-22.

- Truth Project, *Truth Project Experiences Shared*, accessed online at <<https://www.truthproject.org.uk/key-documents/5462/view/truth-project-experiences-shared-june-2018.pdf>> 10/12/2019.
- Unger, Peter, *Living High and Letting Die* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, 'We Remember: A Reflection on the "Shoah"', *Origins* 27:40 (1998), pp.669-675.
- Vatican Council, *Pastoral constitution on the Church in the modern world: Gaudium et Spes* (07/12/1965) 26, accessed online at <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html> 16/04/2020.
- Waller, Lisa, Dreher, Tanja, Hess, Kristy, McCallum, Kerry, and Skogerbø, Eli, 'Media Hierarchies of Attention: News Values and Australia's Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse', *Journalism Studies* (2019), pp.1-17.
- Ward, Tony, and Hudson, Stephen, 'Finkelhor's Precondition Model of Child Sexual Abuse: A Critique', *Psychology, Crime & Law* (7:1-4), pp.291-307.
- Weber, Max, *Essays in Sociology* (Gerth, H.H., and Mills, C. Wright eds and trans) (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946).
- White, William, 'A Systems Perspective on Sexual Exploitation of Clients by Professional Helpers', in J. Gonsiorek (ed.), *Breach of Trust: Sexual Exploitation by Health Care Professionals and Clergy* (London: Sage, 1994), pp.176-192.
- Williams, Hattie, 'Abolish right to remove children from sex-education classes, urges abuse survivor', *Church Times* 30/04/2020, accessed online at <<https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2020/1-may/news/uk/abolish-right-to-remove-children-from-sex-education-classes-urges-abuse-survivor>> 06/09/2020.
- Williams, Rowan, *Faith in the Public Square* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012).
- Williams, Rowan, *First Witness Statement of Lord Rowan Douglas Williams*, accessed online at <<https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/6289/view/ACE026001.pdf>> 16/12/2019.
- World Health Organisation, *Guidelines for medico-legal care for victims of sexual violence* (Geneva: World Health Organisation, 2003), pp.80-81.
- Wurtele, Sandy K., 'Preventing the sexual exploitation of minors in youth-serving organizations', *Children and Youth Services Review* 34 (2012), pp.2442-2453.