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PROLEGOMENA

The reader will note that the language in this thesis, used to denote both the prisoner and the chaplain, is male gender specific, whereas references to clergy ministering within parish settings use the inclusive term ‘clergyperson’. Justification of the use of gender specific language for prisoners and chaplains is required.

The justification, with regard to the prisoner, is as follows. Firstly, a substantial part of the thesis examines the separate system of prisons, in which only males were incarcerated. In more recent historical periods, the thesis examines purpose built maximum security prisons which incarcerate males. The prison population investigated in this thesis is male.

It should not be inferred from the above that women prisoners (and indeed juveniles in detention centres) are considered to be in some way incidental to studies of imprisonment: quite the contrary. The issues associated with the imprisonment of women are extensive and complex. This author is of the opinion that the topic of women in prisons, because of its very complexity, warrants extensive and thorough research. This research has not been attempted in this thesis, which has as its focus the decline of the prison chaplain in the context of male prisons from the separate system to the present day.

The justification with regard to chaplains is as follows. In most of the period under consideration in this thesis, there were no female clergy. The ordination of women is
generally a phenomenon of the third quarter of the twentieth century, and only among some Protestant denominations. At the time of submission of this thesis, the author was aware of no appointment of an ordained woman to the position of chaplain in a male maximum security prison. This situation could, and in the opinion of this author, should, change in the future. However, at the time of submission, the prison chaplains under consideration were male.

Justification is also required for the assumption, implicit in this thesis, that the prison will continue into the future. Justification is indicated, given that the prison has attracted such regular and trenchant criticism for its failure to reform and rehabilitate prisoners and to reduce recidivism (Garland, 1990; 6, 288) This has been the case since the early operations of the penitentiary. It is noted that the much less ambitious goal of ‘risk management’ is now being substituted in some prisons (New South Wales Department of Corrective Services Corporate Plan 2001-2004; 6). Risk management is the targeting of ‘high risk individuals’ for specialised ‘rehabilitative’ programs, within an essentially retributive prison (Garland, 2001; 8, 176). In essence, risk management retains a rhetoric of rehabilitation, but substitutes for the all encompassing, prison wide ideology of rehabilitation, a specifically focussed program for selected individuals.

To justify the assumption of continuance of the contemporary prison into the future, it is salutary to refer to the contributions of David Garland. Garland’s enormous undertaking has been to evaluate and re-conceptualise the sociology of punishment, of which the maximum security prison is but one aspect. Garland argues for punishment to be
considered ‘as a social institution’. This view he contrasts with the what he considers to be the too narrow view of technical penology (Garland, 1990; 277), and the reductionist view of any one particular theoretical perspective on punishment, especially views derived from global theories, such as those of Marxism. Garland advocates a pluralistic, synthesizing approach with regard to the sociology of punishment. Considering the prison from this broad social institution perspective is, in Garland’s opinion, the way to understand how an institution ‘so riven with contradiction, with failure, and self-defeating policies’, manages to survive (Garland, 1990; 277). For Garland, while the prison fails with regard to its more exalted aims of rehabilitation, it succeeds with regard to containing troublesome, or ‘high risk’ individuals. For this ‘success’, the community and government are willing to bear the associated financial and other costs of the frequent use of incarceration. This desire to incarcerate has become ‘an established element in public beliefs, institutional frameworks and social traditions” (Garland, 1990; 290-291). Garland hopes that his ‘punishment as a social institution’ approach, the ‘single master image’ as he terms it (Garland, 1990; 282), may help to challenge and temper some of these taken for granted views. This is debatable, particularly when the experiences of Tony Vinson, Chairperson of the then Corrective Services Commission, are taken into account. Vinson spent several turbulent years at the pinnacle of the command and control structure of the penal system in New South Wales. Vinson was endeavouring to bring about reform, particularly with regard to the prisons. Vinson’s attempts at reform were frustrated. ‘The prison officer’s union was the biggest obstacle preventing us from getting on with the job’ Vinson commented (Vinson, 1981; 55). Vinson’s frustrations produced his resignation, and his book, Wilful Obstruction. These
issues are complex and beyond the scope of this thesis: for its purposes, Garland’s analysis of punishment as a social institution is considered to provide a sound base for the assumption of the continuance of the contemporary prison, an institution which, as Garland notes, has a long history of transforming itself and its operations (Garland, 2001; 14).
PREFACE.

Prisons have been a both a curiosity and an interest of mine at various times in my life. On occasions in my childhood I drove with my parents past the prison at Long Bay, in Sydney, New South Wales. It was a frightening, but fascinating place. My gaze was fixed on the grounds of the prison, both hoping and fearing to sight an escapee.

Later, as a tertiary social work student with an interest in the concept of social control, my thoughts were sometimes focused on the prison. However, it was not until the early part of 1993 that I actually entered a prison. I was then in the final year of my ordinand studies. I had elected, in one of the Field Education components of my studies, to spend time in the Chaplaincy Department of the Long Bay prison in Sydney. The experience was a very significant one in that it was to raise difficult, but fascinating questions for me about the role of religion and the clergy in the prison.

During my placement at Long Bay I observed much which strongly suggested that religion and the clergy (chaplains) occupy a peripheral place in the prison system. I was also puzzled by the role of the chaplains, and here I refer to the Protestant chaplains, the only chaplains with whom I had contact. From the perspective of one trained in both social work and theology, it seemed to me that the chaplains were performing many of the same tasks, which one would expect to be performed by the prison welfare staff. In
fact it was with difficulty that I could identify anything distinctively 'religious' in the role of the chaplain who, it seemed to me, functioned as something of a quasi welfare professional. It was also very apparent to me that the chaplains had a low profile in the prison; at Long Bay even the chaplaincy offices were outside the prison walls. The chaplains were like exiles, an image which stayed with me long after my placement in the prison had ended. These observations presented a stark contrast to the centrality of religion and the chaplain in the penitentiary, the fledgling prison of the nineteenth century.

The chapels in the contemporary prisons, some of which I had seen photographs of, were curiosities. The very prominence and size of the chapel in many of the prisons, both in New South Wales and Britain, many of which were built in the nineteenth century, symbolised the decline of religion from its position of centrality. Religion's function in the contemporary operations and theoretical underpinnings of the prison is marginal by comparison with the penitentiary. The prison chapel is now curiously anachronistic, being used extensively for secular purposes, such as the screening of movies, the holding of various meetings, and sometimes for sports. The liturgical and sacramental functions to which the chapels were dedicated are all but absent, at least for the Protestant chaplains.

As an ordinand on placement in the prison, I was particularly interested in the work of the chaplain. The wider church has not been as convinced about the value of the ministry of the chaplain as compared with the value of the ministry of the parish minister. Some
chaplaincy areas create unrest in the church. For instance, military chaplains have been seen by the pacifist elements of the church as acting contrary to what they, the pacifists, believe to be an essential mission of the church, namely the promotion of peace. This, albeit small, section of the church holds the view that the church should have nothing to do with the military. "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition" is a well-known phrase, which expresses the disapproval directed at military chaplains. The lesser emphasis of the church toward chaplains is typified by the actions of the church hierarchy when funding becomes problematic, as it often has been in recent times of declining congregations and finances. The chaplaincies are always very prominent in considerations for funding cuts, unless they are chaplaincies, which are totally subsidised by the state, as is the case with the military chaplain, or heavily subsidised by the state, as is the case with the prison chaplain.

Chaplains also have their secular critics. These critics have questioned the role and function of the chaplain. Hospital chaplains, while they are almost universally accepted by the church, and are in fact funded by the church, have been involved in controversy with secular professionals within some hospitals. These controversies were essentially demarcation disputes, disputes such as the chaplain having a permanent presence, rather than a referral role, in the Accident and Emergency room. I was informed that just such a dispute arose with the social workers at Westmead Hospital, a large teaching hospital in Sydney. The social workers saw the chaplains as encroaching on their professional territory and regarded them as moving outside what was seen as their traditional and legitimate denominational 'religious' role of ministering to practising church members.
This is a big issue for the chaplain, as the adherents of the mainstream Christian denominations are shrinking in number and hence the denominational and religious role is also shrinking.

Prison chaplains were persons of authority and influence at the inception of the modern prison system. By contrast, the contemporary prison chaplain is peripheral to the prison, as well as being peripheral to the church when compared to the parish minister. The chaplain is operating in the prison because the state subsidises the position: it is likely that there would be a significant reduction in the numbers of chaplains were their positions to be reliant on church funding alone. The prison chaplain is a lesser-known clergy of the church. Few parishioners would know the person or work of the prison chaplain. In the journal of the Australian Health and Welfare Chaplains Association, *Theology and Society*, I have not seen an article about prison chaplaincy, the focus of this journal being heavily skewed toward hospital and health chaplaincy.

Of the traditional, established chaplaincies, the prison chaplain seems to vie with the military chaplain for being the most marginal to the church. This, however, has not always been the case. In the mid-nineteenth century some of the prison chaplains were public figures who were looked to for their opinions about prisons and crime policy. Why is the prison chaplain now so marginal to the prison, and why has there been such a decline from the central position he once occupied? What were the major factors contributing to this decline? How could I approach the study of the decline of the prison
chaplain? These were tantalizing questions. Being preoccupied with other studies at that time, I could not immediately seek answers to these and other questions, tantalizing though they were.

My curiosity about prisons and prison chaplains was aroused again in 1996, when I re-read an article by the noted scholar of the prison, Michael Ignatieff, in Stanley Cohen and Andrew Scull's book, Social Control and the State. In his article Ignatieff briefly noted that there were many aspects of the institution of the prison, which are yet to be the subject of thorough research. One such area he suggested as needing research was the decline of the prison chaplain. A literature search was all that was needed to confirm that there was a dearth of scholarly writing on prison chaplaincy. Most important however, and most encouraging for me, was the fact that a scholar of Ignatieff's standing advocated the value of researching an area in which I, as an ordained minister, have a personal and professional interest. Ignatieff did not elaborate on why he thought that the decline of the prison chaplain was a potentially fruitful and/or useful area of research. While I regarded this as somewhat unfortunate, my curiosity had been aroused to the point where I decided that I would pursue this area of research.

My thinking about the prisons had been influenced by both secular and religious thought. In particular, I had been influenced by powerful religious imagery, especially that contained in the stories, parables and metaphors of the religious literature. These stories, parables, and metaphors, drawn particularly from the Bible, have influenced people throughout the centuries in areas such as art, poetry, literature and cinematography, as
well as the traditional ecclesiastical disciplines. For instance, the theologian Volf made superb use of the metaphor of, 'theology as the queen of the sciences', when he analysed the marginalisation of theology in contemporary times. It has been the 'little stories' of religion, to use Brueggemann's term, that have had a deep influence on me, rather than the grand narratives of theologians.

There is also some use of metaphor, religious and secular, in research in the social sciences. It is here that I am indebted again to Michael Ignatieff, who has used metaphor both perceptively and imaginatively in his book entitled The Needs of Strangers. In this book Ignatieff has used metaphors to help drive his social research. In particular, the metaphors constructed from the mad scene of Shakespeare's King Lear guide his analysis of the welfare state. While metaphor has been used extensively and successfully in religious writings for many years, it was encouraging to see the application of metaphor by Ignatieff in social science.

As will be discussed in detail in Chapter One, which deals with methodology, metaphor has its limitations in social investigation. Scholars in this field make no claim for the exactness of metaphor with regard to the entailments of the topic term (principal subject) and the vehicle term (subsidiary subject). For instance, Sallie McFague, a scholar whose work is relied upon in this thesis, writes of the ‘is’ and the ‘is not’ of metaphor. There is always a tension present in metaphor between the topic term and the vehicle term. Inevitably, metaphor as a mode of enquiry will highlight some aspects of a topic while neglecting others. Metaphor shares this with other modes of enquiry. For instance, David
Garland, in commenting on the various modes of enquiry in the sociology of punishment (based around the writers such as Marx, Durkheim and Foucault) states; ‘Each mode of enquiry sets up a particular image of punishment, defining it in a particular way, highlighting some aspects, while inevitably obscuring or neglecting others’ (Garland, 1990; 13). Frank Ankersmit’s commentary on metaphor, referred to in this thesis, makes it clear that the function of metaphor is not exactness, but rather the opening up of new perspectives on a given topic (Ankersmit, 1994; 158): Garland’s superb, summarizing metaphor, of the infliction of punishment by the state upon its citizens as ‘a civil war in minature’, is a good example.

As outlined in Chapter One, following McFague, metaphor is not, and can not, be used as the sole tool for analysis of the institutional domain of the prison. Garland makes clear in his review of the theories grouped within the sociology of punishment, that no one mode of enquiry is sufficient to give a thorough account of punishment, when punishment is viewed as a social institution (Garland, 1990; 279). McFague notes that metaphors are primary level images that need to be grounded, otherwise the analysis ‘wanders in a land of images that, while rich, is chaotic and unilluminated’ (McFague, 1983; 121). To once again cite Ankersmit, among numerous scholars advocating the same point, metaphors are used to open new perspectives.

It is noted that the production of and analysis based upon metaphor can be criticised as being a personalized cogitative process. This is true in the sense of the bringing into being of a novel metaphor, otherwise the metaphor would not be novel and, it could be
argued, would have little capacity to produce new insights. Scholars in the field readily acknowledge this. However, when a metaphor is grounded, or illuminated, to use McFague’s terms, the metaphor enters the public domain and is open to criticism, as with any other mode of enquiry. While acknowledging its limitations, this thesis will use metaphor to open new perspectives on the functions of the Protestant prison chaplain.

Religious writing and imagery have complemented social work education and practice in my personal formation, as well as being influential in my understandings of the world. I therefore determined that their use would be important in any investigation of the prison chaplain, which I was becoming committed to pursue, and that in a formal manner. After further consideration, I decided that, rather than following a conventional path, I would look to religious resources to provide the means of structuring my investigation of the prison chaplain. It seemed very reasonable that some religious concepts could assist in shedding light on the investigation of a religious institution, the chaplaincy. As well, my thinking around my experiences of the prison had already begun to offer some promising concepts by way of metaphor. While the ecclesiastical disciplines I have studied were of little benefit for what I had in mind, particularly the systematic material, "those tedious books that clutter the shelves and minds of ordinands", as the theologian Timothy Radcliffe commented, there were fragments in the literature that were certainly of value. This is a view that some ecclesiastical and religious studies scholars are adopting; that the ecclesiastical disciplines cannot provide a method of social analysis, but can make contributions by way of fragments such as metaphor, if social science practitioners are open to these inputs.
In Hans-Georg Gadamer's terms, my religious education and formation provides, along with my formal training and experiences in social work, much of the pretext I bring to social investigation. Both disciplines would inform my understandings as I investigated the decline of the prison chaplain. So, too, would my experiences in the prison during my ordinand studies. These were very valuable because there is so little written material, of a critical nature, featuring the chaplain of the modern prison.

My desire to investigate this topic finally enticed me toward my present studies at the University of Sydney. My hope is that the thesis will encourage much needed debate in the neglected area of the ministry of the chaplain in public institutions, particularly the prison.
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SECTION ONE.

INTRODUCTION.
CHAPTER ONE.

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY.

Aim of the Study.

This study seeks to analyse the decline of the Protestant chaplain, as an institution, within the modern prison system. The thesis does not investigate individual chaplains within individual prisons. It rather looks at the chaplain as an ideal typical characterization over the most part of two centuries to the present time.

At the outset, of course, it must be acknowledged that not everyone working within the prisons in an ecclesiastical capacity, or even members of the wider church itself, would agree that there has been a decline. There are those who would see the evidence of the 'Spirit working' in just about anything. These people, usually of a more fundamentalist persuasion, interpret what most would see as clear evidence of decline as evidence that divine intervention is simply not appropriate at this point in time. For these people, God is simply waiting the appropriate time to act to rectify the situation. From a social science perspective, there is no way that this position can be either verified or falsified. From a religious studies perspective, it raises big questions about the nature of God, more so than the evaluation of the chaplain. It will be noted only.
There are those, too, who would argue that there is a qualitatively different approach in chaplaincy, which distinguishes it from other disciplines and professional groupings in the prison and gives chaplaincy a very central place in the prison system. The argument continues that the work of the chaplain is 'unseen' and therefore not able to be measured (Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee (N.S.W. 1993; 8; Shaw, 1995; 10). This view is also on very shaky ground. This is the case from both my own personal experience and from the difficulty of accounting for the peripheral position of the chaplain in the contemporary prison, both in terms of numbers of chaplains serving in the prisons, vis a vis the secular professionals, as well as the obvious lack of a contribution by the chaplain and the church in providing foundational understandings for the day to day running of the prison. As well, if the contemporary chaplain's interventions and input were indeed so prominent, one would expect that there could be some unobtrusive measures of this; for instance changed behaviour of prisoners, or attendance at religious services, which might indicate genuine religious adherence, or genuine religious conversion.

If the chaplain’s role was central, one might also expect that the prisoners themselves would place a high value on the services of the chaplain; this is certainly not the case in the testimony of the prisoners who have made comment about the subject (Nagle, 1978; 198; Shaw, 1995; 49). This view will emerge at later points in the study.

The present study seeks, through its utilisation of the metaphors and other concepts drawn from the field of religious studies, and through sociological analysis, to explore
the decline of the prison chaplain. It seeks to argue that the decline of the prison chaplain has been significant and the study seeks to address the questions 'Why is this so'? and 'Is there likely to be a reversal of this situation, to the point where the chaplain will again be a dominant force in the prison'?

The topic of prison chaplain has received very little attention in either secular writings or religious writings. This is acknowledged by authors from both secular and religious disciplines (Ignatieff, 1983; 78; Shaw, 1995; 1-2; Knight, 1992; 1). At the outset though, it needs to be acknowledged that there is quite a lot of uncritical, celebratory writing, usually tracts, on the topic of prison visitation in its broadest sense. The writings referred to relate the alleged conversion experiences of prisoners, which are said to be the direct result of the actions of visiting religious groups. These groups claim to have had the special assistance of God in the carrying out of their actions. These writings, mainly emanate from fundamentalist Christian groups in the United States, but with some contribution also from Britain, very seldom refer to the full time prison chaplain, that is the clergy officially appointed by both church and state to a designated position within the prison. When these writings do refer to the prison chaplain, the commentary is usually either derogatory or condemnatory. The prison chaplain for these writers represents an impediment to their 'spreading the Gospel', which is seeking religious conversions, and often proselytising within the prison. The writings denote the prison chaplain as being obstructionist towards the endeavours of the fundamentalist groups operating, or wishing to operate, in the prison. As far as such groups are concerned, this is tantamount to the prison chaplains working contrary to God's purposes, which seems to
equate to whatever it is that the group is doing within the prison at the time. These writings, prolific on the internet, add little to a critical understanding of the function of the prison chaplain; hence they are not important to the discussion in this thesis.

What is important in the discussion of the decline of the prison chaplain is the clarification of the use of the terms 'religious', 'secular' and 'decline', as used in the opening paragraph. There are many definitions and understandings of the terms religion and religious. Indeed the United States Supreme Court has ruled that a group of prisoners, who call their organization 'The Church of the New Song' (CONS), have need of Filet Mignon and Harvey Bristol Cream Sherry to celebrate their sacrament (Shaw, 1995; 37) finding that the group can be called 'religious'. The court did add the rejoinder that the matter brought before the court may be a grand deception. Nevertheless the court held that what the group was doing was religious and that the members were part of a religion. With many and wide ranging definitions evident, it becomes important to define the parameters of what I term religious, not as yet another attempt at an authoritative definition, but as a clarification for the ongoing discussion in the thesis.

Terminology.

Within the context of this thesis, the term 'religious' denotes the Scripture, writings, creeds, liturgies, and other institutions, practices and personnel of the Christian religion. This should not be taken to imply that the equivalents from other faiths are not 'religious', or not otherwise valid; it merely denotes that this study is using ideas and images, drawn from the Christian religion, to assist in the analysis of the Christian chaplain within the prison system. In this use of the term 'religious', the primacy of Christ is assumed.
Writings that qualify as religious writings under this criteria are varied enough to include some liberal interpretive works in addition to the basic accounts of the life and works of Christ, such as that recorded by the writers of the synoptic gospels. As Rodney Stark and William Bainbridge point out, most scholars limit the term religion (and its adjective religious) to those systems of thought, embodied in social organization, that point to the supernatural (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985; 3). The term religious as used in this study approximates this position within a Christian framework. By definition, this use of the term does not include writings, which would define all self-transcendent philosophies as religion. These can be included in the broad term, 'spiritual', but do not qualify as religious under my criteria.

Too inclusive understandings of the term religious create insurmountable problems in differentiating science, philosophy and ideology from religion (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985; 5). Too inclusive understandings also create problems in differentiating writings that refer to religious topics, but may well rest upon atheistic or agnostic philosophies. Hence the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche on the 'Death of God', are not included in the broad rubric of the term religious, nor is the publication of Ludwig Feuerbach, The Essence of Christianity, which redefines theology as anthropology, nor the writings of the 'Death of God' theologians, such as Paul Van Buren in The Secular Meaning of the Gospel. It is not the purpose of this study to enter a broad definitional debate; rather the purpose is to clarify how the term religious is being used in the context of this study. No doubt some people may consider the writings of Neitzsche spiritual, and this is perfectly reasonable, however they are not religious in the terms of reference used in this thesis. It
is religious writings that are drawn upon to give direction to the thesis.

For the purposes of this thesis, the 'secular' writings are those that fall outside the term religious as stated above. Some of these writings may, however, be included under the rubric of 'spiritual', as there is no contradiction implicit in a secular spirituality. These writings, however, do not point to the primacy of Christ within the Christian framework as established above, even though some aspect of Christianity may be their subject, Hence, included in the term ‘secular’ are the various social science critiques or analyses of religion. The authors may indeed hold Christian views of whatever kind, but the writings give no evidence of such and hence are not subsumed within the term religious as stated.

The term religious is a covering term, which subsumes religious writings from the various disciplines, such as theology, liturgy, biblical studies, ecclesiastical history, to mention a few. Most importantly, it contains the Christian Canon and it is from here that most concepts central to the study were developed. The Christian Canon is a rich resource for images and stories for the construction of metaphors, as well as being rich in metaphors themselves. As will be outlined below, the thesis will be structured by metaphor, not by systematic theological writings. It will be argued that it is through the 'fragments' that important contributions to social investigation can be made by Christianity. It is acknowledged at this early point that there are writers who would disagree with the fragments approach. While their writings have been developed with relation to the wider considerations of the nature of society, such as broad teleological
concepts such as the Common Good, and ontological notions of being a person, they do require response from a writer using a fragments approach, even thought this approach is often used within a smaller scale social investigation.

'Decline', in the context of this thesis, refers to the lessened influence and authority of the chaplain with regard to both the functioning of the prison and to the foundational understandings, which underpin this functioning. The decline refers to the status and influence of the chaplain within the nineteenth century prison, particularly the penitentiary, as compared to the status and influence of the chaplain within the contemporary prison. This can be exemplified by noting the statement of The Reverend Eustace Jervis, a chaplain at Warwick Prison during the period of the separate system of prisons. Jervis commented: ‘The Act of Parliament states that the chaplain shall ‘see and admonish all prisoners’ and I took care to do it.’ It is clear that Jervis (and his chaplain colleagues) had an authority, bestowed by an Act of Parliament, and backed by the power of the prison authorities to punish refractions. The power and authority of the chaplain could have a significant impact on the lives of prisoners. This authority and power, coupled with his strong influence in the process of prisoner release, gave the chaplain of this period a status in the prison hierarchy second only to the governor. This power, authority, influence, and status is the benchmark for the judgement of the decline by comparison with the chaplain in the contemporary prison.

The thesis will be structured by metaphors developed from religious writings and informed by both social science and religious studies disciplines. The topic of the decline
of the prison chaplain is potentially very large. To make the thesis manageable, quite stringent limitations had to be placed on the study of the chaplain within the prison system. These limitations, with their justifications, are outlined below.

**The Limitations of the Study.**

The first limitation placed on the study was to restrict the references to the chaplaincy to, in the main, the system of prisons within two countries. Some reference will be made to other systems, such as that of the United States, basically because there is such a paucity of material about the prison chaplain.

One prison system referred to is that of Britain, where the ministry of prison chaplain came to the fore after the reforming efforts of John Howard and his strong recommendations and lobbying with regard to religious education and religious observance in the prisons (Forsythe, 1987; 16). The inception of the separate system of prisons, which emphasised the physical separation of prisons in singular cells, and whose ideal physical manifestation was the penitentiary, thrust the chaplain into prominence; the chaplain was the lynchpin of this system. This system was heavily promoted by the Evangelicals, a loose interdenominational grouping of literalist persuasion in their biblical interpretation. The Evangelicals socio-economic orientation was toward the leading classes. The Evangelicals envisioned that contemplative solitude and religious instruction would prick the conscience of the prisoner thereby producing repentance, quite possibly religious conversion, and thereby a concomitant reduction in crime (Forsythe, 1987; 20-22).
The second system referred to is the system of prisons within the state of New South Wales in Australia. This system began with the inception of the Darlinghurst gaol in 1841. Prior to the construction of Darlinghurst, there were various makeshift gaols, mainly for the punishment of convicts. This was a time when New South Wales was little more than a penal colony of Britain (Barrett, 1966; 1; Grocott, 1980; 5). The penal colony concept began to change when greater numbers of free settlers were persuaded to come to New South Wales from the mid 1830's. They came, notwithstanding the confusion produced by the British government emphasising on the one hand the blessings of coming to New South Wales, while simultaneously emphasising the rigours of New South Wales as a penal colony (Sweeney, 1981; 75). A more sophisticated system of prisons was required when the population of New South Wales was not, in the main, comprised of convicts. The period of reference, with regard to both systems of prisons, is from the inception up to contemporary times.

The British and New South Wales systems of prisons suggested themselves as sources for reference because there are many similarities between them, both past and present. For instance, the New South Wales prison system, like many institutions in New South Wales, commenced as an offshoot of a British system. In fact, Darlinghurst gaol, the main metropolitan prison in New South Wales from the 1840's through to the opening of Long Bay, and which from its inception housed colonial offenders and not transported convicts, had its origins in Jeremy Bentham's plan for the Panopticon (Ramsland, 1996; 19) and borrowed its prison discipline regimes from the separate system. Similarities
were looked for, because there are numerous prison systems in the world, influenced by widely differing political and socio-economic structures and conditions. Even within countries and states there is a wide variety of prison establishments. James Beckford and Sophie Gilliat, in their study of rights in the context of multiple faiths in the prisons of Britain, noted the variety of prison establishments and stated that this range defies attempts to make general statements about them (Beckford and Gilliat, 1998; xi). To endeavour make extensive reference to the prison systems beyond those of New South Wales and Britain seemed prohibitive, if not self defeating, particularly as a wide historical period was chosen in order to provide evidence for, and demonstrate the extent of, chaplaincy decline.

In planning the study, I was also mindful of the commentary of Michael Ignatieff, who pointed to what he believed was the tendency to reductionism and idealist constructs in explanations of the origins of the prison, and in this he included his own classic study (Ignatieff, 1983; 77). The main purpose of this study is not, of course, to contribute to the debate on the origin of the modern prison, however the salutary comments of Ignatieff served as a warning against casting too wide a net for the investigation.

Another limitation imposed on the study refers to the term 'chaplain' itself. Within the prison system there are a variety of religious visitors, lay and ordained, from various denominations, who periodically attend prisoners. These religious visitors have their primary ministry outside the prison, usually in a parish or the like, and prison visits are a minor aspect of their ministry. Many of these receive the designation of 'chaplain' by
their denominations. Chaplaincy could be a wide and varied phenomenon to analyse if these people were included in the definition of chaplain. This study does not include these people. It refers only to those religious personnel in the prison, who are appointed and designated as 'chaplain' by both the church and the state, and for whose services the church receives a subsidy from the state. Mostly, these personnel provide a full time, or near full time, ministry in the prison. This study restricts its focus by defining the chaplain, as the full time, or near full time, state and church appointed clergy ministering in the prison.

It is usual within the New South Wales prison system to have full time chaplains from both the Roman Catholic and Protestant traditions. This study will focus only on the Protestant chaplain. Being altogether too vast, it is outside the scope of this study to endeavour to make a comparative analysis of Protestant and Roman Catholic chaplaincies. As well, coming from a Protestant tradition, the author has an inadequate working knowledge of the extensive Roman Catholic writings and tradition, as well as inadequate credentials to comment on the aetiology of decline, if indeed there has been any decline, of the Roman Catholic chaplain, hence the study is restricted to the Protestant chaplain.

Another complicating factor that influenced the scope and the nature of the study is that, in the period leading up to the inception of the chaplaincy in British prisons, and for some time thereafter, the Church of England held considerable ecclesiastical and political power by virtue of being the Established Church. Roman Catholicism was anathema to
the Church of England hierarchy. A Roman Catholic chaplain was a totally unacceptable proposition for the Church of England hierarchy, even though Roman Catholics comprised a significant proportion of the prison population. The chaplaincy was the monopoly of the Church of England. It was not policy until 1870 that Roman Catholic prisoners should receive full ministry (Forsythe, 1987; 107). Roman Catholics did not figure in the establishment of the modern prison in Britain; the prominent religious voices were those of the Evangelicals. The Roman Catholic chaplain is a later phenomenon and requires special consideration, which is outside the possibilities of this study. Historically, it was the Protestant chaplain who held power at the outset of the prison, and for some time thereafter in its development, and hence it is the Protestant chaplain who most clearly reflects decline of the prison chaplain.

The church has mainly concentrated its chaplaincy resources on maximum security prisons and this study has limited its references to these maximum security institutions, which are the focus of most of the literature on prisons. While the maximum security prison is not the sole province of chaplaincy, they are the major focus and it would be unwieldy to try to include lesser security establishments in the discussion. Also, the chaplain's ministry has traditionally been in maximum security establishments. It must be noted, however, that the maximum security prisons of the nineteenth century are significantly different in some ways than the maximum security prisons of the current time. Maximum security prisons have changed over time. The nineteenth century prison was familiar with one of the ultimates of human existence, namely death, both by execution and illness. For the separate system prisons, this was less so, because of their
focus on reformation for criminals being transported and the improved hygiene conditions. The current prison systems of Britain and New South Wales do not perform executions, and death through illness is far less frequent. By way of comparison, the nineteenth century was not as punctuated with death and illness as the prison of the first century, which was basically a holding pen for those awaiting physical punishment, particularly execution. The changed characteristics of the maximum security prison have implications for the scriptural mandates from Hebrews 13: 3 and Matthew 25: 36, 43, often quoted by ecclesiastical sources as the justification for the ministry of prison chaplain in the maximum security prison. The applicability of these first century mandates are questionable in the contemporary prison and this will be discussed at a later point in the thesis.

The Social Science and Religious Studies Focus of the Analysis.

It is considered that this study of the prison chaplain is enhanced by drawing upon perspectives from both social science and religious writings. The prison, during the period under consideration, has evolved, in the case of the penitentiary, from being an institution based on the religious foundational understandings, including repentance and reform, to a secular institution of contemporary society. The contemporary prison primarily employs secular professionals for its tasks of assessment, welfare intervention and counselling/therapy with its prisoners. Secular staff and consultants are central to the development of policy and practice related to the prison. Attempts at reform in British prisons in the late 1960’s and 1970's, although ill fated, were launched by secular professionals, using secular theory and concepts, mostly psychoanalytic in origin
(Raynor, 1985; 82). Religious writings and understandings did not feature in these attempts. In spite of the almost exclusive input by social scientists and secular professionals, based upon secular theory and insights, this thesis seeks to demonstrate that religious writings and concepts can be used to make modest contributions to the analysis of the functions and structure of the prison, if such writings are used perceptively and imaginatively. This thesis seeks to make such use of religious material to investigate the decline of the prison chaplain, who has been in this ministry since the inception of the modern prison.

Although he has been ministering constantly in the modern prison since its inception, the chaplain's role has certainly not been constant. For various reasons, the role of the chaplain has not only declined, it has also changed markedly and has become, it will be argued, progressively more secular, as the traditional liturgical, sacramental and religious education tasks of the chaplain have dwindled to the point of being insignificant (Knight, 1992; 150,175). The chaplain now focuses on the area of pastoral care. The problem here is that pastoral care is a very ill defined area of practice, particularly in a secular setting where most prisoners do not adhere to the denominationally based Christian religion, or any other religion. This tends to produce issues and concerns for chaplains as professional welfare staff move into an area that was once the province of the chaplain (Beckford and Gilliat, 1998; 43). These tasks, which are essentially welfare oriented, belonged to the chaplain, not primarily because of the chaplain's training or expertise, but merely because the chaplain was the first professional in the prison and there was no one else to do it. As it has become more widely accepted that the prisoner still retains rights
as a citizen (Grant, 1992; 29,55), these tasks have become more prolific and hence welfare departments have been established in prisons to handle the matters arising.

The view taken in this thesis is that the chaplain has become progressively more secularised and this will be discussed at later points in the thesis. This does not however, obviate the fact that the chaplain is the official ecclesiastical representative in the prison, and has been influenced by both ecclesiastical and secular structures and thought. The analysis of chaplain in this thesis, given the evolvement of the prison from the dominance of religious foundational understandings to the thoroughly secular institution it is today, was based on the premise that both secular and religious writings can usefully inform the study of the prison and the prison chaplain. Religious and sociological concepts are seen as complementary in this investigation, in spite of the fact that studies of the prison rarely mention religion, let alone use religious concepts to inform the investigation. The complementarity of the social sciences and the religious studies disciplines is not an assumption that is readily conceded, even by the minority of social scientists who have some knowledge of religious writings and an interest in them. Most social scientists ignore religion altogether. Others, who give it some consideration, regard religious writings, particularly theology, as an epiphenomenal matter to the study of religion as a social phenomenon (Gill, 1977; 61). Relatively few theological writers have any comment on the matter at all. The stance taken in this thesis is therefore an unusual one. It is not the intention of this thesis, nor is it within the scope of this thesis, to review all the issues surrounding the few attempts to integrate social science, particularly sociology, with theology. The use of religious concepts in social analysis does, however, need to be
placed in a context and requires explication.

There is no doubt that the social sciences have informed the traditional religious disciplines. Robin Gill is of the opinion that the social sciences have basically kept the divinity faculties of Europe open (Gill, 1977, v). While this statement is open to question, nevertheless it is readily apparent that the social sciences have been enormously influential in the writings of many academics in religious disciplines such as theology, biblical studies and church history. Some prominent theological writers lament what they believe to be the inordinate degree to which the social sciences have influenced religious disciplines, both directly and indirectly. Brueggemann, for instance, is critical of the extent to which Historical Criticism has been adopted. Walter Brueggemann is of the view that the effect of what he believes has been the too ready adoption of Historical Criticism has been to empty the Scriptures of much that is most interesting, most poignant and most disclosing in the text. (Brueggemann, 1993; 58). John Milbank goes further than Brueggemann and attacks what he believes are the very foundations of social theory. Milbank argues that the governing assumptions of social theory presuppose the rejection or modification of orthodox Christian positions (Milbank, 1990; 1). For all the density of argument, Milbank's position is an incomplete one, for the more passive 'ignore' could usefully be added to Milbank's active taxonomy of 'reject' and 'modify'. The ignoring of religious writings by the social scientists is considered more to the point. One could hardly be surprised that writings in theology are unfamiliar to social scientists. My own experience would strongly suggest that much theological writing would be less than compelling reading for social scientists. They could hardly be criticised for ignoring
them. The theologian, Stephen Pattison, makes just this point when he describes most theologians, as living within 'an obscuritanist religious ghetto' (Pattison, 1995; 36).

The ignoring of religious writings, especially theology, by the social sciences is the most accurate description as far as the theologian Gill is concerned. It should be noted that the writings of Milbank, particularly Theology and Social Theory, generated considerable interest among theological scholars, but as far as sociological academics are concerned, it generated virtually no interest at all. (Flanagan, 1996(a); 59,60). Kieran Flanagan argues that contemporary sociology has deliberately opted to be a secular discipline and that God has disappeared from the agenda of sociological writings in the modern era, where modernist and postmodernist views have prevailed. (Flanagan, 1996(a); 144). However, he goes on to argue that this leaves sociology adrift in a sea of relativism, as well as leaving sociology out of any debate on the metaphysical and existential issues raised in the postmodern era. For Flanagan, sociology has thereby lost a prophetic role and substituted for it and endless procession of empirical studies, which do not address the key issues of the time; the moral and ethical issues. (Flanagan, 1996(a); 53). Flanagan, however, does not lay the blame entirely at the feet of the sociologist; he is of the view that the liberal theologians have played a key role in this by breaking down tradition.

In seeking a definite difference, the prospect of spiritual enchantment, the last thing sociology wishes to couple with is a disembodied academic version of theology, grounded in a secular culture that represents everything the sociological mind wishes to escape from. (Flanagan, 1996(a); 56).
Flanagan here obviously expresses a communitarian view of religion and the social sciences, this issue will be addressed later, for the moment it suffices to note that Flanagan acknowledges the lack of influence of theology on the social sciences. As noted previously, Pattison also acknowledges this lack of influence by his conviction that many theologians dwell in an obscuritanist religious ghetto.

The orthodox ecclesiastical scholar, Eric Mascall, expresses a still widely held view that the social sciences have basically determined the way in which many theologians interpret the scriptures, particularly through the suspicion which the social sciences exhibit toward the ‘supernatural’ (Mascall, 1965; 204). According to Mascall, referring specifically to the radical and, Mascall is enthusiastic to suggest, muddled writings of John Robinson in Honest to God, what the modern mind will accept is in fact the rationale for what many theologians write, and, accordingly, this tends to desupernaturalise the Christian scriptures. This is akin to Milbank's commentary about the social sciences 'positioning' theology; meaning that the social sciences subjugate theology, or more precisely, theologians allow their discipline to be subjugated (Milbank, 1990; 2,3). Milbank and Mascall's commentary is echoed by a number theologians who see theology as having been heavily corrupted by the disciplines of the social sciences, based on the rationalism of modernity. It is not only orthodox theologians who hold this view. As noted, Flanagan has been highly critical of liberal theologians. There is indeed ample evidence that ecclesiastical disciplines, particularly liberal Protestant theology, have been heavily influenced by Enlightenment rationality. In the opinion of Flanagan,
the church had set out to Christianise the world, however the trend has been toward the world secularising the church (Flanagan, 1996; 116). There is merit in this observation.

Conversely, Gill suggests that there is little evidence that theology has had much effect at all on the social sciences, let alone on society. (One need not single out theology alone in this regard; there is little evidence of other ecclesiastical disciplines having much effect either). Gill is doubtful that even the most controversial theology, such as Bishop Robinson's publication *Honest to God*, a highly polemical, highly caricaturing, iconoclastic book, written by a high ranking cleric, had significant social impact beyond the ecclesiastical hierarchy, clergy and laity. In Gill's opinion, the public at large may have had some awareness that a bishop was saying provocative things about beliefs widely accepted by Christians, but that was about the extent of its impact (Gill, 1977; 102). Peter Berger adds the weight of the sociologist to this position by his claim that religious legitimations have lost their plausibility as universe maintaining activity (Berger, 1973; 131), that is, an activity that contributes significantly to the holding together of the fabric of society, as Durkheim, for instance, believed that religion did. Emile Durkheim had good reason to believe this at the time he was writing, for the church was then much more influential in society. While agreeing with Gill's assessment of the influence of theology, and Berger's for the decline of religion in general, I will argue that religious writings can in fact be informative for the social sciences. While religious writings have been largely irrelevant to such endeavours as social investigation, there is no compelling reason that they have to be.
Some theologians are not content to simply lament the position of theology with regard to the social sciences. While Gill suggests that there is no intrinsic reason for sociology and theology to dialogue (Gill, 1977; v), others hold views at variance with this. For instance, Milbank argues that theology ought to adopt a more critical position toward discourses in the social sciences and create the possibility, in postmodern terms, of theology as a meta discourse in the social sciences (Milbank, 1990; 1). The question that arises from Milbank's statements is, of course; 'which theology'? and 'which discourse'? There is a plethora of theologies in the Protestant tradition and it is far from clear how these could be related to one another to form a coherent, single discourse. (Ayres, 1996; 187). As Sallie McFague notes, the 'Protestant sensibility' emanating from the Reformation tradition, naturally focuses on dissimilarity and produces critical thought (McFague, 1983; 13). Milbank's theology is orthodox and doctrinal; the assumptions that underpin his critique would be unacceptable to many theologians, let alone sociologists. That all history should be 'read' and 'located' from the Christ event, and that sociology becomes ecclesiology, albeit with the qualification that the church defines itself in practice in continuity with society, (Milbank, 1990; 380) is not a proposition that has, nor is it likely to, receive wide support. Ecclesiastically, such a proposition would have likely support and application within Christian orthodoxy. With regard to sociology, it would probably only have support among scholars who adhere to an orthodox position in their public domain, as well as privately.

There is no compelling reason to accept the interpretation of Christian orthodoxy offered by Milbank and others above the various other interpretations. Orthodoxy is not to be
confused with the 'normal', or 'most appropriate' theology in Christianity, particularly with regard to Protestantism, which has no strong tradition of the necessary acceptance of interpretation formalised by the church. As we have seen, McFague notes that Protestantism tends to see dissimilarity, distinction and tension, and hence it tends to be critical and sceptical. For McFague, who theorises from a perspective of metaphor and parable, orthodoxy is a form of idolatry. Protestantism tends to emphasise the conversation between the reader and the scriptures themselves; this stance is encouraging of individual interpretation and has been particularly evident from the second half of the twentieth century. The possibility of a meta discourse is difficult to envision, but general acceptance of a meta discourse exclusive to Christian orthodoxy is even more difficult to envision and may become more so as interpretation in the Protestant tradition could widen further under postmodern influences. The orthodox position is too restrictive. It would appear that Milbank is looking for a return to an ecclesiastical influence not known since the time of medieval Christendom. The concept of God is an elusive one, even among the ecclesiastical disciplines, there is no reason to think that the sociologist will be any more enamoured of the idea of God in the social sciences than he or she has been previously. It is considered a more likely proposition that the sociology of knowledge will become more interested in the study of the formation of theological views than theology providing a meta discourse in the social sciences.

In this study there is no endeavour to try to develop and impose a model where theology positions the social sciences. The view taken is that there are too many theologies with too many disparate assumptions to make that a realistic endeavour. Such an endeavour
would require a kind of 'fantastic syncretism of science and religion' (Bellah, 1971; 239), which in fact have different purposes, different limitations and different modes of action. If Gill's view, that theology is seen as an epiphenomenon within religion is accepted, it comes as no surprise that theology has had little effect, in modern times, on either the social sciences or the wider society (Gill, 1977; 61). Accordingly, this study has taken the option of using concepts from religious writings as they have suggested themselves as being relevant to the investigation. The option taken has been the eclectic one. The option to impose a system of theological thought onto this social investigation was rejected as being too restrictive and too reductionist.

We have noted that it is widely acknowledged, even by some who lament the fact, that theology has had little effect on the social sciences or indeed on society itself. The dominance of the social sciences in modernity and the trends toward pluralism in postmodern writing leads to scepticism that this trend of the marginality of theology, particularly orthodox theology, in social investigation and theorising will change. This however does not mean that we must abandon the possibility that there can be a mutual informing between religious writings and concepts, as opposed to theology alone, and the social sciences. The approach taken in this thesis is that religious writings can have an influence the social sciences. The influence of religious writings will be in the form of fragment, as Brueggemann, Forrester and others consider, not by the construction of the framework of a theological meta narrative as Milbank envisions. Such a construction is essentially, as Lewis Ayres notes, not taking full account of the many different dialogues that occur between different areas of theology (Ayres, 1996; 186). The advocacy of
theology becoming, once again, 'Queen of the Sciences' is rather unrealistic, given the development of the social sciences.

Duncan Forrester has noted that theology has long since, and for good reason he believes, abandoned its claim to be the 'Queen of the Sciences' and is now widely regarded as one of the least relevant humanities (Forrester, 1997; 9). Forrester is of the view that theology cannot any longer supply widely accepted overall theories, such as theories of justice, to modern Western society. Religion is but one of the many voices in the public arena. Forrester does argue, however, that theology can claim to supply insights, questions and challenges to public discourse (Forrester, 1997; 55). Forrester sees the role of theology as being, ‘modest, disturbing and constructive, offering, but not imposing, insights, values and convictions - theological fragments- and hoping that some of them may be tested and accepted as public truths’ (Forrester, 1997; 84).

Forrester is not here compromising Christianity, but realising that western society is not Christendom and thus he seeks to find ways that it can contribute to the public arena as opposed to the arena of the individual person. Forrester envisions that fragments could increase the relevance of Christianity to the public arena, which has long since abandoned systematic theology.

Brueggemann also takes up the 'theological fragments' approach. Brueggemann argues that the hegemony of the Enlightenment-inspired Historical Criticism is waning and new methods of reading the text (i.e. biblical text) will be developed. In Brueggemann's
opinion, Historical Criticism had eliminated probing speech, daring rhetoric and subversive text (Brueggemann, 1993; 11,12). For Brueggemann, the task for religion is not to provide the 'grand scheme', or coherent system, but the voicing of, ‘a lot of little pieces out of which people can put life together in fresh configurations’ (Brueggemann, 1993; 24, 25).

Brueggemann describes the text as being like a script of psychotherapy, bringing to consciousness all sorts of old features from the past that have been repressed, in this case by Historical Criticism (Brueggemann, 1993; 39). Brueggemann also suggests that imagination will play a strong part as a valued and authoritative practice in the establishing of knowledge (Brueggemann, 1993; 12).

There are other theologians, and some sociologists, who are discontented with the marginality of religious disciplines. These thinkers believe that a modest contribution can be made to public discourse by religion. All reject the grand scheme, in Brockelman's words, ‘finding some sure and certain foundation for knowledge, perhaps an ideal mode of discourse, to which all other modes of discourse could be reduced, or a self-evident first principle’ (Brockelman, 1992; 75).

Imagination has a strong role in their thinking. Pattison is of the view that, ‘at their best and most creative, theologians may be able to suggest better, more comprehensive, or more adequate metaphors and symbols for guiding individual and social processes’ (Pattison, 1995; 43).
Metaphors are used in the manner described by Pattison to guide the social investigation of the decline of the prison chaplain. We now turn to a discussion of the capacity of metaphor, constructed from religious source material, to influence social investigations.

The Place of Metaphor in the Study.
A focus on religion, in contrast to the more narrow focus on theology, casts a wider net and accesses a range of literature which is far more expansive and richer in imagery than the literature of theology, much of which is systematically developed from original source material, particularly the Christian scriptures. This study will look toward religious literature, particularly biblical literature, to provide concepts to inform the social investigation into the decline of the prison chaplain. The specific vehicle to inform this investigation is the metaphor. What is metaphor? Why select biblical metaphor in preference to concepts from systematic theology? Why select metaphor at all? These three questions will be addressed in the remainder of this section.

What is Metaphor?
There are quite a number of different theories and ideas about the nature and function of metaphor (Goatly, 1997; 4). Mara Donaldson, for instance, is of the opinion that, ‘The destruction of a literal sense and a literal reference opens up the possibility for a second order, metaphorical truth’ (Donaldson, 1988; 46).

Writers on the topic of metaphor do largely agree that appropriate metaphors open up
new perspectives and understandings of phenomena to which they are applied. Constructing 'entailments', or 'associated implications', from the metaphor is the hermeneutic challenge. For the purposes of this study, where the metaphors are noun based, the metaphor is comprised of a topic term (T), sometimes referred to as the principal subject, and a vehicle term (V), sometimes referred to as the subsidiary subject. These terms are brought into association as a result of metaphorical thought, which has identified threads of similarity between the two dissimilar objects, events or other phenomena in question (McFague, 1983; 15). An example, and it is an oft-cited example, of a noun based metaphor is: Men (T) are wolves (V). The metaphor works by applying to (T) a system of 'associated implications' that is, entailments, characteristic of (V), such as cunning, a predatory nature, and so on (Black, 1981; 77-78). The metaphor invites comparisons between (T) and (V). It is also the nature of the metaphor that while there needs to be significant parallels between the terms, which invite comparison, there is also a tension between the terms and the 'is not' is as prominent as the 'is' (McFague, 1983; 13). In our example, it is obvious that Man is not a canine covered in long fur, with prominent fangs, and a predilection for eating raw meat from victims he has personally killed. The metaphor, like all metaphors, will therefore channel thought in certain directions rather than others, highlighting some aspects while ignoring others, consequently one has to be cognisant of this when considering the application of metaphor within social investigation.

I affirm the view that has been expressed by McFague, that the metaphor is an expression of primary level images and that these need to be expanded into a secondary level of
concepts. This is what McFague refers to as grounding the metaphor. Without this grounding, as McFague notes, the analysis 'wanders in a land of images that, while rich, is chaotic and unilluminated' (McFague, 1983; 121). Quite clearly metaphors, in and of themselves, cannot develop the deeper theoretical, ontological or sociological issues, although they can point to them; another language is required to complement the metaphorical and develop the issues raised. McFague was writing within the confines of theology and was concerned that metaphors not become literalised, such as for instance, God as Father, has become literalised for many people. For McFague and other theorists, this particular metaphor, far from opening up new thought, has now tended to exclude other ways of thinking. Metaphor can be dangerous unless used adroitly. If metaphor is used adroitly, it has considerable potential to create new perspectives for social investigation. Some writers, including Frank Ankersmit consider it our most powerful tool for creating new perspectives. For Ankersmit, the historical world is the metaphor's 'favourite domain' (Ankersmit, 1994; 159).

This study uses novel metaphors to give direction to the investigation. The organising function of the metaphor is constantly referred to by writers on the topic of metaphor (Black, 1981; 75; Johnson, 1981; 27; Ankersmit, 1994; 158). The study then draws upon the more conventional insights from the social sciences and other sociological concepts to develop the analysis.

**Why Prefer Metaphor to Theology?**

It can be said at the outset, that very few scholars in the social sciences, as we have seen,
have shown the slightest interest about the possible application of theology, particularly systematic theology, to the social sciences. On the other hand, some scholars in the social sciences have used metaphor to great advantage in their writings. Ignatieff in his book, *The Needs of Strangers* (Ignatieff, 1984), made use, among other literature, of the Shakespearian play, *King Lear*. Ignatieff used aspects of this play to both guide and drive his analysis of human need and obligation. He made excellent use of the image of the heath in the mad scene of *King Lear* to construct a metaphor, which drew comparisons between those on the heath of Shakespeare's play, and those on the 'heath' of contemporary Western society. This was an excellent, guiding metaphor and opened new perspectives on human need and human obligation, and in particular what one can expect from others on the basis of an appeal to our humanity alone. Richard Rorty, possibly best known as the defender of the 'bazaar' of liberal democracy against the Thomism of the communitarian, Alasdair MacIntyre, made excellent use of metaphor as a heuristic device in discussing his analysis of liberal democracies, as noted in the following quote

> All we should do is point out the practical advantages of liberal institutions in allowing individuals and cultures to get along together without intruding on each other's privacy, without meddling in each other's conceptions of the good...We can urge the construction of a world order whose model is a bazaar surrounded by lots and lots of exclusive private clubs. (Quoted in Fuller, 1998; 39).

Rorty grounds the metaphor of the bazaar, noted above, by the use of philosophical concepts. Excellent use was made of the metaphor to guide the discussion and assist in
conveying complex philosophical ideas. From the examples cited, it is apparent that metaphor can have both generative and heuristic functions.

It has been noted that the borrowings between the social sciences and theology have been almost exclusively from the social sciences to theology. This is a definite trend. William Pickering makes the observation that it is difficult to distinguish academic theology, as it is taught in the West, from general courses in the philosophy of religion or the history of ideas (Pickering, 1980; 103). Even in confessional theological colleges, this is becoming more difficult; such has been my personal experience. Theology essentially abandoned the field of social thought to the sociologist from the second half of the nineteenth century. Theology is a problematic field from which to look for guidance when undertaking social investigation. It is not simply the trend to incorporate social science into theology that brought about the decision to prefer metaphor to theology as the framework for the investigation of the decline of the prison chaplain. There are problems of method associated with theology, which raise significant problems for the use of theology in social investigation.

