

Dismantling the Discourses of the “Black Legend” as They Still Function in The Episcopal Church: A Case against Latinx Ministries as a Program of the Church

CARLA E. ROLAND GUZMÁN, PhD

The Episcopal Church's failures in ministry to, with, and among Latinx persons and communities are related to the centuries-long historical and discursive animosity between England and Spain. This serves as a background to understanding today's major challenges with respect to ministry with Latinx persons and communities, which function as hyphenated-ministries: programs or projects of the church. The overt and covert insidious replication of the discourses of the so-called Black Legend continue to play out in the inability of TEC to have a substantial breakthrough in ministry with and among Latinx persons and communities.

Roland propone que las fallas de la Iglesia Episcopal en el ministerio con y entre personas Latinx y dentro de comunidades Latinx están relacionadas con la animosidad histórica y discursiva inmemorial entre Inglaterra y España. TEC, como iglesia colonial e imperial, utiliza el “anglicanismo” y sus raíces “inglesas” de una manera que desprecia y muestra prejuicio en contra de las personas y comunidades Latinx, dados sus supuestos antecedentes “españoles” y “católicos romanos.” Esto sirve como un entorno para entender los grandes desafíos de hoy en día con respecto a estos ministerios. Estos retos incluyen, el funcionamiento de los “Ministerios Latinx” institucionalizados, y todos los Ministerios Étnicos, como ministerios “híbridos” que se destacan por su guión (hyphenated-ministries), porque son y funcionan solamente como programas o proyectos de la iglesia. Esto está vinculado a la falta

* Carla E. Roland Guzmán was ordained in Puerto Rico in 2002 and has served the Church of St. Matthew and St. Timothy in New York City for the last fifteen years. Dr. Roland serves as Affiliate Faculty in church history at the General Theological Seminary and is Coordinator of the Faith, Family, Equality: The Latinx Roundtable (a program of the Center for LGBTQ and Gender Studies).

de deseo en compartir poder y recursos, o renunciar al control de la institución y al pánico demográfico sin fundamento teológico, y la reproducción insidiosa abierta y encubierta de los discursos de la llamada “leyenda negra,” a medida que continúan manifestándose en la incapacidad de TEC de tener un avance sustancial en estos ministerios con y entre las personas y comunidades Latinx.

Presiding Bishop John Hines and the General Convention Special Program (GCSP): Precursor to Ethnic Ministries

On Tuesday, October 9, 2018, Seminary of the Southwest celebrated their annual John Hines Day.¹ John Hines, founder of the seminary, was Bishop of the Diocese of Texas in the early 1960s when he was elected Presiding Bishop of The Episcopal Church (TEC) at the General Convention of 1964. Hines had a role in the creation of one of the precursors to what would eventually become “ethnic ministries” of The Episcopal Church: the General Convention Special Program (GCSP). The 1967 GCSP marks the beginning of the institutionalization of Latinx ministries as a program or project of TEC.²

The very structure of ethnic ministries, particularly Latinx ministries, which dictates institutionally how we deal with ministry to, with, and among Latinx persons and communities, is one of the challenges that we face today; it forever enshrines this ministry as a hyphenated-ministry and as a program or project of the church. This observation is not new; what I call hyphenated-ministry, the Reverend Canon Herbert Arrunátegui, Staff Officer for Hispanic Ministry starting in 1977,

¹ A version of this paper was presented at Theologizing *Latinamente*: A Conference on Latino Cultures, Liturgies, and Ethics, Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, TX, October 12, 2018. The term *Latinx* is used as a pan-category inclusive of *Hispanic* and *Latin@* or *Latino/a*, but also as separate from them; *Hispanic* and/or *Latino* are used when included in various titles. *Latinx* is meant to go beyond the binary of *o/a* or *@* in the Spanish language. I believe that the *x* in *Latinx* can go well beyond its use in nonbinary language. It would be my preference to use a different type throughout the article for words like *Latinx* and others, to specifically disrupt the reader and underscore the challenge language itself presents, which is part of the argument of this essay; unfortunately the format does not allow for this intentional stumbling block. For a deeper exploration of the history of ministry to, with, and among, Latinx persons and communities, including how it relates to language, see the forthcoming book by Carla E. Roland Guzmán: *Unmasking Latinx Ministry for Episcopalians: An Anglican Approach* (New York: Church Publishing, forthcoming January 2020).