Theologians such as Milbank and Jennings have advocated that theology ought to be a guiding force within the social sciences; sociology in particular. Willie Jennings in fact wants sociology reinvented as a theological and ethical discourse upon the social, a discourse beyond the 'hermeneutics of suspicion', which he sees as lying below much postmodern thought (Jennings, 1997; 118). But who is going to re-invent sociology? Certainly there is no indication that the social scientists will do so. Jennings ideas are
theological contentions with very little hope of becoming a political reality. For his part, Milbank, of course, is referring to orthodox theology. Orthodox theology, however, is but one of numerous theologies, which have increased markedly in number since the Enlightenment. Herein lies an initial difficulty. If theology is to be used for social investigation, which theology ought to be chosen and why? Theologies have vastly different assumptions on which they are based and these have ramifications for social investigation. A confessional theology has obviously different ramifications to a non-confessional theology, for instance, just as a Deist God has vastly different ramifications to the active, Evangelical God, as we shall discover when we consider the penitentiary.

One of the major reasons for preferring metaphor, drawn from Christian religious writings, as the informing agent in this study, rather than theology, is that it is not fraught with the methodological problems of theology, particularly with regard to such contentious issues such as the existence and action of God. There are implications for analysis if we accept certain theologies with their varying assumptions about God. These problems plague all forms of theology when considering their application to social investigation in particular, and to social science in general. What God do we accept if we are to apply any of the various theologies to social investigation and what are the implications? Metaphor is generally not subject to these problems. In the liberal democratic vein of Rorty, both metaphor and theology are available choices in the bazaar. I have elected to choose metaphor, because it does not have the complications of theology. We need now to consider these advantages of metaphor over theology, both conservative and liberal, in some more detail.
There are many theologies within Christianity. The most basic division is between the orthodox, or conservative position, and the liberal position, the latter burgeoned in the second half of the twentieth century. Each position has many forms, or variants, and each can be discussed in only the most general terms to tease out their implications for the social sciences.

The conservative position, certainly in its evangelical form, assumes a God who acts in and on the world, either directly or indirectly, sometimes at the request of petition; the actions of the conservative God have consequences for human beings, personal and social. The belief in the active God, associated with conservatism, has implications for the way one undertakes social investigation. To hold a conservative position and advocate for its adoption in the social sciences can lead to the position of Milbank: sociology must in a sense become ecclesiology (Ayres, 1996; 175). The social theorist of conservative religious belief can, of course, live in a world of total disconnection between public life and writing, and private life where religion is contained, and one expects that many individuals do precisely this; privatisation of religion is a feature of Western society. However, if one is to hold a conservative position, in the active sense, it seems tantamount to advocating moving along a path toward theocracy. Such a path leads to the intellectual position where theology, as a prominent interpreter of things metaphysical, is again elevated to the position of 'Queen of the Sciences'. In a world of pluralism, and one where a multitude of philosophies, theologies, ideologies and cultures are acknowledged, a post colonial world, the possibility and desirability of a path back to
theocracy are both very questionable. The philosopher, Alasdair MacIntyre, it seems, would put, at the least, Western society on this path.

MacIntyre argues that Western society is not coherent in its thinking and judging on moral and ethical issues, because it attempts interpretation and the reaching of consensus through a pot pourri of social and cultural fragments, detached at various stages of modernity, from the integrating traditions from which the culture derived. MacIntyre goes on to ask what criteria is Western society to use for deciding competing claims of justice, because 'rationality' itself, the great Enlightenment hope, is now just as disputed as anything else (MacIntyre, 1988; 2). In After Virtue, MacIntyre argued that conceptual fragments from the past are deployed in public and private debates, ‘which are notable chiefly for the unsettled character of the controversies thus carried on and the arbitrariness of each of the contending parties’ (MacIntyre, 1981; 238).

MacIntyre contends that liberal democracies are in a state of confusion about ethics and that social cohesion is in disarray in such a liberal individual milieu. MacIntyre calls Western liberal democracies back to the traditions. Specifically he argues that a modified Thomist tradition is the best option on offer to address what he claims is the confusion and the concomitant social cohesion and personal identity problems ensuing from this confusion. There are many who would agree, or agree partly, with MacIntyre's analysis of the modern muddle, but strongly disagree with the communitarian antidote which he offers. Michael Fuller, for instance states,
But the trouble is that MacIntyre's solution, underneath all the ambiguity and qualification, seems to consist of a call for liberal democracies to return to something like the theocratic societies of medieval Thomism. This is about as realistic as expecting liberal societies to embrace Islamic Fundamentalism as a core ideology, and for the USA to model itself on Iran. It is just not going to happen, and for that reason, MacIntyre's analysis of the modern muddle, in spite of its brilliance and insight, is in a sense "merely academic"....If sittlichkeit (Hegel's term for that form of shared "concrete ethics" and shared consciousness which gives people a sense of community and fraternity, (my italics)) is needed, modern liberal democracies are going to have to find it elsewhere (Fuller, 1998; 139, 140).

This is a neat summary that grounds MacIntyre's work, which generally operates at the level of essentialist metaphysics. There are many queries that can be raised with regard to MacIntyre's assertions. MacIntyre makes much of the coherence of traditions, as opposed to fragments, but the Christian scripture itself is collection of fragments. While the scriptures are collected into a Canon, it can be argued that they are not a coherent whole, but fragments from what are already disparate Christian perspectives of the first century, the Johannine perspective, the Matthean perspective, the Pauline perspective and so on. These fragments were written at different times, in different places and cultures, under different conditions, for different purposes and for different communities. It could be counter argued that, at the broadest level of generality, there is unity in the risen Christ, however this does not automatically generate consensus among the Christian
It is asserted here that fragments, such as are found in scripture, can contain concepts and insights of potential value for the bazaar, and that this can be so without necessarily accepting the values, ideology or theology associated with the tradition from which it has come, a point argued persuasively by Robert Simons (Simons, 1995; xv). What is of value need not be contingent upon the application and acceptance of a particular tradition. Fragments will not supply the answer to the modern muddle that MacIntyre seeks, but nevertheless there are benefits, as Daniele Hervieu-Leger states,

it would be mistaken to believe that these demands for meaning, which are expressed acutely during periods of crisis, give the symbolic apparatus inherited from the past (the 'great religions' in particular) a chance of reconquering a central position in the present day culture. Instead, the religious traditions of the past are treated as symbolic 'toolboxes' on which men and women of today draw freely, without this necessarily meaning that they identify themselves with the comprehensive view of the world and Man's place in that world that historically was part of the language of the traditions concerned. (Hervieu-Leger, 1993; 141).

MacIntyre's work, (and other works of communitarianism) is best seen as a critique of the liberal polity than as an alternative to it.

With regard to this thesis, a significant problem in adopting a conservative, systematic, or
tradition-centred theological approach is the problem of the function of the active God inherent in that particular approach. This thesis has the modest objective of a particular social investigation. The approach taken is that fragments are useful in informing the social investigation. The application of a conservative theology, particularly systematic theology, has many assumptions about the nature of God, which would render the analysis very hazardous and compromise later sections of this thesis, which ask questions about God and the prison.

Liberal theology, on the other hand, posits a God who has been 'de-mythologised' (Bultmann's term), a process that had a major impetus in the Historical Critical Method of the nineteenth century and found influential expression in the writings of Rudolph Bultmann in the second half of the twentieth century. The advocates of this position are generally theorists who have been deeply influenced by the disciplines that were given their impetus by the Enlightenment rationality. The God of the liberal theologian has many variations, including at its extreme, non-existence, but in general it can be said that this God has Deist characteristics. The Deist God does not act upon the world; human beings have control of their own destiny. Being so deeply influenced in its hermeneutic by the social sciences, radical theology has little, if anything, to offer back. The liberal God is the God of the conservatives, who has, in the words of the British philosopher, Antony Flew, ‘died the death of a thousand qualifications’ (Van Buren, 1963; 17).

The existence or non-existence of this God is much the same in terms of social consequences. It is extremely difficult to see where such a theology and the God posited
from it could make a contribution to the social sciences (Flanagan, 1996 (a); 56.). There are no apparent ramifications for knowledge for the social sciences from this theology: there is simply no particular need to take it into account. Indeed, it would seem that there would be no need even to refer to it, save, perhaps, as a source of study for the sociology of knowledge. Liberal theologians, it would seem, are probably destined to talk to themselves, a point that Alister McGrath makes lucidly, and often,

Unless liberalism regains a firm commitment to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it is difficult to see what can keep it going. It will be ignored by the church and by society at large. And this haunting fear of being condemned to irrelevance underlies one of the most interesting recent developments within an increasingly beleaguered liberalism - the quest for a 'public theology'. (McGrath, 1996; 128).

Conservatism, on the other hand, would seek to subsume the social sciences, restoring the 'Queen' to her rightful place, as they regard it. The assumption of an orthodox God creates obvious difficulties with regard to the social sciences. The social sciences have simply developed outside of such an assumption. As Robert Bellah notes, Sigmund Freud, Emile Durkheim, and Max Weber, whom Bellah considers to be the seminal minds on which modern social science is built, were nonbelievers, people deeply alienated from the Western religious tradition of their time, and all were of the view that they were in possession of a truth superior to that of orthodox religion (Bellah, 1971; 285). It is hardly surprising then that the social sciences are still little interested in religion, in a methodological sense, and in particular little interested in systematic
theology. The interest in religion, as far as sociologists are concerned, has been generally limited to religion as a field of empirical study.

With regard to theology, we have one branch of theology, the conservative, which presents such difficult problems as outlined above for the social investigator. The other branch of theology, liberal theology, has little of value to offer and the social investigator has no compelling reason to consider it as a methodological tool.

Metaphor, drawn from religious literature, has an advantage over theology in relation to the social sciences and social investigation in that it is not systematic, and hence does not introduce the social investigator, as the creator of metaphor, to the methodological problems associated with the function of God, as mentioned above. Neither does it commit the social investigator to the holistic grand theories of theology. Brueggemann, in particular, is highly critical of these grand theories being as being reductionist and militating against the use of imagination, by ruling out much material, in particular the 'little stories' that do not fit their schemata (Breuggemann, 1993; 59). John Hoffman, too, rejects what he terms the 'tyranny of systematic language in theological reflection', arguing that it destroys imagination, simply promoting an ongoing debate between critics about criticism (Hoffman, 1986; 158-160).

Metaphor is included among the 'fragments', the 'wisdom', that Forrester refers to and which Forrester, Pattison, Breuggemann and others believe is a valuable offering to the social sciences. Metaphor, unlike theology, generally does not demand that the user has a
pretext with certain convictions about the nature and actions of God. For instance, and as will be outlined in the following chapter, the metaphor 'the penitentiary as Armageddon' can be applied without the person applying it being committed to definite theological concepts and the implications which may flow from these concepts. Armageddon is used as an image, without the interpretation of a theological position interfering; in McFague's terms it is a primary, not a secondary concept. The creator of metaphors which have a religious base, it is true, will most likely come from someone trained or versed in religious literature, however that person may hold any one of a variety of religious views, or perhaps none, about the being and nature of God. The use, or development, of metaphor, particularly noun-based metaphors, is not contingent upon the user or developer's theological position, or religious conviction. Religious metaphor has been used by thinkers with as widely divergent theological views as the radical Don Cupitt and the conservative McGrath. It is a content of Hervieu-leger's 'toolbox'.

The other advantage of using metaphor in this thesis is that the religious writings, from which the images to construct the metaphors were drawn, are writings which are tremendously rich in images. Religious writings, particularly the scriptures within the Christian tradition, are given to being heavily dependent on images in their endeavour to explicate the transcendent.

It has been argued that metaphor has distinct advantages over theology for use in the social sciences, particularly social investigation. By way of summary, metaphor drawn from religious writings can be used in the social sciences without the impediments that
theology presents. Metaphor does not commit the social investigator to theological positions, particularly absolutes, and to the problems of method that this assumption entails. Metaphor is, first and foremost, a literary genre, even when found within confessional writings. Metaphor is descriptive, not prescriptive, and does not have the reductionist tendencies of many theologies with their assumptions of the nature and function of God. Metaphor has proved itself to be tremendously versatile in crossing discipline boundaries and has a record of successful, though not widespread, use in those disciplines. This will be outlined below. This does not, however, explain why metaphor should be used in this study. Metaphor has certainly had its detractors, who have argued that metaphor does not and cannot produce knowledge and that the metaphor is merely decorative. These criticisms also need to be addressed.

**Why use Metaphor at all?**

It is only in relatively recent times that metaphor has been regarded by more than the occasional scholar as anything other than a literary artefact. Metaphor has usually been regarded as a tool of the poet and those who do not use, or do not need to use, 'precise' language. Many analytic philosophers have been especially scathing in their attacks on metaphor, particularly during and after the Enlightenment. Metaphor has numbered among its detractors such luminaries as John Locke, Thomas Hobbes and Bishop George Berkeley (Johnson, 1981; 12-13). As Andrew Goatly points out, however, Locke was often in the habit of using metaphor himself (Goatly, 1997; 1). Indeed, it is widely recognized now that it is impossible not to use metaphor in language: the debate now tends to focus on how it is used (Goodman, 1981; 226). Locke's diatribe against
metaphor, afforded wide credibility in the nineteenth century, is anachronistic in contemporary times.

Since the 1962 publication of *Models and Metaphors*, the seminal work of the analytic philosopher Max Black, metaphor began to be regarded more seriously as a means of creating new perspectives on problems and issues. Prior to Black's publication, metaphor had been widely regarded with the utmost suspicion, a suspicion given impetus by the Enlightenment. The suspicion of metaphor was not restricted to philosophers. Metaphor had a chequered history. In the medieval period, it was seen as valuable when used in the interpretation of ecclesiastical writings and in exegesis, the same ecclesiastical writers however denounced its use in areas other than religious writings (Johnson, 1981; 11).

During the ascendancy of the logical positivists, metaphor was mainly regarded as a decorative figure of speech, as opposed to literal speech, which, it was alleged by the logical positivists, was alone verifiable (Johnson, 1981; 17). Metaphor, it was believed, could be given a literal substitute of non-figurative language without loss of cognitive content. Analytic philosophers were condemnatory about the use of metaphor; to them metaphor was imprecise at best and contradictory at worst. This view, suggested by Goatly as emanating from those people 'condemned to literal mindedness' (Goatly, 1997; 129), has been quite widely abandoned. The critique levelled by the logical positivists at the language of metaphor has been effectively countered. A number of theorists have put forward the widely accepted view that no one style of language can claim a monopoly on truth and that, because truth is not necessarily literal (MacIntyre, 1989; 100); there is no
reason why metaphor should have to be restated in literal terms; if indeed that is possible (Binkley, 1981; 151).

Since the 1970's there has been a considerable corpus of literature published on metaphor. The role of metaphor in the development of the field of scientific investigation has been widely acknowledged (Gerhart and Russell, 1984; 22,51) and the capacity of metaphor to alter perspectives, generate new perspectives and assist research in other fields of enquiry such as education (Petrie, 1979; 439-442) and social policy (Schon, 1979; 255-260) has been argued. In metaphoric terms, the metaphor is 'coming of age'.

The potential of metaphor to generate new perspectives was an enticement to this study. There is no doubt that perspectives can change, as McFague notes, by seeing 'this' as 'that'; referring to the subject term being seen as the vehicle term. The metaphor, having been seen by some scholars as advantageous to investigation in various fields, confirmed the decision to utilise it to guide the study of the prison chaplain. There was also the added enticement of the generation of metaphor of the chaplain as the Exile from my Field Experience at Long Bay, mentioned in the Preface. Also, given that the topic under consideration has a religious and ecclesiastical component, and given my own training in the field of religious literature, it seemed apt to seek the metaphors in the rich field of religious writings, in particular the Christian scriptures.

**The Production of Metaphors and their Entailments.**

Metaphors are produced, as well as being discovered in existing writings (McFague,
1983; 137). Novel metaphors have been produced for this investigation into the prison chaplain. How the metaphor is produced is not only a matter of curiosity, but is integral to explaining the methodology of this study.

Many scholars writing on metaphor suggest that there is no authoritative checklist for the production of a good metaphor (Black, 1990; 90-91; Johnson, 1981; 32; Gerhart and Russell, 1984; 170). While being in basic agreement with such views, for the production of metaphors does at times come via the ‘ontological flash’ of sudden insight (Gerhart and Russell, 1984; 114), the production of metaphor is not without order and discipline.

Donald Schon (1979; 2) discusses ‘immersion’ in the topic under investigation, in Schon’s case social policy, as a prerequisite to the generation of good, expository metaphors. From Schon’s discussion of the immersion of the author of metaphor in the subject under investigation, it can readily be noted that appropriate metaphors, to use Black’s term, cannot be obtained by randomly throwing together two nouns. In the case of this thesis, immersion in the subject of prisons, on the one hand, and Christian literature, in particular Protestant Christian literature on the other, was the prerequisite for the generation of the metaphors. It is suggested here that Schon does not go far enough in his claims; an author having an ‘eye’ for the similar amid the dissimilar and feeling comfortable with this is also seen as important in the generation of good, expository metaphors. When the metaphors used in this thesis were constructed, judgements had then to be made as to how well the metaphors selected, emphasised, suppressed and organised the relevant material (Black, 1981; 77-78). There needed to be
an appraisal of the appropriateness of the metaphor.

While there is no authoritative checklist for generating appropriate, expository metaphors, and it is acknowledged that this would certainly be problematic for some writers espousing modernist views, the appraisal of the metaphor has similarities to the appraisal of more obviously literal statements. Binkley, for instance, gives the example of the metaphoric statement, ‘Richard is a fox’ and the literal statement, ‘Richard is a good husband’. Binkley argues that the truthfulness and usefulness of metaphoric statements, when they make claims such as does the example cited above, can be true or false in roughly the same way as literal statements (Binkley, 1981; 150). The metaphor then is evaluated according to how well it defines reality and illumines the topic under investigation as well as how adequately it generates sustained enquiry into the topic, or topics, under investigation.

Constructing the entailments of the metaphor requires considerable hermeneutic endeavour. The ‘is’ and the ‘is not’ of a metaphor enables the rejection of some entailments as inappropriate. For instance, when considering the simple metaphor of ‘Richard is a fox’, the entailment of the fox as cunning is applicable to the consideration of Richard, whereas the fox as having four legs is not so. The entailments of the metaphor have to be evaluated with regard to applicability and appropriateness.

As well, metaphors have to be ‘tried’, just as literal statements have to be tried, in order to make judgements about their claims, specifically judgements about whether those
claims are accurate and appropriate. Entailments also have to be tried to make judgements about their accuracy and appropriateness. Also, judgements have to be made about their faithfulness to the characteristics of the vehicle term. In essence, the metaphor has to withstand the rigour of testing, just as does the literal statement, and the metaphoric statement possibly more so as the literal meaning may have less likelihood of being misunderstood. However, as Binkley notes, the literal has no logical priority in a hierarchy of meaning by comparison with the metaphorical (Binkley, 1981; 145).

Having outlined the characteristics and functions, as well as some tasks in the generation of appropriate metaphors, it remains now to note the main metaphors used to drive the study of the decline of the prison chaplain.

**Novel Metaphors used to Advance the Study.**

The first metaphor is constructed from an eschatological image (i.e. an image of the 'End Times') taken from the Canonical Book of Revelation. The reference is to the Battle of Armageddon and the expository metaphor is 'The penitentiary as Armageddon'.

The second metaphor is constructed from the medieval social structure, where political power was shared by, and at times fiercely contested by, the Roman Church and the secular authority. In this arrangement, referred to as 'Christendom', the world is defined by the Roman Church in religious terms; that is the Roman Church is the major agency, using Berger's term, of 'universe-maintenance'. When it suited the popes of the day, the Church also used its ecclesiastical authority to legitimise the social structures headed up
by the prince. In turn, the prince used political power to advance the ecclesiastical, political and military interests of the Roman Church. This political arrangement finally failed, for a variety of reasons. The expository metaphor constructed from this political arrangement is 'The penitentiary as Christendom'.

The third metaphor is constructed from the biblical and related accounts of the Exile. The Exile refers to the deportation of a considerable portion of the political, religious and intellectual leadership of the population of Jerusalem to Babylon, following the conquest and destruction of that city by King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon in the sixth century BCE. The captive population was in Babylon from 597/587-539 BCE. An account and interpretation of the Exile is spread through a number of books of the Old Testament including: Deutero-Isaiah; Ezekiel; Lamentations; Jeremiah; Daniel; Chronicles; Kings; Nehemiah and Ezra. There is little other contemporary literature of the time that refers to the Exile. The term Exile has several meanings: an historical meaning, being the historical period referred to above, a psychological and social-psychological meaning, being the collective and individual experience of the event, and a meaning in that it denotes the individual person deported to Babylon. The expository metaphor constructed is 'The chaplain as the 'Exile'.

Inevitably, with the use of metaphors, which give perspectives on the prison and the chaplain, there will be information common to each perspective and hence there will be some repetition in the analysis. This is something akin to an analysis of the functioning of a family from the perspectives of two members of that family. The perspectives are
discreet, however there phenomena under consideration (the family) is the same.

Having outlined the methodology and structure of the study, we can proceed to the analysis of the decline of the prison chaplain.

**SECTION TWO.**

**THE PENITENTIARY AS ARMAGEDDON.**
CHAPTER TWO.
THE BIBLICAL NOTION OF ARMAGEDDON AND
THE INITIAL WORKING ENVIRONMENT OF THE PRISON CHAPLAIN.

In the previous chapter the centrality of metaphor to the study was outlined. The guiding metaphor of this chapter was identified as 'The penitentiary as Armageddon', the penitentiary being the form of prison advocated by the supporters of the separate system of prisons. This chapter will explore this metaphor and its entailments to explicate the social, political and religious environment in which the prisoner was incarcerated and in which the chaplain exercised his ministry. A detailed examination of the metaphor requires, and begins with, an outline of the biblical notion of Armageddon. Prior to the consideration of this metaphor however, it must be acknowledged that there have been other metaphors used to describe the penitentiary concept of the prison, none of which have been explored in depth through the construction of entailments. The very prominent one is to liken the penitentiary to a monastery. This metaphor is considered inadequate for several reasons. Firstly, it does not pick up the intensity of the fears and the struggles of the society of the day brought on by the newly emerging capitalist state. The creators of the penitentiary perceived it as the arena in which would take place a conflict to help
preserve the God ordained social structure. Certainly the metaphor of the monastery does not point to the intensity of the perceived struggle between the forces of Good and the forces of Evil. Secondly, it does not point to the compulsory aspect of the penitentiary, as opposed to the monastery, and the vastly differing conceptions of the prisoner as opposed to the monastic. The monastery was not perceived as an institution which would bring order into the chaos of society through the struggle between Good and Evil. Thirdly, and very importantly, the monastery does not represent the theology of the reformers, who were avidly evangelical in their outlook, and who perceived themselves as assisting God in a battle for conversions and for men's souls. This outlook helps explain the almost desperate desire of the chaplain's to see conversions in the penitentiary and hence the many times they were 'conned' by the prisoners. The reformers espoused a theology derived from the Reformation, where the monastery had no place. Rather, to them, the monastery was a place to be destroyed, not constructed. Theirs was no institution of elective tranquillity, but a total institution, which imposed the boundaries of, and supplied the forces of Good for, Armageddon.

**The Consideration of the Biblical Notion of Armageddon.**

Throughout the ages people of all cultures have pondered on 'ultimates'. Ultimates could be defined as 'phenomena of the highest importance'. Often there is a close association between ultimates and the metaphysical. Many people see the notion of God as the supreme ultimate. The existence of God, the nature of God, the relationship of God to the world, have all been topics of debate, dispute and refutation throughout the centuries by writers of many different disciplines and persuasions, both secular and religious. Death,
particularly when death is immanent or threatened, is an obvious ultimate. Death, being
the common denominator of the human race, is also often the object and/or source of fear
and anxiety as well as a source of fascination and speculation. Being surrounded in
mystery for many people, death receives an inordinate amount of attention. Death comes
not only in a surreptitious manner to the individual; it is often brought on in a deliberate,
indiscriminate and cataclysmic way for hundreds, and at times thousands, of people. The
destruction of much of the human race in nuclear and biological holocaust is a possible
scenario in an age of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. For instance mutually
assured destruction (MAD) refers to the outcome of a war between nations possessing
such weapons and is a well-known acronym for people in first world countries and who
are informed in current affairs.

Vivid images of destruction and death on a massive scale, particularly those with strong
metaphysical references have, for many, been the objects of enduring interest throughout
the ages. These images have come through painting, poetry, literature, cinema and the
electronic media. Prominent among the vivid images of destruction has been the biblical
reference to the Battle of Armageddon contained in the Book of Revelation. Even though
most people would not be familiar with the majority of the content of this strange and at
times opaque book, several images from Revelation are well known to the general public.
Armageddon, mentioned in Chapter Sixteen of Revelation, is one such image.

The Book of Revelation is a series of fantastic images, much of which pertain to the 'end
times'. In these end times, according to Revelation, God will bring about the destruction
of Evil and then bring a renewed existence to the world. Revelation was written by a
Christian visionary on the island of Patmos, toward the end of the first century of the
Common Era, a time of persecution of the church. Revelation has been the object of
intense speculation and reverence by millenarian sects who have anticipated a speedy end
to existence in this world; conversely it has been heavily attacked by other individuals
and groups pronouncing it as barbaric and vengeful (Collins, 1991; ix). Others see
Revelation as a spiteful attack on all the pleasures and achievements of Roman
civilisation (Collins, 1991; ix) and, by extension, an attack on all succeeding
civilisations. D.H. Lawrence, for instance, held this view. As Revelation itself is lacking
in order and structure with regard to the episodes it describes, and as much of its rich
imagery is opaque, it comes as no surprise that there are many and varied interpretations
about its nature and meaning. The varying opinions of scholars with regard to the nature
and meaning of Revelation are not central to this study; it is the imagery of Revelation
that supplies the material for consideration.

Some of the images in The Book of Revelation are spectacular and fascinating pictures of
ultimates, particularly the ultimates of death and God. Being rich in imagery, Revelation
is not simply a book for scholars, critics and the eschatologically minded. It is not
surprising that very popular commercial books and films have been inspired by a few of
the images in Revelation, images such as the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse and
Armageddon. From among these fantastic images, the one that has been most intriguing
is that of Armageddon; the image in which the first century author envisions a
cataclysmic final battle between the armies of the world. The forces of Good and Evil are
pitted against each other; the prelude to God restoring order. The concept of Armageddon presents an attractive proposition for contemporary cinematography and publishing. But, commercial potential aside, what is inherent in the image of Armageddon?

In Revelation the visionary refers to Armageddon as both a place and an event. When referring to place, there are varying opinions among scholars as to the siting of Armageddon. While the scholars hold varying opinions about location, the opinions expressed all refer to locations in ancient Israel. The consensus is that the writer of Revelation had a definite place in mind when he referred to Armageddon. For the purposes of this study the fact that Armageddon was definitively seen as a geographic place is sufficient.

As well as being regarded as a geographic site, Armageddon is also an event. In Revelation Armageddon is the drawing together of the armies of the world by the actions of the forces of Evil (symbolised by the Dragon, the Beast and the False Prophet). These armies clash with the forces of Good, as described in some detail in Chapter Nineteen of Revelation. The event of Armageddon is also, among other things, a symbol of the power of Good over the power of Evil.

Having sketched the biblical image of Armageddon and some of the central scholarly thought and popular images surrounding it, we need now to turn our attention to the analysis of the metaphor constructed from the image of Armageddon.
The Entailments of the Metaphor.

To proceed with the investigation of the decline of the prison chaplain, we need to identify the entailments of the metaphor, 'the penitentiary as Armageddon', the first of the novel metaphors and their entailments developed for this thesis. In outlining the nature of the prison, it should be noted that from the 1840's through to approximately the mid 1860's, the influence of the concept of the prison as the penitentiary was strong in Britain. The penitentiary was so called because it was thought that it would promote penitence in the prisoner. The emphasis of the penitentiary was the single prisoner cell and the isolation of the prisoner from other prisoners, this being to avoid the 'contamination' brought about by contact between them. The isolation was punctuated by regular visits from the chaplain and other people who were seen as suitable role models, such as the governor and the medical officer. This emphasis, it was thought, would promote reflection by the prisoners on their criminal activity and result in a feeling of penitence toward God, and conformity toward the leading class practices of what was believed, by the leading classes, to be the God-ordained society. The leading classes here refers to the established landholders, the ‘old wealth’, as well as the rising entrepreneurs of the Industrial Revolution, the ‘new wealth’. The leading classes are identified by what they are, and what they own and control, but also, with regard to the penitentiary, by the distinctive role they have in bringing it to fruition, that is by what they do. The chaplain, of course, assumed a dominant role in the operating penitentiary.

In the consideration of Armageddon, the essential features were as follows.

(1). Armageddon is a symbol of a titanic clash between the forces of Good and the forces
of Evil.

(2). For the author of Revelation, Armageddon is a clash that happens in a definite geographic location (even though modern scholarship makes differing claims about what site the author had envisaged with reference to Armageddon).

(3). Armageddon symbolises order being brought into the chaos by the forces of Good.

(4). Armageddon symbolises faith in the ultimate power of Good over the power of Evil.

(5). Armageddon is a symbol of crisis and divine judgement.

(6). Armageddon is, for the forces of Evil, an appointment with destiny.

The following entailments of the metaphor ‘The Penitentiary as Armageddon’ will give direction to the investigation of the nature and purposes of, and hopes for, the prison as envisioned by the advocates of this separate system.

We begin our consideration of the penitentiary as Armageddon by constructing entailments from the combination of features (1) and (2) of Armageddon, listed above.

We consider the prison as a definite geographic location where the forces of Good and the forces of Evil are brought into collision.

**Entailments One and Two: The Penitentiary as a Place where the Forces of Good and Evil clash.**

The Evangelicals and the British leading classes, (often the two categories overlapped, they are not discreet, but for the convenience of analysis will be treated discreetly), supplied the impetus for the development of the penitentiary. The Evangelicals represented a cross-denominational movement, which emerged from the Evangelical
Revival in Britain in the late seventeenth century. The Evangelicals, and many among the English leading classes, had definite ideas about what constituted Evil; they were well convinced that they were the able to decide this, as they believed that they were the representatives of Good, this having a religious, not utilitarian meaning. They were the representatives of the Good because they were committed Christian believers. They also held firm views that the structure of their stratified society was ordained of God and that this structure was to be maintained against any threats (Forsythe, 1987; 8). It is acknowledged that the issue of the leading classes and the Evangelicals representing the Good is highly debatable, but it is not a debate for this thesis. It is the self-perceptions of the Evangelicals and the leading classes which is the important factor here, and these perceptions were of themselves as the bastions of order and morality; for the Evangelicals and the leading classes morality and religion were inseparable. Indeed, leading into the nineteenth century, this was a very common perception (Chadwick, 1975; 229). They also had firm ideas, although they were not entirely consistent, as to how they would attempt to confront and minimise the perceived Evil of crime and social chaos being perpetrated by the underclass. This term, used in this thesis, is one of many terms that have been used to describe a stratum at the bottom of the class structure that fares particularly poorly in terms of social and economic security (Mann, 1992; 2).

Michel Foucault's seminal work on the physical punishment of offenders, prior to the development of the modern prison, provides insight into the early attempts to confront the perceived threat of Evil. These attempts represented an assault on, or in the case of execution, the destruction of, the body of the prisoner. The event was carried out as a
public spectacle (Foucault, 1977; 8-9). The penitentiary was a later idea in the addressing of Evil, an idea that promoted the reform of the criminal as the essential task, and one, which, from the outset, was pursued with great enthusiasm.

Joycelyn Pollock makes the point that what is most true about the prison is that it, ‘does not have one clearly defined, specific philosophy or rationale for existence’ (Pollock, 1997; 21).

While this statement is unlikely, in the contemporary context, to be widely contested, the advocates of the penitentiary were singly convinced of the merit of their scheme and pursued their goal with crusading zeal. And why would they not crusade for their goal? They were convinced that their society was ordained of God and it was definitively approved of by the Established Church, that is the Church of England (Gilley, 1994; 292; Hempton, 1994; 406). In the reference previously cited, Gilley gives the quaint title of ‘squarson’, a combination of squire and parson, to the Church of England clergy, who were mainly drawn from the leading classes. They were convinced that society, and their position in it, was self-evidently the correct one and that people who represented a threat to this structure needed to be corrected. They needed to be taught the ‘correct’ social and religious perceptions. The penitentiary, which Foucault has described as 'a place of moral accounting' (Foucault, 1977; 250), can be seen as a logical extension of the theology and class structure of the time. It does not imply collusion or conspiracy.

The social, as opposed to the theological, understanding of Evil for the leading classes.
was at least partly the result of the via negativa: that which is the opposite of the Good. Evil for the leading classes was that which was incongruent with the leading class social position, life and values. The commonplace derogatory remarks of many clergy toward the poorer classes well epitomises these attitudes. The Reverend Henry Joseph's description of his prison 'congregation' as 'the vilest of the vile' is not atypical of chaplains' opinions (Priestly, 1985; 99). In the combating of what they perceived to be Evil, by means of the penitentiary, the state and the Established Church were involved in a close relationship (Gilley, 1994; 293). This close association between Church and state is well depicted by the prisoner, Stuart Wood, who, summarising his interactions with the chaplain, stated; ‘We were told how wicked we were and how grateful we ought to be to society for giving us such an opportunity to mend our ways’ (Priestly, 1985; 100).

**The Problem of the Underclass.**

Mending prisoner’s ways was a concept close to the heart of the leading classes. In the early nineteenth century, the time of the shaping of the modern prison, there were signs of potential social upheaval, in the opinion of the leading classes. Across the English Channel in France there was the Republic, the aftermath of the Revolution and a source of no little concern to the leading classes (Gilley, 1994; 293; McDonald, 1996; 235). The French monarchy had fallen and the church, albeit the Roman Catholic variety, which was viewed unfavourably by the English leading classes and the Church of England, had lost much of its power and influence under the Republic. The traditional powers had fallen and this was a source of consternation for the English equivalents. There was concern among the leading classes that the industrial cities of England,
burgeoning in the post Industrial Revolution with an underclass of the dispossessed and displaced from the rural areas, could produce an atmosphere of social ferment. The numbers of the underclass in the industrial cities were growing markedly. As well, the Established Church, a bastion of leading class values, had little presence in the poor areas of these rapidly expanding cities (Gilley and Sheils, 1994; 6). There had in fact been an obvious and gross neglect of the provision of pastoral care by the Established Church. Despite a massive injection of funds by the state, totalling one and a half million pounds in 1818 and 1824 (Gilley, 1994; 294), the Church of England's church building program never caught up with the rapidly growing population in the industrial cities (Gilley, 1994; 291). The underclass was effectively lost to the Church at this point and it was never won for the Church thereafter. It is appropriate to recall here that it is the underclass who have been the nucleus of the prisoner population at any point in history. David Grant, for instance, informs us that a prisoner in a New South Wales gaol of the late twentieth century is usually an unmarried, unemployed, Australian born male, twenty to thirty years of age with no formal educational qualifications who will be in gaol for two to five years. He has been in prison before, he has a literacy problem and has a history of drug or alcohol abuse. (Grant, 1992; 7-8). Predictably, the 2001 statistical data from the New South Wales Department of Corrective Services confirms Grant’s comments (Corbin, 2002; 21-33). The other salient point, as Garland notes, is that the prison populations are increasing in proportional terms to the citizenry (Garland, 2001; 209). As David Hempton points out, however, the problem of the underclass was decidedly not one of buildings alone, there was a lack of religious culture among the underclass contributing heavily to the situation (Hempton, 1994; 309).
The problem of the underclass was compounded when the American Revolution had effectively denied the English state the option of banishment to the colony for its criminal offenders. While hulks were pressed into service to contain the increasing prisoner population, the problem of increasing numbers of prisoners was becoming acute, due in part to the heavy penalties attached to comparatively minor criminal offences. The prisoner increase was also, in spite of the large numbers of prisoners who died during outbreaks of infectious diseases such as gaol fever and cholera, common in the prisons and particularly amongst those imprisoned on the hulks. The conditions in these makeshift prisons were particularly appalling.

Exile to Australia became an option in the late eighteenth century through to nearly the middle of the nineteenth century and this option was certainly exercised. The enticement for the leading classes, however, was the promise of reformation held out by the separate system of prisons. This concept for prisoner reform was deeply influenced by Christian understandings, this concept of prisoner reform had been established in the United States primarily through the deep involvement of the Quakers in the prisons. In Britain it was brought to the fore largely by the efforts of the Evangelicals during the early nineteenth century. The Evangelical built on the foundations laid by the monumental investigative work of John Howard, which culminated in the publication of The State of the Prisons in 1777. The Evangelicals zealously flung themselves into the arena of prison reform. They were convinced that, given the 'correct' physical, spiritual and social environment, the attitudes and behaviour of human beings could be changed for the better. In their view,
the prisoners could be brought to see the error of their ways and become better and more godly citizens and appreciative of the God ordained social structure. It should be noted that this structure was positively punitive toward the underclass: the lawbreaking underclass were punished harshly, while the law abiding underclass lived in poor economic conditions without income security. A qualification must be made though; the Evangelicals were constantly reminding the leading classes of their 'duty' toward the poor (Forsythe, 1987; 167). As we have seen, the leading classes and the social structure they created and represented had the imprimatur of the Church. The Evangelicals, whose soteriological ends aligned with the security designs of the leading classes, set out with great enthusiasm on their task to provide an apparatus for the reform of the individual prisoner.

The period after the American Revolution saw the beginnings of the development of the prison as the major response to crime. Foucault has written a classic work on the emergence of the prison. A central feature of Foucault's work was to outline the change in emphasis from inflicting pain on the body of the offender to a focus on the manipulation of the soul of the offender (Foucault, 1977; 16). Foucault seems to be referring, by his use of the term 'soul', to those characteristics which, in this thesis in later chapters, will be referred to as 'psyche'. In the British context of the penitentiary there was certainly an emphasis on soul, but soul in this context was a definitively more ecclesiastical and theological construct. It will be argued in later chapters that while, in the days of the penitentiary, there was a movement from a focus on the body of the prisoner to the soul of the prisoner, in later times there has been another movement, that
being the movement to a focus on the psyche of the prisoner, a move which saw the recognition of expertise shift away from the prison chaplain.

**Armageddon as a Place.**

The prison was a penitentiary in the sense that it aimed at the reform of the prisoner by isolation from the corrupting effects of interaction with his peers and through the prisoner becoming penitent and convinced of the inappropriateness of his wrongdoing. The latter were to be brought about through religious education, chapel attendance, role modelling and the stimulation of the conscience of the prisoner; 'an almost mystical claim' is the comment of William Forsythe (Forsythe, 1983; 49). The prison as a reformative institution was a nineteenth century invention built upon an eighteenth century dream. The prison, prior to the efforts of the Evangelicals and others, was a place primarily for the detaining of debtors (Pugh, 1968; 41,45). At the time of Howard in the late eighteenth century, these prisons were private, profit making establishments. They also were overcrowded, often rife with infection, and many were managed by a corrupt administration. These establishments were largely unaccountable due to the irregular visits of local magistrates, reluctant or unwilling to conduct inspections. The magistrates were often discouraged by the subtle innuendo about gaol fever, circulated by gaolers keen to prevent the inspection of their establishment (Wright, 1977; vi). The often squalid conditions of these prisons offended the devout and pious Dissenter, John Howard, neatly summarised by Michael Ignatieff as a man in whom, ‘a plodding empiricism was yoked to a pilgrim sense of quest’ (Ignatieff, 1978; 54).
During his term as High Sheriff of Bedfordshire, Howard discovered first hand the atrocious conditions of the prisons (Wright, 1977; iv). It was largely due to Howard's pioneering work and publications that the Evangelicals began their campaign for reform of the prisons. Howard had crusaded for improved sanitation, ventilation and light in the prisons, as well as for a host of other reforms aimed at improving the lot of the prisoner (Wright, 1977; v). A staunch Christian, Howard was also strongly advocating a penitential line, believing in the possibility of the reform of the prisoner through salvation and edification. Howard was emphatic about the need for a strong chaplaincy presence (Forsythe, 1983; 7-8). For Howard, the work of salvation was the work of the state as well as the work of God (Ignatieff, 1978; 56). Howard himself was not one to advocate a 'soft' approach for prisoners (Wright, 1977; iv, v). Nevertheless, Howard was very influential in reform and gave much impetus to the establishment of the penitentiary and to the establishment of the chaplain as the key figure in the reform effort of the penitentiary.

The anxieties of the leading classes were being further raised by the popular socialists, such as the widely known Tom Paine (Priestly, 1985; 102). An example of the anxiety generated by the popular socialists, and the heavy response to them, can be seen in the case of Richard Carlisle. Carlisle, who republished Paine's *The Rights of Man* in 1819, was convicted of blasphemous libel and gaol ed for six years in Dorchester (Royle, 1994; 320). Parallels were being drawn between the doctrines of the radicals and the crime waves. Ignatieff points out that this was not entirely alarmism (Ignatieff, 1978; 158). The possibility of reform was becoming an attractive proposition for the leading classes and
of course for entrepreneurs and industrialists, who sought stability in the labouring classes (Forsythe, 1983; 1). There were enticing precedents for reform in the American prisons, where the Philadelphia and New York prisons were trialing the silent and separate systems of prisons respectively. Interest in these systems was high in Britain and the government sent a representative to investigate the alternatives and compile a report. The task was given to the reforming philanthropist and member of The Prison Discipline Society, William Crawford. Crawford went to America in 1832. On his return Crawford published his report (1834) and recommended for the separate system of prisons and this system was duly implemented.

The separate system was basically one where the prisoner was assumed to have learned evil habits through association in his environment. The prison was seen as the place to create an environment where Evil could be confronted and the character of the prisoner could be changed. The basis of change was seen as being an enculturation into Christian precepts through enforced contemplation, scripture reading, visits from the chaplain and other staff of the prison who would provide role models for virtuous behaviour, that is, behaviour acceptable to the leading classes. The penitentiary was the place where this confrontation would take place and where the prisoner would experience contrition.

As one would expect, the support for the concept of a separate system of prisons was high in ecclesiastical circles, particularly among those with an evangelical conviction. Substantial funds were allocated by the state for the commencement of this program in the prisons. Key figures such as The Reverend Whitworth Russell, who was a most
enthusiastic supporter of the separate system of prisons, and who was to become, along with Crawford, an inspector of prisons in 1835, did much to promote the separatist cause. Russell had previously been a prison chaplain. Another factor that was very influential in promoting the separatist cause was the religious thought of the day. In fact the clash of Good and Evil in the penitentiary was conceived of as much by religious thought as by the societal circumstances mentioned above. Religious understandings provided both a conceptual framework and a motive for the clash between the forces of Good, conceived of as those who staffed and funded the prison, and the forces of Evil in the society, represented by the mainly underclass prisoner, whose deeds were conceived of as an offence against God and the God-ordained social order. The clash, which the prison both confined and promoted, was seen in both secular and religious terms. At stake, in a social and secular sense, was the greater stability for society. In a religious sense, what was at stake was the legitimate, God-ordained order.

The penitentiary had its origins in religious thought, which offered the only articulated viable option for reformation at the time, brutal punishment did not have the desired effect as far as social control was concerned. There were, however, portents that the penitentiary could meet with much opposition in the future. There were those who were implacably opposed to solitary confinement, but more importantly, religious orthodoxy, indeed religion itself, was coming under increasing criticism. Firstly, Enlightenment rationality had been the platform from which there began a questioning of the Christian sacred texts, although biblical criticism was stronger on the Continent than in Britain. As well, Newtonian physics had generated criticism of aspects of the scriptural texts and
Newtonian physics was conducive to the notion of the Deist God, the God who is remote from human and social affairs. Sir Isaac Newton himself, while not antagonistic to religion, had said that he found the concept of the Trinity incomprehensible. Philosophers such as David Hume had challenged various aspects of the Christian scriptures such as miracles, which had, in the main, been understood literally. The challenges in Britain were not as substantial as those on the Continent, where critics such as the scientist Ernst Haeckel were very influential. In spite of increasing challenges, the Established Church was still very influential and in a credible position to influence the development of the modern prison. A most important factor in the significant and continuing influence of the Church was that the social sciences were in their infancy and were largely associationist in their orientation, which meant that there was no obvious reason to clash with the Church: associationism was the dominant thought of the reformers of the time with regard to the behaviour of the prisoner. The prisoner's behaviour, it was assumed, was learned from his environment. The environment of the prisoner, it was held, could be manipulated to discourage undesirable attitudes and conduct, and encourage behaviour acceptable to the leading classes (Forsythe, 1987; 71). Also, as Edward Reed notes, traditional associationism had need of the soul, ‘because something had to hold all the sensations and ideas together’ (Reed, 1997; 217).

Hence secular and ecclesiastical thought was significantly conterminous, at least with regard to reformation. Religious thought had, at this stage, no serious rival for dominance in the fledgling prison.
For the leading classes and the Evangelicals, the penitentiary was where the representatives the forces of Good and the forces of Evil would meet. The prison was Armageddon. The Evangelicals and the leading classes brought to bear upon the prisoner all the weight of the conservative religious thought of the time. The forces of Good were confident that God was on their side. They were creating an environment in which the prisoner would be brought, compulsorily, to encounter his transgressions. He would be brought face to face with himself as sinner. Alone in his cell, the prisoner would, it was variously hoped and believed, spend his solitary hours contemplating the gravity of his sins and the benevolence of the state which, in spite these sins, was not about to give up its efforts to reform him into God's (and the leading class') image. The prison was the place of Armageddon. It created the 'battlefield' where the forces of Good and Evil met and the chaplain would carry much of the responsibility for the conduct of this battle.

**Armageddon as an Event.**

As the prison was the place of Armageddon, where the forces of Good and Evil clash, the prisoners' experiences and the actual clash were the 'event' of Armageddon. The prisoners' socialisation and background were the forces of Evil with which the solitary system and the chaplain would contend. Armageddon, in biblical terms, was an epic clash. The penitentiary was thought of by its ecclesiastical supporters as being an epic clash with the forces of Evil. The prisoners were from a class which the penitentiary supporters both feared, as potential source of sedition, and found repulsive in terms of its culture. Convinced as they were of the merit of the separate system and its capacity to reform, they invested heavily in terms of finances and human resources.
The newer British prisons designed on the principles of the separate system were purpose built to give the maximum advantage to the forces of Good. The emphasis of the prison was cellular confinement to minimise ‘contamination’ Legislation and prison regulations were written to enforce and support the program of reformation in the separate system, particularly such things as compulsory chapel. Lord John Russell's Act Of Parliament legalised separate confinement in 1839 (Dixon, 1985; 150 reprinted from nineteenth century publication).

The prisoner was to contemplate his sin through the reading of the Bible; all prisoners had a Bible in their cell and were encouraged to read it, if they could do so, which many could not. Apart from the Bible there was nothing else to read save other religious literature. Some prisoners made it their task to be able to recite passages of scripture. Recitation of scripture was often undertaken in an endeavour to impress the chaplain; prisoners were well aware that the chaplain had a significant input into the consideration of their release. Many chaplains, with all good intent, encouraged the reciting of the scriptures as part of a prisoner's armament against the forces of Evil. This was probably a flow on from the prevalent view, as exemplified by The Reverend R. V. Reynolds, of Wakefield prison, that crime could be traced to either the failure of parents or guardians to inculcate religious principles into the young, or to the bad example of the parents neutralising any principles that the children may have been taught or exposed to. (Priestly, 1985; 75). Other prisoners read the Bible (and other available religious tracts), not from personal conviction or interest, but simply because it was the only stimulation
available to them and many feared that the isolation would drive them insane. This was particularly the case with educated prisoners, although they were a small minority in the prisons (Priestly, 1985; 42).

The chapel was a key element in the campaign of the forces of Good as they opposed the forces of Evil, especially for those who could not read; they were not to be deprived of, nor evade, their exposure to the scriptures. An imposing edifice, the internal construction of the chapel was such that the prisoner was isolated from his fellow prisoners, whom he could not see; nor was he permitted to converse with them. The prisoners were in effect enclosed in stalls, not unlike upright coffins. A well preserved example of a prison chapel of the separate system stands in the Port Arthur site in Tasmania. Chapel attendance was compulsory and during the height of the separate system the service was a Church of England service, a Church of England clergyman being the appointed chaplain. The prisoner had the choice of attending chapel or being flogged (Priestly, 1985; 91). The chapel was the ideological, as well as the religious centre of the prison in the separate system, as well being as the centre of worship. In the early prison it was at times hard to distinguish the religious from the ideological. From the sermon, the prisoner was in no doubt, in the main, about how the prison authorities, both clerical and secular, saw his position in God's order of things. He was the transgressor, and the benevolent Church and state were trying to assure his salvation. The daily routine of the prisoner was constructed to isolate and indoctrinate. The chaplains of the day would, of course, have seen the routine as one designed to reform and save, both in this life, and for a life to come after death. The discourses and central symbols of the prison, revolved around the chaplain
The forces of Good and Evil in the prison did genuinely clash. The prisoners were not merely submissive; the forces of Good did not have matters all their own way. Numbers of prisoners mobilised their resources to counteract the massive attempt to re-socialise them. There were numbers of them who instigated a tactic, still played out to this day, to 'con' the chaplain by feigning conversion and conniving to obtain early release or other favours. This was a very useful tactic against the zealots among the chaplains who wanted 'results' in what they perceived to be a spiritual warfare, and many prisoners were more than willing to give them 'results' they desired, only for the chaplain to find later that the whole affair had been a sham. The chaplain at Clerkenwell had a more realistic outlook. He knew of only two cases among the estimated one hundred thousand prisoners, who passed through the prison during his incumbency, to have been truly repentant (Priestly, 1985; 118). In New South Wales, The Reverend James Hassall, for twenty years a chaplain at Berrima and Parramatta also reported pessimistically about change, he stated that he knew of only several cases during this time where men became truly godly characters (Grocott, 1980; 113).

Other prisoners connived ways to communicate with fellow prisoners during the singing of hymns in the chapel. The separate system, with its accent on isolation, was feared by prisoners and it is hardly surprising that they would do all in their power to take their leave of it, or minimise its effects.
The separate system itself, however, was only as good as the key staff who were to enforce the discipline and bring about the re-socialisation. The key figure was the chaplain, however the prison officers were also envisioned to have an important role by the architects of the separate system. The chaplains, generally, were not able to bridge the social class gap and win the respect of the prisoners, and certainly not their allegiance, unless the prisoner had an alternative motive. The prison officers, who were to be, it was hoped by the advocates of the separate system, Christian role models as well as enforcers of discipline, were often to fall far short of this rather utopian hope. While there is evidence that some prisoners benefited from pastoral care by chaplains, there is other significant evidence to suggest that many prisoners held poor opinions of the chaplain (Priestly, 1985; 114-115). Some of the chaplains felt a sense of hopelessness at the task that they were given, the experience of the prison merely confirming their established class views of the prisoner.

The separate system of prisons, be it in Britain or New South Wales, was unmistakeably a confrontation; a confrontation conceived in religious thought, a confrontation between Good and Evil. In contemporary western society, such a rigid system of separation would be entirely unacceptable. The closure, after a brief period of operation, of Katingal, the maximum security unit at Long Bay Prison in New South Wales, was, at least in part, due to the deleterious effects of the high degree of isolation it imposed on the prisoners. In fact, even in the fledgling penitentiary, the length of the sentence spent in separate conditions was progressively reduced as the deleterious psychological effects on the prisoner became noticeable, but not noticeable to all. It must be said that there were
chaplains who often did not recognize these symptoms, or interpreted them differently. For example, the assistant chaplain of Pentonville, The Reverend John. T. Burt, was a vigorous defender of the separate system and rued the reductions of time spent by prisoners in solitary confinement. Burt believed that the opponents of the separate system exaggerated the harmful effects of isolation (Burt, 1984; p: ix. Reprint of nineteenth century publication). The separate system came under increasing attack, many believing that it promoted insanity. The attack came in the main from secular activists, but also from religious quarters, for example from the well-known religious visitor Elizabeth Fry. Most chaplains, including highly respected chaplain, The Reverend John Clay of Preston prison, vigorously defended the system (Priestly, 1985; 38), although some, such as The Reverend Joseph Kingsmill, of Pentonville, expressed doubts, and this in 1852 at the height of the separate system (Ignatieff, 1978; 200).

That the separate system could have been such a driving force in the prisons had much to do with the social and political conditions of the time and the leading class response to those conditions. It also had much to do with the nature and status of the religion of the time and the prevailing conceptions of God. Without these factors, the separate system could not have been introduced. Consideration will now be given to this topic, guided by the combining of the features (3) and (4) of Armageddon as listed above.

**Entailments Three and Four: The Penitentiary brings Order into the Chaos through the Ultimate Power of Good over Evil.**

In the account contained in the Book of Revelation, Armageddon brought order into the
chaos, because Good triumphed over Evil. In the time of the early prison, those of a religious persuasion, particularly the socially advantaged of the Established Church and the zealots of the reformist Evangelicals, mainly held to the proposition, evident in Armageddon, that Good ultimately triumphs over Evil. The development of the prison along the lines of the separate system, whereby Good could confront the powers of Evil, would not have happened if it had not been intrinsic in, and supported by, the dominant religious thought of the time. The theology of the late eighteenth century and throughout the period of lobbying for the separate system was still quite literalist in orientation. The Evangelical Revival of the late eighteenth century continued the evangelism, based on repentance and conversion, introduced by John Wesley and George Whitfield. Repentance and conversion were important in the rise of the penitentiary. This theology survived the challenges from the Enlightenment, but the bigger challenges, such as Darwinism and the rise of the social sciences were still in the future; they belonged to the second half of the nineteenth century. At the inception of the modern prison, theology was still the 'Queen of the sciences', and hence it is not surprising to find that it occupied the foundational position in the spatial organization and reformist milieu of the prison. This is not to say that the prisons all suddenly conformed to the separate model, there were too many established prisons and too much expense would have been incurred for such a sudden transformation to have been possible. The penal philosophy of the time was, however, certainly 'separate'. There were by 1850, eleven thousand purpose built cells and fifty-five separate cellular prisons built or nearing completion (Forsythe, 1987; 45).
The theology of the time, when applied to the separate system of prisons and from the viewpoint of the reformers, was optimistic, both in relation to God and to the human being. In spite of the developments of science, God was still the active, direct intervener whose Spirit could, and did, intervene in human affairs. God's power of intervention could bring order into the chaos by triumphing over the Evil exhibited by, and represented by, the prisoner, who was the transgressor against the social order. This is not to say that the reformers thought that repentance and conversions would invariably take place, but the mood was optimistic (Forsythe, 1987; 23-24).

Science had not developed to the point where people were talking about the 'God of the gaps', gaps referring to those areas where science had yet to offer an explanation of the phenomena in question. God's range of intervention was still significant; significant enough in fact to build a whole prison system on. Given the right environment, and given sufficient time, God would be able, through the Spirit working on the conscience, to have the transgressor reflect on the error of his ways and work toward character reformation and salvation. The prisoner was a 'sinner' and the antidote for sin was directed to the soul. 'Sinner' and 'soul' were the dominant concepts for the prison of the time.

In the silence and isolation of his cell, the prisoner would come under the gaze and the power of the all-seeing God. Much to Jeremy Bentham's chagrin, the developers of the modern prison did not build the Panopticon, the building he both conceived of and designed, the building which would keep the prisoner under the constant gaze of the prison officer (Foucault, 1977; 200-201). While the Panopticon, as envisioned by
Bentham, was never built, the separate system substituted the gaze of God for the gaze of the prison officers in the central tower of Bentham's Panopticon. Bentham had reasoned that the gaze would transfer to the world outside the prison where the ex-prisoner would be always wondering if he were under the gaze of authority and reconsider his anti-social behaviour. In the Evangelicals scheme of things, God was in fact the equivalent of the Panopticon; God was the all-seeing presence in the penitentiary. In particular, the prisoners of the separate system would be made very aware, especially during the regular visits of the chaplain, that the gaze of this Panopticon-like being would be upon them, working to convict them of the anti-social and anti-godly nature of their deeds and thereby urging repentance. The job of the supporters of separatism was to create that environment where Evil could be met, and hopefully defeated, and where order could be brought into the chaos. 'Hopefully' because the supporters of the separate system were well aware that they were engaged in a spiritual warfare with the powers of Evil; no less a personage than the apostle Paul had informed them of such through his letter to the Ephesians in the Biblical Canon (Ephesians 6:12). These supporters were well aware of the difficult task which faced them, but were very confident that Good would triumph over Evil; confident enough to commit and solicit finance and manpower for the task.

Another premise on which the separate system was built, and which aided the forces of Good in the battle against Evil, was that the human being was capable of major personal and spiritual change. This was a positive view of human nature. Again, however, a supportive environment needed to be created, as the human beings who were to be thus changed were believed to be among those most heavily influenced by the powers of Evil.
To the leading classes this was evidenced in the ghettos of the industrial cities. The environment needed to be one where God could best use the perceived promoters of change, namely the chaplain, the Bible, and the reflective capacity of human beings to acknowledge their faults and repent of their sins. The faults, of course, were defined by the dovetailing religious and leading class perspectives of soteriology and security/social control respectively. While the society of this time had gone well beyond the social organization known as Christendom, where the world was defined generally in religious terms (Herrin, 1989; 8), there was still a significant credibility given by the state and the leading classes to both the Church and to the literal understanding of the scriptures. The nature of the human being and the nature of God, developed as they were from the more literalist interpretation of the Bible, were not as heavily challenged as they would have been if the social sciences had been more developed and sophisticated. The lack of significant challenge enticed the leading classes to the hope of the capability of the penitentiary to bring order into what they saw as a deepening and menacing chaos.

The introduction of the concept of the separate system of prisons came buttressed by a theology, which offered hope. This hope, steeped in the restoration of the soul to salvation, and at the same time favourable to the restoration of society from the forces of Evil and chaos, helped to establish a punishment which superseded the punishment of the body. The separate system held the hope of the introduction of order into the chaos, and the Evil represented by, and proliferating in, the underclass. The leading classes and the authority of the Church backed this concept of social reality and the dominant religious thought of the day confirmed the symbolic universe of the leading classes. The Bible
informed them that it was God's world, and it was God's power that they looked to when they desired to bring about change, a change which would bring order into the chaos and be in harmony with class interests.

The dominant theologies engendered confidence in the power of Good to prevail over Evil. Draconian laws and punishments had shown no tendency to do this. In fact, quite the opposite had often occurred at macabre public events when spectators developed sympathies for the offenders, particularly when capital punishment was being carried out. The requirements of the expanding capitalist factory system demanded that other, more effective, means of the control of labour needed to be established. In Britain in the 1780's, the crime wave had failed to respond to the severe punishments inflicted, and transportation, a favourite way of dealing with the problem, was suspended. Into this scenario came the reformers with their ideas of reformation as a better method for dealing with criminal offenders. A penitentiary at Battersea Rise came near to being a reality in 1785, but Parliament still preferred banishment (Ignatieff, 1978; 93-95). The ‘kairos’, the ‘right time’ for the penitentiary was to be in the following century.

In Britain, the focus of punishment shifted, in the early nineteenth century, from the body to the soul. The perception and depiction of the offender as 'sinner' ensured that the church became an 'authority' in the prison alongside the state. The religious representatives, as will be argued in the following chapter, were not simply manipulated by the state into providing a legitimation of the fledgling prison system, but rather there was a dovetailing of the interests of religion and state. The leading classes and the state
believed that the religious representatives had an important contribution to make, in both a functional and symbolic sense. It is to the symbolic aspect of the prison of the separate system that we now turn our attention. We do this through the consideration of the third entailment of the metaphor, which is constructed from the features (5) and (6) of Armageddon as listed above.

**Entailments Five and Six: The Penitentiary as a Symbol of Crisis and Divine Judgement, and for Evil an Appointment with Destiny.**

The biblical account of Armageddon portrays a picture of crisis, where the forces of Evil are mustered against the forces of Good. At the same time, there is a sense that the forces of Evil have an appointment with destiny and that their destruction is imminent.

The prison in nineteenth century Britain also stands as a symbol of crisis. The leading classes, as mentioned, had a sense of foreboding as far as order was concerned in the developing industrial cities. The separate system of prisons offered hope for the restoration of order; the forces of Evil were brought into the prison for a confrontation with the forces of Good. While the prison was a symbol of the crisis of the society of the time with respect to keeping order in the newly emerging industrial cities and for the newly emerging capitalist economy, there was also a sense, evident in the confidence with which the separate system was adopted, that a divine judgement would be brought upon those who did not accept the social/structural order of things. The prisoners themselves were not to be destroyed, as was the case with the forces of evil at Armageddon, but they were to be re-socialised into the leading class understandings and
construction of social reality. Antipathy would be overcome, replaced by social control through the collaboration of the forces of Good and the action of God. The production of re-socialised, God fearing people was the function of the penitentiary. Those leaving the prison would be appreciative of Christian values and the benevolence of the state. Such was the confident hope of the leading classes for many of the prisoners. The separate system prison was to be the underclass's Armageddon; their appointment with destiny in the shape of the combined power of the triumvirate; God, Church and state.

What the state and the Church were doing, albeit by human action, but not of human design (Friedrich Hayek's term), was re-creating Christendom within the walls of a total institution. A monoculture of Christian education and influence was being established; the prison was a place where the world was to be interpreted religiously (Herrin, 1989; 8). As the Biblical Armageddon created a monoculture through destruction of the forces of Evil, so the state, the Church and the leading classes sought to create, in a different, but also non-subtle way, a monoculture in the prison through the separate system and the destruction of the forces of Evil. The state (through the state's actions in the removal of individual liberty) and the Church (through lending religious legitimation to the actions of the state) acted in concert in the prison. The combined power of theology and ideology, and a rather awesome power it was, was brought to bear on the prisoner in the penitentiary for the purpose of reform.

In most aspects of penal policy, the colony of New South Wales mimicked the Motherland (Ramsland, 1996; 47), that is when there were sufficient free settlers to
transform the social fabric of colony from its original state of being a 'wretched camp of
convicts and their guards' (Barrett, 1966; 1). Changes took place slowly and Darlinghurst
prison was established in the early 1840's and housed only colonial offenders, not directly
transported convicts (Ramsland, 1996; 12). Even so, there were many continuing
practices from the penal colony as evidenced in the punishments that were meted out in
Darlinghurst. Darlinghurst was also overcrowded and this militated against the separate
system being implemented to best effect, even though half the cells at Darlinghurst were
established as separate cells (Ramsland, 1996; 43-44).

The colony followed the Motherland in the establishment of the separate system, and
Berrima prison was established in 1867, a time when the separate system was losing
credibility in Britain. A Royal Commission into mistreatment of prisoners at Berrima,
acquitted the Governor of wrongdoing, but more interestingly for this study, went on to
proclaim the separate system a resounding success, as Jebb had proclaimed the separate
system a resounding success in Britain some twenty years earlier, in 1847, when he had
the responsibility for the administration of British prisons (Eriksson, 1976; 74).

As with Britain, the chaplain in the New South Wales prisons was a figure of central
importance. The chaplains in the colony prisons strove to bring about reformation of the
prisoner through the production of guilt and penitence, as did the chaplains in the British
prisons. Even though the early colony was quite anomic, hope was entertained for the
reformation of the transported convicts of New South Wales through religious influence.
Governors Macquarie and Hunter, in particular, held such hopes. This hope was there
from this early stage, although it was not until the cellular structure of the penitentiary became a reality that Armageddon could be brought to the New South Wales prisons. When this was possible, the colony embarked on the task.

With its origin as a penal colony, New South Wales had a vastly different history to the Motherland. Yet, even in its beginnings, it was certainly influenced by religion and the Church representatives, the chaplains to the colony. The status of the chaplain was significant, and while there were disputes between the Church of England and the state, represented by the chaplain and the governor respectively, for example between The Reverend Richard Johnson with Governor Phillip and later Major Grose (Cable, 1993; 4) and The Reverend Samuel Marsden with Governor Macquarie (Cable, 1993; 5), there were also consistent appeals to Britain for extra chaplains to be sent to the colony. The appeals reflected a belief that chaplains, in sufficient numbers, could exert an influence for reform in the colony. Hence, while hopes for reform did not take the same form as in the Motherland, the spirit of reform was present, even in the early colony. Even though the colony was often considered a Godless place by many resident there, hope in reform was not absent. With the appearance of more and more free settlers, more clergy, and the beginnings of the modern prison system, the colony was able to emulate Britain's prison system more closely and religion took on a more authoritative and reformative role. As in Britain, the chaplain was the lynchpin of the reform effort. For the colony, the end of transportation signalled the end of a crisis, but the prison stood, as in Britain, as a symbol of divine judgement and the appointment of Evil with destiny. The chaplain was a high status person in the prison (Ramsland, 1996; 120-121). As in Britain, the chaplain was
the key figure, with God, in the appointment of Evil with its destiny.

**Summary: the Chaplain in the Ascendancy.**

The penitentiary was Armageddon, it represented hope for those fearful of the problems of the Evil of social disruption. For the government, for the industrialists and entrepreneurs, for the leading classes, the penitentiary was Armageddon. The penitentiary was Armageddon, too, for the Evangelicals and other pious people seeking to give the prisoner the optimal chance to save his soul in the afterlife, as well as to conform to the God ordained social structures of life in nineteenth century Britain. The penitentiary was Armageddon: the battle fought out between the forces of Good and the forces of Evil. This battle was to be a continuing one for the proponents of the separate system, but a battle that they believed they were destined to go on winning. The chaplain was orchestrating the operations of the forces of Good: 'God's right hand man' so to speak.

From the discussion above, it is clear that the chaplain and the Church he served and represented were in the ascendancy in the nineteenth century prison, particularly the separate system. The chaplain remained in the ascendancy until the mid 1860's, from which time the beginnings of the decline began. The chaplain had a high status, both within the prison and without of the prison. Chaplains such as The Reverend John Clay of Preston were well known in the public arena and, as Forsythe notes, ‘were regarded by society at large as most important officials promising substantial benefits in the name of God’ (Forsythe, 1987; 65).

The chaplain's status was primarily by virtue of a religious role that was the base of the
reform effort, but which also had functions that went beyond the liturgical, homiletic and pastoral alone. He had administrative, educational, consulting and, importantly, parole functions, functions which secular professionals and social scientists have gradually stripped him of. Themes derived from this ascendancy will be noted briefly below and in greater detail in the following chapter. Identifying these themes will serve to highlight the decline of the chaplain in the modern era.

Religion was the prime mover in the concept and creation of the separate system, as well as its operation. John Howard's meticulous work in examining the conditions of the prisons in the eighteenth century and his advocacy of the absolute necessity of religious instruction in the reform of the criminal, was the base on which the Evangelicals built the penitentiary. Howard's work came at a time when crime was very much a social issue and brought ideas of prison reform into public prominence. Howard's monumental labours led to him being seen as a 'Prophet' by many Christian contemporaries. While Howard's patient accumulation of data is not strictly comparable to the confronting style of the prophets of ancient Israel, nevertheless Howard's work had an orientation toward social justice and hence had an element of the prophetic. This was to be obscured, if not entirely lost, when the proponents of the separate system established a hegemony for the reform of the individual prisoner within the total institution: once the chaplain was within the institution of the prison, and within the influence (and stipend) of the state as well as the Church, the prophetic aspect of the Christian effort diminished. The chaplain, it will be argued in the following chapter, was a functionary for the state as well as being the ecclesiastical representative in the prison.
Religion, as well as being the prime mover of the concept and creation of the separate system, also created what will be termed the 'prison lexicon'. The prisoner was defined as a 'sinner' and the orientation to, and treatment of, the prisoner was determined according to this definition. 'Reform' was defined as being the reform of the individual, and reform had a definite soteriological element. As we have noted, the leading classes had a more social emphasis. The leading classes had an agenda for the social control of the underclass; a class they believed could disrupt social stability, and pose a possible threat, through rampant theft, to the emerging capitalist enterprise with its agenda of profit and the accumulation of wealth.

It was religion, too, which defined the 'nature of the human being', the bulwark on which was built the program of reform comprising the separate system. The separate system was built on the premise that the human being, given the right environmental circumstances, could understand that the life of crime, in which he had been involved, was contrary to the purposes of God, and the God approved state, and therefore repentance could be forthcoming. This repentance, it was assumed at the outset, would manifest itself in changed behaviour patterns when the prisoner returned to the community, be it the British community or one of deportation.

Religion, at the time of the penitentiary, was still a significant world legitimating activity. It still provided the plausibility structures for many, although it was certainly not monopolistic. Theology was still the 'Queen of the Sciences', although coming under
increasing challenge from physical science, which was questioning theological understandings of, and dogma about, the nature of the universe. Social science was also beginning to raise questions, in particular regarding the interpretation of scripture and the nature of scriptural authority. Had the higher criticism been more evident in Britain the progress to the penitentiary would have been much more difficult than it was. In Britain, at the time of the inception of the separate system, the world and the society were, for many people, but particularly the leading classes, still interpreted religiously. This was a society in which the Christian church still had an authority based on the status of the Bible as a source of valuable knowledge about human beings and the universe they inhabited. Those knowledgeable about the Bible, generally those legitimised by being an ordained clergy of a recognized church, in particular the Established Church, had a virtual monopoly on 'absolutes' of the time, such as the definitions of the nature of God, and the 'ultimates' of human existence, in particular the ultimate of death. As Berger notes, ‘Human society is in the last resort people banded together in the face of death and the power of religion depends upon the credibility of its commentary as people walk toward death’ (Berger, 1967; 60). The Christian commentary on death was widely accepted at the time of the movement toward the separate system.

The concept of ultimates is a particularly important one in and of itself. At the time of the inception of the separate system, the ultimates were still a focus for the Church. While the state, through the judiciary, was the sentencing body, it was the Church which was the pastoral and officiating body necessarily present at the time of death. This gave the Church, and its representative, the chaplain, a high status as it stood at the threshold of
life on earth and an afterlife, which at this point in time still had a very high credibility.

Given this authority and credibility, it is not surprising that one is able to see in the physical and social structures of the prison, something approaching Christendom, a theme which will be explored later. In medieval times the role of the clergy was very wide; clergy were often involved in education and the civil service, as well as being an authority in areas such as art and literature. The chaplain in the prison, too, found himself involved in an array of activities besides the traditional evangelical, pastoral and liturgical ones. Very importantly, he performed a role which in the contemporary prison is performed by psychiatrists and other experts of the psyche, namely he recommend on parole, this is hardly surprising given that he controlled the lexicon and Christianity provided the foundational understandings on which the penitentiary was established. In the prison system of the time, the human being was perceived and treated as a 'soul', not a 'psyche' as in the contemporary, secular professional dominated prison. The chaplain was the 'expert' of the soul and the definer of social reality. The hegemony of church and state was buttressed by the foundational understandings of the penitentiary provided by religion: religion had a use value for the state.

While religion was the dominant force in the separate system of prisons and the prisoners were inundated with it, the clergy were generally ignorant of the social world of the prisoners, although, as far as the colony of New South Wales was concerned, the journey to Australia on the ships conveying the prisoners acted as an introductory socialization for clergy into the world of the prisoner. Many clergy did not appreciate this
socialization. Feelings of repugnance for the world of the underclass, whether in Australia or Britain were widespread. The world of the underclass was foreign to the clergy, and the underclass made up the bulk of the prison population. As noted, the Church of England had responded abysmally with regard to the expanding populations of the new industrial cities of England. The despair felt by the early chaplains in the colony of New South Wales (Grocott, 1980; 61; Cable, 1993; 5) shows, among other things, how remote were the chaplains from the world of the prisoner (Grocott, 1980; 232). This will be one of the themes pursued in the following chapter.

Clearly in the early prison there was the close cooperation between religious and secular interests in the foundation of the separate system of prisons. Even though there was not a definitive coalescing of motives between the Christian activists and the leading classes, there was a coalescing of interests in wanting to bring about change in the underclass.

At the outset of the separate system, it was religion that provided the foundational understandings of that system. The Christians saw God not merely as a concept, but as an active participant, both directly and indirectly, in the process of reformation. For the Evangelicals, the premise on which the separate system was built was the belief of change being brought about in the prisoner through the conviction the prisoner develops of being a transgressor. The prisoner transgresses against the laws and will of God. For them, only God could convict a person of their sin, the latter belief being a basic tenet of scripture and creed, well known to the reformers of the day. For others, who did not hold the same, or same level of, religious conviction, it was probably the chaplain himself who
held their hopes of reform. For these people, the chaplain was the reality, he was there, and the existence of God was more esoteric. It was the force of religion that they were hoping would carry the day; whether it was true or not, they could not say, and, in fact, it mattered little.

From the inception of the prison, the history of the chaplain was intertwined with what can be termed 'the history of God'. God was the raison d'être of the separate system and the separate system was one of the major factors in the power and status of the chaplain at that time. The place of the chaplain in the contemporary prison and the future status and influence of the chaplain will be investigated in later chapters and will be found to be still intertwined with the history of God.

From the foregoing discussion it can be seen that the dominant theology of the time was an optimistic theology, at least with regard to the nature of the human being. The human being was seen as reflective and capable of change, given favourable circumstances. From this optimistic theology, however, there developed a very repressive penal practice, more reflective one would say of a 'theology of repression' than a penal practice flowing from an optimistic theology. The separate system was feared by prisoners. Theology and ideology rubbed shoulders in the prison, as Church and chaplain had a close association with the state. Certainly it was perceived this way by prisoners. The ministry of the chaplain was not a 'pure' religious one. This will be addressed in more detail in the following chapter.
In this chapter we have looked at the working environment of the chaplain in the early stages of the modern prison, particularly in the separate system, where his training and the foundational understandings provided by religion determined the discourse. We have explored aspects of the environment in which the chaplain had his ministry through the construction of the metaphor; 'The penitentiary as Armageddon' and its entailments. It is to the chaplain and his varied functions in the fledgling prison that we now turn our attention in more detail. In particular the investigation looks at the tension inherent in the position of the chaplain, who in effect represented both the Church and the state.
CHAPTER THREE.

THE ASCENDANT CHAPLAIN: SOTERIOLOGIST AND IDEOLOGUE.

Introduction.

Chapter Two examined the chaplain and his working environment in the fledgling prison through the entailments of the metaphor, 'The penitentiary as Armageddon'. The function of the penitentiary was the focus of Chapter Two. In this chapter the role of the chaplain, will be the focus. The chaplain, it will be contended, operated as both soteriologist and ideologue: soteriology being defined as the doctrine of salvation through Christ (Mautner, 1996; 531) and ideology as

a system of concepts, beliefs, and values which is characteristic of some social class (or perhaps of some other social group, perhaps even of a whole society), and in terms of which the members of that class (etc.) see and understand their own position in and relation to their social environment and the world as a whole, and explain, evaluate, and justify their actions, and especially the activities and policies characteristic of their class (etc.) (Mackie, 1975; 185).
In the penitentiary, we have the situation where both soteriological and ideological functions are contained within the role of the one person; the prison chaplain. Interestingly, the role of soteriologist and ideologue did not, in general, seem to create role strain within the chaplain himself. This was due to the fact that both the soteriological and ideological tasks of the chaplain flowed from the common concept of repentance. Repentance of the criminal actions, or sins, by the prisoner would lead to reconciliation with society and, the chaplain hoped, to religious conversion.

While the dual roles were simply an expression of the chaplain's ecclesiastical education and position in the social structure, it did not abide well with the prisoner, whose immortal soul and social well being were the prime interest of the chaplain. The difficulties associated with the chaplain being both soteriologist and ideologue will be examined along with other aspects of the role of the chaplain.

The hope for the secular sector of leading class and state was for a reform of the underclass (Forsythe, 1987; 6). This reform would, directly, reduce crime and lessen the threat of social unrest and, indirectly, facilitate a more compliant workforce for the industrialist and entrepreneur. The leading classes, at the inception of the separate system of prisons, comprised, as noted, both the well established, landed aristocracy and the rising, capital owning and producing, classes of the newly developing industrial society. It has been noted, by Nicholas Abercrombie et al, that there was a range of different material interests in what they term, the dominant class (Abercrombie et al, 1980; 140),
although large sections of the aristocracy were receptive to the new ideology of capitalism (Abercrombie et al, 1980; 107). Abercrombie et al argue against the position that the leading classes, (the term preferred in this thesis), sought to control the underclass and other social structural subordinates by the imposition of leading class ideology. What was required of the lower classes was obedience and this does not, they argue, require the internalisation of the ideology of the leading classes. They argue that, while there was an ideology of the leading classes, it did not reach the lower classes, to whom they attribute more autonomy than the 'ideological hegemonists' allow (Abercrombie et al, 1980; 96,143). The material in this thesis would suggest that there was a strong attempt by the leading classes, at least through the penitentiary, to impose their ideology onto the underclass by way of reforming the prisoners who were incarcerated there. The failure of the penitentiary would, however, support the claims of Abercrombie et al, that there was not much permeation of the leading class ideology to the working class and underclass (Abercrombie et al, 1980; 143).

The Church of England was very much dominated by people of the leading classes. The hierarchy of the Church of England were very much aligned with the old landed aristocracy sectors of the leading classes. It was from this sector that the Church found strong its support. It also received support from the newly developing capitalists and entrepreneurs. As Abercrombie et al note, ‘The laws of God and the peace of society were indissolubly linked in the minds of the Victorian dominant class’ (Abercrombie et al, 1980; 102).
It must be noted that this view had been common long before the Victorian times; the writings of St. Paul in the letter to the Romans, Chapter Thirteen, extols the virtue (and probably the pragmatism) of obeying the authorities. The claim in this letter of Paul is that these authorities are appointed by God. From the time of the Reformation, when the scriptures were more widely known than they were prior to the Reformation, Chapter Thirteen of Romans was always going to have appeal for the leading classes for the purpose of self-legitimation (Hoffman, 1986; 63).

Both sectors among the leading classes, the established aristocracy and the rising capital owning sector, as well as the Established Church, had vested interests in seeing the reform of the underclass. For its part, the Church, at least the Evangelicals within the Church, were seeking the salvation of the underclass, as well as their social and moral reform. The Church did not have much in the way of opportunity to espouse these views elsewhere as the underclass did not fill the Church pews and were remote from the doctrines and teachings of the church. For all its alignment with conservative politics and policies, for all its neglect of its pastoral care of the underclass in the emerging industrial cities, and for all the contempt of its 'scursons' for the lower classes, the Evangelicals of the Church were seeking salvation for the lower classes. The Church was also seeking similar ends to the leading class groups; the social order was, after all, God ordained. The underclass had a place 'in which it has pleased God to place a man'. So wrote Joseph Kingsmill, chaplain of Pentonville (Kingsmill, 1984; 323; reprint of nineteenth century publication) when commenting on the need for the prisoner to achieve that 'steady consistent state of life' which will 'impress his superiors', as well as his equals.
Kingsmill's view was common among his colleagues.

With regard to the separate system of prisons, within the leading classes, even allowing for the differing material interests, and even allowing for the differing systems of prison discipline circulating at the time and the arguments this generated, such as the separate system versus the silent system, there was a dovetailing of interests in the reformation of the underclass.

Clearly both soteriological and ideological motives were present in the development of the separate system of prisons. It is acknowledged here that the soteriological and ideological motives were not always discreet between the secular and religious sectors of society. Just as the sectors themselves are more ideal types for the purposes of analysis, so the notions of discreet soteriological and ideological motives are ideal typical. There were many people among the leading classes with dual motives, people with both ideological and soteriological reasons for supporting the separate system. Nevertheless, for reasons of analysis, the religious and secular sections will be seen as ideal types, analytically separable, but in practice working to the same ends.

For the religious sector, the salvation of the human being to the presence of God, through Christ, (soteriology) was their primary concern; their core business. They drew the distinction between religious conversion, for salvation, and religious influence, where the focus was on moral improvement due to exposure to religion and its practitioners and adherents. Both, of course, are the results of repentance. Advocates of the separate
system were glowing in their reports of the unqualified success of system for moral improvement and sincere religious change. Crawford and Whitworth Russell, the initial appointments as Prison Inspectors, put out five reports until 1848, all of which expressed this view (Burt, 1984; 5; reprint of nineteenth century publication). The Reverend Burt, in 1852, expressed similar sentiments and berated those responsible for lessening the period of time prisoners spent in solitude under the separate system; a short-sighted and inept action in his view (Burt, 1984; 8; reprint of nineteenth century publication). Critics of the system, where the prisoner initially spent eighteen months in solitude, challenged the system on the grounds of the deteriorating mental health of the prisoners.

For the religious sector, the separate system was the means by which the prisoner would be compulsorily exposed to the ministry of the chaplain, the power of the scriptures and the influence of the Spirit and be saved for the world to come and exhibit not impeccable piety, but, ‘an average standard of virtue, under an average pressure of temptation’ (Burt, 1984; 8; reprint of nineteenth century publication).

The prisoner would be able to return to society without being problematic to the interests of the leading classes. Separated from the contaminating influences of other prisoners and exposed only the good influences of the chaplain and other upright citizens, such as the governor and the medical officer, the prisoner would attain his otherworldly and this worldly redemption.

Importantly, in this rigidly controlled environment, God would be at work, a partner in
the penitentiary enterprise so to speak. The God of the Evangelicals was the God who intervenes in the world, the God who would be busy in the penitentiary was the polar opposite of the Deist God. The Evangelical had a confidence that God was the partner in his quest. Just as Howard had his quest with the prisons, so the Evangelicals had theirs; they supplied the forces for Good at the Armageddon of their own making, and Good, they were convinced, would prevail over Evil. The prisoner was to be purged of the Evil that stood between him and salvation, the soteriological quest, and between him and the acceptance of the leading class social and moral codes, the teleological quest. The soteriological quest of the reformers was, of course, their ultimate quest.

For the leading classes of the secular sector, the temporal world took precedence. Maintaining order and social control of the underclass, through the underclass' recognition of the legitimacy of the social structure and the legitimacy of the newly emerging system of production, was a paramount consideration for the leading classes in their advocacy of the separate system. If the possibility of control and re-socialisation of the underclass was a possible outcome of the zeal of the religious sector, then such opportunity was to be actively encouraged and supported. Ideological and social considerations were to the fore for the leading classes and the prison was perceived by both sectors to hold promise for the achievement of their respective ends.

Vital to the enterprise for both the religious and secular sectors was the chaplain. This was very apparent to advocates from both the religious and secular sectors. The Reverend W.L. Clay, son of the renowned prison chaplain, The Reverend John Clay of Preston, one
of the most prominent of prison chaplains of the penitentiary era, expressed how vital when he wrote, very accurately, that, ‘In the stage of separation, almost all depends on the chaplain’ (W. L. Clay, 1985; 45; reprint of nineteenth century publication).

The task of the chaplain then was an onerous one. No less than the hopes of the ecclesiastical and secular sectors were vested in the chaplain. To the chaplain, keeper of the prison lexicon and versed in the foundational understandings of the penitentiary, fell the task of the reformation of the prisoner to both society and to God.

The chaplain at the inception of the penitentiary was a Church of England clergyman. His Church held a privileged position in the society of the time. It was the Established Church. To the Church of England, the Roman Catholics were anathema and the Dissenters disliked. It was to be some time before the Roman Catholics, Dissenters and others were able to overcome the rather arrogant assumptions of privilege of the Established Church and gain some equity with regard to access to the prisons.

The chaplain was the lynchpin of the penitentiary, carrying the hopes and expectations of both the Church and the leading classes, too large a burden to carry even at this point of time and, as we shall see later, competing foundational understandings of the prison and prisoners helped to render the position of the chaplain as lynchpin untenable. The chaplain was to make the underclass acceptable to God and society through penitence. God, of course, was defined by the Church of England, and thus identifiably a God who patronised the leading class and their values. The chaplain was to encourage the prisoner
toward repentance as well as encouraging him to affirm the benevolence of a society, which was giving him the opportunity to change his ways. According to The Reverend Burt, assistant chaplain of Pentonville, the contrite prisoner was encouraged to acquiesce in the justice of a punishment that was entirely merited. Indeed, The Reverend Burt was of the view that the punishment of evildoers is one of the chief functions of the civil order (Burt, 1984; 116,256; reprint of nineteenth century publication). He had no disputes with the civil authorities as to who were evildoers, in spite of the fact that there were many harsh punishments for many minor offences. The prison sentence in the penitentiary, in the view of the supporters of the separate system, including The Reverend Burt, was the society being benevolent, not punitive, and having the best interests of the prisoner at heart (Priestly, 1985; 37; Burt, 1984; 232; reprint of nineteenth century publication). When convinced, as the leading classes and the Church were, of the God-ordained legitimacy of the structure of society, and of their certain knowledge of what was in the best interests of the prisoner, then there were no significant theological or philosophical difficulties to grapple with regarding punishment.

In face-to-face relations and actual practice with the prisoner, it was a very different matter. The prisoner was not at all convinced of the therapeutic nature of the separate system; mostly they feared the separate system with its isolation (Burt, 1984; 228; reprint of nineteenth century publication). This is not at all surprising. As a class, they would have been among the most poorly equipped, through lack of education and literacy, to manage this isolation. The separate system, according to the view of the contemporary critic, Hepworth Dixon, and numerous others, is a cruel system in that it does not hesitate
to 'ruin the body' in its endeavour to 'save the soul' (Dixon, 1985; 396; reprint of nineteenth century publication). While Dixon is highly critical of the separate system, he is no sympathiser with the criminal class. Indeed he speaks highly disparagingly of them, for Dixon the prisoners he observed, 'hardly seem to belong to anything that can by courtesy be called human' (Dixon, 1985; 245; reprint of nineteenth century publication). Nevertheless, Dixon expressed the view that the separate system, harboured an impossible expectation, was too cruel a punishment, even for the criminal.

As the lynchpin of the ecclesiastical and political/secular reform effort, there was a unified power base buttressing the chaplain in his position of authority and influence. The intention was, and this was in the main enforced, that the chaplain would have the full secular and ecclesiastical power to support his efforts. It is acknowledged that there were variations between the prisons, which were part of the separate system, but on the whole the chaplain exercised great authority and influence. The chaplain's authority and influence were accentuated in the penitentiary, however the chaplain was also a highly influential person in prisons that were not of the separate system, such as large county gaols, where the chaplain was described by Dixon as 'a formidable presence' (Dixon, 1985; 21; reprint of nineteenth century publication).

It must be noted too, that the chaplain was not loath to use his authority to its maximum to punish prisoners for such things as breaches of discipline in the chapel. The Chartist, William Lovett, imprisoned at Warwick prison, was angry to see the chaplain, from the pulpit, point out to the gaoler a prisoner who had unavoidably coughed. Lovett knew that
the man had been kept standing in the cold yard for nearly half an hour before chapel (Priestly, 1985; 93). For his part, that prison chaplain, The Reverend Eustace Jervis, stated, rather coldly, that, ‘The Act of Parliament states that the chaplain shall ‘see and admonish all prisoners', and I took care to do it’ (Priestly, 1985; 95).

This authority of the chaplain was rooted in, and dependent upon, institutional power. While there were chaplains, such as The Reverend John Clay, who exerted some charismatic authority, they, too, ultimately depended on the secular power of the state to maintain their authority.

A significant contributing factor for this dependence was that the chaplain in the prison did not share the same social reality as that of the prisoner. For the prisoner, generally from the underclass of the new industrial cities, it was often the first time that he had come into contact with chapel, clergy or scripture. There was neither common class, nor common tradition between the chaplain and the prisoner, which would encourage interaction. The prisoner from the underclass did not inhabit the Christian universe of the leading classes; he did not ascribe to its values nor exhibit its behaviours. In spite of sharing few, if any, plausibility structures with the prisoner, it was the role of the chaplain to guide the prisoner toward repentance and salvation, both of which were heavily leading class concepts. The prisoner, nevertheless, was thrown into the moral and religious universe of the chaplain. If he was reluctant, as he usually was, the power of the state was there to coerce him. The absurdity of this situation with regard to Christian worship was not lost on one G. W. Foot, a prisoner convicted of the crime of blasphemy.
Foot depicts the chapel 'congregation', of which he was a part, as, ‘a ghastly mockery, a blasphemous farce, a satire on Christianity infinitely more sardonic and mordant than anything I ever wrote or published’ (Priestly, 1985; 96).

Foot, of course, was not an admirer of Christianity, but he had written no more disparagingly than some other articulate prisoners of the time, who put pen to paper about their experiences, prisoners such as Oscar Wilde, who spent time in the separate system prison at Reading.

Mostly, the chaplain was an unpopular figure with the prisoners (Priestly, 1985; 106). Ecclesiastical influence kept the chaplain in a powerful position with the state. He was the bearer of the knowledge base on which the penitentiary was built. His religion held use value for the state, but not for the prisoner: institutional power alone kept the chaplain in a position of authority and influence over the prisoners. We turn now to a closer examination of the chaplain's power base in order to better understand the ascendancy of the chaplain, and subsequently to better understand his decline.

The Ecclesiastical Power Base of the Chaplain.

When the Evangelicals began their crusade for prison reform, the Church still wielded considerable influence in society. This influence had been somewhat lessened by the Enlightenment, even though, operating on the level of ideas, the Enlightenment was not as influential on the mass culture. Also, as Walter Ullmann points out, Humanism, dating from the Renaissance, lessened the influence of ecclesiastical institutions by focussing on
the qualities of the incumbent of the position, something which had not been the case previously. Ullman referred to the papacy, where there had been a series of corrupt popes prior to the Renaissance. In spite of this obvious corruption, and because authority was vested in the position, the qualities of the person were not a key issue and the incumbents continued in office. This changed after the Renaissance and qualities of incumbents became of considerable importance. The humanist perspective reached beyond the papacy to other ecclesiastical institutions. (Ullman, 1972; 267).

The Renaissance and the Enlightenment generated a more critical stance toward the Church; nevertheless the Church wielded considerable influence. The Church of England was still a significant universe maintainer in the society, other than for the underclass. There was still, for instance, no socially approved moral code or broad societal conceptions outside those of Christianity. The teachings of the Church still heavily influenced most fundamental social mores, both personal and collective (Barnett, 1999; 2). The biggest challenges to the Church's authority and influence did not begin until the second half of the nineteenth century when differing conceptions of the nature of the human being and the emergence of an alternative understanding of the 'human being as psyche', rather than the 'human being as soul', would come to the fore. The human being as psyche had its ramifications for the chaplain and the prison and this will be pursued in a later chapter.

In the first thirty-five years of the nineteenth century, leading to the House of Lords Select Committee's favouring of the separate system, the Church's religious interpretation
of the world was still the dominant understanding, other than for some intellectuals and most of the underclass. The church, particularly the Church of England, still monopolised the traditional rights of passage of the society. Even in the colony of New South Wales at this time, where there was a definite anticlericalism, imported from Britain and particularly expressed toward the Church of England clergy (Grocott, 1980; 30,116), people were still married by the Church, had their children baptised, and were buried by the Church. In Britain, the Church could still promote its canons and doctrine and be assured that there would be a significant level of support for its position from the leading classes, in spite of the diversity evident in the leading classes. The biblical language of revelation, although under increasing criticism, more so in intellectual circles and on the level of ideas, had a waning, but still significant level of acceptance and influence in the years of advocacy for the penitentiary. The previously quoted 1819 conviction and gaoling of Richard Carlisle, for blasphemous libel in republishing The Rights of Man, a tract which heavily criticised revealed religion and biblical Christianity, is indication of this (Royle, 1994; 407).

The prison chaplain, in the first half of the eighteenth century, had an influential Church backing him. The chaplain was appointed to his position in the prison by both state and Church. Central to the ecclesiastical power backing the chaplain was the still widely accepted, biblical, and literalist-tending, Church sponsored concept of God. As has been noted, there were beginning theological developments, which were bringing into question traditional understandings of God incarnate, and therefore some of the cherished doctrines of the Church were coming under scrutiny. These developments, however, were
strongest in the theological schools in Germany. The ideas of the German scholars were shown scant regard in Britain among the limited number of scholars conversant with them, particularly after the Oxford biblical scholar, Joseph Lightfoot, had written devastating critiques of the more exaggerated claims of the Tubingen school (Wheeler, 1990; 10).

The biblical God was still credible for the British population. If the biblical God had not been credible, then neither would have been the reformist ideals of the separate system. The separate system presupposed a God who is active in the social world of human beings; Deism could not have propelled the separate system. In the creation of the separate system, belief in this active God was fundamental to believing that the errant prisoner could be convicted of his sin, which would lead to repentance and its concomitants of salvation and or moral reform. The authority of the chaplain was backed by the power and influence of a Church, which firmly believed that there was evidence of God working in a world, which God had created. Many among the general public believed the proclamations of the Church in this regard, even if they had trouble comprehending the language and concepts of its doctrines. God was not the 'God of the gaps' at this point in time, as would be the case in the mid-second half of the century when science began its advances, and in some cases, its attacks on religion. At this point in time, God was not in retreat and seemingly had a secure future, which warranted the significant capital investment that the leading classes made in the separate system.

In the society of the time the church and its guiding light, the scriptures interpreted in a
generally literal fashion, were a considerable force in defining social reality and establishing plausibility structures. As noted, the Church monopolised rites of passage with its liturgies. Individual Christians, and sometimes the Church itself, were prominent in issues of philanthropy and sometimes social justice (Norman, 1994; 286). The position of the church in the society lent credibility to the chaplain, its servant, because it was still an institution which itself had wide credibility and support in society.

The ecclesiastical credibility and influence in the wider society, aided by the insecurities of the leading classes regarding the underclass, promoted the establishment of the separate system. The separate system was founded upon Christian understandings, relating to the nature of human beings and the nature of God. The prison program of reform was headed by the chaplain. It is readily apparent, then, that the prison discourse would be orthodox Christian. The control of language and discourse brings with it the power of definition, and thereby social and organisational prominence in the prison by virtue of those definitions. The ecclesiastical origin of this taxonomy of definitions, the 'prison lexicon', helped establish the type and shape of many of the prison routines. The lexicon also helped to establish the dominant paradigm of the reform effort of the prison. The dominant paradigm at the inception of the separate system could be stated as 'the human being as sinner and soul'. This dominant paradigm meant that the Church, through the chaplain, had a monopoly on reform. The 'treatment' of the sinful prisoner was through encouragement to repent from his errant ways to reconciliation with God and society. The immortal soul of the prisoner was a primary concern of the chaplain. The chaplain was the person with the expert knowledge of the prison lexicon. The chaplain
was also the person, under this paradigm, best equipped by training and vocation to advise on the ongoing operation of the prison. No one else could, realistically, have been considered as the primary worker. The dominant paradigm of the prison, 'the human being as sinner and soul', determined that the reform efforts with the prisoner would be embedded in soteriology, the chaplain's special province, as well as teleology, where the chaplain supported the ends of the acceptance of the prevailing social structure.

There were, of course, soteriological variances from chaplain to chaplain. Theological differences existed between the crusading evangelically oriented chaplains and the more traditional chaplains. Also, there were clearly personality differences between chaplains, such as those between the more humane Clay and the rather harsh Jervis (quoted above), but the goal itself, soteriology, was not obscured. The power and influence of the Church, evidenced in and expressed through the construction of the lexicon and the establishing of the dominant paradigm, contributed greatly to the pre-eminence of the chaplain as the main player in the separate system.

The influence of the Church also determined what was 'spiritual' in the prison context. Pluralism was yet to make its impact. There was no place in the prison for dissenting views, or other faiths, or indeed no faith. The alternative to chapel, for anyone refusing to go, was to be flogged (Priestly, 1985; 91). The prison recognized, by the mid nineteenth, only three denominations, Church of England, Roman Catholic and Jewish. Most prisoners were compelled to attend Church of England services at the prison chapel and the Church of England chaplain was required to visit all prisoners. Unlike contemporary
times, there was no place for alternative spirituality, or even alternative definitions of spirituality. The prison in religious terms was akin to a monoculture. With the complete backing of the state, the chaplain had little difficulty with either his identity or his relevance in the penitentiary. The crisis of ‘identity versus relevance’ is a dilemma of the contemporary church, articulated by the German theologian, Jurgen Moltmann (Moltmann, 1974; 10). Moltmann argued that the contemporary church, with ever dwindling membership, needed to make itself relevant to the community by relating more closely to the culture, but the problem of relating too closely to the culture raises problems of absorption into that culture and hence with the maintaining of identity as 'church', rather than say, 'welfare agency'. There was no problem of identity with the Church of England chaplain, through the power of the state, his was the only spirituality acceptable in the prison and everyone was a member of his congregation, whether they liked it or not.

There were to be problems, to be discussed later, arising from the chaplain and Church having such close cultural and ideological ties with the leading classes and the state. The prisoner's perception of the chaplain was that he was an integral part of the leading classes and the state. He was not perceived as being an independent representative of an independent spiritual institution, but rather as part of a repressive state prison system. In short, the chaplain was not trusted by the prisoner. Interestingly, this view has been a common theme through the history of the modern prison, for this was precisely the view espoused by the long term prisoner, Darcy Dugan, in evidence he gave before the Royal Commission into the New South Wales prisons in 1976 (Nagle, 1978; 198).
Religious thought and the Church had a central part to play in the establishment of the separate system. Just how important a part could be readily seen by the architecture of the prison. The chapels in the newly established prisons tended to be very large and imposing edifices, some of cathedrals like proportions. The centrality of the Christian faith to the prison and its programs and discipline were heralded by the chapel when the prisoner entered the prison gates. The prisoner did not need to be very perceptive to realise that the size and prominence of this building meant that he would be spending considerable time in it. An investment in a building of this size and expense demanded that it be well utilised. It was certainly well utilised, the prisoner having a daily exposure to it.

The power and influence of the church were also well evident in all aspects of the prison and its routines. The chaplain was operating in the environment of a total institution where the church was mostly more prominent than it was in the communities outside, especially the communities inhabited by the underclass. Into this prison came the unchurched criminal of the British underclass, to be confronted by the power of the Church, state and God. Evil was to be confronted by the forces of Good, directed by the chaplain. The chaplains, of course, varied in ability and in how much they were able to utilise the situation presented to them by the status of the Church and its recognition and support by the state. Dr McCook Weir, a prison medical officer, held the strong view that those who sought to be chaplains in institutions had failed to obtain a hearing in the outside world. Weir's judgement, a rather biting one toward the Church and its hierarchy, was that, ‘anything will do for prisoners, lunatics and paupers’ (Priestly, 1985; 113).
This view is rather harsh, as there were numbers of articulate and capable clergy, with an evangelical persuasion, who sought to work in the prisons. Weir's view, however, is indicative that the chaplain was not without his critics within the prison. Views similar to that of Weir can still be heard among clergy and laity in the contemporary churches.

It must be added here, that this strong recognition of the Church as being credible institution capable of providing the basis for reform in the prison, also meant that there was a strong expectation that the penitentiary would succeed and give the leading classes their much desired evidence of an underclass that was not only moving in the direction of the Kingdom of God, but adopting leading class values. The penitentiary was given heavy state support, but it also set a highly expectant scene for results. As Priestly notes, ‘The whole organization of the early Victorian prison was shot through with an expectation of repentance and reform’ (Priestly, 1985; 99).

The credibility of not only the separate system, but also of the Church's lexicon and dominant paradigm were, given the situation of monopoly, set up for critical review. The Church was given strong backing, but in having the monopoly on reform there was a sense in which it was also given an ultimatum. This ultimatum was to produce results. There was no serious competitor for the Church, but also the responsibility for the success of the venture rested with the church and its servant, the chaplain. The state was providing powerful support, although some Church representatives did criticise the state for not following to the letter the original separate system plan, of eighteen months
solitude, by progressively reducing the length of time spent in solitary confinement. These critics lay the blame for the failure at the feet of the state; a most unfair criticism. The church and individual Christians, in entering strongly into the creation and staffing of the penitentiary, were instrumental in setting up their own day of reckoning. The reckoning was not only for its performance in prisoner reform, but a reckoning of its understandings of the nature of human beings, as well as its understandings of the nature of God.

The chaplain had a powerful backing due to the credibility of the church in the wider society. This, however, was not sufficient for the chaplain to mobilise the operation of reform in the prison. In general the prisoner was, at best, indifferent to the chaplain and at worst hostile. There needed to be a coercive power for the chaplain to have full attendances at his chapel services and to ensure that he be received without undue problem by some prisoners when he visited their cells. Staff of the prison compelled the prisoner to attend chapel and other religious observances as prescribed. Often this was simply done as a sense of duty, rather than as an enthusiastic acceptance of the theology and philosophy of reform; prison officers, too, were often drawn from the lower classes. This was a problem at times for the chaplain; the other prison staff were often not as enthusiastic as he with regard to the reformatory model. Indeed a fond hope of those who advocated the separate system was to attract staff who espoused their ideals. Often this was not possible and was a source of great disappointment among advocates of the separate system, who wished to present a consistent front of religious and moral values to the prisoner.
It has been noted above that the interests of Church and state dovetailed in relation to the prisoner. This is not to say that there was a conspiracy between the Church and the state, the bearers of leading class values, to exert social control over the underclass. Evidence for this claim of social control as the sole, or dominant, motive is lacking. Nor is it that the Church and its servants were simply manipulated by the leading classes to control the underclass; it was religious thought that conceived of the penitentiary. The Church had its own mission, its own core business of soteriology to attend to. In carrying out this task, however, the Church was also, at the same time, affirming another view, which it itself firmly held, namely the descending nature of authority and the God ordained social structure. One might equally argue, but it would appear that no one has, that the Church manipulated the leading classes to the Church's own ends. For either view, compelling evidence is lacking. Rather, the leading classes recognised the possibilities of reform that were being presented by the evangelically oriented Christianity of the time and gave their support, because it was in their interests to do so, despite the substantial financial cost that was involved. The leading classes certainly sought to promote their values, which coalesced with those of the reformers, but this does not denote conspiracy. The actions of the leading classes were ideological, but not conspiratorial.

The state provided the ultimate and necessary power to mobilise the separate system in its endeavour to seek reform among the underclass. Through the state we have the coming together of the interests of the key players. The state was not involved in a deliberate exercise in collusion with the Church to control, but it was keen to throw in its
lot with the seemingly attractive reform effort. It is to the role of the state that we now turn our attention.

**The Secular Power Base of the Chaplain.**

While the religious sector provided the practice base for the chaplain, it was secular power that thrust the chaplain into prominence in the prison. Most prisoners had no tradition of church going, yet the key elements in the reform strategies were very much based on concepts and ritual associated with church going: reflection, repentance, Christian education, liturgy, worship and prayer. In fact, as Abercrombie et al note, the differences between the Church culture and that of the underclass were very marked. For the underclass it was, ‘the culture of drink, gambling, fornication, idleness, thriftlessness and superstition which made up the 'rough' working class’ (Abercrombie, 1980; 127).

Quite obviously, interaction between chaplain and prisoner was not going to happen from prisoner initiative and/or prisoners requesting to follow their own religious tradition; quite simply, they had none to follow. Regular contact between the chaplain and the prisoner had to be, and was, created artificially and sustained by the power of the state. There had been significant anti-clericalism brewing in the underclass: the common practice of the clergy, to sit as magistrates dispensing punishment from the bench, meant that the Church of England clergyman was never going to be enamoured of the underclass, who were generally the subject of the sentences. This practice was continued in the colony of New South Wales and in fact became infamous through the 'flogging parson', The Reverend Samuel Marsden. Interestingly, these clerical magistrates had a
reputation for being harsher than the lay magistrates. As Christopher Sweeney notes, this gave rise to the widely used phrase, ‘The Lord have mercy on you, for his Reverence will have none’ (Sweeney, 1981; 158).

An inherited social chasm existed between the prisoner and the chaplain. The state could force the interaction of chaplain and prisoner, and threaten or force the prisoner into quiescence, but the chasm was always going to be present.

An important part of the state support of the chaplain was the prison regulations, which subjected the prisoner to the daily rituals of chapel attendance and sermons and chaplain visits. The prison chapel was not only an imposing edifice, but also an indispensable part of the reform strategy. The prisoners were subjected to chapel services and sermons once daily and sometimes more frequently. There was a substantial effort demanded of custodial staff involved to move prisoners between cells and the chapel (Priestly, 1985; 92), but the state's hope in the potential of the separate system was such that chapel attendance needed to be both regular and compulsory. The isolation of the individual prisoner in the chapel has been noted previously. The anomaly of isolation in public worship, when the purpose of public worship is to be interactive and communal, was not lost on the occasional clergyman outside the prison system, but such views had no impact on the conduct of services within the penitentiary (Priestly, 1985; 92). These services continued in their regulated and isolationist manner. State power was used directly against the prisoner and infractions of the rules of conduct for the chapel were punished severely. The punishment was direct physical punishment, or deprivation of food, or
both. Although some prisoners devised ingenious means of communicating during times in their cell, using such things as the prison pipe systems connecting the cells, and in the chapel itself, there can be no doubting the resolve of the state use its power to punish infractions, and to promote the separate system.

The regulations of the prison also provided for regular contact between the prisoner and the chaplain. In fact, visitation was the most important of the chaplain's duties. The chaplain was required to interview the prisoner on admission and to regularly visit the prisoner in his cell to encourage him along the path to repentance. In particular, the senior staff in the prison were required to provide support to the chaplain in his program of reform. These staff included the governor of the prison and the medical officer; they too made regular visits to the prisoner. It was the chaplain, though, who would assess the 'progress' of the prisoner with regard to repentance and make a 'moral evaluation of prisoners' (Kingsmill, 1984; 338; reprint of nineteenth century publication). The prisoner, alone in his cell would, it was assumed, be reading his bible and other religious literature provided, and contemplating his failings under the gaze of the God with the Panopticon-like qualities; the searcher of the prisoner's soul. Nothing would be achieved other than through the grace of God, was the opinion of chaplain Joseph Kingsmill, who probably spoke for many of his colleagues (Kingsmill, 1984; 245; reprint of nineteenth century publication). This kind of comment also brought not only the penitentiary and the chaplain, but also God into line for critique and review, a matter that will be investigated in a later chapter.
Beside the regulations prescribing the chaplain's visits, there were regulations which provided for the medical officer to refer to the chaplain prisoners who would, in the medical officer's opinion, benefit from the application of the chaplain's 'special care', as Regulation Thirty Two of 1849 defined it (Priestly, 1985; 185). In the contemporary context, such prisoners would, in all probability, be referred to a secular professional trained in the social sciences and employed by the prison service. In the separate system, however, the chaplain had the monopoly on reform and it is not at all surprising to find such a referral process in the Regulations.

Again, provision was made for the chaplain to have a large say in what was the early equivalent of the modern parole system. Provision was made for a report to be submitted by the chaplain with regard to the early release of prisoners. The chaplain's influence and authority in this regard can be seen by the vigorous efforts of some prisoners to deceive the chaplain into believing that they were reformed characters. Ostentatious and affectatious piety and liberal use of the religious vernacular were common practices of these prisoners in their endeavours to court favour with, and freedom through, deceiving the chaplain. The prisoners knew the importance placed on the opinion of the chaplain with regard to their 'progress', and hence with regard to their release. They probably also knew that there were chaplains who were very willing to believe that reform had taken place. Nevertheless, it would have been, as Grocott notes, ‘a grovelling and humiliating experience having to wheedle indulgences from someone in authority’ (Grocott, 1980; 202).
Grocott spoke about the New South Wales convicts, but these were people who simply transported their anti-clericalism to the Antipodes, the situation in Britain was much the same. It might be added that there were prison officers who also thought it wise to court favour with the chaplain to enhance their future prospects. Some officers, in the early days of the separate system, were in the habit of ostentatiously carrying large bibles with them in the course of their duties.

The state had invested heavily in the separate system. Financially there was a heavy capital investment, and then there was the investment in the authority given to the chaplain, whose position was certainly a prominent one. The state exercised this power, because for many in society the Church and its teachings had credibility and God was the active, interventionist God as proclaimed by the Evangelicals. Concerning others, who did not share these beliefs, and/or had no belief at all, the chaplain was reckoned by the state to have a use value by virtue of the possibility of bringing about their reform.

While the chaplain represented the church and its soteriological interests, he was also a defacto representative of the state. This role seemed to sit easily with the chaplain, in fact there was a period at Pentonville where the chaplain was also the governor of that prison. The chaplain was an ideologue and apologist for the state to a group who had no goodwill toward the state. This was a bizarre situation when one considers that the chaplains were, on the whole, unpopular. The chaplain had virtually no chance of succeeding as an ideologue. The chaplain was serving two masters, the Church and the state, and was perceived to be doing so by the prisoner. This severely compromised the
chaplain's soteriological chances from the outset. The evidence, however, is that chaplains themselves were pleased with the authority of the state which backed their actions, for prior to the separate system they had often been the object of derision by prisoners. In 1775, when Howard visited Newgate, he found that the chaplain could not insist upon compulsory chapel attendance by prisoners (Ignatieff, 1978; 41). This was unsatisfactory as far as Howard was concerned, as well as being aggravating for the chaplain, who had no means for quelling noise and vilification, and thereby conducting worship adequately for the few who wanted to attend. The Reverend Whitworth Russell, chaplain of Millbank and later to be, along with Crawford, the first appointed inspector of prisons, was attracted by the helplessness of prisoners under the separate system (Forsythe, 1987; 27). Now the state power could be used to punish the prisoner who had the temerity to exhibit offensive, or anti-clerical behaviour. Christendom, the power of church and state, which failed centuries before, was being revived in the nineteenth century penitentiary.

Having examined the power base on which the authority of the chaplain rested, we will now examine the chaplain's task in more detail.

**The Chaplain as Soteriologist.**

Most of the chaplains, and particularly those of an evangelical persuasion, were in no doubt about the enormity of the task that faced them in their ministry in the prison. They believed that they, as representatives of the forces of Good, were involved in a mammoth spiritual battle with the forces of Evil within the confines of the prison. This was
particularly the case with those of strongly evangelical persuasion. Soteriology was their commission, as well as their commitment; the dominant paradigm of the prison, 'the prisoner as sinner and soul', established the chaplain as the person with the vocational background to drive the prison reform effort. There was a sense of urgency about the chaplain's work in the prison. The chaplain knew that the prisoner was not likely to have an opportunity in the community to come to repentance, as the underclass community largely ignored the church. For this very reason, some chaplains objected vigorously to the period of isolation being reduced, believing that isolation made the prisoner more malleable and their own task much easier. This is typified by the attitudes of some chaplains, such as The Reverend Burt, who complained of any reduction of the 'exhaustive power of protracted separation' (Burt, 1984; 62; reprint of nineteenth century publication). In fact, Burt was wanting the period of separation for 'heinous' offenders increased to as much as three years, with 'special moral instruction' (Burt, 1984; 37; reprint of nineteenth century publication). The power over the prisoner was forfeited resentfully by many chaplains, who seemed to interpret psychological malleability as signs of a spiritual change toward acceptance and repentance. The alternative interpretation, not evident, or acceptable, to these chaplains, is that prisoners suffering the sensory deprivation of solitary confinement were often receptive of any human contact, even the chaplain.

Some of the more articulate and educated of the prisoners recorded their experiences of the separate system. In the main, these prisoners were not from the underclass. Few of them had any positive comments to make about the chaplains (Priestly, 1985; 106). With
such close social and ideological ties to the state and the leading classes, the chaplain was an unlikely candidate for taking the part of the prisoner and speaking out boldly on his behalf. Furthermore, the chaplain was usually convinced that the punishment was merited and, as we have seen, it was common for clergy to have magisterial duties and thus a close alignment with the legal system. Taking these factors into account, it can be seen that the chances of meaningful interaction between the chaplain and the prisoner were, accordingly, slim. This does not seem to have been a factor in the reckoning of the reformers as they campaigned for the separate system.

The task of the chaplain emphasised individual visits to the prisoner, these visits tended to be didactic rather than pastoral in nature. In placing paramount importance on the soteriological and ideological (the acceptance of social values of the leading classes), the practitioner can be unaware of, or indifferent to, issues of importance as defined by the prisoner. This was certainly the case with most of the chaplains in the early prisons. It may also help to explain an approach bordering on callousness toward the suffering of prisoners in the separate system, especially with regard to the rigours of isolation. These sufferings, to many of the chaplains, were of little importance when compared to the soteriological rewards believed to lie in another life beyond the temporal. This did not serve to endear the chaplain to the prisoner, but the chaplain firmly believed that he knew what was best for the prisoner; the prisoner’s soul was at stake and this was the chaplain's area of specialty. There were of course exceptions among the chaplains, however, holding such firm soteriological views, many of the chaplains were, from the outset, highly unlikely to have identified with, or received credibility from, the prisoner.
Another factor contributing strongly to the chaplain's failure to communicate meaningfully with the prisoner was that the theology of the day was developed from a much more literal reading of the scriptures than is the case with much contemporary theology. At this time the 'grand story' (Brueggemann, 1993; 8) of soteriology was sustainable. It reflected the fact that religion and theology were more prominent and less challenged than they are in contemporary, pluralistic society where, as Brueggemann asserts, the grand stories of systematic theology can no longer claim assent (Brueggemann, 1993; 8). Brueggemann argues that it is in the honouring of the little stories and the breakdown of the grand stories that we counter our tendency to reductionism (Brueggemann, 1993; 59). The chaplains of the penitentiary were classic examples of reductionism, all experience had to be understood and contained within the bounds established by the penitential and soteriological grand story. Soteriology has been nowhere near as prominent an issue, since at least the mid-1960's, within the mainstream churches (Martin, 1980; 111, 112).

The theology of the time, which informed the chaplains, emphasised a God who was much more directly active in the affairs of human beings than most mainstream Christians would claim today. It was a theology which was much more 'other worldly' than is the case with much contemporary theology. With literalism more credible, the churchmen of the early and mid-nineteenth century were more confident in making statements about God, and God's actions in the world, than is the case in the mainstream churches of today. The chaplain of the penitentiary was confident that he had the truth,
the grand story, and that the needs of the prisoner were penitential and soteriological, even if the prisoner were to deny that altogether. Such a statement of denial, if a prisoner dared to make it in the penitentiary, would only confirm for the chaplain the prisoner's ignorant state.

The prison chaplains of the time were also, due to the dominance of the religious understandings which defined the nature of the prisoner, the specialists in interpreting behaviour and prescribing 'normality'. The chaplain in the prison had the grand story, or narrative, through which all other narratives were interpreted. The prisoner, with his small story was validated only when his story could be subsumed into the grand narrative of repentance and salvation. Prisoner behaviour was defined by the chaplain and seen in terms of spiritual/moral failings. With the command of the prison lexicon and the foundational understandings on which the prison functioned, the chaplain was the composite of the helping professionals of the modern prison. The nineteenth century chaplain was much more sure about where his emphasis lay and what his task was than is the current prison chaplain. The chaplain could view the sufferings of the prisoner and justify them in terms of a possibility they held for the salvation of the prisoner, the ultimate good, and the promotion of the God-ordained social order. For the chaplain, immersed in the struggle against Evil, the prisoner was a typification, a representative of Evil to be subdued on the soteriological battlefield.

Adding weight to the definitional and knowledge supports for the chaplain in his soteriological role was the fact that the chaplain was the sentinel of the ultimates. While
it is true that some prisoners refused the ministrations of the chaplain at their execution, and some prisoners even cursed the chaplain at this point, the chaplain still had the status associated with this role. Death was not uncommon in the prison of the nineteenth century and the chaplain was the person who had a monopoly over the rituals and liturgies associated with death. The chaplain had to be present for an execution to take place and had to sign the official record of death (Priestly, 1985; 249). This was a significant role and one that gave added reinforcement to the chaplain in his role as soteriologist. Ultimates contributed to the chaplain's primacy in the prison.

The separate system brought soteriology into prominence in the total institution of the penitentiary and established it as an integral part of the program for reform. It also established the representative of the Church, the chaplain, as the prime mover of reform. The chaplain, as the soteriologist, was integral and indispensable to the penitentiary. He was in fact the heart and soul of the penitentiary and the orchestrator of Armageddon.

**The Chaplain as Ideologue.**

The chaplain's manifest function was clear as evidenced by the nature of the separate system and the prison regulations, which were written to support the system. The chaplain was seeking to bring the prisoner to repentance through reflection. Concurrently the chaplain was performing another function, the ideological function, the adjunct of the soteriological. Any acceptance of the soteriological by the prisoner would bring with it the acceptance of a world interpreted religiously. This interpretation of the world was more than likely to lead the prisoner to accept the God-ordained social structures of the
leading classes. In accepting the soteriological, as preached and professed by the prison chaplain, the prisoner was in essence accepting the prevailing social order. The God of the chaplain was the God of the leading classes; indeed there is a sense in which this God was a 'leading class God'.

The latent function of the chaplain was in fact as an ideologue for the state and the leading classes. There was a high level of predictability in this. The chaplain was strongly identified with the state and the leading classes in terms of his position in the social scale, his education, his power in the prison, and his identification with the landed aristocracy. There is little evidence of the chaplain having any alternative understandings of poverty and crime, certainly nothing that would look toward poverty itself, or the social structure as offering meritorious explanation. The Reverend R. V. Reynolds of Wakefield prison is not exceptional with regard to chaplains' understandings when he stated, in words that mirror contemporary conservative accounts of the roots of crime in family pathology, that: ‘The cause of crime is to be traced primarily to the parents, or guardians, in having neglected to infuse religious principles, or having neutralised these principles by evil example’ (Priestly, 1985; 75). According to this account, the poor as a class are to be blamed in entirety for their poverty and their crime.

Grocott, writing about the situation of clergymen in New South Wales expressed similar thoughts about clergy. He noted that while many clergy expressed a charitable concern for the 'degraded poor', very few ever looked critically at social, economic and political forces that may have contributed to poverty and crime (Grocott, 1980; 280). Grocott's
comments mirror the situation of the prison chaplains in Britain, although expressions of charitable concern were overshadowed by the soteriological concerns for the soul of the prisoner. The prison chaplain had little or no alternative critique. As we have seen, those secular activists and theorists who espoused alternative views, such as Tom Paine, were anathema to the Church.

The separate system was brought into being by the combined power of both Church and state. To many prisoners, the chaplain was but an arm of the state, and for this he was distrusted and often held in contempt. A prisoner at Wakefield, for instance, was not likely to think that the chaplain, who resided in the state provided 'massive and noble residence' (Dixon, 1985; 364; reprint of nineteenth century publication), would be likely to take his part against the state. Significantly, the chaplain was associated closely with the dreaded separate system. Occasionally, it is true, a chaplain would be critical of conditions in which the prisoners lived and sometimes took the part of prisoners, but most disputes arising between the chaplain and the governor of the prison came about as a result of issues pertaining to the scope of chaplain's authority and had nothing to do with the welfare of the prisoner. Joseph Kingsmill, chaplain of Pentonville, saw this as the chaplain, 'conscious of his moral superiority', making the mistake of being concerned with matters of 'mere discipline' and turning attention away from the 'weighty matters' of the chaplain's vocation (Kingsmill, 1984; 334; reprint of nineteenth century publication). The weighty matter for the Reverend Burt was soteriology, however for others such as The Reverend Jervis, cited earlier (Priestly, 1985; 95) discipline was very much a weighty matter.
Chaplains appreciated their rise in authority with the inception of the separate system. The backing of the state meant that the focus of the chaplain could be on the 'priestly' functions. A 'prophetic' function, focussing on issues of justice, which was a Christian tradition taken from the ancient prophets, was little evident as a supplement to the priestly work of the chaplain. The potential for the prophetic, evident in some of the work of Howard, was lost when the church had to rely on the power of the state to enable the chaplain to carry out his task in the separate system. It is interesting to note that the highest points of the chaplain's authority and status in the prison system coincided with the form of imprisonment (i.e. the separate system) most feared by the prisoner and most destructive of the prisoner: the chaplain was the ideologue and legitimator of this system.

At the time when the separate system of prisons in Britain was in its advocacy stage, the colony of New South Wales still had convicts as a large proportion of its population. Darlinghurst and the beginnings of the modern prison system were still some twenty years away, however the authorities in the Colony, in accord with the authorities in England, had hopes that there could be changes in the society through the influence of religion and some of the governors, such as Macquarie and Hunter, were keen to have more chaplains in the colony and they tried to exert influence on the home government to bring this about. The authorities in the Colony did not rely solely on the home government; they acted as best they could to bring about change. Like their English counterparts, they looked to religion for the answer to the issue of bringing stability and
conformity into the social structure. As with the authorities in the Motherland, the authorities in the Colony, with the Church Act of 1834, encouraged the construction of churches through financial incentives. Religion was still influential enough, in both hemispheres, to create expectation and hope in the leading classes.

In being both the soteriologist and ideologue of the separate system, however, the chaplain was faced with a task of monumental proportions. Some of these problems were structural problems, inherent in the position of chaplain. He was essentially charged with re-socialising the underclass who had, on the whole, no allegiance to the church, no understandings of its doctrines or theology, and certainly no love for the state. In endeavouring to reform the prisoner, the Church's remoteness from the underclass and the chaplain's association with the state was always going to present a huge obstacle in the way of developing trust with the prisoner. In the separate system, the religious input, including compulsory chapel, was mostly going to be viewed as a part of the punishment by the prisoner. Being viewed as a part of the apparatus of punishment was always going to make the task of the chaplain onerous. While the chaplain did not appear to see or experience significant role strain or contradiction in the task of being both ideologue and soteriologist, to the prisoner, who saw the chaplain's ideological task clearly, this was obvious. The Reverend Kingsmill's statement by way of his address to each new batch of prisoners at Pentonville that he was 'their friend' (Kingsmill, 1984; 214; reprint on nineteenth century publication), if it did not seem contradictory to some prisoners at the time, would soon have become so.
Other problems the chaplain faced were personal. The chaplain was faced with the unenviable task of crossing class boundaries in relating to the prisoner, when he had scant, if any, knowledge and experience of the underclass. Indeed many chaplains were contemptuous of the underclass and had it not been for their ecclesiastical tasks in the prison, these chaplains would have been unlikely to have related to the underclass at all. It is hard to imagine a group of people more poorly equipped than the Church of England chaplain to take on the task of convincing the penitentiary prisoner of the need to repent to save his immortal soul and to see the state as a benevolent power with his best interests at heart.

Summary.

The penitentiary was as close and as co-operative, with regard to shared power arrangements, as the church and state had been in the medieval times. The secular and ecclesiastical hope in the separate system was sufficient for the concept and its subsequent operation to withstand a lot of criticism, and there was considerable criticism of the separate system of prisons. This criticism came from a wide variety of sources. There was criticism from parliamentarians; voices were raised about the cost involved in establishing the system. Other critics raised concerns for the welfare of the people incarcerated in it. The concern about the effects of solitary confinement on prisoner sanity came from many sources, even from that well-known prison visitor, Elizabeth Fry (Priestly, 1985; 38). There were also voices raised among the sceptics, often from among the intelligentsia, who doubted the whole notion of the reformation of the prisoner through religious intervention, particularly compulsory intervention. There were voices
raised among those who had direct experience of incarceration. Slowly, the voices of criticism began to prevail.

Notwithstanding the powerful forces of Church and state, which supported reform through the separate system, it failed, and it is not surprising that it failed. The separate system was created by a composite of forces, which had a history of failure. What the separate system can be likened to, in essence, is the recreation of Christendom within the walls of a total institution. This theme of the creation and failure of the separate system as the creation and failure of Christendom will be pursued in Section Three, through the construction and use of a guiding metaphor. The purpose of Section Two was to establish the dominant position, which the chaplain held in the early prison system, to examine the functions of the penitentiary, and to examine the reasons why the chaplain came to this position of ascendancy. The failure of the penitentiary heralded the beginnings of the decline of the prison chaplain. We now turn our attention to Christendom, and its subsequent failure, to create the metaphor for the failure of the penitentiary and the decline of its lynchpin, the chaplain.
SECTION THREE.

CHRISTENDOM AND THE FAILURE OF THE PENITENTIARY.
CHAPTER FOUR.

THE PENITENTIARY AS CHRISTENDOM.

In Chapter Two the metaphor, 'The prison as Armageddon', was developed and the entailments of the metaphor led the investigation in a number of directions, but in particular to the analysis of the clash of Good and Evil in the penitentiary. The analysis in Section One of the thesis was primarily functional, with regard to both the penitentiary and its lynchpin, the chaplain. In this chapter and Chapter Five, the analysis is primarily structural. A new metaphor is developed which leads to an analysis of the social structure of the penitentiary and then leads, in Chapter Five, to an analysis of the failure of the penitentiary. The metaphor is 'The penitentiary as Christendom'. The failure of the penitentiary had great repercussions for the future of the chaplain in the prison system. The future of the chaplain is for later analysis; the first task is to examine and develop the metaphor, 'The Penitentiary as Christendom'. 
There are strong basic similarities between the penitentiary, both in its conception and in its operation, and the social structure of Western Europe of the medieval era, which has come to be widely referred to as Christendom. The penitentiary, a total institution with very definite geographic boundaries, features an ideology, a theology and a concept of the nature of the human being closely paralleling Christendom. The penitentiary exhibits power relations with similarities to the social structure, which dominated Western Europe in the thirteenth century, where the influence of the Roman Church and the Christian faith was very strong. From these very obvious similarities, it was decided to develop the metaphor further. It was decided to tease out the entailments as aids to an investigation of the decline of the penitentiary; this in turn provided the contextual framework for the analysis of the decline of the prison chaplain.

While it is contended that the concept of Christendom has close associations with the penitentiary, however this does not imply that either the Church or the state, whether independently, or in collaboration, had set out to deliberately recreate Christendom within the walls of the penitentiary. In fact, the concept of the Christendom of medieval times would have been repugnant to the Evangelicals, with their fervently anti-Catholic attitudes. The Evangelicals, heirs of the Reformation tradition, would have equated this social structure with 'popery', one of the most disparaging terms in their vocabulary. To use Hayek's concept, while the penitentiary has strong similarities with Medieval Christendom, this was 'of human action, but not of human design'. Nevertheless, there is a great irony inherent in the social structure of the penitentiary. To develop the entailments of the metaphor, a brief outline to the concept and practice of Christendom
The Concept of Christendom.

'Christendom' refers to the social structure within which Christianity, as expressed through the Roman Church, provided the institutional tradition and legitimacy, doctrine and behavioural prescriptions, which influenced the lives of many people in medieval times. In Christendom the Roman Church provided the rites associated with the important events of life: birth, death and marriage. From the cradle to the grave, the Roman Church provided meanings for its flock. At the height of Christendom, Christianity seeped into every aspect of life. In Jaques Ellul's view, it provided the framework in which the Roman Church could endeavour to control culture (Ellul, 1975; 8). For instance, the Roman Church, through the legitimacy associated with the office of the papacy, controlled the universities and had overall supervision of education (Ullmann, 1972; 244). This is but one important aspect of the power the Roman Church exercised, as Paulo Prodi notes,

In the golden age of the medieval papacy, temporal power was not only not a protagonist, but was almost entirely absent from the great debates on the origins of law and power, the elaboration of the great canonical studia and the daily life of the institutions (Prodi, 1987; 9).

In Ullman's view, in the thirteenth century, what held the disparate political entity of Europe together was the common faith, and that was largely fixed in its content and
parameters by the papacy (Ullmann, 1972; 251). There have been scholars who have contested the view that the Roman Church was as powerful in medieval times as is generally acknowledged. An example of this argument is advanced by Abercrombie et al, who argue that Roman Church did not provide a dominant ideology which held the classes together under the control of the culture of the ruling class (Abercrombie et al, 1980; 80,82). Abercrombie et al are not asserting, however, that the Roman Church was not a highly important institution; they were asserting that the ideal type of ideological dominance of the peasant class by the leading classes cannot be supported. Given the crude means of communication in this period, it is hardly a surprising conclusion to reach that an argument for an ideal-typical ideological dominance cannot be supported. For the purposes of this thesis, it is contended that the Roman Church was by far the most dominant institution of the time. Any institution that controls education, that can declare secular law invalid, change governing powers and rulers by papal tribunal judgements (Ullmann, 1972; 238) and claim a succession from the Disciples for each incumbent pope to speak for Christ (Thomson, 1980; xiii) in societies that tended to be intolerant of anything other than the Christian religion, has to be an important institution, notwithstanding that it does not ideologically dominate the peasantry in ideal-typical fashion. Judith Herrin's judgement is a sound one, acknowledging that the Roman Church was very powerful, but also cautioning that the society was not a monoculture.

While beliefs certainly did unite and restrict Medieval Christendom, they seem to me indefinitely more complex than they are often thought. There are a great many subversive aspects to belief, and medieval culture was more varied than
ecclesiastical leaders cared to admit (Herrin, 1989; 7).

In Berger's terms, Christendom was the major provider of 'plausibility structures' for the majority of the people of the society. The individual in Christendom was, even if nominally, a Christian. Professing something else could be a potentially hazardous undertaking as the Roman Church had stringent laws, which defined orthodoxy and heresy, and prescribed severe penalties for the latter. Christendom was a force, which, although not strictly a monoculture, strove to produce a monoculture, particularly in relation to the individual's plausibility structures.

Christendom not only significantly affected the life of the individual; it also deeply influenced the corporate life of society. Politically and ideologically, each ruler had to contend with the ecclesiastical authority, and in Christendom this was a formidable authority to deal with, as Frederick II, the Germanic prince and the would be Holy Roman Emperor, found out in his ill-fated attempts to re-establish imperial control over the papacy (Ullmann, 1972; 192).

Abercrombie et al did establish that Christendom is an ideal type. No society has existed where Christianity was entirely dominant, as Karl Marx believed was the case in medieval society. Even during the papacy of Innocent III, in the early twelfth century, which many scholars consider to be the zenith of the papacy and ecclesiastical influence, there were continual pockets of dissent and resistance. In spite of the intensive and repressive efforts of the Roman Church, there were people and groups who resisted
monoculture and the subjugation of the individual to the institution. Dissent and resistance varied widely: the pious Albigensians as well as the non-believers kept pressure on the ecclesiastical authorities. These groups were considered as an 'illness' and dealt with ruthlessly by ecclesiastical authority, much as a health authority would deal with a plague in its midst. It was considered by the popes to be a duty to keep Christendom as free as they possibly could of the heretics, who were potentially sources for the introduction of chaos into what the popes believed to be the God ordained society. It was the will of God to have a social structure where the individual had every opportunity to work out his salvation; it was the duty of the pope and the Roman Church to seek to bring about the will of God. In spite of rigorous efforts by the church, dissent and resistance were never entirely eliminated.

By the time of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, the papacy had consolidated its triumph over Frederick II and the Roman Church was unquestionably the pre-eminent power in Europe. Innocent III, in reality, presided over Christendom. The authenticity of the pope as the successor of the disciple Peter, whom posterity proclaimed as the 'first Bishop of Rome', was widely accepted as credible, even though the documents on which this status was based were later revealed to be palpable forgeries (Ullmann, 1972; 13). The office of the pope was widely revered. There was constancy in the office of the pope, which made it a focal point. The Crusades, the Inquisition, the capacity to actually appoint some princes of Christendom, all these pointed to the power the pope and Roman Church wielded, due mainly to the credibility they enjoyed by being seen as the successors in the lineage of the disciple Peter. They also point to the strongly anti-
pluralist position of the ecclesiastical authorities of the time. The ecclesiastical powers of Christendom were a powerful force for individual conformity: this is evidenced by the Roman church's animosity toward groups with different perceptions of reality. It is also evidenced by its claim to, and its demand of, a monopoly on the interpretation of reality, social and theological; and by its strong aspiration to widespread control through its mission to become a universal institution. The Roman Church wanted to create a land of followers whom it would guide along the path to salvation. As Ellul notes,

Christendom was the result of a conscious, deliberate process, 'how was Christian faith to permeate every area of life, public as well as private?' (Ellul, 1975; 1).

In contrast to its Eastern counterpart, based on the city of Constantinople, the church of Western European Christendom was focussed powerfully on divinity as opposed to history. The Roman Church held that the historical was of minor importance to ecclesiastical government, which was supra historical in nature (Ullmann, 1972; 23). It did benefit however, from historical edicts, such as that of 380 CE, when the Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire and that of 415, when Emperor Valentinain declared that nothing should be done against, or without, the authority of the Roman Church. The secular authority in the East was the main force in providing the plausibility structures of the society. Unlike the Roman Church, the Eastern Church was subsidiary to the secular authorities. The Roman Empire and its history was the main reference point in Eastern society.
By way of contrast the Roman Church of Western Europe, claiming its legitimacy from Peter, was very much a force to contend with. The popes sought to maintain Europe against the illness of heresy, which meant anything that threatened disintegration of, or struck at, the universalistic aspirations of the Roman Church. In particular the sects that threatened the principal of the priesthood-mediated divine favours were treated very harshly (Ullmann, 1972; 251). The ecclesiastical view of society was that it should be crafted to provide the best framework through which one could attain salvation; this presupposed the diffuse power of the Roman Church throughout this society in order to bring about this end. Ecclesiastical and secular power co-operated to establish and maintain Christendom, with the power of the Catholic Princes invoked at times to serve the political ends of the various popes. We have seen already, in Chapter Three, just how closely intertwined were the secular and the ecclesiastical with regard to the work of the chaplain in the penitentiary.

In medieval Christendom, the ecclesiastical was to the fore, the secular and temporal very much a background force. The Roman Church had the legitimacy and credibility, the monopoly on education, and the legal and administrative structures to maintain that pre-eminent position. It was the binding force. It also supplied the necessary legitimacy and credibility that Charlemagne harnessed to forge together, from a highly fragmented political and geographic mass that was Europe, the Holy Roman Empire. The Roman Church also had some fearful reprisals, such as excommunication, with which to threaten those who would oppose it. With its Petrine plenitude of power vested in the pope, the Roman Church, at the zenith of its powers in the medieval times, looked invincible. The
office of the pope, the incumbent of which was widely believed be the Vicar of Christ, survived some incumbents who could be variously described as criminal, corrupt, dissolute, and incompetent. This survival was only possible because it was the office that was to the fore, not the individual. The trial for the Roman Church and the papacy arrived with the Reformation.

From this outline of the essential features of Christendom, brief, but sufficient for the purposes of this thesis, the entailments of the novel metaphor developed for the investigation, 'the penitentiary as Christendom' are identified and listed below then further explicated.

The Entailments of the Metaphor 'The penitentiary as Christendom'.

The following are identified as the essential entailments of the metaphor.

(a). The penitentiary as the bulwark against heresy.

(b). The penitentiary as the supremacy of office over person.

(c). The penitentiary as the impersonalising force.

(d). The penitentiary as the reflection of the will of God.

(e). The penitentiary as the supremacy of divinity over history.

(f). The penitentiary as the land of the obedient.

The Penitentiary as the Bulwark against Heresy.

The early warning signs of disintegration of society were there as far as the members of the leading classes in Britain were concerned: the French Revolution, the Chartists, the
threat posed to capitalism in its infancy by the underclass. It was believed that underclass also posed a threat to social stability. Although he emphasises the concerns about the underclass as far back as the Reformation, The Reverend W. L. Clay expresses what many felt about the underclass at the time of the development of the penitentiary,

now that there were no monasteries to throw a sop to the open-mouthed evil, its ravenings began to alarm the public. Hangings by the wholesale, and other ferocious methods of repression were first tried; and after their failure, milder measures, the stock, whipping, "gaoling", and when the gaols became dangerously crowded, houses of correction and transportation (Clay, 1984; 7-8; reprint of nineteenth century publication).

There were certainly draconian laws in force, such as execution as the penalty for relatively minor offences. Although these penalties were more often than not commuted, the point is that they were there to endeavour to control the possibility of significant social disturbance. Also, the penalty of exile was a fearful and harsh one, and it was enforced often, until the colonies began to develop their own thriving economies and objected to the transported underclass, for essentially the same reasons as the leading classes of the mother country objected to the resident underclass. The underclass was a matter of grave concern at the social level, but they were also the nineteenth century's heretics. They were heretical in the sense that they were outside of the orthodoxy of the day. In the prisons, prior to the separate system and its backing by the state, they were often blasphemous toward the chaplains; Howard was very aware of this on his tours of
Orthodoxy complied with the laws of God, among the laws of God, so the leading classes believed, was the social structure and the descending order of authority. The heretical underclass did not respect the social structure.

The penitentiary, by the containing power of its very walls, defined the heretic. The heretic was the one who transgressed against the laws of the God-ordained society and threatened to bring chaos into the order of society. As with the heretics of early Christendom, the prisoner of the nineteenth century was a 'sick' person, someone who was bringing his 'plague' into society and thus someone who had to be 'cured' for the 'plague' to be combated. The penitentiary was very much a medical model, even though its language was ecclesiastical. The cure offered by the penitentiary was to bring about a clash between the forces of Good and the forces of Evil, in which it was believed that the forces of Good would prevail.

In the early penitentiary it was ecclesiastical language which defined the prisoner; and it was ecclesiastical language which defined the cure for the heretic. The penitentiary was the place where the prisoner had to be cured of his plague and gain an identity as a law abiding member of society. Much like medieval Christendom, there was one identity that was acceptable in the penitentiary and that identity was the 'Christian'. The prisoner was acceptable if, and only if, he accepted the Christian precepts presented to him by the chaplain and exhibited acceptable behaviour; he otherwise remained the heretic.

Medieval Christendom used all manner of measures against those who transgressed and
carried the plague. Christendom was to be preserved at all costs, for it was Christendom, which provided the best opportunities to preserve the immortal soul through the God given order. The penitentiary of the nineteenth century was created to transform heretics into believers: believers in the God-given order and believers in the orthodox soteriology. The prisoner was as much an alien in the penitentiary as he was when transported to a new land. The prisoner in the penitentiary was now in the land heavily influenced by the Church and the clergy: the land of chaplains, bibles, liturgies and compulsory chapel. As with those medieval ecclesiastics who were threatened by any sign of pluralism, so those who sought, through the penitentiary, to preserve soul and society were averse to pluralism. A structure of Christendom was created in the penitentiary by Church and state, and the Church, as in medieval times, had power through determining the foundational understandings and its monopoly on the reform effort. As in medieval times, where the state and Church worked to endeavour to create and enforce a Christian monoculture, so the penitentiary was the nineteenth century bulwark against heresy. However, even a cursory analysis of such a structure for the penitentiary would raise doubts about the likely success of the venture; it was based on a social structural model that was an historical and theological anachronism, it was not a model that was evident in the society outside the prison walls. In the wider society, pluralism was becoming more evident.

The Penitentiary as the Supremacy of the Institution over the Individual.

We have seen that the height of the Roman Church's influence was at the time when the office of the papacy was far more important than the individual incumbents of that office.
This supremacy was connected to the widely held belief that the pope was the successor of Peter; the Petrine line gave the popes a legitimacy that overshadowed their individual characters and placed them on a metaphysical plane, irrespective of how corrupt or profligate they were. The golden age of the papacy (and the Roman Church) in terms of its power and influence was prior to the Renaissance, which brought forth a humanistic focus and critique.

The prison chaplain of the nineteenth century did not have this lineage, which had so much to do with the pervasive influence of medieval Christendom. The Christendom of the penitentiary was constructed in an age where pluralism and humanism were themselves becoming increasingly influential: the seeds of secularisation were already in place. There was certainly a belief in the office of the chaplain, beginning with the recommendations of Howard. The early supporters of the separate system were, in essence, advocating the supremacy of office over individual when they were devising the penitentiary. The chaplain was seen very much in Durkheimian terms as the integrating force of the prison reform effort. The structure of the penitentiary, however, could not function as the Petrine line myth did for the popes of medieval Christendom. The Christendom of the penitentiary had to be enforced, as we saw in the previous chapter. While the Christendom of medieval times was also created, it did not have to be enforced as rigorously as the Christendom of the penitentiary, it was widely accepted as legitimate. The legitimacy of the chaplain was not recognized by those living in the institutional Christendom of the nineteenth century penitentiary. As we shall see in the following chapter this was to be a major cause of the failure of the penitentiary and a contributing
factor in the decline of the chaplain.

In the nineteenth century, the voices of criticism from the developing social and physical sciences were increasing even as the separate system was developing and being constructed. The main challenge to religion, though, would be in the second half of the nineteenth century and religion continued to be the main provider of plausibility structures. Nevertheless, a number of factors militated against the successful establishment of Christendom within the walls of the penitentiary. The Enlightenment legacy of rationality, the use of the social sciences to criticise the notions of the literal truth of the scriptures, the alienation of the underclass from church and scriptures; all militated against the re-establishment of Christendom. The structure of the penitentiary could not provide legitimacy for the chaplain. Again, as we shall see in the following chapter, the belief in the office of the chaplain over the individual incumbent of the position was anachronistic. This belief belonged to the golden age of medieval Christendom. There was to be no winding back of the clock.

The Roman Church of the medieval times operated in a world where the educated and articulate were heavily represented among its ecclesiastical ranks, or among its followers. The Roman Church provided the foundational knowledge on which the medieval world functioned; the world was interpreted religiously. While Abercrombie et al make a valid point about the dominant ideology; the Roman Church was certainly the dominant knowledge base for Western Europe of the time. The Roman Church was ever vigilant to root out the heretic and those who opposed its doctrines, dogmas and policies and it was
in a position to do so. The maintenance of Christendom required not only dominance via the knowledge base, but also the backing of the military power of the secular princes. Christendom was a structure created to socialize the individual in the context of Christian values and doctrine (Norman, 1992; 24). In medieval times, the individual was promoted as being subservient to the institution, as the Church strove to bring everyone within its influence and jurisdiction. The Evangelicals of the Church, advocates of the penitentiary, were seeking to create those conditions. They were successful in obtaining the backing of the state, although the backing came, not from the state being necessarily convinced about the legitimacy of the theology, but from hope and political expediency. Here there were differences in relation to the medieval Christendom. Many of the secular rulers of the medieval world were very committed to the Roman Church and convinced of its legitimacy.

In medieval Christendom, the Roman Church had definite universalistic aspirations. Those supporters of the separate system also sought to bring the entire prison system under the influence of the separate system. There were probably no more energetic and committed people than Whitworth Russell and Crawford, the separate system advocating inspectors of prisons. They worked tirelessly and their reports were effusive in their praise of the system in operation (Burt, 1984; 5; reprint of nineteenth century publication). The Christendom of the penitentiary, too, subjugated the individual to the institution. The individual prisoner was to be reared and socialized in the milieu of Christian values. The entire structure of the penitentiary was developed to this end.
A major problem with establishing Christendom in the penitentiary was that it was ultimately reductionist. In a society that was developing rapidly and making advances in the physical sciences and, particularly from the second half of the nineteenth century, in the social sciences, a penitential and soteriological base was always going to be under scrutiny as being too narrowly conceived. The medieval Christendom was established on ecclesiastical concepts, as was the penitentiary, however a Christendom in a nineteenth century public institution was not going to have the same level of credibility. Although, as noted, associationism was a shared concept between religious and secular thought, the penitentiary was a total institution in a much more pluralistic world that which existed in medieval times. The reform effort was based on a simplistic foundational understanding in an increasingly sophisticated society.

The advocates of the early penitentiary did not incorporate important factors into their considerations of reform in the prisons. Their understandings of the underclass were very limited; they had little understanding of the raw material that they were to feed into the machine they had created. To the advocates of the separate system, it was the institution that prevailed in their thinking above the individual. The effects of the separate system on the prisoners attest to the fact that the individual was subjugated to the institution, as in medieval times. In the penitentiary, the grand narrative of the soteriological and ideological quest meant that the individual had to be incorporated into it. The complexities of the prison were not countenanced, in either conception or practice, in a fledgling system steeped in the belief, and the hope, that one foundational understanding, biblical orthodoxy, could bring about the desired reformative effect in the prisoners.
Hepworth Dixon reports a prisoner he encountered at Preston Gaol, who was engaged in the rote learning of biblical texts. It was a common practice of the chaplains to give the prisoners biblical texts to recite. The prisoner, ‘was reading the marriage of Cana with the rapidity of an elocutionist: but being asked what was the meaning of marriage, he stared blankly and replied, "They did no' tell me ony o' th' meanings!" (Priestly, 1985; 104).

The early prison was reductionist and minimalist in its orientation. In ways the penitentiary was an historical anachronism, in a society that was developing in pluralistic and humanistic directions.

In medieval Christendom, the institution was revered above the individual. Christendom was established to direct the individual toward salvation and the Deity was held to act through the clerics of the Roman Church. The institution of the pope was revered, notwithstanding some dubious individuals who occupied the office. The Christendom of the penitentiary was also created to guide the individual in the defined soteriological and social reformative directions. The chaplain was the lynchpin of this system, however there was little reverence for the office of chaplain, as opposed to the office of the medieval clerics, particularly the pope. Obedience was enforced, but reverence for the office was not there. The chaplain in the penitentiary was almost totally reliant on secular authority compared with the control exercised in medieval Christendom, where the secular world was often reliant on legitimation from Roman Church.

The Penitentiary as the Impersonalising Force.
Medieval Christendom had a tendency to place restrictions on the expression of individuality: its purpose was to create 'Christians', not persons, rather in the manner of the office of the papacy diminishing the importance of, and relevance of, the personalities of the popes. The coming of Renaissance humanism challenged this restricting ecclesiastical definition, where the individual was perceived mostly in terms of spirit. This limiting, impersonalising concept of the human being gradually retreated before the humanist critique.

In the nineteenth century, humanism was well established. It was not surprising then that humanism generated considerable criticism of the penitentiary, which also functioned on a limiting and impersonalising notion of the human being. In Britain, substantial humanist criticism came from writers such as Percy Shelley (Reed, 1997; 43). These writers often criticised the orthodox religious assumptions of human nature. Shelley expressed his ideas in the publication Queer Mob. For his efforts Shelley was accused of blasphemous and seditious libel, particularly when he wrote on topics such as materialistic philosophy, which was seen in the early nineteenth century as threatening to religion, the idea of the immortal soul, and hence to the moral fibre of society. Queer Mob was subsequently banned.

Increasing numbers of critics railed against the impersonalising system of the penitentiary, which sought to mould prisoners to ecclesiastical formulations (Dixon, 1985; 411; reprint of nineteenth century publication). Criticism was not only forthcoming from individuals. The London Times had kept up a long campaign against the separate
system on the grounds that it created mental instability; 'this maniac making system' as 
The Times referred to the separate system (Priestly, 1985; 141).

The medievals made strong endeavours to stifle thought which challenged the accepted 
ideas of Christianity, the philosopher Giordano Bruno and the scientist Galileo being 
notable examples. In this they achieved some degree of success. By comparison, threats 
and sanctions, both for this life and the next, were nowhere near as convincing in the 
nineteenth century as in medieval times. Secularisation was becoming more strongly 
influential in the nineteenth century (Chadwick, 1975;  27), and Deism was a legitimate 
movement in theological, if not ecclesiastical thought. The penitentiary was grounded in 
orthodox biblical understandings and the Church was still influential enough to have the 
penitentiary established on the anxieties of the leading classes. While the Church was still 
influential and the penitentiary was established, there were alternative understandings of 
the world developing. Secularisation and pluralism were developing quickly and the 
future of an ecclesiastically dominated public institution was always going to be under 
attack, even if it did produce results. In ecclesiastical terms, the nineteenth century was 
not the 'kairos' for the penitentiary. In other words, the time was not right for this 
reductionist, impersonalising approach and for a medieval Christendom to be re-imposed.

Pluralism was publicly evident in the nineteenth century. It was a tide that the Church, 
even if it wished to, could not stem. Public expressions of disbelief in God, or religion, or 
criticism of the Church, would not bring such a cataclysmic response from authority,
secular or ecclesiastical, as would have been the case in medieval times. As was noted with the response to Shelley's (and other) publications, and the gaoling of people for blasphemy, the Church still had considerable influence, but the Church lacked the power and influence of the Roman Church of medieval times. The secular authority now, unlike in medieval times, experienced the ecclesiastical authority as but one, albeit an important one, of a number of pressure groups competing for its rulings and action. The penitentiary was, in essence, an attempt to re-impose an impersonalising definition of the human being that was operational centuries beforehand. This reactionary definition ignored the movements of the ensuing period, which were creating and reinforcing the notions of being 'human' as opposed to being Christian.

Even though it was put into practice within the context of a total institution, the separate system was always going to attract attention from the articulate and influential critics sympathetic to humanism. Reactionary attempts to impose old paradigms of the nature of the human being and discredited models of society, that is, Christendom, were destined to find strong opposition; the spirit of the times was beginning to move in an opposite direction, and was gaining momentum.

Foucault, when seeking to account for the emergence of the prison, argued that the human being was already much regulated and impersonalised by the disciplines in other institutions, such as the hospitals and the barracks. This is true, however religious regulation was little evident in British society. The Protestants had, in a highly symbolic act, destroyed the monasteries after the Reformation, as an act of rejection of the
regulation of the Roman Church. Religious regulation was now being reimposed in the penitentiary. The disciplines, introduced into the prisons following the decline of the penitentiary, were severe (Priestly, 1985; 118). These disciplines, however, did not attract near the amount of criticism as was directed to the penitentiary. It was specifically the religious regulation that was being criticised, as it was contrary to the times.

**The Penitentiary as the 'Will of God'.**

The Christendom of the penitentiary was moving against the spirit of the times. While there was a strong body of committed Christians in the nineteenth century, the society was much more pluralistic, and publicly so, than medieval Christendom. The nineteenth century citizen of Britain was no longer a 'Christian', in the medieval sense of living in Christendom. Into this society came the penitentiary, the total institution, with ecclesiastical and ideological links to a social structure long defunct. The question arises as to why the idea of the penitentiary could be countenanced and embraced at this point in time when pluralism was on the increase.

Foucault argues persuasively that the prison came at that period in time when the 'disciplines' were widely established, an invention of the Enlightenment (Foucault, 1977; 222). The disciplines were able to regulate human behaviour and were used extensively, Foucault argues, in the establishment of the hospitals and other institutions as well as the prison. The disciplines had strong links into institutions established long before the prison; very important among these institutions was the military. The disciplines were certainly evident in the penitentiary of England. However, Foucault's account, as noted
by Ignatieff, ‘retains the secular rationalist tone of its initial Enlightenment formulation’ (Ignatieff, 1983; 88).

This is a serious problem for understanding the penitentiary in Britain, and in particular for understanding the function of the chaplain, for as Ignatieff observes, ‘Foucault's neglect of the religious vernacular of reform argument obscures the deep hold which this symbolic drama of public guilt and repentance held for the Victorian imagination’ (Ignatieff, 1983; 92).

In the penitentiary, the mode of cure was repentance, discipline being a contributor to the cure, not the cure itself. The penitentiary was aimed at convincing the prisoner of the moral legitimacy of the rulers. The reformers had always had as part of their campaign that good physical and hygiene conditions of the prison should reflect the moral superiority of the state. They wanted to bring the prisoner and the leading classes back to a shared moral universe (Ignatieff, 1978; 213). It was the orthodox, biblically based faith of the reformers, which gave the penitentiary its unique form. Buttressing this faith was the God who had ordained the structure of the society. The God of the reformers is the God who intervenes in the world and supports the servants, who are seeking to bring about God's ends: those ends were seen as the preservation of the God-ordained society and the salvation of the individual. As in the medieval Christendom, it was assumed that those occupying the upper levels of the descending authority had to educate the lower echelons about God's ways. It was the will of God, which was being enacted in the penitentiary, and the chaplain was the persuader, the one who was to encourage reflection...
to engender guilt and repentance.

The support for the reforms of the prison system came heavily from the Evangelicals and the religious philanthropists of the time. The theological understandings of these Christians tended to be literalist and optimistic. In their view, it was the Will of God that human beings were to be saved from eternal damnation; it was the responsibility of the Christians of the day to co-operate in that process. The state could be part of that process and, as far as the reformers were concerned, would be part of that process. The penitentiary was a microcosm of the model of medieval Christendom, which was the means of affording each person the opportunity of working out their salvation. The penitentiary was, in sum, the will of God. In the penitentiary, the activity of the chaplain and the backing of the Church would legitimate the structure of society; God would legitimate the chaplain.

Heavy blows were to be inflicted on orthodox biblical views in the second half of the nineteenth century, but at this point in time God was a contender in the public policy and reform arena, and the chaplain, charged with bringing about God's Will of repentance and salvation, was in the ascendency in the prison. Like the papacy of the medieval time, the chaplain's duty, as God's servant in the penitentiary, was to create an atmosphere conducive to the realisation of salvation. The chaplain had the added brief of social reform of the underclass.

The Penitentiary as the Supremacy of Divinity over History.
We have seen that, in the medieval world, the church developed in markedly different ways in Rome and Constantinople. The Petrine connection in Rome had thrust the Roman Church into a prominent position in the social and political arena. In Constantinople, the church was subsidiary to the secular power, something akin to the contemporary Church of England, having a prominent legitimating and ceremonial function, but with minimal social authority and power. In Rome, Christendom emerged because the world was interpreted religiously, rather than historically as in Constantinople. The Roman church wielded very considerable power and was a force to be contended with, it was the sentinel of the gates of Heaven.

In the nineteenth century there was no inevitability about the penitentiary model coming about in the prison, rather there was the possibility. The Church of England was not the sentinel of the gates of Heaven. The penitentiary, although religious in conception, was thrust forward by secular impetus. That the penitentiary came into being was based on hope, rather than conviction on the part of secular authorities. In the Christendom of medieval times there was a conviction about the Petrine lineage that permeated society, in the Christendom of the penitentiary there was no such strong ideological base, whereas in the Christendom of the penitentiary was wholly dependent upon the state continually acting in the role of a Charlemagne, the papal protector, for its survival. The modern British state however was not prepared to be a nineteenth century Charlemagne, at least not indefinitely. There was no doubting the conviction of the reformers, however there was every reason to doubt the secular authority, which was looking to results from the penitentiary. The state was an empiricist, not a metaphysician. It was the social, more
than the metaphysical transgressor that the state wished to see transformed. The state was looking very much from the Durkheimian view, to the power of religion to 'integrate' disparate elements in society.

In the nineteenth century, there was a sense in which there was an epiphany brought to the prison, and brought by secular decree. In other words, there was a sense in which God 'appeared' in the prison and appeared quite suddenly with the coming of Christendom. This was unlike the medieval Christendom, which had developed gradually. Until Howard's crusade, the prison had been in the control of private citizens in Britain; these local entrepreneurs had control of the prison, virtually without magisterial review. Now the prison was given a Christian base, by secular decree, much as the Christendom of medieval times had been initially confirmed by decrees of the secular authority of Rome, which buttressed the religious authority of the Bishop of Rome. Once decreed, the Bishops of Rome, the men in the Petrine line, began to build what was to be the empire of medieval Christendom. Successions of popes maintained the supremacy of divinity over history by the force of their perceived legitimacy, with occasional resort to military intervention, as well as the political funambulism of some of the popes.

In the Christendom of the penitentiary, it was the chaplain who was charged with this responsibility of maintaining divinity over history. There can be no underestimating of this responsibility as, unlike the papal responsibility of medieval Christendom, the chaplain had very little popular support among his flock and very little voluntary recognition of his claim to authority. The reformers succeeded in having their religious
agenda transformed into public policy and acquiring state backing, but the times were not medieval. With neither ideological backing nor appeal to lineage, the credentials of the chaplain were tenuous, at best.

While an orthodox interpretation of the Christian scriptures created hope for the transforming power of God to be prominent, it was the responsibility of the chaplain to work in the field to reap the harvest of souls. By secular decree, divinity had triumphed over history in the total institution that was the penitentiary, but as we shall see in the following chapter this was only a temporary phenomenon, because the penitentiary contained its own contradictions. In medieval times Christendom had a strong base by virtue of its widely recognized legitimacy and this base was the key to the supremacy of divinity over history, whereas in the nineteenth century penitentiary the victory of divinity over history was hollow and short lived as this Christendom was artificial and imposed. The penitentiary, in its initial form, barely survived the 1840's before modifications to the period of solitary confinement began to take place. Given that the institution of the penitentiary was flawed from the imposition of an anachronistic historical model, the authority and legitimacy of the chaplain would never be sufficient to sustain the Christendom so established.

**The Penitentiary as the Land of the Obedient.**

Medieval Christendom had its heretics and recalcitrants, whom it was continually harassing and persecuting. There was, however, a widespread recognition of, and obedience to, the Roman Church, particularly among the leading classes. The Roman
Church was seen as the legitimate interpreter of reality and it was the provider of the language to define that reality. Its edicts were widely accepted. Many feared its sanctions, particularly the sanction of excommunication. In short the medieval church, in creating Christendom, created a land of the obedient, not exclusively, but predominantly.

Post-Reformation times were less likely to produce the obedient than the pre-Reformation times. The Reformation had severely questioned authority and tradition. The Reformation had introduced radical concepts such as: the priesthood of all believers; contact with God not needing to be mediated through a priest; and individual reading of the scriptures by the laity. There was a questioning of, and ultimately less reliance upon, ecclesiastical tradition and dogma. The Protestant denominations could not command obedience in the manner of the Roman Church of medieval times. Obedience toward the chaplain in the penitentiary would always be contingent upon the application of state power.

Consideration of the entailments of the metaphor, 'the penitentiary as Christendom' opened up a number of areas of enquiry. The penitentiary period was the last period in which the paradigm of the human being as sinner and soul was credible in the establishment of public policy for the prison system. While it was credible for the establishment of the separate system, it did not last for long and this is the subject for consideration in the following chapter.

The investigation raised important similarities and distinctions between the Christendom
of medieval times and the Christendom of the penitentiary. With regard to the similarities, both systems endeavoured to impose Christian thought and ideals, albeit of varying kinds, onto their respective populations. Both endeavoured to make their influence as pervasive as possible and both were willing to use secular power to enforce this when the need to use such power was indicated. Importantly, both systems failed.

While the similarities are numerous, there are important distinctions between the two Christendoms. The most important distinctions are between their bases of support and legitimacy and the ecclesiastical milieu of the respective times. The Christendom of the penitentiary was going to have a highly doubtful future, because the ecclesiastical status of the Church of England was not as prominent as the Roman Church of medieval times. In the wider society of the early nineteenth century, while the Church still had significant influence, history was supreme over divinity. The Church of the time functioned like that of medieval Constantinople, not medieval Rome. The imposition of a Roman structure onto a Constantinople-like society, albeit within a total institution, would likely generate problems, which is precisely what happened.

These structural problems translated themselves into practice problems for the chaplain. As the person charged with administering the clash between the forces of Good and the forces of Evil, he not only was given significant power, but he also had very significant expectations placed upon him. The chaplain, lacking the Petrine-like credibility necessary for the successful maintenance of Christendom, began his decline from the heights; a decline in parallel with the decline of the separate system which had elevated him, a
CHAPTER FIVE.  
THE FAILURE OF THE PENITENTIARY  
AS THE FAILURE OF CHRISTENDOM.  

The previous chapter explored the metaphor of the penitentiary as Christendom. It was found that a structure, approximating the medieval social structure, was superimposed onto a nineteenth century public, total institution. Both medieval Christendom and the Christendom of the penitentiary faltered and ultimately failed. The failure of the medieval Christendom will be used as a reference to examine the failure of the penitentiary. 

During the papacy of Innocent III, (1198-1216) the Roman Church had shown itself more than capable of withstanding the attempts to subjugate it to secular Romanism (Ullmann, 1972; 192, 221). Frederick II wanted to establish descending power from the Emperor to the pope; this of course was unacceptable to the papacy. It was the papacy that prevailed.
The primacy of the papacy, however, was to come under further challenge. As S.J. Barnett states, ‘By the sixteenth century a gradual erosion of Church power in relation to princely power was already evident and there was often a bitter dissatisfaction with the nature of the Church’ (Barnett, 1999; 2).

The catalyst, with relation to severely limiting the power of the Roman Church, came with the Reformation in 1517. It was then that Martin Luther nailed his ninety-five theses to the door of the Church at Wittenberg. While there had been harbingers to the Reformation in John Wyclif and Jan Hus, Luther's was the momentous the action that propelled the Reformation. The Reformation shook the foundations of the monolithic Roman Church; it challenged the performance, the credibility, and the legitimacy of the Roman Church and the Bishop of Rome. Importantly, it challenged the priest as the mediator between man and God and the Roman Church as the interpreter of the meaning of the Christian sacred writings and the custodian of those writings. The Reformation was an event from which the Roman Church never recovered in terms of the extent of its influence and power; it was also the death knell for Christendom.

While the Reformation was the critical event, which brought about the ultimate failure of Christendom, there were other precursors that were already undermining the power and influence of the papacy and the Roman Church, upon which Christendom was built. The failure of medieval Christendom was a complex matter and in this chapter there will be an endeavour to relate these precursors to the intertwined events of the failure of the penitentiary and the decline of the chaplain.
The Chaplain: a Vassal, not a Pope.

The pope of medieval Christendom had a 'plenitude of power'. It was long held by the papacy and the Roman Church that the popes stood in a Petrine line as the head of the Roman Church. As Ullmann notes of the papacy, ‘It was held to be the most exalted kind of monarchy, because established by Divinity itself’ (Ullmann, 1972; 22).

The concept of the Petrine line established the pope in power and was a major force in maintaining the pope's power and influence. This was not a confusing concept, as long as there was one universally identifiable and confirmed pope. Such was not the case during the Great Schism, which commenced in 1378; then there were two popes, one sitting in Rome and the other in Avignon and both had considerable backing (Thomson, 1980; xv.). It was during this schism, that the secular powers, the princes, made considerable inroads into controlling the power of the papacy. The Roman Church had spoken with one voice through the popes; now with the advent of the schism there were different popes and different voices, with different political and military allegiances. The schism led to the advancement of movements such as Conciliarism, which helped to undermine the pope's plenitude of power and, in turn, undermine Christendom.

By comparison with the power of the popes, the chaplain’s power did not emanate from a widely held certitude about the legitimacy of his own office to wield power in the prison. Certainly he had no legitimacy with the population he would call his 'flock' or his congregation. The chaplain was backed by secular powers, but these secular powers were
hopeful with regard to his interventions, rather than convinced of his credentials. Unlike
the popes of Christendom, the chaplain had no powers, such as excommunication,
inherent in his office, with which to threaten or sanction people to enforce his will. In the
exclusively Protestant chaplaincy of the penitentiary, there was no intrinsic power,
emanating from his own office, which the chaplain wielded; punishment for the
transgressor had to be meted out by the state. As we have seen, the Church of England
could lay no claim to the allegiance of the underclass, even pastorally, let alone
theologically or ideologically. The underclass was not part of the Church of England, so
its members could hardly be excommunicated from it. The chaplain of the penitentiary
had no tradition to invoke, as did the pope, the chaplain had little power to wield that
emanated from tradition. It is true that the chaplain had the grand narrative of soteriology,
but the underclass knew little of this grand narrative: it was not a tool with which the
chaplain could gain ready compliance, rather the underclass had to be socialised into it; it
had to become part of their system of meaning for it to have any effect.

In the penitentiary, the relationship between the ecclesiastical and secular powers was not
as it was between the Roman Church and the secular powers at the zenith of medieval
Christendom. The Roman Church provided the widely accepted universe maintaining
meaning systems from its own legitimacy, the Church of England was but promoting
them in the penitentiary, not through its widely accepted legitimacy, but in an artificial
way through the backing of the state. The penitentiary was a novel structure in the
nineteenth century with no precedent, or ecclesiastical tradition to support it.
The impetus to the chaplain as the lynchpin of the penitentiary had its base more solidly in the secular exercise of power, rather than a purely innate ecclesiastical power. The chaplain, although being given power and authority, was basically in his position of prominence as long as he had use value for the state. He was, in reality, a vassal; yet a vassal who was expected to carry out a soteriological task which would have necessitated the power and legitimacy of the medieval popes to implement. The reformers would not have agreed with this analysis. The reformers certainly had visions of the chaplain as a person who would exercise power. Their concept, however, was more rooted in metaphysics. The state would provide the framework, but the chaplain in his practice would manifest power. It was not a power vested in an office, rather this power was the power of God as outlined in the scriptures and to be harnessed by the chaplain. The reformers knew their Bible and they knew that, ‘Indeed, the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides soul from spirit, joints from marrow; it is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart’ (Hebrews 4:12).

The reformers, from Howard on, had a faith that the gospel was the most powerful force to apply to the human mind to bring about change. The chaplain, Joseph Kingsmill expressed the sentiment well when he wrote, ‘the application of the gospel is the best remedy for the worst diseases of man's depraved nature’ (Kingsmill, 1984; 342; reprint of nineteenth century publication).

The power that it was envisioned the chaplain would exercise was most unlike that exercised by the pope of medieval Christendom, the pope’s power being an institutional
power. The chaplain's power was very 'Protestant'. Curiously, though, these anti-Catholic, Evangelical reformers of the Protestant tradition were building their own Christendom within the penitentiary, a structure remarkably similar to the one that Protestant leaders from the Reformation onward had roundly condemned when differentiating themselves from the Roman Church.

The authority of the chaplain was tenuous, as it became heavily reliant on state power to promote the chaplain's ends. The chaplain was utilising state power but, paradoxically, as a vassal. The state was hoping that he could exercise power to the ends of the state. Continual reliance on the state, which was becoming the broker of different interests, can be a hazardous enterprise; the state can be a fickle taskmaster. The power of the state can elevate, but it can also relegate, which the chaplain was to find out in due course, just as the popes of medieval Christendom found out with the emergence of the European states, prior to and in the wake of the Reformation. The state contributed heavily to the failure of the earlier Christendom (Prodi, 1987; 182) and the state also played the central role in the failure of the penitentiary, which heralded the decline of the chaplain. It is to the role of the state in the decline of chaplain that we now turn our attention.

**The State and the Decline of the Chaplain.**

The gradual fragmentation of Europe into autonomous political entities from the second half of the thirteenth century began a process that placed increasing pressure on the Roman Church. These political entities would become national monarchies, or states, and would develop a nationalism, which would have fundamental divergences in aim and
outlook to the Roman Church (Ullmann, 1972; 276,277). The Roman church vigorously promoted universalism. It was to the advantage of the church, in politics as much as mission, to have the influence of the church universally. The wider the church's influence and the greater the population of adherents, the more political as well as soteriological influence the church could wield. In medieval times, the population of Western Europe was 'Christian'. The emergence of the nation states, however, began to offer people another identity, namely that of 'citizen' of the nation state. This identity, which was welcomed by many of the princes of Christendom, was a moderating influence on the power of Rome.

While the structure of medieval Christendom and the penitentiary were similar, their populations were dissimilar; the inmates of the penitentiary had allegiance to neither Christianity, nor the state. In the prison, there were convergences of the teleological objectives of both Church and state; both wanted to reinforce the existing social structure. There were few prisoners capable of making the fine distinctions between them: Church (and chaplain) and state were part of the same repressive system for the prisoner.

The nineteenth century state put pressure on the Church and the chaplain in different ways to the pressures placed on the Roman Church by the emerging nation state of medieval Christendom. In the medieval church it was the emergence of the state, per se, with its national identity militating against the universalism of the Roman Church, which was problematic. For the nineteenth century Church it was the emergence of the state as the broker of competing interests, which was problematic. The Church was but one of an
increasing number of interest groups in the society and it did not have the institutional power of the Roman Church. The continuing power of the chaplain and the Church in the prison was contingent upon results; there was no innate legitimacy of office to buttress failures, which was the haven of the Roman Church under corrupt popes. The nineteenth century Church had the backing of the state, because it still held out the possibility of reform after the state's endeavours to quell crime with draconian punishments had been an abject failure. In short, at the inception of the penitentiary, there was little in the way of alternatives for the state to broker in terms of reform strategies for the criminal, who was alarming the leading classes.

The secular power of the nineteenth century did not have as close a tie with the Church as the secular powers had with Roman Church in medieval times. The Roman Church had to be contended with as the major provider of universe maintaining meaning systems. The Church as the provider of meaning systems was not so exclusive in the nineteenth century; other ideas and knowledge systems had entered the arena and began to mount challenges to the Church. In the period to the inception of the penitentiary, these ideas and knowledge systems had not translated themselves into strategies for the reform of the person and hence were not serious contenders for application in the prison. The penitentiary was a Christendom, whose structure was heavily buttressed by the state. It was a Christendom maintained by the power of the state as long as it had use value for the state, it was not maintained by the power of religious tradition and ideology.

The state in the nineteenth century was the legitimate ruling power. The power of the
chaplain in the penitentiary was not an intrinsic power of the office, but a grant made by the state in the hope that the penitentiary would help to bring greater order into the wider social and economic arrangements of the society. The state, in effect, brought an epiphany to the prison: an epiphany in the service of the state. This was one of history's uncelebrated epiphanies, in fact unmentioned by the contemporary churches. It was also the state that watched, and judged, as the chaplain sought to sustain the epiphany and consolidate the Christendom of the prison. Christendom and the epiphany were in the prison at the state's pleasure.

**Penitentiary Christendom and its Contradictions.**

Regularly, throughout his many writings, Karl Marx theorised that capitalism contained its own contradictions (McLellan, 1977; 132,176,191,387). Marx believed that the interests of what he termed the ruling class and capital were contradictory to the interests of the worker, the provider of labour power. The tensions inherent in the contradiction between labour and capital would destroy the capitalist mode of production, so Marx predicted. While the notion of the collapse of capitalism through its own contradictions may seem Millenialist, there is a value in the notion of institutions and other phenomena containing their own contradictions. This notion did not originate with Marx, however it is not the intention in this thesis to explore the aetiology of the concept, but, rather, to apply it, as there is evidence that there are contradictions in medieval Christendom, which can be usefully explored in relation to contradictions within the penitentiary.

Medieval Christendom contained its contradictions. For example, the encouragement by
various popes of intellectual, artistic and literary endeavours assisted the development of Humanism (Ullmann, 1972; 251,267), which was gradually undermining the office of the papacy by building the platform for critique of the performance of the popes, rather than maintaining reverence for the office of the papacy itself. The Reformation indicated that the advance of Humanist thinking had invaded ecclesiastical circles; Luther's initial criticisms in his ninety-five theses were essentially ethical, many focussing on the actions of those in the hierarchy of the Roman Church, rather than on matters more theological in their nature. Contradictions helped to set in motion the demise of medieval Christendom. The decline of the penitentiary was also promoted by the contradictions inherent in it and these will be explored below.

The Contradiction of 'the Manufactured Epiphany'.

Through the penitentiary, a nineteenth century form of Christendom was established and an epiphany brought to the prison system. Epiphanies were not uncommon claims in medieval times. There were thousands of pilgrims on the roads to various shrines during these times, because of the association of these places with relics of a saint, or saints, and/or of an epiphany. In the increasingly pluralistic and rationalistic world of the nineteenth century, however, epiphanies were not common claims. A world that, in post medieval times, had experienced the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and the continual rise of Humanism and Deism was not about to unquestioningly accept an epiphany. Epiphanies are most readily accepted when the element of mystery is present. The contradiction of the penitentiary was that this epiphany was clearly manufactured. The 'presence' of God in the penitentiary was an epiphany by legislation. The epiphany thus
contradicted the element of mystery that had been one of the prerequisites for making an epiphany credible in earlier times and to a more religiously oriented population than that of the prison.

The epiphany of the penitentiary was not a matter of decision for the prisoner in terms of belief; it was an imposition from the state and the prison authorities. This epiphany did not bring hope, but represented a judgement about the life of the prisoner by both the state and the Church. Traditionally, epiphanies brought some form of hope to the believers: hope of salvation, hope of change, hope of healing are some examples of what was hoped for by the believer. Hope emerged for the believer from the metaphysical mystery, which, for the believer, was the essence of the epiphany. The penitentiary epiphany brought neither mystery nor hope. The penitentiary was not an encouraging setting for an epiphany. The penitentiary brought regularity, austerity and discipline at best, and suffering and mental disturbance at worst. The penitentiary was not the place to expect that a blatantly manufactured epiphany would work. The epiphany of the penitentiary contained its own contradiction from the outset.

**The Contradiction of Ecclesiastical Hegemony in a Multi-Denominational Environment.**

The penitentiary came into being three centuries after the Reformation had further challenged the already waning power of the Roman Church and dealt the final blow to the faltering medieval Christendom. The initial ecclesiastical division had been between the Eastern and Western centres of the Roman Empire, namely Rome and
Constantinople. To all intents and purposes, and notwithstanding this division and the later Great Schism between Rome and Avignon, the Roman Church of Christendom was an hegemony in Western Europe. Other sects were, by definition, 'heretics' to be quelled and, if possible, eliminated. Hegemony for the Roman Church was a long-standing aspiration to further its soteriological and secular political purposes. The hegemony for the Roman Church was in a sense the natural outflow of the Petrine line claim, which was by and large accepted in Western Europe.

Conversely, ecclesiastical hegemony in the nineteenth century penitentiary had to be grafted onto the structure; it came about by default. The state endowed the Church of England, a Church with many detractors among Dissenters in the wider society, into an ecclesiastical hegemony in a penitentiary Christendom, and this in spite of the growing popularity of the Dissenter churches. These churches had developed an enthusiastic following since the Evangelical Revival of the previous century. The Church of England providing chaplains to the penitentiary was a move, which, as pointed out in Chapter Three, was a disaster in terms of their clergy being in a social class with little or no understanding of the underclass. The predictable consequence of this was that the Church of England chaplain seldom related to the prisoners in any meaningful way. Some of the dissenting clergymen were at least socio-economically closer to the prisoner. Importantly, they were not engaged as magistrates, which would have aligned them with the state and leading classes as far as the prisoner was concerned. Lacking as he was, and indeed as the Church was, in credible credentials to minister to, or relate to, the underclass, the Church of England clergyman was not an inspirational choice for the task
that was given him.

The hegemony of medieval Christendom was established over a long time and because of its influence with a more highly churched population than the population contained within the walls of the penitentiary. The denominational exclusiveness of penitentiary Christendom was a contradiction imposed on the structure. This hegemony was not reflective of the state of affairs in the society as a whole, where the Church of England had no such ecclesiastical hegemony among the churches. In fact, the dissenting Churches had more success with the lower classes that did the Church of England. This contradiction soon manifested itself in the problems experienced by the chaplains in making progress toward the goals they set for the prisoners, notwithstanding the glowing reports of the prison inspectors, Crawford and Whitworth Russell. The question is open, of course, as to whether the Dissenters would have fared any better, however that was never tested. The point remains that an hegemony for the Church of England in the penitentiary was contra-indicated.

**The Contradiction of the Brechtian Chapel.**

The German playwright, Bertolt Brecht, introduced a style of play that attempted to turn the theatre into a lecture hall. Brecht developed 'distancing techniques' in his drama, which were designed to bring the didactic element of the theatre to the fore (Banham, 1988; 122). In essence, this is what happened in the penitentiary chapel, the prisoners were 'distanced' from each other by the erection of stalls, whereby they were only able to see the front of the chapel. The rationale behind this was that there were no distractions,
or 'contamination' to use the vernacular of the time, for the prisoner from the other prisoners around him. It was reasoned that the prisoner would thereby focus on the teachings of the chaplain, free from the contaminations of other prisoners, much as Brecht sought to distance the theatre audience from the emotional identification of the character of the play and to thus focus on the issues the play was raising.

Criticisms of the chapel by prisoners have been cited earlier, however there were also objections from within the Church. These critics pointed out that the chapel of the penitentiary bore little resemblance to the chapel practices of traditional Christianity. The Reverend Daniel Nihill, while not a chaplain, was a contemporary clergyman, he commented thus of the penitentiary chapel,

This plan involves a striking anomaly. On the one hand, we bring Christians together for joint sympathetic worship, for the primary idea, the essential principle which sustains it from private devotion, is sociality-the recognition of brethren- members of the same family-heirs of the same hope-aided by the sight and hearing of each other in a common assembly, where with one heart and one mouth they glorify God. Such is the principle on which the prisoners are brought together in chapel; but on the other hand, whilst so assembled, there is a studious effort to keep them all in a state of separation, and to defeat the idea of their communion (Priestly, 1985; 92)

While Nihill's comments could be seen as rather naive in that the prisoners basically
identified the chapel with punishment rather than a gathering to glorify God, he raises an essential contradiction of the penitentiary chapel. Christian chapel services are indeed about voluntary gathering and communion in the context of worship. The chapel in the penitentiary exemplified compulsory division and isolation. The glaring contradiction was that social control, in the form of wanting to resocialise the prisoner, took precedence over the Christian tradition of worship. Even the atheist G. W. Foote, quoted previously, was alert to this contradiction. From both inside and outside of the Church there was recognition that the penitentiary chapel contained a contradiction. It was a bizarre introduction to the Christian chapel and 'worship' for people whom it was hoped would follow the Christian way upon their discharge from the penitentiary.

**The Contradiction of Papal Aspiration.**

It is noted that the chaplain's efforts in the didactic arena were not limited to the chapel and the prisoner. Being the person most closely identified with the foundational understandings of the prison, some of the chaplains were inclined to seek wider control: the attempts to dominate the mind of the prisoner were matched by the attempts to dominate the governor. The chaplain, Joseph Kingsmill of Pentonville, expressed a concern about this when he wrote,

> The evil to be apprehended now is the invasion of the governor's province by the chaplain, from an over-earnestness in his profession, or a wrong estimate of position and duties (Kingsmill, 1984; 254; reprint of nineteenth century publication).
In the Reformation, Luther had disparaged the popes for what was regarded as their interference in matters that were the rightful area of the princes and secular authorities (McGrath, 1988; 144). Since the Reformation, Protestants had continued with this fundamental criticism. The chaplains of the penitentiary stood firmly in the Protestant tradition of the day in that they were anti-Catholic. Here, though, we discover the contradiction of some of them contesting with the governor, the representative of the secular power, not on prisoner advocacy, for as we have seen, the Church of England clergyman was not one to take up issues for the prisoner, but for power and influence, something that they would roundly condemn if it were evident in a pope.

**The Contradiction of Theodicy in the Penitentiary.**

Another contradiction within the ecclesiastical realm, which militated against the success of the penitentiary, was that of theodicy. Many volumes have been written to address the theist dilemma, that the concept of an omnipotent and perfectly good God can be sustained concurrently with the obvious and extensive presence of moral and natural evil in the world. The contradiction is claimed by some to be logical, by others to be epistemological, the latter claiming that the contradiction presents powerful evidence against the existence of a theist God (Davis, 1981; 4-5). Theists have generated a great deal of literature in defence of the omnipotent and perfectly good God. It has often been remarked, in contemporary times, that there is an apparent contradiction between the theist God and the brutality of the prison. Shaw's comments that prisoners, 'when right thinking prevails' discern that the chaplain is not the author or supporter of punishment
and suffering in the prison (Shaw, 1995; 70) is neither convincing, nor reassuring. Certainly, as the evidence suggests, this was not the case in the penitentiary: the presentations and visitations of the chaplains did not suffice to convince the prisoner that there was an all powerful and perfectly good Being amidst the suffering of the penitentiary.

While there were vociferous critics of the penitentiary, the chaplain laboured at his task of repentance and under his beliefs that the prisoner was being given a wonderful and humane opportunity to find the love and forgiveness of God and to live within the God-ordained leading class structures of society. For the chaplain, the psychological and physical suffering of prisoners in solitary confinement could too readily be contained, and alternatively interpreted, within the paradigm of the prisoner as 'sinner and soul'. The contradictions of theodicy were lost on the chaplain, but were certainly not lost on some of the convicts and critics of the penitentiary. To present the theist God in a context where there were glaring issues of theodicy and where, for many prisoners, there was little, if any, evidence that the herald of repentance bore any resemblance to his Master was destined to meet with little success.

Penitentiary Christendom could not contain its contradictions and the political resolve was never going to maintain Christendom for its own sake when it did not deliver up the hoped for reforms. There were other interests acting upon the state in its role as broker. As well as contradictions, there were other factors, which precipitated the demise of penitentiary Christendom.
The Absolutist Orientations of the Reformers and the Limitations of their Theology in Sustaining the Penitentiary.

It was clear that the reformers, in their evangelical zeal, had no conception that what they were endeavouring to do was to impose a defunct social structure by grafting Christendom onto the prison. This is a little surprising, given that they stood in a tradition that contributed heavily to the demise of the medieval Christendom. In particular, the reformers failed to understand that the imposition of Christendom was contingent upon a legitimacy of the office of the chaplain. This legitimacy, unlike the legitimacy of the papacy in the zenith of the medieval Christendom, was simply not there. The hegemony in the penitentiary would depend on state power alone.

There were other issues, besides the failure of the reformers to foresee the social-structural problems of the penitentiary, which contributed to its decline. These can be grouped into two categories: the theological views of the reformers, which tended toward the literalist and absolute, and the limitations of their theology to sustain the penitentiary.

(a) The Reformers and the Problem of the Possession of God.

In one of his sermons, Paul Tillich wrote, ‘I am convinced that much of the rebellion against Christianity is due to the overt or veiled claim of Christians to possess God’ (Tillich, 1969; 152). Even in the nineteenth century there were various interpretations of God and the nature of God. The Reformers were Evangelicals, people whose
interpretations were at the literalist end of understandings of the Christian Scriptures. Such an absolutist view would have been needed for the Reformers to have enthusiastically advocated placing prisoners in the solitary system with the expectation of repentance, particularly as the prison's dominant population, the underclass, but perhaps prisoners of any class, were generally ill prepared for such a confinement. This ill preparedness became very quickly evident in the prisoners' fear of the separate system and the ensuing mental health problems. A confidence that the ways of God were known to them would have been required for the reformers to entertain the idea that such a move would be therapeutic, rather than destructive. The reformers certainly believed that they possessed knowledge of the workings of God. Evidence Whitworth Russell and Crawford and the long and arduous hours they worked to establish the penitentiaries in Britain. This commitment emanated from the powerful belief in the veracity of what they were doing and the confidence they had in their understandings of the biblical writings, which they believed supported their actions. This strength of belief in their knowledge of the ways and workings of God allowed the reformers to withstand the considerable criticisms and objections to the separate system and see it introduced, particularly after doubts about solitary confinement arose in the secular sector in the late eighteenth century. This strength of belief and the claim to intimate knowledge of the ways of God convinced a desperate secular sector that the penitentiary should be supported, but the claim to possess God was always going to mean that the credibility of both the reformers and their system was under scrutiny and that results had to be produced.

(b) The Limitations of the Reformer's Theology to Sustain the Penitentiary.
The penitentiary was created from a specific theological conception; one among a variety of theological views apparent in the nineteenth century. In a society of Christian religious pluralism these views would inevitably emerge and did so to place further pressure on the penitentiary. The penitentiary came under scrutiny from within the Church and from within other churches; criticisms emerged on ethical, liturgical and theological grounds. Problems were encountered when the penitentiary was not producing the hoped for results. One of the issues was where to place the blame, for the chaplain could hardly place the blame for the failure on God. Much of the time the victim of the separate system was blamed for his intransigence and for being the 'vilest of the vile'. Another source of blame were the secular authorities, who failed to prosecute the system to its fullest degree; chaplain Burt would have had prisoners in solitary for two or three years if need be (Burt, 1984; 37; reprint of nineteenth century publication). What stands out, however, is that there was no contingency plan if the operation of the penitentiary were to run into difficulty; the reformers were very confident of success, defined in terms of repentance, acceptance of the God-ordained social order and conversion. The penitentiary had a relatively short life in the prison system, in part because it was based on an absolutist theology. For the reformers, the Bible was not a document produced by human beings and influenced by the social structures and settings of the time when the various books were written: continental European criticisms were not for them. The reformers were imposing a soteriological grand narrative on the prison, but they failed to understand that there was an increasing questioning of that narrative.

The reformers had one way of understanding the nature of God, but failed to take account
of others. These legatees of the Evangelical Revival approached the task of reform in the prison in much the same way the Whitworth Russell and Crawford would approach their prison inspectorates, with a propensity to see only what they wanted to see. This theological narrowness led to the expressions of confidence in reform through the separate system that brought it to the British prisons, but in turn led to the relatively rapid demise of that system.

Also lacking in the theological underpinnings of the penitentiary was any means of explaining and predicting the behaviour of the human being; the underpinning thought was essentially moral/prescriptive rather than analytic. The religious thought associated with the penitentiary centred around the concept of repentance before God, but instances of genuine repentance and value change with regard to prisoners were few and far between. The 'failures' were put down to the complete moral depravity of the underclass and the timidity of the state in fully executing the separate system. But any notion of reform, if it is to survive and evolve, needs to have a basis for offering an explanation, rather than a moral condemnation of human behaviour. This was lacking in the religious thought underpinning the penitentiary. In fact a comprehensive, practical theory of the nature of the human being, which could be used to interpret, predict and shape human behaviour, has not been rigorously pursued by ecclesiastical disciplines. The lack of any applied religious thought on the nature of the human being, which could provide the basis of a reform effort, left a vacuum in the prison. The social sciences would eventually fill this breach.

The Failure to Understand Issues of Social Class.
The reformers, as with the chaplains after them, failed to understand social class. For the popes of Christendom, with their Petrine line legitimacy, this was not a problem. For the reformers and chaplains, with no such legitimacy and allegiance flowing from it, this was a serious shortcoming.

As we have seen, in the nineteenth century the Church of England responded very slowly to the provision of church buildings and pastoral care in the underclass areas of the emerging industrial cities and London. As Grocott pointed out, the Church of England had 'married the spirit of the age' with its heavy identification with the leading classes and it became a 'widow' in the next (Grocott, 1980; 284); a widow in the sense that the underclass was lost to it, even with the massive state injection of funds for church building. There was no equality for the underclass in terms of the opportunity for religious worship and education. The Church's resources were certainly not sent in the direction of the underclass and the wider church knew little of the underclass. Nevertheless, the reformers, in spite of their lack of understanding of the underclass, made decisions about the reform process, which gave rise to the penitentiary. We have seen also that the chaplain, who was a product of the leading classes, had no experiential understanding of the underclass; indeed in many instances there was little sympathy for them either. The chaplain also had no credibility through his ‘office’ that would alleviate his lack of understanding. The views of the state held by the chaplain and that held by the prisoners were mostly at variance. The prisoner often did not distinguish between the chaplain and the state. The chaplain in the contemporary prison still has a significant problem in this regard in that prisoners often have difficulty seeing him as independent of the state. Lacking knowledge of the underclass was a major deficit with both the
reformers and the chaplain and a contributor to the early failure of the penitentiary.

If reform was to have any chance of success, it had to have a basis in the understanding of the class of persons to be changed, otherwise realistic expectations could not be determined, and indeed this is precisely what happened, the expectations on the penitentiary were unrealistic.

Summary.
The successful creation of a nineteenth century Christendom was dependent upon similar conditions prevailing to those that prevailed in medieval times. Human knowledge, however, had come too far for religious thought to dominate, even within the confines of the total institution of the prison. Old and failed models need not, of course, necessarily fail in a new context, but the reformers were cognisant of neither the model and its applications, nor its contradictions and shortcomings.

The penitentiary was at its peak in the early 1850's and thereafter began its decline. The failure of the penitentiary heralded the decline of the chaplain. The decline of the chaplain was also heavily linked to the 'decline of God'. The decline of God does not refer to a literal decline in the nature and power of a being or the phenomena which, or whom, Christians refer to as God. Rather it refers to the decline in the influence of the concept itself and of the practices surrounding that concept within the prison context. The decline of God, the subject of a later chapter, and the decline of the chaplain are intertwined.
The failure of medieval Christendom had brought with it a corresponding decline in the power and influence of the popes. The failure of Christendom and the increasing sophistication of the nation state meant that the popes were no longer the direct and integral part of the political process they once were. This is not to argue that the church was no longer influential. While the direct influence of the fragmented church, post Reformation, had waned, ideologically the church was still undoubtedly influential. Weber's classical work on the 'Protestant ethic' argued for the indirect influence of religious ideology on the very secular process of the development the capitalist mode of production. As the foci of the prison process shifted away from repentance, the chaplain of penitentiary Christendom became, like the popes of medieval Christendom, peripheral to the operations and the structure of the Christendom to which he was once so central. When medieval Christendom failed, religion began the process of becoming privatised and compartmentalised. Similarly, in the prison religion gradually became a matter for private devotion for those so inclined, rather than a base on which the operational policy of the prison could be based.

Both the chaplain and God began to decline, a decline which led to both the chaplain and God becoming peripheral to the prison. There were undoubtedly some practising Christians among the prisoners and staff, however the operations of the prison were less and less influenced by religious concepts. The symbols of God, too, such as the imposing chapels, began their downward spiral toward their dominant contemporary purpose as movie theatres and general-purpose halls. The prisoner was becoming an object of
historical and psychological, rather than soteriological interest as the new paradigm of the prisoner as psyche began to replace the old paradigm of the prisoner as sinner and soul. The prison was increasingly influenced in its operations by the secular sector. This increasing marginality of religion and the chaplain will be the subject of later chapters.

The reformers, within the confines of the penitentiary, brought together the forces of Good and Evil to contest Armageddon; it was the forces of Evil that prevailed. The decline of the penitentiary was the decline of Christendom. While Christendom has collapsed the contemporary chaplain is still operating in the prison, although in an unobtrusive and peripheral manner. But in what capacity? And for what purpose? The prison is now a secular institution and the underclass have no more allegiance to the mainstream Protestant churches and institutional Christianity than they had in the nineteenth century, when the Church of England was very marginal to their daily lives. In the following chapters it will be argued that the chaplain is now, to use the biblical concept, the one who is the 'exile'. Displaced from prominence with the failure of the penitentiary, the chaplain is now the exile in the land of the social sciences. In Section Four, the biblical account of the Exile of the people of ancient Israel to the land of Babylon will be used to guide an examination of the decline of the chaplain, following the failure of penitentiary Christendom. The question will also be asked as to whether there is likely to be a return to prominence for the chaplain within the prison context.
SECTION FOUR.

THE CHAPLAIN AS THE EXILE.
CHAPTER SIX.

THE BIBLICAL CONCEPT OF THE EXILE.

'Exile' is the biblical image used to construct the metaphor which drives this section of the investigation of the decline of the prison chaplain. Exile is a term which is often encountered in literature and politics: broadly speaking, when used as a noun, it can refer to an event, as when a person or persons go into exile, or it can refer to that person, or those persons, who are exiled. Exile is often used in highly emotive and/or ideological ways and as a consequence can be a rather elusive term. To use it in a heuristic manner requires that an endeavour be made to establish the parameters of its use.

Exile has multiple meanings and referents. For instance, exile can be self imposed, as
when King Oedipus leaves Thebes following the discovery of his tragic past, or it can be a banishment, for instance on a journey with a church group to Amman, Jordan, in 1993, I met Dr Nasser, the president of the Palestinian Berzeit University at Ramallah. Dr. Nasser described himself as the 'President in exile'. Dr Nasser's exile was not self-imposed; his views were unacceptable to the Israeli military authorities. Asher Milbauer in his book, Transcending Exile, explores the lives of three prominent writers, Singer, Nabakov, and Conrad, whom he terms exiles. These writers have written in countries other than their native one. For Milbauer, an intellectual is able to survive his, or her, exile by resolving the dichotomy in exiled existence between being the bearer of past experiences while simultaneously coping with the new realities of a new present (Milbauer, 1985; 123). From the persons previously mentioned, historical and fictional, it can be seen that exile can be experienced variously. It can, for some, be a relatively positive experience away from a politically and socially difficult environment. For others, it can be tremendously damaging, both emotionally and socially. Some exiles, if they had some reasonable opportunity, would return to their native country, others would decline such an opportunity. Many factors come into considerations of exile and exiles, including the strength of the identification with the homeland. Status, as well as economic and political position in the homeland, is also a prominent factor for consideration.

Thus far we have mentioned exile from the perspective of an individual, who has either formed the belief that he or she must, for psychological or social reasons, to go into exile, or, alternatively, has been forcibly driven into exile. The latter category predominates. In
modern terminology, the exile is more akin to the refugee, as opposed to the immigrant, who has made choice with many fewer constraints on free will, to reside in the foreign country. Refugees, too, have many more constraints with regard to any decision to return to the homeland, personal safety and survival being to the fore.

We have not thus far mentioned those people who have gone into exile on a collective basis. The most famous example of this is, of course, the forced relocation of people from Jerusalem to Babylon in the sixth century BCE. There is scarce extra-biblical literature about this Exile and there are few examples of this type of exile in modern times. Writing on the Exile tends to be diverse and often speculative. Daniel Smith, for example, applies what he terms a 'sociological exegesis' to the Exile of the people of Jerusalem: he does this by analysing the few modern era examples of collective exile and applying his findings of the experiences of these contemporary exiles to create what he argues is a plausible account of the Jewish Exile (Smith, 1989; 3,4,5).

The paucity of contemporaneous literature referring to the Exile means that there are varying theories about what actually happened. While there are few modern examples of collective exiles, this was not the case in the biblical times. The Assyrians, in particular, made collective exile a strategy of warfare, their conquest of Samaria being a prime example (Smith, 1989; 29). The conquered peoples had many of their able bodied, politically competent and other capable people moved in large numbers to other locations, where they were confronted with the problems of different languages and suspicious local residents. For the Assyrians, this strategy lessened the chances of
breaches of military security. In particular the strategy lessened the likelihood of insurrection by depriving the conquered populus of those people most capable of organising and participating in insurrection: the conquered land was left with people whom the Assyrians would have regarded as a liability with regard to economic, political and military recovery. Those left in the conquered land therefore required a lesser commitment of military personnel to keep them subjugated. Whole families were often taken forcibly from the homeland to blunt the motivation of exiles to return to family left behind.

In the sixth century BCE, the people of Jerusalem suffered the fate of exile at the hands of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon; the Babylonian Empire succeeded the Assyrian as the dominant power of the Middle East. Elements of the Jewish population were forcibly marched to Babylon. This event is termed, 'The Exile'. It is this particular event, as opposed to other exiles, which is the referent of the metaphor, 'The chaplain as the Exile', used in this section of the thesis. The event of the Exile will be outlined and it is from this outline that the entailments of the metaphor, 'The chaplain as the Exile' will be constructed. As the metaphor of the Exile is central to much of the analysis that follows, it is necessary to outline the event in some detail before constructing the entailments.

**The Historical Event of the Exile.**

The Exile of the people of Jerusalem, most scholars agree, took place as distinct events. In 597 BCE there was a deportation of residents from Jerusalem and in 586 BCE, when Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Jerusalem, there was a second deportation (Herrmann, 1975;
289). One of the many aspects of Exile on which scholars do not agree is the numbers of people involved in the Exile. Scholars also disagree about the numbers of those who returned from the Exile in (approximately) 539 BCE. It must be noted at the outset, that the Exile is both an historical event and an ideological concept (Crabbe, 1998; 18). The ideologies surrounding the Exile are based very loosely on the historical occurrence. It is the ideological event that is the most socially significant, particularly in the contemporary context of the religious and secular politics of modern Israel. The end of Exile came to be associated, by some, with events of the recent past, such as the creation of the state of Israel in 1948 and the capture of the city of Jerusalem from the Jordanians by the Israeli forces during the Six Day War of 1967. The political and social ideologies that have developed around the Exile will be avoided in the creation of the entailments of the metaphor. The focus will be on the confrontations, which the Exiles can be plausibly assumed to have faced during their time in Babylon. The aspects of the Exile of interest to this thesis are the social, psychological and religious confrontations.

The Exile, as an event, was made possible by the Battle of Carchemish in 605 BCE, in what is now Lebanon. At this battle, the armies of Nebuchadnezzar decisively defeated those of the Egyptian Pharaoh, Neco. The defeat of Neco saw the inhabitants of Judah, in particular Jerusalem, paying taxes to the Babylonian Empire. King Jehoiachin came to the throne of Judah succeeding his father. Jehoiachin, it seems, opposed the interests of the Babylonians and courted Egyptian alliances. However, soon after his accession, the Egyptians, relied upon by Jehoiachin as allies, were driven back to their borders by the Babylonians and Jerusalem was essentially defenceless. The 597 BCE rebellion of King
Jehoiachin ended meekly three months later when the city capitulated to Nebuchadnezzar's siege. While there is little non-biblical documentation about the Exile, it is generally agreed that the Babylonians followed the Assyrian practice, to a large degree, and took King Jehoiachin and the royal family, probably along with much of the priesthood and prominent citizenry, into exile in Babylon. King Jehoiachin was captive some thirty-six years in Babylon before his death. Nebuchadnezzar did not take vengeance on the inhabitants of Jerusalem for the rebellion and the city was left intact.

Upon Jehoiachin's removal to Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar appointed the puppet Zedakiah to the throne of Judah. Zedakiah, too, rebelled and formed an alliance with the Egyptians. Nebuchadnezzar responded by again besieging the city of Jerusalem. The siege was lifted when the Babylonians had to confront an advancing Egyptian army, which had entered Judah to aid the inhabitants of Jerusalem. After repelling the Egyptians, Nebuchadnezzar returned to besiege Jerusalem and the city fell to the Babylonians in 586 BCE, sixteen months from the onset of the siege. This time Nebuchadnezzar dealt with the inhabitants of the city harshly. Zedakiah's family were massacred in his presence, before Zedakiah himself was blinded and taken to Babylon. Priests and other leading citizens were taken to Nebuchadnezzar's headquarters and executed. Jerusalem itself was razed and the Temple destroyed. Artefacts from the Temple were taken to Babylon and placed in the temple of the Babylonian god, Marduk. Scholars give varying estimates of the numbers of people taken into exile, however, the majority opinion is that the practice of the Assyrians would likely have been followed and a large number of the leaders and able bodied would have been taken into exile. What is certain is that those who were taken to
Babylon had lost their land, their King, their Law and their Temple. In one event the people had lost much of their culture.

There is a paucity of material, in either canonical or non-canonical sources, about the conditions under which the people of Israel lived during their Exile. Debate continues as to what the conditions of life were really like. Complicating this is the differing opinions among scholars as to the degree of reliance that can be placed on scriptural accounts of even the deportations and return, let alone the much sparser field of the conditions in the Exile itself. Scholars such as Carroll are of the view that historiographic approaches to reading the biblical accounts are highly suspect in the absence of confirming external data (Carroll, 1998; 70,73). Other scholars, such as Daniel Smith-Christopher, taking a more sociological approach, as well as a more pragmatic approach, place more importance on the biblical texts, provided that the hermeneutic is significantly informed by a wider familiarity with patterns of dominance, resistance and social subordination (Smith-Christopher, 1997; 35-36). The latter approach provides a plausible reconstruction and is the one favoured in this thesis.

Material in canonical books dated to the Exile, such as Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, suggest that the greatest challenges to the Exiles were theological more so than social. Scholars such as Klein, point out that this is very plausible, given that the destruction of the Temple called the Exiles understandings of God into question (Klein, 1979; 3). Some of the Psalms of lament, such as Psalm 137, depict a craving to return to the homeland and suggest that conditions may have been physically harsh for the Exiles, as well as
presenting problems with regard to sustaining the religion of the homeland. It seems, however, that as comparatively few of the Exiles returned to Jerusalem (Crabbe, 1998b; 95), that even if conditions had been harsh that they may have improved over time and that a level of integration could well have taken place, the so-called 'generational answer' to exile. Clearly not all Israelites in Babylon at the time of the return longed for the homeland they had never resided in nor even seen. Conceivably, many had little knowledge about it. Other of the Exiles, it is thought, remained very discontented.

Deutero-Isaiah with its invective against other gods (Isaiah 44:9-20; 57:1-13) suggests that syncretism in the Exile, (the taking of ideas, beliefs, liturgical and other practices from one religion, or religions, into another religion (Droogers, 1989; 7), was a constant challenge which confronted the priests and elders among the Exile, who were striving to maintain the purity of the religion of the homeland. The prophet Jeremiah's correspondence with the Exiles (Klein, 1979; 51) suggests that there was a hierarchy of elders dedicated to the preservation of the religion from syncretistic practices. There is no doubt, however, that the central concepts of the religion of Jerusalem: the all powerful Yahweh; the people of Israel as the elect people of Yahweh; the Covenant giving the people the Land, all had their credibility severely challenged with the devastating defeat of 586 BCE. The Temple, the home of Yahweh had been destroyed and its treasures taken to the temple of Marduk. It would have appeared to many, perhaps most, of the Exiles that Marduk had defeated Yahweh: the wars of the day were believed to have been fought on a metaphysical level between the respective gods of the combatants as well as on a physical, military level (Pfeiffer, 1962; 46). According to these beliefs, it appeared
that Marduk was triumphant. The only alternative to Yahweh having been defeated by Marduk and hence losing the mantle of being all powerful, was that the events were of Yahweh’s doing and that Yahweh had abandoned his elect people. Apologetics needed to be developed, for although as Sanders notes, a major part of the Bible is about explaining defeats (Sanders, 1997; 39), this was a catastrophic defeat and the people were under pressure from the old theologies appearing inconsistent with the circumstances and context of the defeat and Exile. The priestly class of the Exile would have worked hard on apologetics and in particular striven to keep the idea of return before the Exiles; the priestly class had strong motivations to return to practise their calling in their homeland.

**Summary.**

While there is a paucity of source material, and therefore the biblical records are not confirmed by substantive numbers of documents from the period, many commentators believe that there is sufficient material to construct a plausible account of the Exile. These commentators rely on archaeological evidence; fragmentary Mesopotamian and Assyrian notation; as well as form, textual, literary and redaction criticism of canonical and non-canonical texts, and some, such as Smith, use sociological exegesis in their endeavours.

It is the position taken in this thesis that, between the biblical references to the Exile, evaluation of the existing source material and other ideas put forward by scholars, a plausible account can be given of the initial difficulties faced by the Exiles. It is the broad confrontation experienced by the Exiles, and not a detailed attempt at a reconstruction of Exilic history, that is necessary for identifying the entailments of the metaphor, 'The
chaplain as the Exile'.

**Confrontation and Response to Confrontation in the Exile.**

Smith suggests that there are some broad social and psychosocial behaviour patterns that can be identified as common to communities, or significant portions of communities, forcibly displaced from their homeland. A few of these suggest 'striking biblical analogies', i.e. analogies to the community of the Exile (Smith, 1989; 10). Smith cites exile communities such as the community of Bikini Island, moved because of United States nuclear testing. Smith is quick to point out that these are not 'direct analogies' but that the collective sociological and anthropological data suggest themes and questions to inform his sociological exegesis. There would seem good reason for Smith to exercise caution here, because of the uniqueness of the Exile, as opposed to other modern exiles that Smith refers to. For instance, the people of the Exile considered themselves to be the chosen people of the all-powerful God (Yahweh), who had brought them out of servitude in Egypt and covenanted with them to provide them with a homeland, which would be perpetually theirs (Israel and Judah). The theological dimensions here would seem more prominent than other exiles. Nevertheless, there are socio-behavioural patterns, some of which are common to communities in exile, and some of which seem more specific to the Jewish experience, which will be discussed below in the context of the Exile.

A frequently experienced problem in the experience of exile is the problem of language. The reasons for communities being forced into exile vary widely. For instance, the twentieth century inhabitants of Bikini Atoll were an impediment to United States
nuclear testing, whereas the people of ancient Samaria were forcibly removed by the conquering Assyrians to obviate any threat of insurrection and thus reinforce the military control of their Empire. The exiles were not moved into the Assyrian heartland, but placed in other areas. The problem of no common language, as well as lack of resources, would certainly have created major logistical problems for any would-be resistance organizers. Language was, of course, an obstacle to the Exile community. While they were taken as captives, the problem of language would have initially hindered their interaction in the social, economic and political domains of Babylon although, as we have seen, the generational answer often decreased the problem for succeeding generations and would likely have done so in Babylon.

While language is a vital aspect of culture, in exile, communities suffer greater assaults on culture than language alone. This would certainly have been the case with the Exiles. The social structure, headed by the King, was destroyed in 586 BCE, Zedakiah died in Babylon, where he was taken after being blinded while his predecessor, King Jehoiachin, lived in captivity and obscurity in a Babylonian prison following the first deportation in 597 BCE. Regarding the Law, that was difficult to apply in the situation of captivity and the chaos which surrounded the captivity. This would have been the case even though there were priests and elders among the Exiles, many of whom would have been doing whatever they could in the circumstances to retain the customary practices. References in Deutero-Isaiah, as well as in Ezekiel, dated to the period suggest that syncretism, if not outright religious defection, was evident in the Exilic community. It is not uncommon for nationals living away from their land of origin to create a solidarity and be highly
conscious of the customs of the homeland, some more so than when they actually resided there. This is very doubtful with regard to the Exiles, given that their religious practices revolved around an all-powerful Yahweh, with whom they had covenanted for the Promised Land, and Yahweh was seemingly defeated. The presence of the Temple was important to the faith of the people of Israel and it was in ruins in far off Jerusalem. The old practices and the old theology would have been extremely difficult to reconcile in the circumstances of Exile. Psalm 137, a psalm of lament about the difficulty of singing the old songs in a foreign land, lends some credibility to this hypothesis. The psalm is thought to be of exilic dating.

The Exiles, initially at least, lived in a social context where the economic, political and symbolic dimensions of life had been devastated by the destruction of Jerusalem. The Exiles, thought by many scholars to include the elite of the Jewish society of the time, were likely to have been traumatised by these experiences. A theology began to develop, which held out to the Exiles the hope of return to the homeland. This theology was likely a response to the harshness of the conditions the Exiles were initially living under. This theology was but one response; the relatively small numbers of people returning from Exile after the Persian conquest of Babylon suggests that there could have been considerable integration of Exiles into the society. It could also suggest that later generation Exiles had no concept of the homeland and were not willing to travel across precarious terrain to a place which they did not know and had no claims in; land claims in particular.
The dominant symbolic dimension of Jewish life, at the time of the conquest by Babylon, was religious. There are consistent references in the prophetic and historic writings to the failure of the people of Israel to comply with the requirements of Yahweh: history was interpreted religiously. Some of these writings are thought to be either a direct response to the calamity of the Babylonian conquest and thus created to present an apologetic theology; the Deuteronomic History is thought to be in this category (Sanders, 1997; 44), while other writings are thought to be a response to the conquest by virtue of being a redaction of earlier writings. Such opinion is often held about the book of Jeremiah (Klein, 1979; 44). The Israelite society was religious and the Exile shook the foundations of their religion. The explanations of Yahweh as not all-powerful and unable to contend with Marduk, or the Covenant people having been abandoned by Yahweh, were unacceptable to the devout. A body of theology developed whereby Yahweh was seen to have purged the wayward people, who had not followed the path that Yahweh had set for them. According to this theology, Yahweh, who controls history, had used the Babylonians for his purposes of chastising the people: the conquest of Jerusalem, according to this theology, was the will of Yahweh. Questions about Yahweh and the Covenant were being asked that had probably seldom been asked previously, in the less turbulent times. If these questions had been asked, they had not been asked with the same intensity and sense of urgency.

The greatest challenge in the Exile was to retain the religion of Yahweh following the humiliating defeat. Retaining religion for some of the Exiles, was tantamount to retaining hope, the hope that Yahweh was indeed chastising the people for their wrongs and would
again return them to the homeland. The hope in Yahweh returning the Exiles to the homeland also reflected the hope that the Exiles would retain the traditions of the religion, even though the central point of the religion, the Temple, lay in ruins. The destruction of the Temple also meant that the Exiles would need to develop new responses to the religious crisis of the day. The Exiles were therefore in the position of contending both with the reality of the present situation while also fostering hope for a future that would see a return to the homeland.

A theology, and later a literature, of hope began to build, particularly in Babylon, but also in Jerusalem with those who remained behind. The struggle between what is and what is hoped for was seemingly intense. More so, because the Babylonians were not going to tolerate any overtly seditious activity and thus these hopes were probably the more private hopes of the Exiles.

The precise above has broadly outlined essential features of the Exile, confrontation and response to confrontation, for the purposes of developing the entailments of the metaphor, 'the chaplain as the Exile'. Of course the Exile has been used often and very loosely and thus has many associations in Judaism and Christianity. It has been used for political propaganda and political influence and for religious persuasion and encouragement. As the history of the Exile is so limited and fragmentary, the use of the term for a variety of political and religious ends has been easy. This is the very reason why it was considered important to go back and look to the available literature to ground the metaphor prior to constructing the entailments. It is to the construction of the
entailments that we now turn.

The Entailments of the Metaphor: 'The Chaplain as the Exile'.

The Exiles in Babylon of the sixth century BCE experienced radical confrontations to their pre-Exilic lives. As we have seen, these changes were not simply restrictions in terms of physical liberty. The confrontations were pervasive and covered economic, social, cultural and religious aspects of life. As one would expect, when the Exile is used as a metaphor there are rich and varied entailments. The entailments have been reduced somewhat by constructing the metaphor from a more vigorously defined historical, more so than ideological, context. This still leaves the metaphor as a rich field for entailments, while avoiding the bewildering array of political and ideological implications, which have developed over the centuries as people and groups have used Exile for political and ideological ends with little reference to the likely events of history.

As religion was so central to life in ancient Jerusalem, from whence most of the Exiles came, the religious theme will feature strongly in the entailments. The method of analysis will be similar to the previous chapters and will be used to structure the investigation in three of the following chapters. As well as guiding the analysis of the factors in the decline of the chaplain, the metaphor also readily poses the question of whether there could be a 'return' for the chaplain from the place of exile to a place of centrality in the prison system. The issues discussed in the following analysis include the growth, within the prison system, of alternative understandings from the social sciences and their effects on the chaplain (Chapter Seven). The 'Decline of God' in contributing to the decline of
the chaplain will be discussed in Chapter Eight. By the decline of God, as previously noted, it is not being suggested that there is a literal God, who can be seen to have declined according to certain established criteria. Rather, the phrase is being used much in the way that the 'Death of God' theologians, prominent in the 1960's, used that phrase. In their use of the phrase, theologians such as Paul Altizer and William Hamilton were not suggesting that there was a being, 'God', who had literally died. Rather, the suggestion was that the construct of a particular theology, in their view the God of orthodoxy theology, had been discredited. It will be argued in this thesis, that the God of the chaplains of the penitentiary experienced a crisis of credibility and is one of the prominent factors in the decline of the chaplain.

In the final section (Section Five, Chapter Nine) the entailments will be used to analyse the possibility of the chaplain returning from his exile and back to a prominent, if not dominating position in the prison. One of the objectives of the analysis is to gauge whether what is identified as current secular, dominant paradigm in the prison is likely to change to one favouring the re-establishment of centrality for the chaplain. In the following discussion of the entailments of the metaphor, the entailments and their brief explanations will be grouped under those to be discussed primarily in Chapter Seven, those to be discussed primarily under Chapter Eight, and those to be primarily discussed in Section Five, the final section.

Chapter Seven (Life in Babylon: The Challenge of Alternative Foundational Understandings) Entailments.
Entailment One. The Chaplain as the One Driven far from the Homeland by Conquest.

It was seen that the Exile was compelled to leave his native Jerusalem and taken to captivity in Babylon. The Exile was confronted with many disruptions to his/her life, particularly as the Exile was, in general, a person of considerable status and/or influence in the Jerusalem of the sixth century BCE. Similarly, it will be argued, the chaplain went from being a person of status and influence to a person who is on the periphery, as far as influence, power and status are concerned, in the contemporary prison. It has already been noted that there is a dearth of published material about contemporary prison chaplaincy, giving some indication of its obscurity among an otherwise expanding literature on the prison. By way of contrast, the chaplains of the penitentiary, such as The Reverend John Clay, were published, quoted widely and regarded as authorities on the topic of the prison, discipline and reform. The exile of the chaplain was not as abrupt as the Babylonian Exile. It will be argued, however, that the chaplain, too, inhabits his own 'Babylon', far from the days of pre-eminence in the penitentiary.

Entailment Two. The Chaplain as the Exile who Experiences Cultural Confrontation.

Following the Babylonian conquest, the Exile entered a land that was unfamiliar. This was an alien culture for the Exile. The fact that the Exile did not know the language of the Babylonians clearly would have created significant problems in relating to the captors. Meaningful participation, as opposed to total subservience in Babylonian society, was heavily dependent on acquiring language skills.
The chaplain has never had any such problem with the spoken word in the prison system. While the chaplain was of a higher and more privileged class than the prisoner and his vocabulary would have reflected this, nevertheless, he shared the English language with the prisoner and prison staff alike. It will be argued however, that major problems for the chaplain were that his religious language, and the knowledge and education which underpinned it, became anachronistic within the prison system. It will be argued that this development required language compromises for the chaplain, which further undermined his status and influence. The chaplain, it will be argued, has had to speak in the vernacular of the secular professional who inhabits 'Babylon'. By largely adopting the language of the secular professional, communication has been enhanced, however it is the knowledge base and hermeneutic powers of the language of the secular professional, which have rendered anachronistic the religious knowledge base and hermeneutic powers of the religious language of the chaplain of penitentiary times. This issue with language has further eroded the position of the chaplain and the perception of him as the supplier of a unique service.

The exiles brought with them a culture that was seen as of no particular relevance to the host civilisation. Military humiliation had brought with it cultural humiliation. Jerusalem was razed and some artefacts from the Temple were brought to the Temple of Marduk in Babylon as trophies for the triumphant god. Psalm 139 gives some hints that the victorious Babylonians subjected the Exiles to derision. It will be argued that the chaplain, similarly, has suffered a defeat, and that by the secular forces versed in the
social sciences. Although not routed, as were the people of Jerusalem, the chaplain is in the position of being a peripheral presence in the prison, which, on the whole, looks, particularly when politically expedient, predominantly to the social sciences for its insights and for any policy guidance. Even the symbols of the religious presence in the prison are changing, particularly with regard to the chapel, which is being questioned with regard to its use value and utility.

**Entailment Three. The Chaplain as the One Struggling to Retain a Unique Identity.**

With the fall of Jerusalem, the destruction of the Temple and the subsequent Exile, those taken to Babylon had the task of trying to keep alive the traditions of their culture. The prison system, once an institution drawing its foundational understandings from religion, now has secular influences to the fore and the prison chaplain is being hemmed in by the secular professionals in the prison. Many of the tasks he has previously performed are being taken over by secular professionals and the prison chaplain has seen a paradigm shift where the understanding of the human being is no longer the province of the religious disciplines.

The prison chaplain, it will be argued, has the considerable problem of retaining a unique identity, while at the same time remaining relevant to a prison culture that no longer functions on religious understandings and which has virtually no understanding of the literature and doctrines in which the chaplain has been trained. It will be argued that the chaplain has flirted with wider definitions of spirituality in an endeavour to broaden the base of identifying with prisoners and other prison staff alike. This flirtation has its
problems of identity with the orthodoxy under whose auspice the chaplain works. It also creates boundary problems for the chaplain seeking to establish a role within the prison.

Chapter Eight (Life in Babylon: The Decline of God).

Entailment One. The Chaplain as the One whose God is in Question because of Defeat.

The major confrontations for the Exiles were religious: the plausibility structures of the pre-Exilic time were under threat, because the understandings of Yahweh were under serious question due to the Babylonian conquest. The chaplain's God was also under scrutiny, firstly because of the failure of the separate system of confinement to bring reformation of the criminal, and secondly, by gradual process, the social sciences began to be the area the prison system looked to for ideas on the prison system itself: the chaplain's input became increasingly minimal and marginal. God went into decline with the chaplain and the paradigm of the prison began a process of change. The perceptions of the prisoner were changing from the theological concept of sinner and soul, to the social science concept of psyche; this was placing not only the chaplain, but also God on the periphery.

Entailment Two. The Chaplain as the One Lured by Syncretism.

The conquest of Jerusalem by the Babylonians and the transportation of Temple trophies to the Temple of Marduk in Babylon gave strong suggestion that the power of Marduk exceeded the power of Yahweh. Polemics against other gods, such as in Deutero-Isaiah, Daniel and Ezekiel, dated to the Exile, suggest that syncretism was a problem for the
religion of Yahweh.

For the chaplain, the social and behavioural sciences have been triumphant. It will be argued that the chaplain has adopted the 'syncretistic' practice of importing much of the social and behavioural sciences into his understandings of the human world. The capacity of the Protestant religious writings to provide a comprehensive base for the understanding of the human being in his/her social context is an issue of contention, but there is certainly no argument that these writings are regarded as being of little value by the secular world. The chaplain, as a syncretist, is more tolerated in the secular world of the prison, but has less capacity to demonstrate that he has something unique to offer in his practice. Certainly this was a finding of the Nagle Royal Commission.

With the decline in mainstream Protestant religious affiliation in both Britain and Australia (Hughes, 1997; 6,66), the chaplain is under pressure to adopt a syncretistic practice. Few prisoners have any denominational contact, and hence to have legitimacy of contact the chaplain is under pressure to be 'spiritual', rather than 'denominational' to have contact with the prisoner, for whom the chaplain's religious knowledge is largely irrelevant, and quite possibly incomprehensible. The enticements of syncretism for the chaplain are ever present.

Entailment Three. The Chaplain as the One who Finally Develops an Apologetic Theology.

Unlike the Exiles, the chaplain has not in fact done this in any systematic or
comprehensive way. With the Exiles, a theology developed which proclaimed Yahweh as still omnipotent. Nebuchadnezzar in fact was just an instrument used by Yahweh to purge and chastise the chosen people. This theology certainly had considerable success and the Exile has become a success story and rallying point among the devout in both the Jewish and Christian worlds. The chaplain, on the other hand, has not developed an apologetic theology for his decline. There is little material written about chaplaincy in the prison, and what literature there is rarely ever even alludes to the subject of a function for God in the prison. The chaplains, who are, or are being, deprived of their welfare role in the prison (they have long since had a very diminished liturgical role), struggle to find a convincing and widely accepted raison d'etre for their own presence in the prison, let alone articulate a function for God.

Chapter Nine (Secular and Ecclesiastical Impediments to a Return from the Exile.

Entailment One. The Chaplain as the One who Struggles between what is and what is hoped for.

The Exiles, at least those with strong religious convictions, were caught between the empirical evidence of the power of Babylon and the hope that they would one day see the homeland. It will be argued that the chaplain, by contrast, has largely accommodated to a subservient position. The exile was sustained by the hope that God would honour the Covenant, restore their fortunes, and return them, chastised, to the Holy Land. Can the chaplain dare to entertain such a hope of a restoration to the point where religion will again provide the foundational understandings for the operation of prison? The exiles were sustained by prophets who preached return; for the chaplains, at present, there are
Entailment Two. The Chaplain as the One who Overcomes Religious Crisis.

The Exiles are often hailed in the Jewish and Christian religions as those who endured the crisis of their religion and were vindicated by God. Numerous scholars suggest that the return from the Exile is nowhere near the scale that is suggested by the Jerusalem texts purporting to write about the return (Ezra and Nehemiah in particular). In fact most of the Exilic community declined the invitation of King Cyrus of Persia, when he conquered Babylon, for a return to their homeland. For those who take up the invitation and return, probably quite a few of them priests, there is truth in the view that they had prevailed and overcome their religious crisis.

For the chaplain however, the religious crisis is still very apparent. The situation in Babylon would have appeared bleak for the Exiles, until the rise of Persian military power reinforced hope and buttressed the developing theology of the Exile as being Yahweh’s purging of the people. The chaplain, in contrast, appears confined to his Babylon, with no 'King Cyrus' in sight, and with no seeming prospect of one appearing and restoring their fortunes. Hope of return was never extinguished in the Exilic community. It would appear that it has never been lit in the community of modern chaplains.

Having outlined the entailments of the metaphor, the following two chapters will focus on: the rise of the alternative foundational understandings, in the form of the social
It will be argued in the following chapter that these are crucial factors that have seen a change in the foundational understandings of the prison and the prisoner. These changes have been away from religious understandings, contributing to the decline of the chaplain. It will also be argued that these are crucial factors which have changed the dominant paradigm of the prison from 'prisoner as soul' to 'prisoner as psyche', that is to the prisoner considered as a psychological entity.

The first matter for consideration is the rise of the alternative foundational understandings. Religious views of the nature of the human being and the means of reform of the individual had been dominant in the early prison. The religious view came under increasing challenge from alternative understandings from the 1850's when the separate system reached its height.

CHAPTER SEVEN.
LIFE IN BABYLON:
THE CHALLENGE OF ALTERNATIVE FOUNDATIONAL UNDERSTANDINGS.

Introduction.
The penitentiary arose from the fervour of the Evangelicals and the anxieties of the leading classes. Together they created a total institution, where the forces of Good and
the forces of Evil clashed. In this total institution they were in fact creating Christendom, and, paradoxically, creating it at a time where both the Established Church, and Christianity itself, were encountering strong and increasing criticism. Even during the period of the lobbying for the penitentiary, and during the period of its establishment, there was considerable criticism of its basic operating principles, which were essentially religiously inspired. Before the fall of Jerusalem and the subsequent Exile, there was a lengthy siege. Similarly, for the chaplain, before his exile there was a time of siege: a time where both the chaplain and the operating principles of the penitentiary, as well as Christianity and the church in general, were under scrutiny and critique.

A firm date cannot be placed on the time when the chaplain became the exile, as was the case with the deportation to Babylon. One can say, however, that the gradual rise of alternative foundational understandings for the functioning of the prison helped bring about the conditions which promoted the exile of the chaplain. The chaplain's siege began when the questioning of the efficacy of the separate system became more widespread and persistent. This questioning helped bring about progressive reductions in the length of solitary confinement for the prisoners. The initial thoughts that solitude, buttressed by visits of the chaplain and other role models of piety and/or good citizenship, would naturally lead to prisoner repentance were being severely questioned.

From a wider social perspective than the prison, the church itself was under siege, but it was putting up stout resistance to the rise of alternative understandings of human existence and human behaviour and the nature and origin of the natural world, which
were challenging the veracity of orthodox theology and doctrine. Erasmus Darwin and Shelley were but two of a number of people who advanced alternative understandings. Generally, these understandings, which underpinned much popular psychology, were either strictly materialistic, denying the existence of the soul outright, or stated that, if the soul existed, it existed in the body as a whole, obliterating the distinctions between basic impulses and rational thought (Reed, 1997; 42). Neither option, of course, was acceptable to the Church. These understandings posed a threat to the Church's doctrines of the separate immortal soul, as well as the Church's authority, prestige and power, which depended on the Church being seen as the expert authority in this field. The role of the Church as the leading interpreter in society was at stake and the Church struggled hard to ward off the threat. As Reed notes, this was not a resistance of intellectual debate alone: for instance, anybody willing to defend Darwin's psychology could not expect to hold a professorship in post 1815 Europe (Reed, 1997; 43). The wider church had allies such as Kant, and the Scottish philosopher, Read, who argued that the soul could not be analysed scientifically (Reed, 1997; 13), however the tide of the search for new understandings, particularly by atheists and agnostics, was not to be stemmed. As Hugh McLeod comments, the declining credibility of the literal interpretation of the Bible, post-Charles Darwin, was gradually making it more difficult to be a Christian and easier to be an agnostic (McLeod, 1995; 6).

The resistance of the Church could not prevent its gradual decline, both in terms of its influence and its membership. The chaplain, as the servant of the church, is obviously affected by the fortunes of the institution he serves and hence the church in the wider
society must feature prominently in the analysis of the decline of the chaplain. We now turn to the consideration of the entailments of the metaphor, 'the chaplain as the exile'

**Entailment One. The Chaplain as the One Driven from the Homeland by Conquest.**

There is strong evidence that the separate system was the 'homeland' of the chaplain. The chaplain was a high status person in a total institution, which was established to operate with a high dependency on his vocational training and interpretations. The chaplain had strong support for his efforts from both the ecclesiastical and secular sectors of society. The Regulations of the prison and the various Prison Acts regarded him as the lynchpin of the separate system of prisons and an important person in those prisons which were not, or not yet, based on separation. The ecclesiastical sector provided the definitions of the nature of the human being and hence the operating rationale of prison reform.

While the prison was homeland for the chaplain, it was not necessarily a comfortable homeland and many chaplains found their work trying. Notwithstanding this the chaplain, particularly those of evangelical persuasion, were prepared to battle for the soul of the prisoners. They were soldiers in the forces of Good engaged in the Battle of Armageddon being fought within the walls of the penitentiary. As was indicated in Chapter Three, this situation, with its high levels of support, political/legal and architectural, placed great pressure on the chaplain to produce results; failure, given such levels of support would be near impossible to recover from. In the event of failure, the religious understandings were very likely be succeeded by other understandings, particularly those emanating from the developing social sciences. This is precisely what happened. Recovery did not occur; the
religious understandings faltered and failed.

The extent of this failure has been commented on by Flanagan, who makes the point that in the wider, contemporary society, modernity has made theology irrelevant in the marketplace. ‘Secularisation, as a disengagement from the sacred, governs everyday reality’ (Flanagan, 1996(a); 9). Few would doubt that the core business of society is done without reference to religion or theology and with minimal and sporadic reference to the wider church. This everyday reality includes the everyday reality of the prison.

From the centre stage to the margins, from Armageddon to Babylon; this has been the story, and the journey, of the chaplain. The chaplain supplied the skill and represented the foundational understandings on which the penitentiary was based. As well, the chaplain was the person in closest direct contact with the prisoner, apart from the low status prison officers, hence chaplains were often sought after to talk or write about their prison experiences, especially during the penitentiary period. It is not surprising then, in a society keenly interested in crime, punishment and reform, that clergy were prominent among those referred to for their opinions and pronouncements on the aetiology of crime. In the chaplain’s homeland of the penitentiary, he was held in high regard, and rightly so, being in the vernacular of the twenty first century, an amalgam of a hermeneutic specialist (interpreter) and therapist.

In the contemporary situation, this view of the chaplain as the source of expert opinion is far from being the case. It is not the chaplain who is looked to when expert knowledge of
the prison, or the behaviour of the prisoner, is required; rather it is the secular professional who is trained in the social sciences. With regard to the prison, the chaplain does not sit on important committees, such as classification, which is dominated by health and welfare professionals: medical officers; psychologists; trades supervisors and psychiatrists (Ramsland, 1996; 84). The Nagle Royal Commission recommended specifically that the chaplain should not sit on such committees, quoting as the specific reason the need for the chaplain's independence, as perceived by the prisoner (Nagle, 1978; 198). There is reason to wonder about this statement, however, for Nagle on the one hand says that the chaplain, ‘has done an enormous amount of good in the prison’ (Nagle, 1978; 198). On the other hand, he complains that the chaplain will not be effective until his role vis à vis the welfare professionals is defined more clearly, ‘for they are virtually in competition with other welfare bodies for the other tasks’ (Nagle, 1978; 198). Notwithstanding this vagary, the evidence is abundant that the chaplain is marginal to the contemporary prison, in the case of Long Bay prison the chaplain is even accommodated outside the prison. The prison is no longer the homeland of the chaplain, but the place of his exile.

The prison was the homeland of the chaplain because Acts of Parliament and prison Regulations helped to ensure that this was the case. In the British prison system, these Acts and Regulations proclaimed that the chaplain must visit each prisoner, emphasising the chaplain's prominence (Forsythe, 1987; 95). Further the medical officer had to refer prisoners, whose state of mind appeared to require 'special care', to the chaplain (Forsythe, 1987; 185). The chapel, that special province of the chaplain, was compulsory
for all prisoners. Such directives are no longer enshrined in the current Acts and regulations.

The prison was also the homeland of the chaplain because he had the authority of some of the luminaries in the field of penal reform promoting him. Principal among these luminaries was John Howard, whose publications were instrumental in bringing about such radical change in the hygiene and administration of the prisons. The pious and devout Howard was a strong advocate of the necessity of religious instruction in the moral reform of the prisoner, although he was not an advocate for solitary confinement. Howard was held in great esteem, and his work of bringing attention to the state of the prisons was seen as the work of a prophet by many in the ecclesiastical circles. Howard's advocacy of religious instruction as an important tool of reform in the prisons was of great advantage to the chaplain (Beckford and Gilliat, 1998; 26). There is no equivalent of John Howard's advocacy for the chaplain of the modern prison; interest in the chaplain is low.

The prison was also the homeland of the chaplain because the Church was still influential, in spite of Enlightenment inspired critiques becoming more prominent. McLeod discusses the fact that in 1831-2 the cholera outbreak in London was widely seen as a divine visitation. A day of fasting and humility was prescribed by the government of the day. In 1848-9 another outbreak was this time seen in terms of a public health issue, there was no metaphysical involvement attributed to the outbreak, at least not publicly (McLeod, 1995; 13). Public opinion was shifting. As Owen Chadwick
notes, ‘In the years 1860-1880 contemporaries were agreed that the tone of the society in England was more 'secular' (Chadwick, 1975; 27). Lest this give the impression of too great a lack of influence by the Church in public affairs, it should be remembered that the Church still effectively controlled the universities and that professing the religion of the Established Church was still a prerequisite for employment in the civil service. That the Church was still prominent is hardly surprising as many saw morality and religion as inseparable. The penitentiary itself would never have come into being if this had not been the case. By comparison, the chaplain of today operates in a milieu of waning ecclesiastical power and influence.

The prison was the homeland of the chaplain, but he was to become the exile. Although few writers on modern prisons mention the chaplain, those that do, in the main, mention the marginality of the chaplain within the prison system (Wolff, 1967; 251; Rinaldi, 1977; 53; Beckford and Gilliat, 1998; 166,168). Marginality was, of course, the conclusion I drew with regard to the chaplain, based on my experience of Long Bay prison, as mentioned in the Preface.

Pattison notes that the Christianity as a whole has suffered from the attacks of those who have been influenced by the thinkers who established what he refers to as the critiques of suspicion. Pattison singled out Freud, Marx and Nietzsche as the three thinkers who contributed most to the critiques of suspicion. Freud's psychological criticism was that religion is a dysfunctional projection, while Marx regarded religion as an ideological tool of social control. Nietzsche theorized that Christianity was an alienation of human
potential (Pattison, 1995; 36). While Pattison's comments related to what he maintained was the marginality of theology within the university, his commentary is applicable to the vast majority of secular workplaces, including the prison. In contemporary society, religion is often treated with doubt and suspicion. Liberals often see religion as a divisive force in the public forum, not a force that can help society to attempt to gain consensus on issues. There are others, such as MacIntyre, who take the view that religion, in MacIntyre's case a Thomist form, can offer society the opportunity to clear what they believe to be the muddle of its ethical and moral dilemmas. This is highly contentious and the issue of the future of religion will be picked up in later chapters, which deal with whether there can be a return of the chaplain from his position of marginality; his exile. The contemporary situation contrasts starkly to that of the eighteenth century where religion was regarded as the moral base of society and the force that had the potential to help society cohere by reforming the underclass, or some of them, into law-abiding citizens.

Religion is often distrusted in the public forums of the liberal democracy. It is often distrusted in the face-to-face contacts between individuals. Richard Shaw, a United States prison chaplain, and the author of one of the few books on the prison chaplain, gave an interesting illustration of this when he referred to an incident between a nun, engaged in advocacy work in a juvenile court setting, and a probation officer. The nun had indicated to the probation officer that a juvenile should be sent to drug rehabilitation instead of gaol. The probation officer was dismissive of the nun and asked her what her qualifications were for making her decision. The nun replied that she had a Ph.D. in
counselling, and countered by questioning his qualifications for questioning her judgement. The probation officer was apparently both embarrassed and impressed, and presumably agreed to the juvenile going to drug rehabilitation.

Shaw, too, was impressed by this incident, so much so that he decided, there and then he tells us, to go back to graduate school to attain secular qualifications to impress the 'big boys', because they do not respect religious personnel in their 'proper role' (Shaw, 1995; 76-77). This is a classic illustration of the 'proper role', or indeed, one thinks, of any role of religious personnel in the wider prison system being a mystery to the probation officer in question. It was also unknown to the Director of Special Security Units giving evidence before the Nagle Royal Commission into New South Wales prisons (Nagle, 1978; 198), just as it was confusing to the Royal Commissioner himself (Nagle, 1978; 198). It seems also that it is unknown to many chaplains in the British prisons (Beckford and Gilliat, 1998; 43,166). To pursue the issues raised by Shaw's example a little further, a nun operating from the educational qualifications and perspective of a secular professional, would hardly help to clear the confusion about the 'proper role' of a chaplain and what the chaplain offers that is unique, if indeed anything unique is offered at all. If secular qualifications are paramount, is there any unique role for the chaplain derived from his religious education? Is there any point to ongoing continuing education in religion? Might it not be better if the whole field were left to the secular professional? After all there are very few people in the prison who have a strong connection with the mainstream church, certainly the Protestant church. The prison is so highly secularised that doubts have been raised as to whether it is best left to the secular professionals, with
clergy coming to the prison when needed. Doubtless there would be ecclesiastical objections to this. These will not be discussed here, but raised in later chapters dealing with the possibility of the return from the exile. Suffice it to note, at this point, that the issues regarding the relevance of the chaplain in the prison have been raised.

Shaw's example is a good illustration of the extent to which the prison is now a secular institution and how secular knowledge has been heavily incorporated by religious personnel. While Shaw is writing from a United States perspective, the trend is widespread, the church was given its commission to Christianise the world (Matthew 28:19-20), but the reality is that the world has secularised the church.

The evidence for the chaplain as the exile comes not only from the secular sector, there is evidence from the ecclesiastical sector. In Australia, the decline of the mainstream churches has been evident for some considerable time and there has been a subsequent reduction of religious activities and programs. This excludes those that are largely welfare in orientation and funded by the state, such as church substitute care programs for children and church counselling services. These services are basically secular professional services offered under a church auspice and where staff are employed for their secular qualifications, and religious convictions, or lack of them, are excluded by the state as a relevant criterion of employment. Such services could easily be taken over by the Humanist Society without detriment to the clients.

The church emphasis has always been focussed on the parish, and services such as the
chaplaincies have always been a secondary consideration. Church chaplaincy services have always been among the first services to be reduced in times of budgetary restraint. The exception to this rule is when the state traditionally contributes a substantial subsidy to the church for provision of the chaplaincy, in which case it is not under ecclesiastical threat, for example fully subsidised defence force chaplains and the substantially subsidised prison chaplains. The case is not the same with non-subsidised or minimally subsidised chaplains, for instance those of the hospital and health system. In the Canberra Region Presbytery of the Uniting Church, where I was ministering until 2000, the hospital chaplaincy service was continually being reduced as budget problems became progressively more significant. Churches in general are reluctant to commit their own financial resources into the chaplaincies, clearly indicating that their priorities are elsewhere. While the rhetoric may deny this, the evidence is overwhelming.

The contemporary chaplain has been forced from the homeland and is in exile in Babylon. The major force, which extracted the chaplain from the homeland, was the failure of reform in the penitentiary and the foundational understandings underlying it. The continuing exile has been heavily influenced by the competing foundational understandings. These understandings were in early formative stages at the inception of the penitentiary, but grew in stature as they became disciplines in themselves, for instance psychology, and as the Church and its theology and doctrines came under increasingly telling criticism from the physical and social sciences. As some of these disciplines formed themselves into professions, with their own spheres of influence and codes of ethics, the areas and organizations in which they operated were further removed
from the influence of Church, whose power and status were diminished.

The competing understandings created both external and internal pressures on the theology and doctrines of the Church. Externally, the pressures came through such happenings as the use of Darwin's work to criticise, and in some instances attack, the literal biblical account of creation. Internally, pressure was created by the adoption, by many biblical scholars, of the secular science based Historical Critical Method, which raised difficult historical, textual and canonical problems for the church. The pressure from within the church was a latent rather than a manifest function of the development of the Historical Critical Method. It must be noted here that this criticism was not just a trend among ecclesiastical elites, but had significant repercussions among the laity of the churches. Critical approaches in the ecclesiastical disciplines, especially biblical studies and theology, were considerably more influential pressures on the churches than the external criticisms. Flanagan is quite correct when he says, in a response to Milbank's assessment of sociology that,

> The damage sociology might have done to religious belief, that makes it a scapegoat for secularization in Milbank’s eyes, is as nothing compared to the internal demolition job accomplished by the liberal progressive theologians (Flanagan, 1996(a); 61).

We have seen that the prison was the homeland of the chaplain, from which he has become the exile; we now turn to a more detailed consideration of the problems
encountered by the chaplain in the exile.

**Entailment Two. The Chaplain as the Exile who Experiences Cultural Confrontation.**

The chaplain's decline accelerated with the failure of the penitentiary. As mentioned there was a siege prior to the failure of the penitentiary. This siege came on several fronts.

(a). **Specific confrontations through attacks on the separate system.**

There was the social criticism front, where the 'Times' was to the fore, keeping up a constant criticism of the separate system which it depicted as being inhumane. Well known individuals, such as Charles Dickens and Oscar Wilde were also prominent in their criticisms. These criticisms, of course, received significant publicity. The penitentiary and its separate system had a number of other critics. These ranged from proponents of other systems, such as the silent system, to governors, such as Major Fulford of Stafford prison, who argued that the system of moral reformation was almost valueless, through to some members of parliament and even the occasional clergyman. The attacks were initially deflected by the desire on the part of the leading classes to believe in the potential of the penitentiary and the positive, and exaggeratedly optimistic and idealistic reports of the inspectors, Whitworth Russell and Crawford. The day of reckoning was simply being staved off for a time.

When the separate system, with its culture of the reformation of the individual through repentance, failed, reformation as a whole was taken to have failed. The prison was now
an open market with regard to the understandings that would drive it. The chaplain would now face contending understandings, given that the ecclesiastical understandings did not fulfil what its enthusiastic advocates claimed that it would do. Some chaplains defended the separate system, believing that it had not been given a fair chance and that the decisions to lessen the length of time spent by prisoners in solitary confinement were ill considered and antithetical to repentance and reform. Theirs was a lost cause. The failure of the separate system meant that the chaplain's input was no longer the lynchpin of the penal system, however he was not, at this point in time, in a completely alien culture as were the people of the Exile when Jerusalem fell. Going into exile was a lengthier process for the chaplain.

The Du Cane era (1877-1894) commenced following the passage of the 1877 Prison Act when Sir Edmund Du Cane was appointed Chairman of Prison Commission; he had previously been Director of Convict Prisons from 1869. After 1877, all prisons, local and convict, were brought under central government co-ordination. Ultimate responsibility for the prisons was vested in the Home Secretary and delegated to the Prison Commission, where Du Cane was the dominant figure (Playfair, 1971; 98) and nothing was conceded to local factors (Freeman, 1978; 72). The Du Cane era saw the any lingering emphasis on reform exchanged for an emphasis on severe and hard labour, deterrence and discipline (Forsythe, 1987; 196-197). The Du Cane era did not see the chaplain discarded, but the diminished reliance on his understandings and interpretations meant that the prison was not organised around his input. Reformation was not to emerge strongly again until the twentieth century: the 1960s and 1970s, but this emphasis on
reformation was also short-lived and soon discredited. Fiori Rinaldi, was not alone in
castigating the notion of reform when it re-emerged, although he was more severe than
most, describing sections about reformation in prison reports as 'not to be taken seriously'
and consisting mainly of 'gobbledygook' (Rinaldi, 1977; 29). The point to be emphasised
here is that the renewed emphasis on reformation and rehabilitation was not inspired by
religion and the chaplain was neither the promoter of it, nor featured in it. The driving
force behind this movement was the secular professional and the social sciences. The
chaplain by this time was decidedly the exile.

The failure of the separate system was both multi-causal and complex. One contributing
factor, undoubtedly, was the chaplain's understanding of human nature. There is much
evidence that the chaplain was often 'duped' by prisoners into believing that repentance
had come about. The chaplain did not seem to be able to detect genuine repentance from
feigned repentance. In this sense the chaplains were their own worst enemies. The
duplicity seemed obvious to just about anybody but themselves and their supporters.
Clearly most chaplains, members of the leading classes, were ill equipped to assess the
motivations of the underclass.

There was also the question of the chaplain's theology; there was an emphasis that God
would be the partner in bringing about change in the individual. The Select Committee of
the House of Lords in 1863 assessed that there was virtually no evidence of repentance
and reform to show from the huge investment in the separate system. The Prison Act of
1865 made it clear that while the separation of prisoners would continue, there would be
no emphasis on spiritual reformation, rather the emphasis would be on separation at night and hard labour during the day. The chaplain had not been successful, but what are we to say about God? It would seem that either God had to be assessed as a failure, or that the chaplains and supporters were mistaken in their understandings of God. For the nineteenth century chaplain, God was an active participant in the addressing of Evil in the penitentiary. The chaplains of today would make no such grand claims about the role of God in the prison. The contemporary chaplain, if he speaks at all of God in public, certainly does not speak in these terms. Religion today is very private, even for the chaplain. It seems, not only has the chaplain declined, but God, too, in a sense, has declined. This issue will be pursued in the following chapter. For the moment, the point to be made is that the secular understandings were developing to challenge the theological and ecclesiastical ones, which, with regard to reform, were failing the empirical tests.

The chaplain also was seen as advocating a system that had deleterious effects on those who were subjected to it. It was perceived that the chaplains failed to understand the aetiology of the deleterious effects of solitude; hence they were seen as naive (Dixon, 1985; 396 reprint of nineteenth century publication). Other critics saw them as being 'soft' on the criminal, the Select Committee of 1863 certainly held this view. From this perspective the chaplain was seen as promoting a system that was not deterring crime, and crime was once again becoming a matter of grave concern to the leading classes in the late 1850s and the beginning of the 1860s (Forsythe, 1987; 147).
As theological and ecclesiastical understandings were supplanted, a more pessimistic attitude developed toward the underclass and change. Reformation came to be seen as something that could happen within the individual, but which could not be imposed externally (Ramsland, 1996; 300). The state was no longer willing to be the active sponsor of a religiously inspired effort of reform in the prison. This attitude is consistent with the a continuing trend from the mid nineteenth century to see religion as a private matter, something which has greatly troubled the advocates of 'public theology' in the latter part of the twentieth century. These advocates want theology to once again become part of the public discourse. This will be addressed in more detail later.

The chaplain, in the lead up to and following the failure of the separate system, was confronted by competing understandings. As time progressed these understandings became more sophisticated and specialised and organised into professions. The confrontations became more organised and formidable. The understandings of the Church, personified in the chaplain, were progressively less able to compete. It is emphasised that this was progressive, for in the Du Cane era, which came after the loss of confidence in the separate system, DuCane himself, while pessimistic about reform, was not averse to chaplains being in the prison (Forsythe, 1987; 198). The chaplain, however, did not have the power and authority as with the separate system. The ideas on penal policy were no longer driven by religion.

The confrontations for the chaplain have increased markedly since the separate system failure. The supremacy of secular understandings has seen the chaplain's place on
important prison committees assumed by secular professionals. The chaplain's core knowledge in theology is not regarded as relevant to the workings of these committees. Nor do chaplains even supply assessment reports on prisoners; it is the expertise of the secular professional that is sought in these instances. Assessment by the chaplain has not been disregarded because of the private nature of his work, but rather by the fact that there is little interest in his work.

The chaplain has also experienced the confrontation of language. The language of soteriology and repentance was another victim of the failure of the penitentiary and this language no longer has any credibility in the prison. It is the language of the secular professional which dominates the prison and the chaplain, to have a hearing, must adopt this language as best he can. This language is not just the language of the rehabilitation sections of prison reports, as Rinaldi seems to think, but also the language of policy and assessment. The language of theology and ecclesiology is a 'foreign language' for the prison. As Pattison, himself a theologian, notes, theology is now the language of an obscuritanist ghetto in a secular society (Pattison, 1995; 36). McLeod makes a similar point when he notes that the language of religion has been superseded by the scientific (McLeod, 1995; 117). The process of the challenge to the dominance of religious language began in earnest in the mid nineteenth century. It has now reached the point where the American chaplain Richard Shaw, as mentioned earlier, believes that secular qualifications are a necessary qualification for the chaplain operating in the prison. (Shaw, 1995; 76-77).
The separate system failed in its endeavours for reform. The chaplain's status within the community deteriorated on this account; he was no longer the recognized expert for the prison, which no longer functioned on religious understandings. This however was not the only source of attack on the chaplain's status. The Church itself was hard pressed on a number of fronts and the chaplain, as part of the Church, was part of this confrontation.

(b). Broader confrontations by way of attacks on the church.

The Church was under attack from the physical sciences. Specifically under attack was the authority of the scriptures. From the late 1860s, Darwin's work on the origin of species was beginning to have repercussions in the Church. Although Darwin's work was seen by some to justify the placing of European man at the apex of social development, the thought of man descending from the lower forms of life was galling to many in the Church. Galling enough for some Church leaders to be unwise enough to debate the eminent scientist T.H. Huxley on the matter. Sir Charles Lyall's work in geology, too, caused its problems, the world could no longer be credibly dated to 4004 B.C., as had been thought, based on a literal interpretation of the scriptures. The fundamentalists in the Church counter attacked and made accusations that liberals were endeavouring to promote atheism and thus undermine the society and destroy its moral base. This was a sore point, and did quell the attacks of some who feared the destruction of the moral base of society. As Chadwick notes,

Some thinkers refused to admit any necessary connection between religion and morality, but nevertheless admitted that in the situation of Western Europe,
history had connected them; and on this ground even some non-Christians like Henry Sidgwick, and in his mellow years, John Morley, refused to attack religion because they had no desire to weaken morality (Chadwick, 1975; 230).

The attacks of the physical scientists certainly led to loss of influence for the Church. The authority of the scriptures declined among the leading classes. They were among the first of the reflective groups in British society who, as David Pailin noted (Pailin, 1994; 211), increasingly looked to reason as the final authority in matters religion. The more long-term repercussions, however, came from the church disciplines as they began applying the new sciences to the study of religion, particularly the scriptures.

Orthodoxy, the position of the Evangelicals who were to the fore in the establishment of the separate system, had always had its challengers. The Deists had challenged the view of Orthodoxy that God was active in the world, in the sense of directly intervening in the physical and human world. The Deists concurred that God had created the universe and established its laws, but since then had not intervened with this established regularity. God was the 'unmoved mover', not the God who would intervene in human affairs, this God would certainly not be a partner in the penitentiary enterprise. The Deist challenge was, however, insignificant compared to the challenge that was to come from the social science based Historical Critical Method.

Historical Critical Method had its origins in Germany in the nineteenth century. Strauss had raised questions about the historicity of the scriptural accounts of the life of Jesus in
1835 when he published the 'Life of Jesus'. This account shocked many in ecclesiastical circles by its approach to the scriptures (Eliot-Binns, 1971; 17-18). Historical Critical Method was slow in making its mark in Britain, due to the efforts of scholars such as Lightfoot of Oxford, who challenged the excesses of the early German scholarship. While the proponents of Historical Critical Method were depicted as 'Fifth Columnists' by Orthodoxy, it gradually began to significantly shape the attitudes and practice of liberal Protestants (Eliot-Binns, 1971; 12). Enlightenment rationality was becoming a significant influence in liberal Protestantism. It was one base from which challenges were mounted to the creedal and doctrinal statements of the Church. The chaplain's understandings were continuously being eroded by confrontations with other, secular understandings; Enlightenment rationality was gradually clearing the skies of saints and angels, so to speak. The chaplain's status in the prison had received a blow with the failure of the separate system, while at the same time his Church was being confronted by the rising physical and social sciences. The chaplain's fortunes were significantly tied to his accrediting and sponsoring body from the wider community. Declines in the church's fortunes were reflected in the fortunes of the chaplains.

Notwithstanding the confrontations noted above, the chaplain and the Church were not entirely spent forces; they were definitely weakened, but not spent. For example, in 1916 a building that can aptly be described as an edifice was officially opened at Long Bay prison in New South Wales. That edifice was the chapel, opened by Archbishop Wright, the Church of England Archbishop of Sydney. The building could easily seat the entire population of both the male and female prisons (Ramsland, 1996; 192). Obviously, the
church was still influential, even though its understandings no longer directed the policy of the prison.

The influence of the church was soon to take a sharp decline, in Britain and Australia, following the First World War. Commenting on Britain, Stuart Mews notes,

> It was not just the experience of war which undermined faith, but also the experience of peace in a country where many had grown used to living now, for tomorrow may bring death. The craving for vitality and sensation, though an intelligible reaction, also challenged convention. The collapse of deference was one of the lasting legacies of the First World War and was bound to undermine religious authority (Mews, 1994; 466).

Even the Sunday Schools, to which the majority of children were sent in the nineteenth century, suffered significant declines during this period. Sunday schools were the only religious institution which the public in mass had any intention of using, seventy five percent of children were enrolled in Sunday school in 1851. Few ever went through to church membership (Hempton, 1994; 311).

(c). Repercussions of the confrontations.

The confrontations with cultural forces have contributed to the power and influence of the church being eroded and the chaplain being marginalised in the prison. As we have seen, the language of the prison, and indeed of just about any organization, including
church sponsored agencies, is the language of the secular professional. The trend of the chaplain has been to accommodate to the intellectual and ideological trends of modernity, in order to be afforded a hearing. The language of the chaplain's theological training is either not understood, or not tolerated, in the secular organization, whether that secular organization is a hospital, military establishment or prison. The chaplain has not received assistance in this regard from the church, which has similar difficulties in the wider society. An alternatively construed world has not been forthcoming from the church's 'peculiar memory in faith', to use Brueggemann's term (Brueggemann, 1993; 17-18). Moving Christianity to the centre stage, from a position of marginality, is a momentous task, particularly when one considers the problem of language. The task of the chaplain is similar, moving to the centre of prison discourse from the present position of obscurity is similarly momentous, particularly in the chaplain's case where the church is making no headway in the larger society and thus can render no assistance.

In the Exile, the Exiles had the prophets who endeavoured to encourage and sustain them, these prophets did not always have had a good reception, but an alternative view to the dominant Babylonian one was always at hand through the prophets (Klein, 1979; 97). The prophets encouraged the Exiles to remain with the faith. In contemporary times the chaplain has not had the prophets to give an alternative construal of reality. The mainstream Protestant chaplain has moved to the position where a wide range of people, including Royal Commissioners (Nagle, 1978; 198), academics (Wolff, 1967; 254-255) and secular prison staff, both custodial and professional (Nagle, 1978; 198; Knight, 1992; 190) find difficulty understanding his presence in the prison.
The chaplain has been a syncretist in his exile, taking into his religion foreign elements, in this case numerous, of the social science formulations and practice of the secular professional. As these have been taken in, the boundaries between the chaplain and the secular professional have been increasingly blurred. What is religious in the chaplain's role is obscure, particularly as liturgical tasks have diminished severely. Rinaldi notes that there are few protestant services in the gaol and that these are poorly attended, even though the alternative options are not at all pleasant (Rinaldi, 1977; 53). Knight, who was chaplain at Long Bay gaol in New South Wales, acknowledges this and adds that there was little interest in group studies (Knight, 1992; 150). Knight also acknowledges that the prisoner, if he seeks the services of the chaplain, is likely to seek 'support/counselling' than a religious function (Knight, 1992; 176). The formal spiritual aspects of the chaplain's work are minimal and the skills and knowledge for the tasks he performs are drawn from secular, rather than ecclesiastical disciplines. There have been no prophets and no voices of guidance in the prison. Syncretism is rife. It is not at all surprising then that the chaplain’s work is a mystery to people who work in the prison, or people who have reviewed the functions of the prison.

When referring to syncretism, of course, there is the position of Paul Halmos to be taken into account. Halmos argues that the secular counsellor bases his or her practice on 'faith' and he argues that there is a spiritual or metaphysical basis for counselling practice (Halmos, 1965; 6,156,182). This definition of faith is so obviously broad that anything can be placed within it and seen as spiritual. It is rather like the argument presented by
Milan Machovec in 'The Vatican Symposium on the Culture of Unbelief' (Machovec, 1971; 100-101). Machovec argues that there is a faith and spirituality in Marxism. If faith and spirituality are defined widely enough, then he is correct. Obviously what both Halmos and Machovec refer to is not a specifically Christian spirituality. Halmos defines spirituality broadly, he is not speaking of a counsellor deliberately incorporating into his practice specific aspects of the Christian religion, as the Exile of ancient Babylon would have incorporated aspects of the religion of Marduk. The counsellor is not involved in a syncretistic practice with regard to the Christian faith.

While some people express doubts about the usefulness of full time chaplains in prisons, now that full-time welfare staff have been appointed, the chaplains and other ecclesiastical representatives point to the imperatives contained in the scriptures to visit the prisoner (Matthew, 25:36 & 43 and Hebrews 13:3). These texts are seen as a justification for the chaplain being in the prison. The situation in the prisons of the first century, however, is vastly different to the prisons of Britain and Australia of contemporary times. The ancient prisons were places that held prisoners who, in the main, were awaiting execution. Capital punishment is very likely to raise ultimate questions about human existence, questions that are at the very core of religion. The presence of religious people in, or the visitation of religious people to, prisons which contained people sentenced to death is not surprising.

The British and New South Wales prisons are not places where capital punishment is any longer part of their punishment regimen and thus are places where ultimate questions of
human existence are less likely to be raised merely as a consequence of prisoners being kept within these institutions. The imperative of the scriptures was conceived in a first century environment and is more obviously relevant to the prison environment of the first century than contemporary times; in the contemporary prison, most prisoners are serving short sentences (Grant, 1992; 7).

In modern times, there are few people who look to the church for their guidance and opinion on issues, with the exception of some moral matters. In fact, it has been commented that when the opinions of church leaders, or prominent religious people have been sought, it is usually when the mass media want to create a polemic to 'liven up' an issue being discussed. The specific religious opinion sought is for the purposes of polemic rather than edification. For instance, the opinion of the well-known Protestant Sydney clergyman, The Reverend Fred Nile, is often sought when matters regarding homosexuality are in the public arena; Nile has a very conservative view. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, George Pell, equally conservative, can also be relied upon for the purposes of polemic in this area. A moderate position, or a supportive position does not make 'good' television or broadcasting.

It is difficult to imaging the media, or policy makers, seeking the opinion of a prison chaplain regarding prison policy or administration. Taking up the points made earlier by Shaw, it is conceivable, but not highly likely, that opinions of some chaplains may be sought because of their secular, rather than their religious training, and most likely if there is no evidence of their religious education intruding in the consultative process.
Overwhelmingly, if not exclusively, the opinions sought would be those of academics, or secular professionals with prison experience, which is a far cry from the situation that prevailed in the times of the penitentiary. In modern times, a scan of the literature produces only sporadic evidence of the chaplain's existence; credible evidence of the chaplain's influence is extremely difficult to uncover in the prison context where the secular sciences prevail. This is another confrontation to the chaplain. What use can their training in the church disciplines have in the prison system?

As previously mentioned, in the late 1960’s and 1970's in Britain there was a revival of the idea of rehabilitation in the prisons. It is interesting to note that this had nothing to do with the religious input or the chaplain. It was not religion that supplied the understandings on which the effort was based. These understandings came from some schools of thought within the social sciences. In New South Wales there was a reform effort, through the Corrective Services Commission, which was resisted and the attempt was short-lived. Unlike the nineteenth century effort at reform, this failure created no movement away from the source of these originating understandings, namely the social sciences. There was a move away from rehabilitation to a more disciplinary, punitive approach, but it was still the social sciences that were consulted for policy formation and the like, it was simply that rehabilitation was, once again, abandoned. This is indicative that, unlike the situation prevailing at the time of the failure of the penitentiary, there was no challenge from alternative understandings. Religion had not revived to provide an alternative; secularisation had gone too far and religion had been firmly relegated to the sphere of the individual and the private.
The prisons are now exclusively secular institutions. The secularisation of the prison has been strengthening from the days of the penitentiary. Some theorists, such as Jose Casanova, are of the view that secularisation has not been as pronounced as generally thought and that there was a 'deprivatization' of religion in the 1980s (Casanova, 1994; 5). Casanova based his claims around case studies, one in a modern liberal democracy, the United States, others in Third World, or emerging democracies. Casanova's claims are weakest when he analyses the church's influence in the modern liberal democracy. This argument does not have much relevance for the prison, however, for in the prison there is ample evidence of the, at least overt, religiosity of the nineteenth century, both in the penitentiary and in society, and ample evidence of its absence in contemporary times. Progressively, the secular professionals have been narrowing the sphere of the chaplain's influence as they have taken over functions where the chaplain either had direct or supervisory input. The prison has become highly secularised along the three dimensions mentioned by Casanova, namely, secularisation as: religious decline, differentiation and privatisation.

The most problematic issue for the chaplain has been the establishment of the welfare departments in the prisons. Welfare issues and pastoral care issues are difficult to distinguish, as Royal Commissioner Nagle found. They are so difficult to distinguish because the two groups in question, chaplains and welfare officers, use a similar body of knowledge when dealing with those issues. The chaplain has, to a large extent, borrowed from the social sciences. It is no surprise then to see that the chaplain is feeling that his
territory is being intruded upon and overtaken by the welfare professionals. This is increasingly the case in public institutions, as the chaplain cannot relate to most of the people in these institutions by way of his ecclesiastical disciplines, for the simple reason that they make no sense to those people. Few people now, even within the churches, are theologically literate, and theology and doctrine mean little or nothing to them, a point that McGrath both points out and laments (McGrath, 1990; vii). This may account for the fact that the basic post-ordination training available to chaplains, Clinical Pastoral Education, which I undertook, was basically a course in the application of elementary psychology and inter-personal communication with an occasional theological or biblical reference added here and there. The latter could easily be dispensed with and not effect the program; the relation to Christian theology and doctrine is tenuous. This observation is similar to those of Martin when he discusses the secularisation of preaching within the church (Martin, 1980; 104-111).

The decline of liturgy, both in the form of worship services and as the ecclesiastical accompaniment of executions, has lessened the visual impact of the chaplain's duties and has made the professional boundaries, which were once quite sharp, very blurred indeed. The chapel, the imposing edifice of many prisons, is now best known to prisoners as a cinema or other meeting hall. The chaplain has little territory, either physical, or cognitive/intellectual, which is readily identifiable as his alone.

The secular professionals are a considerable threat to the chaplain. The chaplain is the exile in the prison, which is definitively the province of the secular professional. The
chaplain is in the difficult position of relating to prison staff, few of whom share a
Christian faith, broadly defined, and even fewer of whom have a denominational
allegiance, which manifests itself in regular church attendance (Knight, 1992; 152). This
raises the issue of the chaplain's identity in this secular environment, which has long
since abandoned the religious understandings as an approach to penology.

Entailment Three: The Chaplain as the One Struggling to Retain a Unique Identity.
The chaplain in the penitentiary had no problems with his identity. The prison was
organised around his knowledge and training. His were the understandings that promised
reform and the chaplain was a high profile professional in the prison. There were no
issues associated with identity that confronted the chaplain. As we have seen, the
penitentiary was, in effect, an endeavour to construct Christendom. The daily routine of
the penitentiary was far more Christian in its rituals and observances, albeit forced, than
the society that sponsored it. In modern times the situation is markedly different,
chaplaincy is marginalised, both within prison and within ecclesiastical hierarchies.

The parish minister is within an organization where the people attending services and
other activities do so from their own choice. Admittedly some of these choices may have
more to do with such things as who else attends, or the parishioner’s perceptions of the
status and acceptability of churchgoing, nevertheless there is no compulsion to attend.
The creeds and theology of the church are not out of place in the parish building, even
though the parishioner’s understanding, or interest, may not be all that is desired by the
clergy. People go to church because they desire to go to church and may even be
enthusiastic to see and hear the parish minister. This is not so in the prison. The prisoner usually has nothing to do with the clergy prior to entry to prison and nothing to do with them when he leaves the prison. Within the prison, they see the chaplain, if they do, usually with no religious question in mind (Knight, 1992; 176). The deceiving of chaplains is still a regular activity, even though the range of rewards for the prisoner were nowhere near as attractive as in the days of the penitentiary. An interesting account of this time-honoured process is provided by John Justin, an articulate man once imprisoned in New Zealand. The 'God screw', that is the prison chaplain, was fairly easy to 'con' i.e. deceive, according to Justin (Justin, 1973; 43).

In the community, a clergyperson has a unique identity. The clergyperson still deals with some of the ultimate issues, especially death, through the conducting of funerals. Within the prison, identity in a person as demonstrably marginalised as the prison chaplain is a big issue. Unlike the community clergyperson, there is little support and confirmation of his role in a setting that is little dependent upon it. The chaplain is required to do very little by the state. Jurgen Moltmann, when speaking of the dilemma facing the contemporary church, spoke of the issue of 'identity versus relevance' (Moltmann, 1974; 7), by this Moltmann was suggesting that there is a fine line that the church has to tread between adopting ideas and practices that modern human beings can readily relate to, (relevance) and maintaining tradition, which has for centuries defined the church and its clergy (identity). It is argued here that in the prison the chaplain has adopted many of the practices of the secular world, in an endeavour to seek relevance. The chaplain has adopted social science concepts and practices, although not generally on the scale that
Shaw seems to think necessary. This has allowed the chaplain to relate in the language of the secular professionals of the prison, but it has also brought the chaplain into difficulties with regard to professional boundaries.

In an endeavour to appeal to a wider audience the chaplain adopted a very broad definition 'spirituality', certainly one that is well outside the confines of denominationalism, and often outside of orthodox Christianity. Denominationalism and orthodoxy, with its creedal, doctrinal and sacramental approach has very little appeal in the prison. However, in adopting the 'spiritual' approach and casting his net widely, the chaplain is reaping some unintended consequences. In the United States, for instance, there are prisoners who are demanding to be assisted in the pursuit of their chosen spirituality, Satanism. This type of dilemma has brought about the resignation of some chaplains, who have felt compromised in their ministry. Such dilemmas have arisen because of the adoption of the broad concept of spirituality, where the chaplain has endeavoured to be all things to all people and find relevance in the rapidly diminishing religious 'market' in the prison. Far from finding relevance, it has more likely left people puzzled about the functions of the chaplain. Eric Knight found such puzzlement in his small survey of prisoners and prison staff at Long Bay prison in New South Wales (Knight, 1992; 172, 184, 190). The prisoners on the whole saw the chaplain as irrelevant to their daily lives. This finding, of course, is predictable.

Within the terms of Moltmann's dichotomy of relevance versus identity, the chaplain has sought to adapt to the prevailing culture of secularism: he has become the syncretist. He
has sought thereby to find relevance in the prison system. This endeavour has not been successful; rather it has created awkward issues of professional demarcation. Neither would the chaplain's identity be served by retreating to denominational and orthodox practices, for then there would be scarcely a prisoner to affirm that identity. Further, the entailment speaks of a unique identity. The many of the Exiles sought to retain a unique identity within their Exile, the identity of their religion. It seems that the chaplain is seeking an identity, as opposed to a unique identity. Just as in the church welfare organizations, where in many cases it would make no essential difference if the responsibility for the delivery of the service were to be assumed by a secular organization, so in the chaplain's service to the prison the same issues of the unique identity are to the fore. When assessing the prison at the time of the penitentiary and currently, it is hard to escape one particular conclusion; whereas the chaplain and the Church of England had set out to Christianise the prison, the prison has performed rather better at secularising the chaplain and the church.

In the modern prison, it is difficult to identify any task of scale that is the unique to the chaplain. The tasks around the execution of prisoners have long gone and the liturgical tasks have all but gone. The language and foundational understandings are those of the secular professional and the social sciences. The question is posed, to be answered in a later chapter; 'Is there a way back from marginality for the chaplain in the modern prison'?

We have explored the confrontations for the chaplain of the alternative understandings.
Alternative understandings, challenging at the time of the penitentiary, are now dominant through the secular professional. We now turn to the issue of God. In the penitentiary, God as a word and as a concept was to the fore. Great happenings were expected in the penitentiary, instead there was disappointment. The chaplain held the hopes of the leading classes, and he too was a disappointment. The question remains, 'What of God?’ In the following chapter we will look at this question; just as we have examined the fortunes of the penitentiary, the chaplain, and to some extent, the church, we now turn our attention to looking at the fortunes of God as this relates to the prison chaplain.

CHAPTER EIGHT.

LIFE IN BABYLON:

THE DECLINE OF GOD.

Introduction.

When Armageddon was brought to the penitentiary, confidence was high, the Evangelicals were confident of the God of their theology, the active God. The
Evangelical's God was the God who intervenes in sudden and dramatic ways through his servants, in this case the chaplain, to achieve reformation of the individual (Forsythe, 1987; 34). This Evangelical confidence was evident in spite of the influence of the Deist's theology, which was enjoying considerable popularity at the time. The Deists were inspired by the Enlightenment rationality, especially Newtonian physics and the concomitant mechanical universe, to attack the fundamental, 'active God' theology of the Evangelicals. Prison policy followed the active God of the Evangelicals.

The leading classes, for their part, were convinced that religion was socially useful, even if, as Placher notes, many of this class were ambivalent as to whether or not it was true (Placher, 1983; 241-242). True or not, they were wholeheartedly behind the reformist attempt to turn the prisons into a structure approximating Christendom, a structural form which had long since collapsed in mainland Europe and in fact had never been in existence in Britain.

A concept central to the penitentiary was, most definitively, that of the active God, and the active God would work with the chaplains and the state. Together the chaplains and the state would provide the favourable milieu to bring about a reformation of character. Such was the thinking behind the penitentiary. The active God, the chaplain and the state would be the triumvirate, which would work for the eternal soul and salvation of the prisoner and also his restoration to society as a law-abiding citizen. The naturalistic God of the Deists had no place in the penitentiary.
The penitentiary failed. The infrastructure of the separate system is still evident in the many surviving prisons, however, reformation as a policy failed; it did not survive to the 1870's. The chaplain, the servant of the Church and the servant of the active God, had failed. The foundational understandings of the Church had failed. The state, as reported on by various commentators and committees, had been wrong to support the reformation effort, financially and politically. But what of the third member of the triumvirate? What of God? Did God fail? God who was to convict the prisoner of the evil of his ways; God who was to be the all-seeing, all-pervading force; God under whose scrutiny the prisoner would always be; God who was to be the substitute for the physical panopticon that was never built. Did God fail, along with the chaplain, the Church and the state?

The failure of the active and all-powerful God was the pressing and critical question which the Exiles in Babylon had to address. Were they simply wrong in their assumptions about God? Or was there another explanation, one that would suffice to preserve God and God's qualities and characteristics? For the chaplain, God was the base of the foundational understandings that underpinned the reformation effort and the penitentiary. God was the base of the language of the penitentiary. Since the time of the penitentiary, great changes have taken place. The language of the nineteenth century penitentiary would be totally anachronistic in today's prison. When one reads the literature on the contemporary prison, God is missing from both the language and the foundational understandings of the prison. Both God and the chaplain are marginal to the prison, God more so even than the chaplain. The absence of God in both language and foundational understandings and the marginality of the chaplain were obvious to me
during my field experience in the prison. This marginality was evident also at a recent meeting of chaplains, albeit in another chaplaincy area: I heard an informal talk by an Air Force chaplain, in which he stressed the high importance placed by chaplains on moving further into the area of critical incident debriefing. There was no mention of God at all and the talk could have just as appropriately, and perhaps more competently, been given by a secular professional trained in the social sciences.

The chaplain and the reformation effort failed in the penitentiary. The state also failed in its efforts at promoting reformation. If God was a failure in the penitentiary, no one is saying. The other members of the triumvirate have been roundly criticised, but there has been no judgement on God, nor any apologetic for God's role in the penitentiary, as had been done by the Babylonian Exiles to explain the ‘failure’ of God at the fall of Jerusalem.

In the research for this thesis, a well-articulated conception of God in the modern prison could not be found. There does not appear to be a role for God. God it would seem, from the heights of activity in the penitentiary, has become for all practical purposes, Deist by default. It is highly questionable that God even forms the most important foundation of the chaplain's practice. The decline of the chaplain and the decline of God cannot be considered in isolation from one another, they are inextricably linked in their respective declines.

Like God at the destruction of Jerusalem, the God of the prison chaplain suffered a defeat
with the collapse of the penitentiary. God was ascendant in the penitentiary, but has been in decline in the prison since this time. What defences of the God of action, if any, were attempted? The stakes were high. The gradual replacement of the God of action with a by-default Deist God, who for all intents and purposes differs little, if at all, from no God, virtually meant exclusion for the wider church and the chaplain from the policy making and administration of the prison. The decline of God will now be analysed through the entailments of the metaphor, 'the chaplain as the exile'.

Entailment One. The Chaplain as the One who’s God is in Question because of Defeat.

Opinions of the value of the religious foundational understandings and the practice based upon it in the nineteenth century prison varied widely, even among the religiously committed. Prison inspectors, Crawford and Russell, saw the penitentiary as a tearaway success as evidenced by their reports. On the other hand the chaplain of Clerkenwell prison thought that of the one hundred thousand or so prisoners to pass through the prison during the time of his incumbency, there were only two definite repentants among them.

The questions of the value of religious foundational understandings in a prison setting were not comprehensively broached prior to the penitentiary being established. The leading classes were anxious and the Evangelicals irrepresible. This lack of comprehensive appraisal was also due, in part, to the fact that the most telling challenges for religion were a decade or more away. The penitentiary would have had far more grim
prospects of establishment in the social climate of the 1860's, when criticisms from science, the developing social sciences, and from within the Church itself were making Christianity more vulnerable.

The separate system failed, and there was an inevitability about its failure. The chaplain's failings in the great scheme of reform are there to see: his problems in relating to the underclass, both interpersonally and to their social situation; his identification with the legal system, the leading classes and the state and his consequent distrust by the prisoners, discussed at length in Chapter Two; his lack of assessment skills and tools to utilise in decision making with regard to prisoners; the unreasonably optimistic expectations placed on him to succeed.

The reasons for failure are not, of course, to be laid solely at the feet of the chaplain. As we have seen, there were expectations of what the active God could do. The expected happenings did not transpire. The Exiles knew that their holy vessels and other religious treasures were mere trophies in the Temple of Marduk; it was the liturgies and creeds of the Babylonian god that were to the fore. With the failure of the penitentiary, the chaplain saw the foundational understandings of the prison now being largely formulated by the secular world. God's omnipotence and omniscience were under challenge in the wider community and that challenge increased and intensified throughout the nineteenth century. There was resistance from the Church in the wider society and some chaplains tried to defend reform through the separate system and hence to make a de facto defence of God in the prison. These defences were largely futile; the foundational understandings,
premised in part on the active God, fell from favour in the prison, and this fall was largely unproblematic and without much repercussion.

In the wider society, the voice of science was continuing to force God 'into the gaps'. The appeal to proofs from nature was increasingly doubtful in the scientific age following the demise of the penitentiary (Gilley, 1994; 291). Ideas from evolution were proving difficult for Orthodoxy and questions about the suppositions of God having all the creative power and nature none were proving very awkward when it was being conceded that the world was several billion years in the making (Griffin, 1989; 31). More and more of the gaps were closing on God. God was diminishing from the all-powerful being who intervened in the world in cataclysmic ways. As William Placher notes (Placher, 1983; 285), on the scientific issues, Darwinists, and that highly successful combatant against religion, the scientist T.H. Huxley, carried the day. Leonard Eliot-Binns (1971; 25-26) was of the opinion that the effect on the general public of science in general and evolution in particular, was disastrous. Eliot-Binns put much of this problem, as he saw it, down to the public's deficiencies in being able to appraise these matters. Many people hailed evolution as the new gospel, despite Darwin's statements that it was not inconsistent with Christianity (Eliot-Binns, 1971; 25). But Darwin was reclusive and worked outside the academy and his ideas were taken up and often modified by others, such as the social scientist Herbert Spencer. Many people were seeing truth as relative and not fixed, evolving over time. The dominant, ecclesiastically approved interpretation of Christianity at the time appeared fixed and rigid, and to many out of harmony with the developing sciences of the day.
In the social sciences, the Social Darwinists were derisive of much Christian social action, and by implication, derisive of the underpinning of this social action, namely the active God. The Social Darwinists claimed that such social action could not lead to any substantive changes within what were regarded as inferior beings, such as prisoners. Explanations for criminality and personal failings, such as foul sanitation and the failings of parents to inculcate Christian teachings, were regarded as superficial explanations of human behaviour by the Social Darwinists (Forsythe, 1987; 176). Herbert Spencer was particularly influential. While Spencer did not deny the existence of God, he argued that God was unknowable. There is a fine line between an unknowable God and no God at all, and in practice it basically ceases to exist.

Secularist associations, after the tradition of Tom Paine, were also having a considerable influence on Christianity in the nineteenth century. They mainly adopted the position of attacking the Bible and the Established Church, which they regarded as socially and economically reactionary. Their critique was social rather than scientific, or philosophical (Royle, 1994; 407). As Edward Royle further notes, the influence of the secularists was far beyond what could be anticipated from their numerical strength, which was quite small. Christians felt compelled to defend themselves, particularly from the pulpit and the criticisms of the secularists were greatly resented by the Church (Royle, 1992; 422).

The late nineteenth century brought with it perhaps the most significant challenges to
God, in the form of Sigmund Freud. Like the other influential thinker of the time, Nietzsche, Freud had direct criticisms of God. Freud's idea of God being a projection was not new, after all Feuerbach had said precisely that just over a decade prior to Freud. Freud, however, was developing his ideas within a new psychology, an influential psychology, and was not willing to simply give theology its sacrosanct ground, as were the empiricists in psychology, and this made him a dangerous thinker in the eyes of the churches (Reed, 1997; 159). Freud was one of many thinkers who were challenging Christianity and theories were proliferating to explain how the idea of God arose at all if, as many contended, direct sensory experience was the prerequisite.

God, the Church and the Scriptures were being assailed by the protagonists referred to above. The critics were variously atheists and agnostics. Even thinkers such as Spencer, who did not rule out the existence of God, only conceded the possibility of a Deist God, a God who did not intervene and who essentially did not have to be taken into account as far as the physical and human sciences were concerned (Martin, 1980; 2). Gadamer is of the view that in the current social situation there is even more resistance to the active God; in Gadamer's view the militant denials of religion, evidenced in the nineteenth century have been replaced by what he calls the 'atheism of indifference'. (Gadamer, 1998; 202). God no longer excites much passion in either denial or assertion, as in the turbulent days of the nineteenth century. Secularists, humanists and the like no longer 'go after God' as in the nineteenth century, because there are few who are interested enough to listen. Ecclesiastics, such as Bishop Shelby Spong, excite some interest with books criticising orthodox Christianity, but this is mainly from outraged conservatives and those
amused about a bishop exciting very public verbal brawls with other bishops. One gets the impression that if Spong were not a bishop, there would be little interest in his ideas. There are Fundamentalists, who still preach fire and brimstone, and they are growing, but nowhere near as fast as the disinterested. The 1996 census figures for Australia indicate that those who profess 'no religion' now make up 16.6% of the population. To this figure could be added at least some of those 9% of the population who indicated ‘no stated religion’ (Hughes, 1997; 72-74). These figures also are somewhat inflated in favour of religion. For instance ‘Church of England’ is counted as Anglican and ‘Methodist’ as Uniting Church, when neither the Church of England, nor the Methodist Church has existed for over twenty years. The interest in institutional religion of those stating 'Methodist' and 'Church of England' must be, at the very least, questionable.

God is not a factor in public discourse. The Psalmist in Psalm 137, depicts Exiles, when being taunted by their captors, asking the question: 'How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land'? Now the situation is that the chaplain, as the exile, would rarely contemplate singing it. The 'strange land' of the chaplain is the land of the secular professional. The secular professionals formed themselves into associations, particularly from the twentieth century onwards, and now occupy the high ground as far as the foundational understandings for the prison are concerned: the chaplain was expelled from this high ground with the demise at the penitentiary. The secular professional has no room for the active God in his or her explanations of human behaviour, certainly not publicly. With the defeat at the penitentiary, God has been driven from both the arena of policy and the arena of the explanation of human behaviour.
The questions raised with regard to God have come not only from the secular world, but also from the religious studies disciplines themselves, often through the use of secular methodologies. Within the disciplines of religious studies, particularly New and Old Testament Studies, Historical Critical Method was having an impact on how the scriptures were viewed. In particular it was having an unsettling effect among some of the educated of the leading classes (Gilley, 1994; 302), including those in the churches, due to the tendency of Historical Critical Method to distrust the pronouncements of tradition (Watson, 1993; 42). The inspiration of scripture was in question when it was being shown that the scriptures contained many errors and contradictions in text, history and authorship (Griffin, 1983; 31). The churches’ initial response to this was often one of criticising the various scholars of being heretical and destructive of the scriptures, which were the very base, they believed, of public morals. It was feared that public morals would be undermined if the scriptures themselves were being undermined, as many in the church believed that Historical Critical Method was doing. In modern times, Historical Critical Method is not feared and has been mostly incorporated into ordinand studies (at least those of mainstream churches) as modernity and secularisation have made inroads into the churches. Historical Critical Method itself has now been criticised from postmodern perspectives, which deny that the intent of the writers and their historical contexts can be accurately captured. Theological scholars such as Brueggemann have also criticised the method: Brueggemann claims that the method empties the texts of what is most interesting and poignant, as well as criticising it for simply pandering to modernity (Brueggemann, 1993; 58). The nineteenth century, however, did not have the
scholarship available to Brueggemann, and Historical Critical Method was feared and seen as destructive by many of the orthodox in the Church. To them, God's literal Word was under threat.

The active God of the penitentiary chaplain was being questioned at the time of, and after the failure of, the penitentiary. There had been questioning, particularly in the wider society, prior to this failure, however this very public failure of the God of public policy was a defining time for the chaplain. The active God was now being seen more widely as the Deist God. The failure of the penitentiary spelled the end of the active God in public policy, because the promised reformation of prisoners never materialised.

The lively questioning of God's omnipotence was not to be protracted indefinitely. The secular world, the source of the heavy questioning, simply lost interest; now the atheism of indifference prevails in the modern prison. The sequence of events has been that with the penitentiary the active God was effectively on trial. The demise of the penitentiary was the demise of the active God. The modern period has seen the atheism of indifference prevail. Whether this will continue to be the case will be the subject of discussion in later section.

**Entailment Two. The Chaplain as the One Lured to Syncretism.**

We have seen that there were initial attempts to resist the dismantling of the penitentiary. Chaplains protested the shortened times in solitary confinement, basically arguing that time is needed for the process of reformation to take effect in prisoners, especially those
heavily influenced by the criminal culture. These arguments were unconvincing, politically, but were also dubious theologically. How much time does God need? These protests were soon to turn to laments as the reformative ideal succumbed to sustained criticism and God was no longer the foundation of, and the reformative force in, the prison. In spite of this particular demise, there was no enthusiasm to completely replace God in the wider society of the nineteenth century, as the more hopeful zealots of rationalism had both predicted and hoped for. Eliot-Binns is of the opinion that empiricism had replaced transcendentalism in importance by the end of the nineteenth century, but throughout the century people wanted to accept the findings of science and as well to retain a faith: it was a century of conflict, inconsistency and ambivalence (Eliot-Binns, 1971; 7) This Eliot-Binns saw as evidenced by one trend to attack Old Testament miracles, while at the same time being far more reticent to do so for New Testament miracles. While religion was being both heavily attacked and defended by opposing zealots, those who were not committed one way or the other were exercising caution.

With the collapse of Christendom in the prison, and with language and foundational understandings becoming predominantly secular, the chaplain was in a very difficult position. Secularisation was demonstrating itself to be a powerful force. How was the chaplain to react to this? The active God of public policy was expelled from the prison and religion in the prison became progressively privatised. This eclipse of the reliance on God and the ecclesiastical in penal policy is a significant happening in penal history, yet, surprisingly, it has failed to inspire a discourse of rigour with reference to any possible
function of God in the prison. At the same time as the chaplain was having his status and his understandings challenged, theology, as the 'Queen of the Sciences' was being dethroned in the wider society. The lure for the chaplain to adopt parts of the alternative understandings on which to base his practice must have been strong.

The prison chaplain is a syncretist. This in itself is not unusual, as all religions of the world, except the most isolated ones, would exhibit some evidence of syncretism (Droogers, 1989; 12). There are, however, variations with regard to syncretism. For instance, syncretism varies in religions according to the degree to which it is evident; the degree of toleration toward syncretism; whether it is deplored as moving away from ‘purity’ of religion, or seen more benevolently; the extent to which syncretism is conscious and deliberate, or not conscious and emanating from cultural contact; the extent to which ‘other ingredients’ are included in syncretism, such as a ‘mixing’ between a religion and an ideology, a religion and a science, or a religion and a culture (Droogers, 1989; 9, 10, 13). The chaplain’s syncretism with regard to the social sciences, it will be argued is asymmetrical, that is the movement is emphatically in one direction toward the chaplain’s religion and stems from both a conscious adoption of social science concepts and from the cultural factor of interaction with secular professionals.

Syncretism was clearly considered a problem by those of orthodox exiled in Babylon, because some of the prophets, such as Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel, railed against it. The lure of syncretism to a people whose deity has been seemingly defeated by another, more powerful one, is understandable. There was syncretism in the Babylonian Exile, even
though there was a community identity and a strong tradition of prophets to encourage the preserving of the religion and maintain the hope of a return from the Exile. With the prison chaplain, there was no community as such, no tradition of prophets, and the idea of a hope for a return to prominence is not identifiable. The lure to vigorous syncretism in the absence of strong support is hardly surprising.

(a). The particular susceptibility of the chaplain to syncretism.

It is the chaplain, more so than the parish minister who is most susceptible to syncretism. There have, however, been numerous criticisms of parish ministers, some of these criticisms are that the minister has taken into his religious understandings so much from the social sciences that he or she is more resembling of a counsellor, or manager of a welfare agency than a minister. The parish minister, too, has difficulties pertaining to role and to diminishing congregations. The parish minister, however, does not operate in a completely secular organization. He, or she, is not confronted by the same constraints of language and knowledge as the chaplain. Congregations in the church, on the whole, are not surprised by references to God, although some critics claim that there is a trend to edge God out even here. Nevertheless, the parish minister does not have the same direct structural constraints in the working environment, as does the chaplain. At best, God in the prison is Deist.

The influence of the secular sciences is very strong for the prison chaplain. The lure of syncretism for the chaplain is the lure of better acceptance in the prison by secular prison staff, who, after all, have established the foundational understandings. The lure of
syncretism for the chaplain is the lure of trying to find a significant niche in the prison, and a relevance to the prison, greater than that which could be attained by a creed and sacrament based cleric. The lure for the chaplain is multifaceted: the suppression of any overt religious references and keeping religion 'private' is foremost; prominent, too, is the lure to supplement or displace a religious foundational understanding for a foundational understanding from the social sciences.

In the Exile, the prophets operated from an overtly religious perspective, and this was not difficult to do, apart from the threat of Babylonian reprisals, if it was considered that the prophet was subversive. In Babylon, the world was interpreted religiously. In the current time, to operate from specifically and overtly religious premises is to court ostracism by the secular professionals. The lure for the chaplain is to seek legitimation for himself, in the secular institution in which he works, by way of syncretism. The liturgical, sacramental and homiletic tasks are things of the past, even though in New South Wales the prison chaplain’s job description, formulated by the Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee, gives them prominence (Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee, 1993; 7). As Knight notes, ‘Use of chaplains was quite small in terms of religious functions compared to the weight they gave to this activity in the description of the chaplain's role’ (Knight, 1992; 175).

'They' refers to the Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee. It can be seen from the above quote that the 'pastoral' is what is left for the chaplain and pastoral affords some very wide definitions. Pastoral seems to refer to whatever the chaplain does outside the
obviously religious functions referred to by Knight, rather than to some intrinsic task with definitive skills and knowledge that are required to accomplish that task. This gravitation of the chaplain toward the more widely legitimated secular tasks, which are generally welfare oriented, or as some chaplains would contend 'pastoral', leads to confusion. The problem for the chaplain with regard to movement in this direction is that there will be inevitable demarcation disputes over what is welfare and what is pastoral as far as these tasks are concerned. Justice Nagle noted this in his report to the Royal Commission (Nagle, 1978; 178).

Confusion over what is pastoral care, in the wider social context, is raised by Pattison when he refers to the literature of pastoral care being dominated by references to psychotherapeutic authors, who have no religious belief (Pattison, 1988; 27). Pattison is of the view that it is almost as if the churches' pastoral tradition has been completely forgotten as being of no use. The uncertainty of just what pastoral means is also evident in the queries about the value of chaplains in prisons. In the modern prison, welfare tasks that were previously the province of the chaplain, because there was no one else available to do them, are now being redefined and managed by the Welfare Departments of the prison. The chaplain's abandonment of religious references and language broadened his scope in the prison, at least in the chaplain's perception, but inevitably led to territorial disputes and questions about the chaplain's role and the role of religion in the prison. If the chaplain focuses on a traditional liturgical, homiletic and sacramental role in the prison, he will be faced with the prospects of little to do, if he broadens his 'pastoral' role, he is faced with boundary disputes and a syncretistic reliance on the social sciences, as it
is the social sciences and not the religious disciplines which have the corpus of literature
which informs such practice, as Pattison has noted.

As with the prison, religion in modern society has gradually become a predominately 'private' matter, that is a matter for private individual devotion, whereas it had in previous times also been a public phenomenon, that is the church had been heavily involved in public policy and administration. Casanova would dispute that religion is a heavily private phenomena. Casanova argues, in Public Religions in the Modern World, that religion has a public dimension. It can be readily conceded that religion has a public dimension, however it is not conceded that religion has as large a role in the public arena as Casanova claims. Casanova, when discussing this issue, cites a number of case studies. It is considered that Casanova does not give sufficient weight to the fact that in most of his case studies the religious component is heavily underpinned by ideology. His citing of liberation theology is a prime example. In liberation theology, Marxist ideology and theory provides one of the launching pads for analysis and action. Many writers, particularly conservatives, such as Canon Edward Norman, are quick to point to what they claim are the secular underpinnings of the churches’ comments on the conduct of human society (Norman, 1992; 27). Most critics would agree that religion is now a mainly private matter, particularly in western societies. In Australia, churches, along with many other social groups and organizations, make contributions to the public debate on social issues. A glance at these contributions will indicate, however, that there are fleeting references to religious argumentation. In fact, Simons suggests that such references should be played down, if not expunged, if an author wants a serious hearing
in the secular world, where decisions are made (Simons, 1995; xv). Pattison makes much
the same statement (Pattison, 1995; 39). The private nature of religion is only reinforced
by the mainly social science based nature of church submissions on public issues. The
highly secular nature of the public arena reinforces the secular nature of the prison
chaplain's working environment.

In a secular organization such as a prison, references to the active God are often
offensive, even to some of the chaplains. Shaw, an American prison chaplain cited
earlier, complains of charismatic adherents coming into the prison and angering staff by
their "high powered, emotionally intense expressions of religion'. Official reactions bring
negative consequences for the appointed chaplains, Shaw maintains (Shaw, 1995; 150).
While Shaw is coming from a Roman Catholic traditionalist stance and clearly has no
time for charismatics, even though there are charismatics in the Roman Church, he is far
from the only one complaining about such groups and individuals making a difficult
situation for the chaplain to deal with later. Beckford also notes the strains between
chaplains and visiting representatives of other religious groups in British prisons
(Beckford, 1998; 120). Whatever the merits of the chaplains' claims, it does point out
another problem to be acknowledged, namely that the language of the prison chaplain is
so thoroughly secular that references to God are surprising and often embarrassing. This
reaction should not surprise, because in the wider society, as Young points out, 'God
language' has become problematic and theology has been sidelined (Young, 1995; 1-2).
To talk of God in public in secular society is unusual, and the prison is a secular place. A
common criticism by evangelicals is that church and clergy are too deeply influenced by,
and in fact pander to, modernity (McGrath, 1996; 126,134). Their argument is that 'God language' should in fact be common in society and not at all problematic and their aim is to work toward that end. Whether in fact God will come to the centre stage again will be one of the topics addressed in the final section of the thesis when we look at whether there will be a return from the exile for the chaplain.

**The relation of language, social science and theology to syncretism.**

As discussed above, the parish minister does not have the same level of difficulty as the chaplain in terms of the lure of syncretism. When it comes to language, they are in a somewhat protected enclave in a community church. Unlike the prison chapel, which hosts many secular activities, the community church, as opposed to the community activity church hall, is usually a dedicated place and can be very private from the surrounding society. Ecclesiastical language still prevails. By contrast, the chaplain in the prison operates in an environment where the language of the secular professional controls the discourse. It would seem that the chaplain would be hard pressed to survive in the prison if he endeavoured to operate outside of this discourse. The language of his specialist training does not have any relevance to the prison as an institution. It may have some relevance to the occasional prisoner, who has some church affiliation and socialisation prior to his imprisonment, but there are few regular church attenders among prisoners. The modal profile of the prisoner is a person in his twenties, with a low level of education, unemployed, unmarried, often substance addicted and a recidivist (Grant, 1992; 7-8). By comparison the parishioners of the mainstream churches are over represented, in proportion to the total population, in terms of both age (sixty plus years)
and university education (Hughes, 1997; 8,9,66,77).

Acquiring the language of the secular professional is desirable for satisfactory functioning in the prison. The secular professional's language is the 'relevant' language. It is difficult to acquire that language without also acquiring the assumptions that underpin it. Those assumptions are of course, the assumptions of the social sciences. In these assumptions, God is either excluded or there is a tacit assumption of the Deist God. This is a very difficult environment for a chaplain to operate in if the chaplain was to adhere to the view of an active God, particularly when all the evidence around him points to that view being unacceptable to the institution of the prison. The secular use of the chapel is a significant indicator that God, if not irrelevant, has a very low profile.

The chaplain is also lured by the explanations of human behaviour given by the human sciences. McGrath, it is believed, is quite right when he claims that many religious studies writers, when writing on topics such as ethics, merely rehash secular ideas and values (McGrath, 1990; 96). McGrath accuses such writers of using secular writings to judge the scriptures, which, in his opinion, is the inverse, of what ought to be happening (McGrath, 1990; 103). This is an interesting phenomenon when one considers that the reform, or ‘treatment’ movement in penal policy of the late 1960’s and 1970's in Britain, referred to by Raynor, was no more successful than was the reform of the penitentiary, even though it was based on the social sciences (Raynor, 1985; 3, 125). Notwithstanding this, the social sciences continue to be extensively embraced by those in religious organizations and pursuits. One has only to undertake a course in basic Clinical Pastoral
Education, the preferred training for chaplains, as I have done, to realise that the human sciences have made huge inroads into pastoral care. Pattison makes the point that this incorporation is often done undiscerningly. He asks the rhetorical question of how many theologians, much less pastors, are really competent to evaluate and engage in critical dialogue with the social sciences (Pattison, 1988; 45).

Clerical reactions to the social sciences would suggest that training in the social sciences is seen as 'better' than that of the ecclesiastical disciplines with regard to understanding the human world. There has been, as we have seen previously, some very difficult times for the church when powerful critiques have been launched at both the church and the scriptures, such critiques were questioning of the capacity of the church and the scriptures to provide an adequate understanding of the world. This was particularly difficult for the Protestant Church, which has emphasised the inspiration and value of the scriptures more than ecclesiastical tradition, as was the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, at least prior to Vatican Two. Historical Critical Method raised many specific and difficult questions for the church, but it was the cumulative effect of the Enlightenment rationality, which led to a lessened confidence in the scriptures in many quarters. Indeed for some it led to doubt about their veracity; what Brueggemann calls the 'seduction into modernity' (Brueggemann, 1993; 40). McGrath made a point about twentieth century ideologies, such as Feminism and Marxism, being made foundational in some Christian quarters, and Christian writings, at the expense of the scriptures (McGrath, 1996; 63). Clearly such moves make for a great deal of doubt and confusion about the value of the scriptures and their place in understanding the human condition.
This has promoted a great deal of confusion in Christianity, particularly in field of pastoral care. It also seems to be an ingredient in the problems of identity of the prison chaplain, who is hard to distinguish, in practice, from the secular professionals in the Welfare Departments of the prison. This has been the experience of Royal Commissioners, academics, and indeed of lowly ordinands on Field Placement experience. The lure has been compelling for many a prison chaplain.

The chaplain has also been lured into syncretism because of the nature of theological writings, and here I differentiate theological writings from the writings described above, which are essentially ideological writings with theological afterthoughts. Much theology, which emanates from the academy, is in fact of relatively little value to someone like the chaplain, who requires something that can guide his practice and at the same time is intellectually respectable. Pattison and McGrath are quite right when they say that much theology is written and read only by theologians in the academy (where the majority of theologians are) and that theologians have largely lost contact with the church their writings were envisioned to support (Pattison, 1995; 38). The theologian cannot be said to speak for the church, at least not the Protestant churches. Nor can the theologian be said to be the Gramsci's organic intellectual speaking for the community, for the majority of the community has no interest whatsoever in what a theologian has to say. The theologian Stanley Hauerwas illustrates this very neatly in the preface to one of his books when he states of the publishers, ‘They are a remarkable publishing house that makes it possible for serious theological scholarship to continue to be made available in a world that is not all that interested’ (Hauerwas, 1989; viii). By contrast with theology, there are
a great many publications in popular social science that purport to give insight into the functioning of the human being in society. These can be of great appeal to the chaplain in a secular setting, and a great lure to syncretism.

There exists, of course, a plethora of fundamentalist tracts and other publications, which the chaplain could refer to, however these are very literalist in orientation; of the type quite rightly attacked by the secularist organizations and others in the nineteenth century. The Internet has a surfeit of such tracts. If the God of the penitentiary is the active God, then the God of the fundamentalist tracts is the hyperactive God. This material simply ignores any scholarship that has been accumulating over the past two hundred years. While theology tends to be widely ignored, there is some that merits attention. The fundamentalists fail to give these writings attention. The chaplain has relatively little substantive religious material with which to work. It is no surprise then to find that the chaplain orientates himself toward the social sciences. In theology there is little serious writing, which seeks to give theological, as opposed to ideological, perspectives on the nature of the human being and society, this area being largely left to the social scientists.

Scripture itself is a disparate collection of writings by disparate, often unknown, authors, addressing a disparate range of topics, in different locations, and written, approximately, between two and two thousand five hundred years ago. Given this scenario, only fundamentalists would expect scripture to provide a comprehensive and coherent model of the human psyche. Postmodernist thinkers would suggest that an endeavour to create such a model is fanciful. Cupitt, for instance, in criticising Platonist, Freudian and
religious grand schemes suggests that,

The old fictions of theoretical mastery, systematic unity and control are not doing much good any longer, and we are currently abandoning them'...'In morality, we want to give up the old idea of a thoroughly examined and unified life: we are incorrigibly bitty, ambiguous creatures (Cupitt, 1992; 154).

Cupitt's statements have currency with some scholars. It is the position of this thesis that the Christian Scriptures contain wisdom, albeit not a systematic, or 'grand scheme' wisdom. There have been arguments advanced by scholars that the wisdom of the Scriptures has been neglected by the social sciences and this to the detriment of both theology and the social sciences. Forrester, Brueggemann and others have argued that scripture, particularly its images and metaphors and stories, (Brueggemann's 'little stories') can be used in an eclectic manner to advance knowledge. The theologian, however, has generally settled back to write on more obscure topics and left the field of individual and social functioning to the secular writers. For their part the secular professionals and social scientists of the Western world, and those writing for them, have long since squeezed God out of their formulations when considering the human being and the human condition. It is not remarkable then that the chaplain has been heavily influenced by the secular writings, when theologians have generally vacated the field.

As noted previously, the lure to syncretism has also come in the form of ecclesiastical contributions to public policy. While I am unaware of any chaplains who have written for
the purpose of influencing public policy, some churches certainly do make contributions. These contributions are secular in character. The contemporary secular world is disinterested in any attempt to justify a position with reference to religion, especially to systematic theology. There is no reason to assume that this trend will be reversed. The lesson to be learned from an analysis of the nature of ecclesiastical submissions to the state is that the state speaks the secular language. In an age of marked pluralism, the state is hardly about to encourage theology into public discourse. Theologies, as with denominations, often differ markedly in their theological positions. Presumably the state could not take them all into account, and it would not favour being in the position of including some and excluding others. In John Rawls' terms, religion is 'not politicised' (Rawls, 1999; 127). It seems unlikely that this position will be altered, because it is difficult to envision what would alter it.

Richard Fenn in his book, *Trials and Liturgies*, has given a very good account of the state holding the power, through its agency, the courts, to legitimate or not legitimate religious definitions, concepts and language in matters of contention. In Fenn's book, particularly the account of the trial of the Berrigan brothers, even those who claim to speak as prophets, and use prophetic speech, are ultimately legitimated, or not legitimated, by the state when there are matters of contention at stake. In the Berrigan case it was the contentious matter of civil disobedience. Contributions to debate in the domain of public policy are much more likely to be listened to when framed in the language endorsed by the state as opposed to the language of religion. In the public arena of civil disobedience, God's prophets were put in their place by the court! The judge, not God, was supreme.
The language of power and legitimation is the secular language, and this is another lure to syncretism for the chaplain.

The chaplain is heavily disadvantaged, if he adheres to outmoded foundational understandings. The foundational understandings of the penitentiary, with the assumption of the active God as the basis of reform and policy, has been discarded in the prison system. The chaplain has been in a virtual hiatus ever since. The lure of other understandings is a constant. If there is a God in the prison, then that God is a Newtonian, Deist God. Newton envisioned God at the helm of his mechanical universe, but this God was forever quiescent: Newton found the God of the Nicene Creed unintelligible (Placher, 1983; 239). As the human condition is largely defined by the social sciences, the latter is a prime source for syncretistic practices by the chaplain, who is endeavouring to operate in the secular arena of the prison. These syncretistic practices are not minor and peripheral ones; the borrowings are very basic to the understandings of the human being and the human condition.

The chaplain of contemporary times is the exile. He has many syncretistic pressures on him to adapt to the secular practices operating in the prison. This pressure, the pressure of syncretism, was present for the Babylonian Exiles. We look now to the insight that the Babylonian Exile can bring to the understanding of the prison chaplain as we consider further aspects of the metaphor, the chaplain as the exile.

**Entailment Three. The Chaplain as the One who Finally Adopts an Apologetic**
Theology.

In Babylon, where the defeat and subsequent Exile had heavily challenged the traditional notions of God, there was compelling need to explain what had happened. The old theology was not sufficient to the new circumstances: new wine could not be contained in the old wineskins, so to speak. The depiction of God in the old theology did not lend itself to explaining the defeat and more importantly, for the devout, religion as they knew it was under grave threat. The omnipotent, omniscient and active God was undergoing a legitimation crisis.

An apologetic theology was finally developed whereby the defeat was redefined. The defeat was not a defeat at all. Rather, God had contrived the defeat to punish the people of Israel for their apostasy. The conquerors were merely instruments for the omnipotent God to bring about his will, namely the chastisement of his chosen people. New texts were written and older texts were redacted to accommodate the new theology, which preserved the integrity of the omnipotent and omniscient God, at least for those who were content to accept the theology.

In the nineteenth century, the active God, who intervenes in the natural and social world, was under challenge. The fixed doctrines of the Church, which defined God from both tradition and the scripture, were also under challenge. The new disciplines of the physical and social sciences were making doctrine look very excessively restrictive, particularly to a society now steeped in the notions of evolution and progress.
The defence of God was no easy task. The rapid advances in science were shrinking the active God and making the Church appear as the opponent of progress, which in fact it often was. The Historical Critical Method was making the defence of the active God that much harder as it questioned many of the biblical texts on historical, form critical, and literary grounds. In the nineteenth century, as in Babylon, God was being redefined. In the nineteenth century however it was not the religious authorities who were doing the redefining; God was being redefined by the criticisms of the protagonists, aided in many cases by the poor defences mounted by the Church. The omnipotent and omniscient God was losing ground.

The defence of the ‘active God’ in the penitentiary was not a spirited effort. The Evangelicals had set up the penitentiary in a manner that was not readily able to explain failure. They were very enthusiastic about the prospects for success. Failure, when it came, was an embarrassment. There were the suggestions from some chaplains that the separate system had not been given a fair chance, because of time reductions placed on the solitary confinement. Generally speaking though, the capitulation was relatively meek. The Whitworth Russell and Crawford reports were found to be deficient and there were no indications that crime had decreased, as the Evangelicals had predicted it would. In fact the 1860's heralded an increase in crime (Forsythe, 1987; 147).

In the Babylonian Exile there was a theology which retrieved, for some of the Exiles at least, the reputation of God. In the nineteenth century, there was no endeavour to develop an apologetic as to why the active God had not been active in the penitentiary, as was
anticipated. Saving the active God of the penitentiary did not seem to be viewed as a priority, as the Babylonian Exiles had seen it as a priority in their situation, even though God was posited as the ally in the penitentiary undertaking. It may be that it was subsumed under the defence of God that was going on in society at large.

In the Babylonian Exile, ‘the active God’ survived; God was still shaping history and events. God simply shaped them in different ways than those expected by the Exiles; so the new theology stated. The active God of the penitentiary was not to be saved by redefinition by the ecclesiastical authorities or their representatives, the active God in fact disappeared from the prison and prison policy, as has not returned. The chaplains, by way of contrast, were more accommodating of defeat than the Babylonian Exiles.

The Babylonian Exile had dissimilarities to the situation faced by the chaplains at the failure of the penitentiary. Primarily, no active endeavours were made by the Babylonians to displace the religious understandings of the Exiles with the religion of Marduk. The Exiles themselves had to work out ways to restrict the damage of their defeat. Conversely, the chaplain of the penitentiary had vocal critics wanting to see his foundational understandings replaced. Moreover, the chaplain did not have newly developing apologetic theologies that sought to rescue the active God. The Church was mostly on the defensive as it sought to cope with the challenges from without and within. At the time of the failure of the penitentiary, the Church was hard pressed to restrict the damage from the criticisms launched against it and its scriptures.
As time has gone on, the prison has become increasingly problematic for the chaplain. Not only were alternative foundational understandings gradually adopted after the failure of the penitentiary, but also representatives of alternative foundational understandings gradually became organised into professions and became entrenched as part of the staff of the prison, taking on many of the functions of the chaplain in the process. Psychologists, social workers, welfare officers and psychiatrists became staff members. None of these professions make assumptions about the existence of God, and there is no place in their theoretical formulations for the active God. Theirs are the major professional inputs from the social sciences into the prison, at a practice level, there are of course policy development specialists, but generally they are not employed in the prison. These secular professionals supply the reports and sit on the important committees. They also are the court-defined experts in the management of human behaviour. Both God and the chaplain remain peripheral to the prison and its processes.

As mentioned previously, Halmos talks of the faith of the counsellors, but this is a vague term, with no reference to the God of the Christian creeds, but rather to an amorphous spirituality. Interestingly, amorphous spirituality is what has been adopted in the prison. This seems the case in chaplaincies in the various areas, not simply the prison. Orthodox Christianity is on the wane. The chaplain has cast his net widely in trying to relate to people as a spiritual 'expert', through a widely defined spirituality. This is a peculiar role for one trained in one tradition of a specific spirituality, Christianity. This facilitating of spirituality, too, has its problems for the chaplain, as we have seen with the satanic cults
developing in the prison in the United States.

In the contemporary prison, by way of comparison with the penitentiary, there is no expectation on God. As nothing is expected, God cannot therefore be seen to have failed, nor, obversely, could God be seen to have succeeded or done anything. This is very clear in the statement of The New South Wales Chaplaincy Service: Objectives: God does not rate a mention here. There is no evidence of the active God in any of the areas of activity of the chaplain, as outlined in this document, namely: religious ministry; pastoral support; building working relationships; developing chaplaincy standards; and encouraging justice. The situation is much the same as when I was undertaking my Field Experience.

It is interesting to compare this statement of objectives with those of the Welfare Department and note the considerable overlap. When one considers that the provision of what is regarded as 'religious ministry' in the Objectives of the Chaplaincy service is minimal; namely the conduct of worship; administering the sacraments; facilitating the visits of denominational ministers of inmates and facilitating worship for non-Christian faiths; is small, the areas of overlap with welfare are correspondingly large.

The Babylonian Exiles redefined, refined and exonerated God, but the difficulty of this task was reduced because life itself was viewed religiously. The chaplain's exile is a different matter. God is in question in the wider society, but only for those who can be bothered to ask the questions, and these are a diminishing population in the 'atheism of
indifference.' There are numerous views about the nature of God. These ideas come and go with great rapidity and many of the ideas are linked to, or generated by, ideologies, such as Marxism, Feminism and the like. The Babylonian Exiles revived God, but there has been no revival of the God of the penitentiary. Here, a consistent apologetic theology has not been forthcoming.

God has slipped off the centre stage in the prison. The God of the prison is, to all practical purposes, much like the God of Don Cupitt, basically a word. God has no reality to be discovered, but may, nevertheless, be a useful linguistic creation to foster idealism or aspiration, or perhaps serve as a reference point (Cupitt, 1999; 34). Even as a word, however, God is seldom present in the prison.

The chaplain is in exile, occupying his Babylon. Enmeshed in his captivity, he has become syncretistic. His identity as the 'religious' person of the prison is ambivalent, simply because there is little that is religious in the prison. The more syncretistic the practices, the more difficult it is to identify the chaplain as someone with something unique to offer. If the chaplain did not adopt syncretistic practices, he would have something unique to offer, however his problem would then be that very few prisoners, or indeed staff, would want what he had to offer. Adding to the dilemma is that secular professionals do not want the chaplain encroaching on their professional territory. It seems that the chaplain is marginalised, whether he is syncretistic in his practices or not.

The prison is definitively secular. God is a private matter for the individual and irrelevant
to the policy and administration of the prison; 'God talk' in the prison is anachronistic and not wanted, even if the chaplain were so inclined. The chaplain of the modern prison is in the decidedly strange position, in his interactions with prisoners, of looking to establish a Grace without God. There is no doubt that the active God disappeared following the failure of the penitentiary, but there has not been an endeavour to construct an apologetic theology to account for God's apparent failure, or restore the active God to the prison. All this raises the question of 'Where to for the prison chaplain'?

This will be the theme of the final section of the thesis. It will be argued that in the penitentiary the prisoner was viewed as 'soul' and reformative endeavours were aimed at securing the prisoner’s repentance. The prisoner, it was thought, would thereby become a law-abiding citizen in the society ordained of God and also secure his eternal salvation in a life beyond death. In the prison of modern times, the prisoner is viewed as 'psyche' and it is the secular professional who is dominant in the prison and looked to for the expert advice and assessment. The chaplain no longer provides the foundational understandings for the prison and in fact has been involved in syncretistic practices as he has sought to be relevant to a system that is overwhelmingly secular in orientation. The prison does not have any use for God in either its policy or practice, much as the state has no use for God, apart from some ceremonial occasions, where the churches, established or otherwise, have decorative roles.

The question that needs to be addressed is whether the chaplain can return from the exile? Modernity has accounted for the chaplain by pushing him to the margins of the
prison. It is thought by some that modernity is itself failing. If this is indeed the case, what implications does it have for the chaplain? What would need to happen for the chaplain to be able to return from the exile? The ascendancy of the chaplain was dependent on the chaplain being perceived as having use value by the state, can the chaplain again have use value for the state and re-establish his ascendancy in the prison? The chaplain is in a religious crisis, as were the Babylonian Exiles. The chaplain's crisis is his irrelevance to the prison system. Can this be overcome? These are the questions that will be addressed in the following and final section of the thesis.
SECTION FIVE.

A RETURN FROM THE EXILE?

CHAPTER NINE.
SECULAR AND ECCLESIASTICAL IMPEDIMENTS
To a Return from the Exile.

Introduction.

Is it likely that the contemporary prison chaplain will return from the exile, from their position of being peripheral to the prison? An answer to this question lies in a consideration of what is happening in penology on the one hand and of the prospects of religion in an increasingly secular society on the other.

In Chapter Six, we saw that the rise of Persian power gave the Exiles the opportunity of returning from the Exile in Babylon to the Holy Land. It was the change in the circumstances of the society in which they were captive that gave the Exiles the opportunity to return to the Holy Land. The circumstances in Babylon were changed when Cyrus took Babylon by military force.

Although the scale of this return is conjectural, it is agreed that there was a return, although most of the Exiles elected not to return. For those who did return, it was the culmination of what was hoped for. In the Exile, those who wished to return were caught between what is and what is hoped for. This was a particularly trying time for the devout. Many of these were the priests and other religious and the homeland had the positive associations for them of the Temple and the Covenant. A return was what had been needed to confirm that God had honoured the covenant. A return would be the confirmation of the new theology, which stated that the defeat by Nebuchadnezzar was not a defeat at all, but God chastising his chosen people for their apostasy. The return
signified for the devout that Yahweh was indeed in control. Babylon had fallen and God's purposes would be worked out.

The Exiles had overcome their religious crisis: they had a theology in place which explained the anomalies of Yahweh's assumed defeat and now they could return to the land of the Covenant. An apologetic literature was to build up which would explain to future generations that the defeat by the Babylonians was itself the work of the all-powerful God.

The chaplain, too, inhabits his own Babylon. The chaplain waits between what is and what might be. Any chaplain with an historical knowledge would know that his predecessors in the early to mid nineteenth century were influential figures in the prison system. He would know that, compared to them, his position is one of marginality. He would know also that his marginality is not one that emanates from being an advocate of prisoners, or other such action that would put him at odds with the administration. His marginality is one that emanates, in a large part, from prisoners and secular professionals being indifferent to his office. For the chaplain with an historical perspective, the 'what is' of the metaphor 'The chaplain as the one who struggles between what is and what is hoped for' would be depressing to contemplate.

Some of the Exiles in Babylon maintained their hopes of a return to the homeland. These hopes seemed to be independent of their external circumstances, for the power of Babylon was formidable. Nevertheless, they maintained a hope that God would one day
restore their fortunes and that they would return to the land of the Covenant. They responded to their theological crisis by developing a new apologetic theology, which enabled them to maintain their hope, for it maintained the omnipotence of God. It has been argued that the chaplain is in exile. There is no doubt that, viewed historically against the ascendancy at the time of the penitentiary, the chaplaincy in the prison is in a crisis; he is marginal to the prison and prisoner; no other reasonable conclusion can be drawn from the available material. What can be hoped for to return the chaplain to a position of centrality? How reasonable are these hopes? Is marginality simply accepted? This metaphor will now be examined in more detail.

**Entailment One. The Chaplain as the One who struggles between what is and what is hoped for.**

The first question to be addressed is the 'what is' for the chaplain. It has been previously argued that the social sciences have come to dominate foundational understandings, both in the prison and beyond, and that theology, once the 'Queen of the Sciences', is now, in Miroslav Volf's terms, 'old and feeble'. It has also been argued that secularisation has been the dominant process in the prison and that the paradigm has shifted from the 'prisoner as soul' to 'prisoner as psyche'. This process of secularisation has indicated an essentially one-way process of knowledge exchange from the social sciences to theology: the chaplain borrows from the social sciences, often in the name of relevance. The social sciences show no interest in religious studies, indeed evincing an indifference that reveals plain hostility.
In an endeavour to find a greater relevance and acceptance within the prison, the chaplain has engaged in syncretistic practices, which have further obscured his function within the prison. The contemporary chaplain is in the bind of engaging in only definitively religious tasks, and being an irrelevance to the unchurched inmates, or widening his tasks under the rubric of 'pastoral care' and finding demarcation conflicts and obfuscation about the role of a religious person in the prison, as well as having questions raised about the appropriateness and competence of religiously trained personnel undertaking wider, 'welfare' work (Nagle, 1978; 198). Either direction seems perilous for the chaplain. But is this really an either/or situation for the chaplain? Are there not possibilities for the chaplain, other than the way outlined above, which depicts the chaplain as merely maintaining his presence in the prison?

There are other ways, ways that are at least conceivable, whereby the chaplain could once again come into prominence in the prison, although in a much more modest way than was the case with the penitentiary. It will be argued, however, that while these ways are conceivable, there are impediments to their being realised. These ways and impediments will be outlined below and will be divided, for convenience of analysis, into secular and ecclesiastical, although it is acknowledged that this dichotomy is not discreet.

The secular impediments to the return from the exile are both on the macro level, pertaining to the position of the church in society, and the micro level, pertaining to the position of the chaplain in the prison. At the macro level, the strong secularising trends in Britain and Australia would have to be reversed or modified to see benefits to the
chaplain arising from the increased influence of the church in society. As it is, the mainstream churches are marginal to societal decision making processes and religion remains largely relegated to the private sphere of individual devotion. A return to prominence for the prison chaplain would probably be highly reliant upon the church becoming, once again, a significant and influential force in the public square.

Forrester is of the opinion that, with regard to considerations on matters of justice in society, there is a absence of theological concepts, insight and narratives in public debate. it is commonly assumed that religious believers are a declining minority of the population. Theological notions are assumed to be no more than in-house communication of religious communities; they have no general relevance and cannot be presented either as a public truth or as the nucleus of a consensus. Since the seventeenth century, religion has been seen increasingly as divisive and arbitrary (Forrester, 1997; 2).

There can be little cause for doubt that Forrester is correct in his observations about the absence of theological material in debate in the public square. Neither can there be much cause for doubt about religion and theologians being at times unwelcome if they try to move into the public square. The very public interaction, resulting in newspaper headlines, between the then Prime Minister of Australia, Mr Hawke, and the then Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane, Archbishop Peter Hollingworth, is a prime example. Archbishop Hollingworth made public comments about government economic policy and
its claimed effects on poverty, which prompted Mr Hawke in turn to suggest to Archbishop Hollingworth that he tend to his flock and leave the business of governing Australia to the representatives who were elected to do so. Mr Hawke later toned down his statements. However, in light of the recent, very public, revelations of the sexual abuse of children in the Anglican schools, which children were then under Archbishop Hollingworth's pastoral care, Mr Hawke's advice could be seen as apt and timely.

Those who suggest that theology be kept out of the public square often point, very reasonably, to the numerous conflicts in history that have a religious impetus, or at the least a religious buttress. These critics are distrustful of religion and point to the periods in history where religion has been abusive of humanity as it has sought to establish hegemony. They argue that religion is divisive and has no place in a public square, where consensus is being sought. Numbered among prominent philosophers who entertain the idea that theology cannot make a useful contribution in the public political arena is Habermas (Forrester, 1997; 24). This line of argument has prompted Wolterstorff to comment, with regard to the university, but it has application to the wider society, that theology in the future, 'may well be tolerated in the university, if it firmly renounces the legacy of Christendom and the attempts at hegemony that have accompanied that’ (Wolterstorff, 1996; 45).

Within the churches themselves, there are various opinions about the role of the church in the public arena. Not all opinions are favourable to this involvement. McGrath, as a representative of the evangelical movement, is dismissive of the very idea of a 'public
theology'. In his view this is the liberal theology movement's desperate and last-ditch attempt to find relevance for itself. In McGrath's view, the secular authorities have no interest in this contribution of a public theology beyond the occasional need to sift around for an additional justification for what they are doing (McGrath, 1996; 128). The presence of widely divergent opinion about public theology and the absence of theological notions in the public arena gives cause for speculation as to how social circumstances may change, whereby the church might come into greater prominence in the public arena and hence, by virtue of its higher profile, give impetus to the prison chaplain coming into greater prominence in the prison, possibly even ending the chaplain's exile. The likelihood of the church coming into prominence in the public square, by various means, is evaluated below.

A Conquest of the Public Square?

With the fall of ancient Babylon to the Persian armies, the Exiles were given the choice of ending the Exile. Can the church, through a rise in its power and influence, offer the chaplain a return from his exile? In contemporary society, the church is not prominent in the public square. One conception of overcoming that is a conquest of the public square, which is the logical consequence of the work of MacIntyre, were it ever to become a political reality, from its current status of essentialist metaphysics. MacIntyre is of the view that the liberal polity has failed and needs a successor. It has, in his view, produced an individualistic society, where there is no sense of community and which militates against the development of the Aristotelian virtues, such as justice and tolerance. For MacIntyre, the liberal polity lacks a telos through which to give rational justification to
its moral statements. What is regarded by MacIntyre as the liberal polity's fragmented approach to the moral issues of the day simply leads, he claims, to those involved becoming combatants and 'shouting at each other', without ever truly resolving the moral issues at hand. MacIntyre's avidly communitarian position has been criticised by an equally avid liberal, David Conway. Not surprisingly, Conway is unconvinced by some of MacIntyre's arguments. Conway states, in his assessment of the arguments propounded by MacIntyre,

> There are two questions we must address. First do moral convictions admit of rational justification only through appeal to some conception of a human telos? Second, must members of a liberal polity be bereft of any such conception? (Conway, 1995; 98).

Conway answers the first question in the affirmative and hence agrees with MacIntyre. With regard to the second, he answers in the negative and hence takes issue with MacIntyre. The crux of Conway's argument is that MacIntyre has failed to provide a convincing argument that utilitarianism, the basis of the liberal polity in his estimation, does not, and cannot, provide the grounds for a 'perfectly serviceable notion of telos' (Conway, 1995; 100). Further, Conway argues that there is no reason why notions of duty and virtue and the quest to discover the good of both oneself and others cannot be accommodated within a broad utilitarian framework that informed and informs the liberal polity. Conway is in turn unconvincing to communitarians.
The debates about the communitarian ideal are, however, long and complex. It is not the purpose of this thesis, nor is it within the scope of this thesis, to assess the relative merits in of these positions in detail. It is the purpose of this thesis to determine the likelihood of any change in the status of the church and religion within the social environment that could impact on the chaplain in the prison. The arguments propounded by MacIntyre are influenced by the writings of Thomas Aquinas. The question that has to be answered here is whether or not Thomist-inspired arguments are likely to prevail in the public square. If that were to be the case, then it could be argued that religion and the Roman Catholic Church would come into more social and political prominence, supplying a Thomas-inspired telos, which would guide individual and community practice. This seems highly unlikely in the foreseeable future, which appears likely to remain predominately secular, pluralistic and multicultural. And would MacIntyre’s scheme have an impact on the Protestant chaplain, as opposed to the Roman Catholic chaplain, given that the Roman Catholic faith has produced Thomism? It is acknowledged that there are some Protestant theologians interested in Thomism, however this is far from being a trend.

It has been argued previously that these discourses about the communitarian ideal are on the level of essentialist metaphysics and that there is little reason to think that they are going to be grounded in practice, the issue of interest for this thesis. Julia Kristeva, when writing about the ‘stranger’, raised the question as to whether cosmopolitanism was not merely a religious reality, without the capacity to become a political reality (Kristeva, 1991; 61). A question along similar lines can be legitimately raised of MacIntyre's work. It is considered that MacIntyre's work is a religious/philosophical scheme, with little
capacity to become a political reality and bring with it sweeping social change implicit in communitarianism. As we have seen, religion and theology struggle to be heard in the public square, let alone be seen as the harbingers of sweeping social change.

It is suggested here that Hauerwas presents a grounded and practical approach to the issue of religion in the public square. Hauerwas, quoted in Ronald Thiemann, is of the view that,

The first task of the church is not to supply theories of governmental legitimacy, or even to suggest strategies for social betterment. The first task of the church is to exhibit in our common life the kind of community that is possible when trust, not fear, rules our lives...Therefore any radical critique of our secular polity requires an equally radical critique of the church (Thiemann, 1996; 103).

This is a particularly pertinent statement by Hauerwas, for the credibility of religious statements cannot be separated from the credibility of the institution of the church. At the present time, the credibility of the mainstream churches in the Western world, which were already on the wane, has been, and continues to be, dealt some very considerable blows by proven sexual abuse, particularly of children, within the church itself. There are continuous questions in the various media as to how capable the church is of putting its own house in order. These are valid questions and suggest that the analysis of Hauerwas does likely point to the most pressing matter needing to be addressed by the church.
It is not anticipated then that the Thomist communitarianism of MacIntyre will be responsible for bringing the church universal and religion into the kind of social prominence that would influence the perception of the chaplain in the prison. Pluralism, both secular and religious, is too well established to credit that there would be a telos of the kind that is suggested by MacIntyre. The trends are toward lessening adherence to mainstream churches (Hughes, 1997; 66). The trends are also toward increasing atheism and agnosticism (Hughes, 1997; 72). Certainly there will be no pressure from the state to advocate such a telos in the public arena. If religion is not able to conquer the public square, as has been suggested, by the persuasive power of the proposals put forward, then perhaps it could be invited into a prominent place in the public square? It is to the assessment of the likelihood of this happening that we now turn our attention.

**An Invitation to the Public Square?**

Could the social circumstances change, and the church and religion come into prominence in the public square by way of invitation? MacIntyre's view is that the public square needs to give credence to the voices of tradition, which are effectively precluded in the public forum (MacIntyre, 1988; 398-399). This is unlikely to happen by the way of the public square adopting a version of Thomism. It is also no more likely that religion, speaking from an identifiably Christian platform (as opposed to speaking in a manner that is hardly able to be differentiated from a Humanist Society dialogue), will be embraced in the public square. On the face of it, this seems highly improbable in what all indications suggest will be a continuing secular, pluralistic and multicultural society. There is no evidence to support a contention that religion will be given any position of
privilege or prominence. Chadwick makes the following pertinent point,

> If the right to be irreligious is won, then the institutions, privileges, customs, of a state and society must be dismantled, sufficiently dismantled at least, to prevent the state or society exercising pressure on the individual to be religious if he wishes not to be religious. The liberal state, carried on logically, must be a secular state (Chadwick, 1975; 27).

Chadwick's view of the inevitability of the secular state is supported by the observations of Norman with regard to Britain. Norman makes the following observation of British society.

> In today's world, political leaders only very rarely show any preparedness to consult the Established Church over matters of public policy. This occurs in matrimonial law and education, where the church has an historical function, and even then the church is only one among a number of institutions and sectional interests whose views are sought out (Norman, 1992; 20).

Breward, speaking about the Australian situation, makes the point that historians writing general histories of Australia have, with the occasional exception such as Manning Clark, seen the churches as being of minor interest and importance to Australian history (Breward, 1993; viii). The recorded history of Australia is overwhelmingly a secular history.
Norman goes further and asks the more penetrating question about the legitimacy of church claims in the area of social policy and development. ‘Are the churches qualified to offer opinions about the material management of the state, which is now the primary function of modern government?’ (Norman, 1992; 21).

Of course, not all clerical opinion would support the question as posed by Norman. There is a body of opinion which would argue that the churches are so qualified. Nevertheless the question of the competence of the church to make comments in the public square, which is becoming increasingly more technical, is sometimes raised when the church does happen to comment, and in a pluralistic society this is hardly surprising. The secular and the religious have been so dichotomised that rarely would the church's advice on economic and social development be actively sought, particularly if the advice was to be drawn from and premised on its scriptures. This is probably the sentiment behind the comments of Simons about keeping notions such as God's will out of any social comment by ecclesiastical authorities (Simons, 1995; 15).

It is difficult to conceive of the conditions that would need to prevail for the state in contemporary secular and pluralistic society to actively invite religion into the public square. Royle helps to pinpoint how dramatically religion and the church have changed in Britain since the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,

Chief Justice Raymond stated at the trial of Thomas Woolston for blasphemy in
'Christianity in general is parcel of the common law of England'...Christianity underpinned the political establishment and was the basis of both law and morality; those who lacked religious beliefs were deprived of their civil rights (Royle, 1994; 406).

Religion is no longer the mainstay of the public order, as was perceived at the time of the penitentiary. The church no longer has much use value in terms of reform, and the state and the leading classes, as Solle notes, no longer depend upon the legitimation of the church (Solle, 1996; 22). The partial exception to the latter seems to be when the state is looking for extra legitimation for its violence, the obvious example being where the church provides chaplains for the military, those chaplains being fully stipended by the state.

The further problem the church has with regard to being invited into the public square is its image within the community. Image is sometimes media created and more often media influenced. Gideon Goosen discusses the media and their portrayal of the church, emphasising that the media highlights such things as 'zany theology' and sexual abuse by the clergy. The presentation tends to focus on sensation and ridicule. (Goosen, 1997; 185-186). The church seems throughout the 90's to have been constantly embroiled in scandals, particularly sexual abuse, and whatever the merits, or otherwise, of the media presentation there appears little doubt that it has influenced the outlook of the politicians and those who make the decisions in the public square. It would be highly unlikely, for an institution, which is viewed with some mistrust, scepticism and derision, to have not
been further affected by such presentations of it in the mass media.

It could hardly be expected that the churches would be encouraged and welcomed into the public square by the secular world, given the current image of the church and its declining influence through its declining membership; the latter is something not lost on those in positions of decision making. It might be objected that media interests may wish to promote the church in a more favourable way at some other point in time, which could influence the perception of the church by the public. In the absence of any compelling reasons as to why this would be likely happen, one can only assume that the current patterns will continue into the future.

Could it be that the nature of the public square may change and that this might result in an embrace of the church in the public square? Postmodernism is an intellectual movement that has called into question many aspects of surety associated with modernism. It has called into question the grand theories and grand narratives that have sought to offer a comprehensive explanation, of social phenomena in particular. It has also, albeit quite obliquely, called into question much of the assumed knowledge that had been widely used to criticise scripture, such as historical criticism. Could this not hold out the possibility of a change in the status of the church arising from a questioning of the very knowledge base that was used to criticise the church and its scriptures? Wolterstorff, when commenting within the context of theology as taught in the university, is of the opinion that this may be the case and that the challenge to the credibility of the logic of the natural sciences, among other things, may assist a more confessional theology to be
tolerated in the university, which it is not at present, and thereby assist the church. Wolterstorff is of the view that theology, as currently produced in the universities, is of little value to the church. ‘As modernity has advanced, the work of these latter (i.e. university theologians) displays less and less the stamp of Christian conviction, and proves less and less useful for the life of the church’ (Wolterstorff, 1996; 36-37). Wolterstorff is of the view that this questioning of the logic of the natural sciences may challenge the current teaching of theology, which ‘betrays no religious partiality’ (Wolterstorff, 1996; 43).

It is contended here that this is not likely to be so. There are those who have argued that the influence of postmodernism is now waning in the social sciences (Beckford, 1996; 44). While this is contentious, what is not contentious is that postmodernism does not discriminate in its critique. Postmodernism questions the grand narratives of the church as well as the secular equivalents. Postmodernism only advantages the church to the extent that it has launched a criticism against the epistemological credibility of those modernist grand narratives and bodies of knowledge that have been, and are, used to attack the church, such as natural science. The church itself, however, is not exempt from the postmodern critique, which it is suggested nullifies any advantage from the critique of secular knowledge.

It would seem that changes at a macro-social level, which would allow the ecclesiastical voice to be prominent in the public square, are unlikely to come about. In terms of the metaphor, there is no Cyrus on the horizon to bring hope of a change that would end the
chaplain's exile. MacIntyre's views will continue to have an airing in the academy, but there seems no reason to hold hope for any wide social acceptance, and certainly the conquest of the public square is not at all likely. An invitation into the public square is not a likely proposition either. It seems that the church is only credible to the extent that it is secular like all other participants in the public square, when it displays a Christian perspective, its credibility becomes correspondingly lower.

The likelihood of macro-level social change bringing about changes in the wider society, which would impact on the status and effectiveness of the chaplain and promise an end to his exile, is not the cause for optimism, for either church or chaplain. The secular public square will not be conquered, nor will it invite theology into prominence. But what of changes on the micro-level of the prison? Might there not be possibilities within the total institution of the prison that could see the chaplain, once again, come into a position of prominence?

**A change at the micro-level?**

If the chaplain were to come back into prominence within the penitentiary, there would need to be a shift in focus from the prisoner as psyche, for the prisoner as psyche is the paradigm of the secular professional: with this paradigm dominant, the chaplain can only be a follower. The chaplain was in the position of prominence when the prisoner was seen as soul. Will the notion of soul come, once more, to dominate the manner in which the prisoner is understood, and will the chaplain become the prominent force in the prison that he once was?
This seems to be highly unlikely. As the church no longer has the monopoly on God, so the chaplain no longer has the monopoly on soul. Soul itself is an elusive concept. Foucault, for instance, in his influential book, *Discipline and Punish*, seems to see soul as a social construction, when he states that the soul is,

> not an illusion, or an ideological effect. On the contrary, it exists, it has a reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished - and in a more general way, on those one supervises, trains and corrects (Foucault, 1977: 28).

Soul here for Foucault bears no relation to the concept of the soul immortal that is put forth by the church. For Foucault, it would appear that the soul can be created and terminated, according to context and to circumstances prevailing at the time, soul is a emasculated term by comparison with the concept as used by the church, and by the chaplain of the penitentiary. Soul, as defined by the church, seems unlikely to find its way back into the prison vocabulary. Much of the powerful terminology and vocabulary of the chaplain of the penitentiary has been emasculated and incorporated into everyday usage. The emasculation of language, and in particular the soul, has made it less likely for the chaplain to re-emerge as the provider of a unique service. Without the monopoly on the soul, the chaplain, on this basis alone, faces a difficult prospect for the return to prominence. The impediments for the chaplain however are much more formidable than this.
Even though religion in the prison had declined markedly in the British and Australian context, the chaplain had (a largely secular) welfare role to play, simply because there was no one else to undertake these tasks. Now that has changed and the chaplain has been deprived of much of this task since the introduction of the welfare officer into the prison. As Tony Vinson notes, ‘Executive staff in the gaols generally hold the welfare officers in high regard. That the prisoners share this view has been confirmed by the results of an independent survey conducted by a university team’ (Vinson, 1982; 168).

Vinson, of course, was in an unsurpassed position to comment on this because of his role as Chairman of the then Corrective Services Commission of New South Wales. Vinson's comments on the welfare officer in the prison contrast strongly with those of Knight, when he was commenting on prisoner indifference to, and distrust of, the chaplain.

The professional welfare officer is entrenched in the prison and the scope for the chaplain continues to narrow, due both to the presence of the welfare officer and the diminishing presence of religion in the prison. The Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee in New South Wales, the body that oversees prison chaplaincy, seems to hold another view about the chaplain, for it states,

The ministry of the care of souls, or pastoral care, consists of helping acts, done by representative Christian persons, directed toward the healing, sustaining, guiding and reconciling of troubled persons whose troubles arise in the context of
ultimate meanings and concerns (Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee, 1993; 7).

As we have seen previously, the Committee's view bears little relationship to Knight's experience in the prison. The main point here, however, is just what the Committee means by 'ultimate meanings and concerns.' Unfortunately, it does not elaborate. What is evident though, is that the ultimate of death has been taken from the prison in Britain and Australia. At the height of the chaplain's influence, in the mid-nineteenth century, the death penalty was in force and the chaplain had the central role to play at the execution, as well as at other deaths that occurred in the prison. In fact executions created a frenzy of ecclesiastical activity both within and outside the prison, many applications were received from clerics outside the prison wishing to minister to the condemned man (Priestly, 1985; 236). The execution could not in fact go ahead without the presence of clergy. With the abolition of the death penalty, the ultimate of death has left the prison. The one area where the chaplain could be prominent has disappeared. The question arises as to whether the death penalty would come back. With Britain being part of the European Community, that is unlikely in the extreme. It appears no more likely in Australia, where the last execution took place some forty years ago. The area of ultimates, where the chaplain had his exclusive province, has gone and is not appearing likely to return.

Another compounding problem for the chaplain is that there is no Christian theory of punishment. The church supplies chaplains to the prison, but has not supplied any ideas
about the justification or otherwise of the institution in which the chaplain operates. The Wesley Mission, a prominent part of the Uniting Church in Australia, did at one stage float the idea of tendering for the construction of a private prison. This idea was met with implacable opposition from the Uniting Church's Board for Social Responsibility, which produced a paper entitled, *Should the Church run a Prison*. The Wesley Mission proposal was defeated at Synod level. The Board's paper concluded that the true identity of the church cannot be expressed in running a prison. The paper advocated, among other things, the provision of chaplains and other support services and a challenging of what it regarded as the over-reliance on prisons. Unfortunately, the paper made no endeavour to develop a Christian theory about punishment, which may in turn have made a useful contribution to promoting debate on the work of the chaplain in the prison.

The final consideration at the micro-level is the prisoners themselves. Could it be that the prisoners might bring the chaplain into prominence by their appreciation of, and demand for, his services? This would be the best possible scenario for the chaplain. It is also extremely unlikely. It would require that the underclass, who have virtually no knowledge of ecclesiastical matters, and who have shown no inclination to find out, would reverse a trend that has been a feature of the modern prison. It could, however, be suggested that there exists a ‘spiritual hunger’ among prisoners in all prisons, as exemplified by the rising numbers of prisoners in the United States prisons nominating Islam as their religion. Overwhelmingly this occurs among black Americans. It would be naïve, however, to suggest that this trend has come about simply as a result of a ‘spiritual hunger’ on the part of prisoners, for there has been a continuing and strong race politics
component in this movement. As Shaw states,

Islam, in this country, developed largely from a prison movement which was
parented by anti-white feelings on the part of black inmates….This history creates
no little problem for the Imam who enters the facility and has to deal with home
grown philosophies which wear the name of Islam. An Imam has to differentiate
ture Islamics from jail formed groups who preach death to all whites (Shaw,
1995; 87).

The ‘spiritual hunger’ suggestion is not convincing, even with regard to the United States
prisons and, as has been noted throughout the thesis, there is no evidence for this
‘spiritual hunger’ in prisons in Britain or New South Wales.

It has been argued that social change on the macro and/or micro level, which would
reverse the marginal status of the chaplain in the prison, is not evident, nor is it
foreseeable. It has been argued that social processes will not change to alter the situation
of the chaplain, but could the church itself change to bring about hope for the chaplain
for a recovery of prominence? This will be the issue to be next explored.

**Can the mainstream church hold out hope?**

The greatest hope that could be provided by the church for the advancement of the prison
chaplain would be to do what it has failed to do throughout its existence since the
Reformation, namely to make some penetration into the underclass of the society. This is
the case because the underclass, who make up the bulk of the prison population, have virtually no exposure to the church and its teaching. It is hardly surprising that the language of the church is irrelevant to them, nor is it in the least surprising that the liturgical aspect of the chaplain's work has diminished so markedly. The 'welfarisation' of the chaplain is a natural concomitant of the vastly diminished importance of the liturgical. The chaplain had little option but to seek refuge and relevance in the 'pastoral', and in so doing courted demarcation disputes with welfare staff. The present evidence suggests that the mainstream churches, which supply the chaplains to the prisons, are no more successful with the underclass than they have ever been. Further, the Uniting and Anglican churches in Australia, the two main Protestant churches, recorded significantly decreased numbers of adherents in the last published census, while the population of Australia continued to rise (Hughes, 1997; 6; 66). A similar situation exists in Britain and is well documented (Bruce, 1992; 20; Badham, 1994; 489). The question remains, will this dismal profile of the church in decline continue into the future? There are indications that this will be the case.

The congregations of the Uniting Church in Australia and the Anglican Church in Australia have much higher proportions of people over sixty in their members and adherents than is the case for the population at large. When actual attenders are compared with the population at large, the figures are much higher again (Hughes, 1997; 8, 68). The figures of those between twenty and forty years of age who are adherents of the Uniting and Anglican Churches indicate a much lesser proportion compared to the population at large. The figure is much diminished again when actual attenders are
compared to the population at large. These figures merely confirm what is patently obvious to anyone who attends; the mainstream congregations are aging and they have limited appeal to the young. Significantly, the church is at its weakest in precisely those areas where the prison population is most prolific, namely among the young and the underclass. There is little to suggest that the mainstream church will recover either their numbers or their appeal to the young in the near future. The churches no longer have the monopoly on God and there is such a thriving market in religion and para religion that regaining the dominant place seems beyond the capacity of the mainstream churches.

Due to their declining numbers, and their aging congregations who generally have less income from not being in the workforce, the churches face increasing problems with finance. The problems with numbers also mean that the capacity of the church to support ministries other than the parish is becoming more difficult: the churches are more dependent upon external forms of support, which generally means state support. The state, of course, will support those ministries that potentially may assist its legitimation; again the obvious example is the chaplain in the military. The prison chaplain, too, has received significant state support. Support by the state, however, always has the capacity to compromise the independence of the chaplain, but the independence of the chaplain is very much a matter of conjecture (Nagle, 1978; 198). The circumstances of significant state support are not conducive to the prophetic tradition of the ancient prophets, but this tradition has not been evident in the prison. For instance, many clergy had been into the Grafton gaol in New South Wales, the facility that so disturbed Royal Commissioner Nagle, and said nothing about the circumstances, even assuming that they had been
disturbed by them.

It seems that one contributing cause of the lack of evidence for a prophetic tradition is that little is expected of the church any longer. Ian Dalferth expressed this very succinctly.

the influence of churches is unmistakeably diminishing, and the objections of the Christians increasingly fade away unheard. One no longer expects much of Christians, at least not regarding anything determinative for today. .... Increasingly, people are living quite as a matter of course without their churches (Dalferth, 1996; 127-128).

The attempt to create a public theology is a good indicator that the church and theology languish outside the public square. They are no longer important enough to be an integral part of it.

Bruce goes further than Dalferth when he suggests that,

As well as there being fewer churchly people, the lives of those who retain some organised religious connection seem less dominated by religion'. ...'Being church members distinguishes them relatively little in belief and behaviour from those who are not (Bruce, 1992; 20).
The influence of the institution and of its members is negligible in the society. The mainstream churches have not performed well when it has come to differentiating their product. It must be pointed out that it is the mainstream churches that are declining. The Pentecostal churches are growing, although the increases in numbers of the Pentecostalist churches nowhere near offsets the losses from the mainstream Australian churches. The Pentecostals make up less than one percent of the population (Hughes, 1997; 50). A similar situation exists in Britain. The Pentecostal churches are essentially fundamentalist in nature and they do not supply the appointed chaplains to the prisons, they would be unacceptable to both the state and the secular professionals. Pentecostal enthusiasm would be anathema within the ordered existence of the prison. For our purposes in examining the likelihood of the return to prominence of the prison chaplain, it is the mainstream churches that have to be focussed upon and, as Paul Badham notes, ‘the history of religion in twentieth century Britain makes depressing reading for any religious believer who confines his attention to the mainstream Christian churches’ (Badham, 1994; 489). The mainstream church of the twentieth century does indeed make for depressing reading, whether it be in an Australian or British context.

The churches seem to be unable to arrest their decline in the spiritual pluralism of the liberal polity. With their monopoly on God broken, the churches are 'competing' with the New Age 'movement', which is simply a useful term for categorizing a pot pourri of spiritualities. The mainstream churches are losing ground. A browse through any general bookshop will reveal a large number of books under headings such as 'New Age', or 'Spirituality', yet Christian theological books are hard to find. The competition goes far
beyond literature. The competition from civil celebrants in the area of the rites of passage is very strong. Civil celebrants are gaining a significant share of the market in weddings, funerals, and 'namings', the secular counterpart to baptism. These rites of passage were once the sole province of the church, but now the secular providers are rapidly overhauling them in the market, particularly with regard to weddings, but there are also increasing numbers of secular funerals.

Whilst the church has been steadily declining, the social sciences have come more and more into prominence. The building of the grand narratives of modernity has been the province of the social sciences. Much has been written about the postmodern challenge to modernity. Writers such as Lyon suggest that the postmodern challenge of critique of the grand narrative, presented problems of finding a ‘way forward’. ‘When heresy has become the universal condition, appropriate 'ways forward' are bound to be contentious and incomplete, and many postmodern writers emphasise that this is what it means to live in postmodernity’ (Lyon, 1997; 107-108).

Postmodernity may effect the social sciences and their standing, however the church's primary mission is to 'point the way forward', and arresting the decline of the church requires that more people must consider that the church is a credible institution with regard to pointing the way forward. This may be very hard to do against the postmodern critique of grand narratives, if that critique is sustained. If this was to be, postmodernism may well represent as big a threat to the church and its teachings as did Historical Critical Method when it emerged with Enlightenment rationality and it may be no easier for the
church to deal with. There is no compelling reason to believe that postmodernism would bring a hope for the arrest in the decline of the mainstream church, as a consequence of its assault on modernity.

The decline of the mainstream church has created impediments to the chaplain coming back from his exile. The standing of the church in the community clearly has an impact on the standing of the chaplain in the prison. Whilst the decline of the church impacts on the chaplain, there are other factors that also place impediments in the way of the chaplain returning from the exile. These problems have to do with the church's predicament as noted by Moltmann and as previously quoted. Moltmann's contention was that the church faced a crisis of relevance versus identity. The church had to find ways to relate to the modern world without at the same time losing its identity as an institution proclaiming a longstanding tradition. It is considered here that the problem is best encapsulated as one of uniqueness. How does the church maintain a uniqueness and promote the uniqueness of its message, while at the same time commanding the attention of the secular society.

This has been a particular problem with liberal Protestantism, which has gone down the path of seeking relevance to the world, but which now flounders, because it has not found that relevance in the eyes of the secular society that it sought to influence. At the same time it has inflicted some considerable blows to its tradition base (Heelas, 1996; 77). The problem for liberal Protestantism has been that it has failed to differentiate its product and has been absorbed as an obscure and unimportant part of modernity. This issue is
Modern liberal theology was simply not religious the Daily Telegraph remarked in a leading article in December, 1985, prompted by a report 'Faith in the City' presented to a meeting of the Church of England General Synod. The key question the newspaper said, was whether the document, '...owes anything at a fundamental level to a supernatural understanding of human life, and whether or not precisely the same conclusions might not have emerged from a meeting of the British Humanist Association...The problem is whether such documents owe anything whatsoever to a specifically Christian understanding. Producing biblical quotations in support of secular arguments proves nothing.' (Gilbert, 1994; 516).

The questions are obviously rhetorical. The above commentary notes the extent to which a mainstream church has become highly secularised. The churches, Protestant churches in particular, show a high degree of secularisation. Stark and Bainbridge give an account of the fragmentation of the churches, noting that churches tend to emerge from sects when conservative and affluent people enter those sects, only to fragment again when they become highly aligned to society. As the traditional churches move more toward a greater accommodation with the secular society in which they exist, they generate schisms through groups that want to retain or create a more other worldly version of the faith. These groups then leave the parent group. (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985; 103, 444). The mainstream churches could conceivably suffer further decline.
Whilst the mainstream churches have become highly secularised, the state has taken over functions that were previously the province of the church. The reference here is not simply to the welfare and educational functions the church performed prior to the advent of the secular state. The medieval church once spoke for all people on the ultimate issues, such as death. Now it is the state, through its legislation and through its agent, the court, which is much more likely to speak for all people on the ultimate issues. Fenn points this out superbly in his discussion of the Karen Quinlan case in the United States. Quinlan was a young woman in a comatose state as a result of an accident, whose life was being artificially protracted by the life support systems of the hospital where she was a patient. The woman's family, who were close to her and knew the woman's wishes, wanted the life support removed, the medical staff would not comply. The matter was determined, not by those who loved her and knew her wishes, and who had the strong support of the church, but by the secular court, the arm of the state.

Inevitably, such encroachments by the state will raise issues of identity, a most important issue. It is very difficult for a mainstream church to hold out hope for the chaplain, when it seems unsure of itself and its identity in a highly pluralistic culture. MacIntyre would argue that this is a problem of coherence and that the issue of tradition is to the fore (MacIntyre, 1988; 7, 397). As far as Protestantism is concerned, this is not a convincing argument, for the 'Protestant sensibility', to use McFague's term, is one of critique rather than looking for harmony. It is suggested here that it is more a problem of knowing just what is the status of the scriptures. On this point, there is evidence of a great deal of confusion, as well as a great deal of diversity. For example, the Church of England, on
the one hand takes a quite literal view of scripture with its Articles and liturgy, (to what extent they are believed by clergy and parishioner alike is another question). On the other hand, its 'Faith in the City' document, cited earlier, relies on the social sciences rather than the scriptures to 'point the way'. Douglas Hall is of the view that the liberals have been 'too inclusive' and homogenizing. In Hall's opinion, the liberals, have lost their way and will lose it even more emphatically in a postmodern context as they are the ones with the biggest investment in modernity (Hall, 1996; 15-15). Hall's criticism, of course, is contingent upon postmodernism consolidating as a definitive and pervasive movement, a contention that is certainly not without its critics (Beckford, 1996; 44).

Deconstructionism, an integral part of postmodernism, has come under much heavy criticism. Evangelical Christians are to the fore in this criticism primarily because, as Michael Ovey notes, deconstruction attacks the notion of the objectivity of language and proposes language as self-referring, language is 'outsideless' and a phrase or word can only be known from other phrases or words. Language is therefore no guaranteed vehicle for the transmission of objective meaning and has the definite and strong tendency to undermine belief in the scriptures as revelation, a fundamental tenet of Christianity (Ovey, 2000; 320). Such an undermining reduces the scripture to just another text. Ovey, as an evangelical Christian, is not about to let deconstruction, which poses such a threat, go unchallenged and presents his case with particularity.

It is extremely hard to rescue deconstruction from self-refutation. The case is advanced using language and discussed using language! If the proposition (the deconstruction thesis) is true, then language in at least one instance communicates
truth. But the words and the concepts used to express this proposition are not severable from the rest of the linguistic structure: they are part of it. In which case, does not the entire system receive some kind of grounding from this proposition? If deconstruction is true, why does it not apply to the proposition itself? In which case we could ignore it, because it could never be communicated to us. If the proposition false, it can be ignored anyway (Ovey, 2000 (b); 324-325)

It would appear that neither modernity, with its Enlightenment rationality, nor postmodernism with its critique of the meta-narratives, will do anything to reverse the decline of the church in the contemporary context. It is argued here that the churches show no sign that a recovery of influence is on the way, and that they cannot be seen as likely to alter the reverses of the chaplain, which have been happening since the failure of the penitentiary.

Numerous commentators are similar to Hall, in that, far from thinking that the church is pointing the way, they are of the view that the church has lost its way (Dalferth, 1996; 129). Many think that the church has given too much credibility to modernity and that this has facilitated its decline, as well as undermining its uniqueness. It is to the topic of uniqueness and its role in keeping the chaplain in exile that we now turn.

**The Church and the Problem of Product Differentiation.**

Assuming that there is competition in an economic marketplace, there is a need to
positively differentiate one's product from that of one's competitors. If this is done successfully, then a good share of the market will be obtained and the organization will operate successfully. It would appear that the church is that it is failing to differentiate its product. The example of the London Daily Telegraph, previously cited, puts this contention poignantly; even the popular press is having difficulty in determining, from the social science riddled church commentary, if there is a distinctively 'Christian' social commentary. The process of secularisation in the mainstream church has meant that the church has had problems differentiating itself from the society around it.

McGrath, Volf, Hauerwas and Dalferth, to name but a few writers, have criticised the church for being overly accommodating to modernity. It is little surprise that with such accommodation, the church is unsure of its status in a pluralistic culture. Hauerwas has noted this in his criticism the church's tendency to adapt to the modernist culture.

Our preaching and theology have been one ceaseless effort to conform to the canons of intelligibility produced by the economic and intellectual formations characteristic of modern and, in particular, liberal societies...Christians in modernity thought that their task was to make the gospel intelligible to the world rather than to help the world understand why it would not be intelligible without the gospel (Hauerwas, 1996; 28).

Hauerwas contends that Christian theology and preaching has degenerated into a 'high humanism' and that the adaptive brand of Christianity of the liberals has no enemies other
than 'everyone's enemies', namely, sexism, racism, homophobia and the like (Hauerwas, 1996; 29). In the process, Christian uniqueness has vanished and Christianity has become homogenized into the prevailing culture. Hauerwas welcomes the prospect of postmodernity on the basis that the 'comforting illusion of modernity', namely that the church can and should exist in society without conflict, will be over. ‘Enemies’, or counterpoints, are necessary to the church in Hauerwas' view; they assist in definition and identity.

That the church has suffered decline and that it has difficulty with identity and status within modernity is a view held by many commentators. The impact of church decline and the problem of its absorption within modernity have created difficulties for the church in supporting the chaplain. The difficulty of the chaplain in demonstrating the uniqueness and effectiveness of his work has compounded the problems of a return from his exile. What is contested by various commentators is how and whether the church can extricate itself from the situation. Here, in particular, we need to ask the question of whether theology, as the crowning discipline of the church, can hold out hope for the church, and as a consequence, the chaplain. It will be remembered that, for the Exiles, a radical new theology came into existence. This theology sufficed for many to explain the defeat and the subsequent Exile. This radical new theology redefined God's purposes and actions and held out hope for a return from the Exile. What hope does theology hold out to the church and the chaplain? This will be assessed in the next section, which explores the metaphor, 'The chaplain as the one who overcomes religious crisis'. 
Entailment Two. The chaplain as the One who overcomes Religious Crisis.

The Exiles were buttressed in their hope by the development of a new theology. Theology played an important part in the preservation, not only of hope, but also of the religion itself. In contemporary times, there are theologians who appear less than confident about theology having much of value to offer. Many theologians suggest that radical changes will be needed for theology to have some influence in society.

The Small and Ugly Queen.

Dietrich Ritschl made the following comment of theology ‘in most of our books and lectures we merely order and evaluate anew what has long been known and said. And all too often we merely report what others have said and add our own critical or assenting commentaries’ (Ritschl, 1996; 53).

We have seen that it was Gill's contention that divinity schools in Europe had been kept open by the social sciences. While it was suggested that this was hyperbole, it was argued that social sciences have, nevertheless, heavily influenced theology. Solle depicts contemporary theology as, 'the small and ugly queen' suggesting that it is in need of transformation (Solle, 1996; 22). It is the contention of this thesis that such a transformation would require that theology discontinue seeing itself as primarily a social science. It seems that one reason that contemporary theology has become increasingly marginal is that it has become syncretistic of social sciences, reflecting a predicament of the prison chaplain. Wolterstorff makes the point that theology makes little contribution to what is becoming a more and more beleaguered church. He suggests that theology has
had to 'trim its sails' to meet the requirements of the academy in terms of religious impartiality and that this 'trimming of the sails theology', or non-confessional theology, provides the church with little of benefit (Wolterstorff, 1996; 40-41). It has been observed by some commentators that theologians write for other theologians. Certainly what they write has very little relevance to the parishes, and there is little evidence of much interest from other sectors of the church.

Volf sums up this situation, from the perspective of the clergy, quite exquisitely ‘A fresh reflection on the relation between theology as a scholarly endeavour and theology as a helpmate of the church, between academic exercise and spirituality, is urgently needed’ (Volf, 1996; xii).

As numerous theologians operate independently of the church in the academy, this exercise as suggested by Volf would be very difficult to put into operation. It is agreed that this exercise is a very necessary one, however it is suggested that the brief would need to be widened to include the purpose of theology, for that is far from clear.

The state of theology gives no indication that the discipline is going to provide the radical hope that it provided for the Babylonian Exiles desiring a return to the Holy Land. The chaplain in his exile would be ill advised to pin any hopes on a return to prominence in the prison on the development of new theologies. For where would they come from? What relevant new foundations would they rise from; what new message of relevance would they offer?
Theology in the Babylonian context was an example of creative praxis. Theology makes its best contributions when creative praxis is evident. Radcliffe states this well in his explanation of the task of the theologian in relation to the sociologist.

the theologian must provoke and enable a mutually illuminating encounter between the gospel and contemporary understandings of man and his destiny. He cannot bring to that task a 'ready made' perspective. Whatever perspective might arise must be engendered by the encounter, not brought to it (Radcliffe, 1980; 155).

In Babylon there was an illuminating encounter between the common understandings of God, and the social reality of the Exile. A creative praxis emerged. In the contemporary situation, the chaplain is very much the syncretist on the social sciences. The chaplain's practice is as a quasi-welfare officer and it is to secular insights that the chaplain looks, in his essentially secular practice. Theology offers nothing that would help the chaplain re-align practice. We have seen that theology itself heavily borrows from the social sciences. Furthermore, as Wolfhart Pannenberg notes, theology is more focussed on the pluralism of religions than it is on Christian uniqueness (Pannenberg, 1992; 97,99-100) and this is hardly likely to bring forth material that will assist the chaplain to come back from the margins of the prison to a position of influence by virtue of having a unique contribution to make.
Contemporary theology will not likely be the catalyst whereby the chaplain again finds himself an influential person in the prison. Griffin depicts the contemporary theological environment as one that can be readily ignored: conservatives and fundamentalists, he informs us, are ignored because they are 'unscientific' and liberal theology because it is 'vacuous' (Griffin, 1989; 2). The assertion that theology has been largely ignored is easily substantiated, not only by the literature referring to this topic, and lamenting the demise, but also by the absence of theology from discourses in the public square. Theology has not been able to arrest the decline of the church, because theology itself has also been in decline. It is not surprising then, that theology has given no indication that it could restore the fortunes, and the hope, of the chaplain, as it restored the hope of the Exiles. Theology is indeed the 'small and ugly queen'. It is suggested that the criticisms that theology has become irrelevant, because it has been primarily concerned with secondary issues and fixated on the requirements of the academy, are largely true. Theologians concerned to have theology seen as a social science have largely detached their endeavours from the church that they supposedly serve. Both the church and theology are beleaguered, but beleaguered in isolation from each other.

With regard to the chaplain, theology does not hold out any hope of a return from the exile. To do so, theology would need to be challenging the dominant paradigm of the prisoner as psyche. Theology, however, is but the small and ugly queen. It is, in essence, but a minor discipline, and with its heavy dependence on the social sciences, not a unique one either. To have the chaplain returned to prominence, there would need to be a shift in paradigm, a shift to a paradigm where the chaplain could claim special expertise, as in
the days of the penitentiary, where the prisoner was seen as ‘soul’. There has been much emphasis in theology on homogenizing religion and on broad notions of spirituality. While being inclusive, this approach leaves much to be desired, for there are relatively few people who have any interest at all in being 'included'. This homogenizing, broadly inclusive, absolute truth-denying approach does not give credibility to the uniqueness of Christian spirituality and hence to promoting the uniqueness of the chaplain's input into the prison.

The syncretising chaplain, bereft of assistance from theology and the church, appears unlikely to either solve the religious crisis of his exile, or have the problem resolved on his behalf. The state will not thrust him into prominence, in the manner of the state of the penitentiary era. There is no Cyrus on the horizon to bring about a return from the exile for the prison chaplain.

The prison chaplain has travelled the road from Armageddon to Babylon. He occupied the position of influence when he led the battle for the forces of Good against the forces of Evil at the Armageddon of the penitentiary. He now occupies the position of the exile in the modern prison. He has managed to survive in the prison, rather better than religion itself. When not propped up by the power of the state and made compulsory by legislation and regulation, religion struggles. It is by syncretism that the chaplain has managed to survive, although there are questions raised at times about the nature of the work he does, which has little content that is identifiably religious. The term 'pastoral' has little currency in a setting that has no congregation and a population with little
understanding of either the church or its doctrines, and where the welfare needs of the prisoners are addressed by professionals who are competent in this field and, as Vinson has noted, are respected by prisoner and prison staff alike.

What might the future hold for the prison chaplain, given that neither church, theology, nor the chaplain himself is either able to, or competent to, bring about change required to return the chaplain to prominence. Is the chaplain any longer needed in the prison? In a secular institution, should not the welfare professional take over the tasks of the chaplain, with perhaps a visiting clergy conducting services for those few prisoners who show an interest? Is the provision of the prison chaplain by the church simply a tradition, a response to biblical verses, whose references to the prison were to institutions vastly different to the contemporary institutions in Britain and Australia? In the concluding comments on the chaplain and his decline, these issues will be addressed, along with some comments on the methodology used.
CHAPTER TEN.

CONCLUSIONS.

A basic assumption of this thesis was that the creative use of metaphor could guide the social investigation into the decline of the prison chaplain. In Radcliffe's words, 'the creative interplay of different modes of discourse' was used to drive the social investigation (Radcliffe, 1980: 160). Metaphors were linked in order to investigate and portray the marked decline of the chaplain from the time of the ascendency in the nineteenth century to the marginality of the present time.

It is believed that metaphor proved to be a useful method in the investigation of this topic: it drove the analysis as well as providing a framework for ordering the material. This thesis is seen as a vindication of the view, held by scholars such as Pattison, that fragments can provide a useful and unique contribution from the religion to the social sciences and social investigation, particularly when those fragments take the form of metaphor constructed from religious writings. It is held that metaphor has the potential to allay the asymmetrical trend in syncretism that is apparent between religion and the social sciences without engendering any fear that an endeavour is being made to resacrilise the world, a particular concern of social scientists, as previously noted by Woltersdorff (1996: 45). The use of metaphor may even lead to some tentative dialogue
between the social sciences and religious disciplines.

This thesis has sought to depict the chaplain as having travelled the road from Armageddon to Babylon. It now remains to speculate on what happens to the chaplain from here. It has been argued that there are significant impediments, secular and ecclesiastical, to the return of the chaplain from exile. Will the chaplain remain an exile in the prison, albeit in a full time, state subsidised capacity? The prisoner has an established and recognized right to practice religion in the prison, but by and large the prisoner has not exercised that right. Is there, then, a need for the chaplain to be in the prison as a full time appointment? If there is such a need, then whose need is it that the chaplain be there? The need of the prisoner? The need of the state? The need of the church? These three questions will be considered in turn.

The Need of the Prisoner?

It was never essential to most prisoners, even in times that could be considered more religious than the present, that the chaplain be in the prison. This is not to deny that the chaplain has not done some good in the prison, or that there are occasional prisoners who contact the chaplain for religious purposes, or even that the occasional prisoner may experience a genuine religious awakening in the prison. It does recognize, however, that for the large majority of prisoners the chaplain is an irrelevance. It further recognizes that it is quite conceivable that the institution of the chaplain may in fact have done considerable harm over the years, in much the same way as compulsory religious education and chapel attendance in private schools has done religion considerable harm.
among the young (Macarthur, 1997; 136-143; 150-153). For much of the time during the penitentiary era and later in the nineteenth century, the prison chaplain was resented. In more recent times, religion and the chaplain have had little influence with prison policy and planning and, as Knight has indicated, the prisoner has little interest in the chaplain (Knight, 1992; 177, 184). The chaplain has only ever been prominent by virtue of the exercise of state power; there has never been a significant consumer demand for his services.

The value of the chaplain has been asserted in a publication of the New South Wales Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee. The Committee indicates that the chaplain meets the prisoner, ‘in the context of ultimate meanings and concerns...of total welfare, rather than band-aid treatments’ (Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee, 1993; 7).

The Committee, in the same document, goes on to suggest,

> The relevance of the church and its varied ministries is not readily apparent to those who are not immediately in receipt of such ministries, and is often quickly forgotten by those who receive them...Chaplains performing their work may be devalued because they exercise their ministry in a way which is not measurable and often by its very nature has to remain unseen (Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee, 1993; 8).

While it is conceded that confidentiality is an important part of the chaplain's work,
(although little or no more one would think than the psychologist and other secular professionals operating in the prison), it does not follow that the chaplain's work cannot be evaluated. Most importantly, however, it is not readily apparent as to why those people who receive ministry in the context of 'ultimate meanings and concerns' should so readily forget them. Surely engaging conversations on matters of ultimate meanings and concerns would be readily remembered as being important, perhaps even life shaping, by those engaging in them. A more likely explanation of the forgetting is that the conversations with the prisoners are more on non-ultimate matters than ultimate meanings and concerns. Such a position has been argued in this thesis. The New South Wales Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee again has a dissenting opinion. It comments that,

the chaplain's expertise in moral and spiritual counselling to a large degree distinguishes him from other professionals. 'People expect in a man or woman of God something of the presence of God. It could be said that this, above all other factors, is what distinguishes a chaplain from the other helping professionals (Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee, 1993; 9).

With people who are clearly exercising such religious functions, such a case can be argued. It is contended that such is not the case with the chaplain in the prison, where the prisoner's expectation of the chaplain, and contact with the chaplain, rarely has anything to do with religious functions. Knight made this point very clearly (Knight, 1992; 175). The prisoners have given no indication of regarding the chaplain's religious functions, if
indeed they are known to the prisoner, as valuable, let alone indispensable. Nor is there evidence that they have seen in the chaplain something of the presence of God. The Committee's statements are ideological rather than empirical.

The Need of the State?

It was seen in previous chapters that the state looked to the chaplain in the hope of his providing the reform impetus of the penitentiary. The penitentiary failed. It was the state that brought the chaplain into prominence and the state that then turned away from the chaplain to the secular world when it considered that it needed to be informed about the prison. In spite of the chaplain's marginality, the state still provides a significant subsidy for the prison chaplain. It seems that the chaplain still has use value for the state. What might that use value be?

The chaplain's use value for the state is certainly not in a monitoring role. Prison visitors are now an established part of the prison. As well, the prisoner has access to the ombudsman and the courts. Also, there is little to suggest that the chaplain ever performed a monitoring role, even in an informal manner, as the as the previously mentioned case of Grafton gaol in New South Wales testifies. There were no complaints from clergy about treatment in this facility for incorrigibles, described by Royal Commissioner Nagle and affirmed by Vinson as being one of the most shameful and sordid episodes in New South Wales penal history (Vinson, 1981; 1).

It seems that the chaplain's broker role is still a useful one for the state, perhaps
increasingly so in an age of religious pluralism. The chaplain acts as brokering agent for the many proselytising charismatic and fundamentalist groups who would desire entrance to the prison. The chaplain gives credibility to the state as catering to the religious needs of the prisoner, even though the chaplain has, demonstrably, little in the way of liturgy and education that is of any interest to the prisoner. Demonstrably, the prisoner is given the right to at least mainstream religious input, if and when he ever chooses to exercise it. Such is the case in New South Wales. In Britain, the situation is similar, with the chaplain of the Established Church being the broker of the guidelines, which restrict both the religious organizations that can enter the prison and the conditions under which they can enter (Beckford and Gilliat, 1998; 194). It would seem likely that this broker role will continue. It is useful to the state to have this system to handle the potentially disrupting influences on prisoner discipline of proselytising groups wanting access to the prison. The prison chaplain, even though he is largely irrelevant to the prisoner, performs a useful symbolic function for the prison by his presence, he signals that prisoner rights are being recognized, at least with regard to religion. Whether the chaplain does anything religious or not is not really an issue for the state, it is his presence that is useful.

The chaplain has further symbolic value for the state. In the New South Wales state health system, the chaplain is not funded by the state, whereas in those areas where the coercive power of the state is to the fore, namely the military and the prison, the chaplain is funded by the state. The chaplain is a symbolic presence in the prison, which the state plainly considers worthwhile preserving, even when religious understandings as an underpinning for prison practice and policy, and the chaplain's power to reform, have
been found wanting from the nineteenth century.

Those areas that have symbolic value for the state receive state subsidies for the chaplain. For this reason alone, it seems highly likely that the chaplain will continue to have a presence in the prison. Less and less does the state look to the church for some form of legitimation in what it is doing, however while the prison and the military would still operate perfectly well without the fulltime subsidised chaplain, the state still considers the investment worthwhile.

**The Need of the Church?**

The church's need for the chaplain to be in the prison also seems to be largely symbolic. For the church, it seems to be sufficient to point to the Matthew and Hebrews texts about visiting the prisoner and to the presence of the chaplain in the prison as its response. As has been pointed out, both the interpretation of the text and the effectiveness of the chaplain in the prison are very vulnerable to criticism. Little critical thought about the chaplain in the prison has been evident from the church; as long as the state pays the subsidy, the chaplain will be there. 'For what purpose?' is a question that the church has not posed in a serious and critical way. The church's statements about chaplaincy, voiced through committees such as the Civil Chaplaincies Advisory Committee, whose publication on prison chaplaincy has been referred to, are largely self promoting. The church entertains and promotes the idea that it is reaching into areas of need, but little evaluation seems to have been done on whether this effort is in any way effective, or indeed valuable.
Summary.

It would seem that the chaplain will remain in the prison, constantly seeking to define a role for himself in an institution where reform based on religious foundations has been tried and left behind. For both the state and the church the chaplain is largely a symbolic presence. Can the chaplain have a greater impact on the prison than this? Murphy and Dison, have argued, in the North American context, but the argument can be extrapolated beyond that context, that the prison is in need of professionals with a broader vision, broader than that possessed by those they term sociological 'technicians'. They argue that, if the prison is to be an institution for reform, professionals with wider vision will be needed. They see reform as both necessary and possible and consider the sociologist, as opposed to the sociological technician, to be the person who can potentially bring this about (Murphy and Dison, 1990; 167). The merits of Murphy and Dison's case need not be argued, but importantly, and completely unintentionally, they raise, for the ecclesiastically minded, the issue of the prophetic in religion. The prophets of the Old Testament tradition were individuals who took the wide and critical view. Could the chaplain have such a role here within the prison? A role as the one with the wide sweeping view, one who, like the prophet, is independent of the system and able to stand outside it and offer criticism. This is not currently the case, but could it be in the future? Could the prophetic be recovered? This is very unlikely. Casanova has argued that there is evidence that old religious traditions can be revitalised by public roles (Casanova, 1994; 224). Casanova's assertions are not considered convincing; with regard to the prison they are irrelevant, for it has been argued that traditional religion has been left
behind, both by the institution itself and by the syncretistic chaplain. The broad notion of 'spirituality' has taken over from the specificity of Christian creed, liturgy and tradition, which includes prophetic tradition. Added to this are the previously discussed secular and ecclesiastical impediments to the return from the exile. The prophetic tradition seems unlikely to emerge in the prison to thrust the chaplain into prominence.

The chaplain has travelled the long road from Armageddon to Babylon. There is no Cyrus on the horizon building a power that could bring him back from the exile, back to the place, or even a place, of prominence in the prison. An obvious retort to this observation might be, 'O you of little faith'; a return looked unlikely to those Exiles of the Old Testament. However, in the contemporary situation of the exile of the prison chaplain, as opposed to the situation of the Exiles in Babylon, the prophets are absent and we look for evidence of Cyrus in vain.

Syncretistic practices have made a distinctiveness in chaplaincy practice unlikely, it is likely that the chaplain will continue to take the crumbs from under the table of the secular professionals in the prison. The chaplain's distinctly religious functions have all but disappeared and his presence as a practitioner in the prison has been questioned. However, as his practitioner presence in the prison is a marginal one, such questions have not generated vigorous debate; the chaplain is not seen as a key player in the prison, as evidenced by his being largely absent from mention in the literature on the prison. This very marginality, one might think, could behove the church to open up the area of debate on the role of the prison chaplain, as opposed to making self-promoting and ideological
statements, and this, it is held, has been the church's custom. For there to be any hope of liberation of the chaplain from the exile in the prison, whether that be through a return to prominence, or the development of another religious intervention (whether substitutive or complimentary), the prerequisite is that the church will need to provide the impetus by critically reviewing the role of the chaplain and asking the very difficult question of how the chaplain came to be an exile. Besides being a necessary undertaking, it would be a very difficult one, for the church would have to start by first accepting that the chaplain is in fact an exile and then critically reviewing the history of its own pronouncements on the chaplain which, as we have seen, bear little resemblance to chaplaincy practice. It is difficult to imagining this happening.

The chaplain, it is asserted, is likely to remain marginal to the policy and practice of the prison. In spite of this marginality, the chaplain will remain in the prison, and in his exile. It seems unlikely that there will be any definitive endeavour, either by church or state, to bring the chaplain back to a practice prominence; his, it would seem, is a symbolic presence in the prison for both the church and the state.
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