² Kenneth Kesselus, *John E. Hines: Granite on Fire* (Austin, TX: The Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, 1995).

characterized in 1988 as “‘appendix ministry’ or merely a project or a program.”³

Hyphenated-ministry is divorced from “ministry” (which is then considered “white” or of “majority culture”) as a program or project and depend on the dominant group’s resourcing of the program or project appropriately. Such a ministry inevitably needs a level of placating resourcing solely for the upkeep of the structure, as in the case with the undermining of the GCSP; the passing of Resolution D038 at the 2009 General Convention (“The Episcopal Church’s Strategic Vision for Reaching Latinos/Hispanics”) serves as a more recent example. This resolution requested \$3.3 million, and only received about \$330,000.⁴ Not resourcing or underresourcing a program of the church is ultimately about power.⁵

Yet, how did we get to hyphenated-ministry? It is the culmination of a century-long trajectory, which began with the late nineteenth century’s post-industrialization emergence of “special ministries,” as described by Robert W. Prichard,⁶ and then dovetailed with the liberal/progressive Social Gospel movement of the first half of the twentieth century. This, in turn, morphed in the middle of the century with the values of the civil rights movements, ecumenism as envisioned in the Second Vatican Council, other social justice endeavors, and liberation theologies as seen in Latin America. Unfortunately, although many of these movements sought agency for oppressed groups, as did the GCSP, a different possible outcome took hold in the United States and in TEC: “social ministries” that served as the “conscience palliative” for white liberal/progressive Protestants, as described by

³ Daniel Caballero, ed., “Hispanic Ministry: Opportunity for Mission,” rev. ed. (New York: The Office of Hispanic Ministry, The Episcopal Church Center, 1998/2001), 13.

⁴ Reverend Canon Anthony Guillén, email message to author, July 2, 2018. “Resolution D038,” *Journal of the 76th General Convention of the Episcopal Church* (New York: Church Publishing, 2010), 181, 521–24.

⁵ Some of the things envisioned in the Strategic Vision were finally accomplished through the \$1.1 million evangelism allocation related to GC2015-A086. A report was submitted at the 2018 General Convention: “The Task Force for Latino/Hispanic Congregational Development and Sustainability.”

⁶ Robert W. Prichard, *A History of the Episcopal Church*, 3rd rev. ed. (New York: Morehouse Publishing, 2014), 230.

Juan Francisco Martínez.⁷ These end up going “just far enough,” thus maintaining the structures of power and oppression.

While I criticize our structure of ethnic ministries as hyphenated-ministry, and its limited resourcing—legacies of the GCSP—I also believe that Presiding Bishop Hines was a prophetic voice in the church, with a message of racial reconciliation and agency for minoritized communities that unfortunately The Episcopal Church could not handle, and rejected. This rejection stunted the possibilities Hines’s vision would have afforded, if people had moved beyond fear and lived into the possibilities. To make this point more clearly, here is a brief presentation of some salient aspects of the GCSP.

According to John L. Kater Jr., in the summer of 1967, violence, death, and destruction occurred in urban ghettos, including Detroit and Newark. Presiding Bishop Hines visited ghetto areas in New York with black members of the Executive Council staff, and from that “Hines became convinced that the Church must make some substantial institutional response to the urban crisis.”⁸

In September 1967, when Hines called for the GCSP, it was envisioned as “assisting the poor to organize themselves so that they may stand on their own feet, rise out of their degradation, and have a full share in determining their own destiny.”⁹ Hines would bring the issue front and center at the convention in Seattle, requesting \$3 million annually for the GCSP, aiming to bring

peoples in ghettos into areas of decision making . . . [by providing money] to community organizations involved in the betterment of depressed urban areas, and under the control of those who are largely both black and poor, that their power for self-determination may be increased and their dignity restored.¹⁰

⁷ Juan Francisco Martínez, *The Story of Latino Protestants in the United States* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2018), 94.

⁸ John L. Kater Jr., “Experiment in Freedom: The Episcopal Church and the Black Power Movement,” *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 48, no. 1, Historical Prolegomenon to the Renewal of Mission: The Context of the Episcopal Church’s Efforts at Outreach 1945–1975 (March, 1979): 74.

⁹ David L. Holmes, *A Brief History of the Episcopal Church* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993), 165.

¹⁰ Kater, “Experiment,” 74.

This fit within the various strategies of the civil rights movements and was consonant with the contemporaneous articulation of liberation theologies in Latin America.

The GCSP was approved by both houses "by large majorities."¹¹ Yet, by 1969, many Episcopalians, who did not understand the relationship of racism and power, were increasingly uneasy with, and fearful of, the perceived ties of the GCSP to Black Power and nationalist movements, and began trying to limit the funding and structure of the GCSP.¹² To say the least, the "Special Program" was divisive in the church, and at the General Convention of 1970, Presiding Bishop Hines reiterated the belief that The Episcopal Church should fund minority groups and permit them to "achieve political, economic, and social power." The many objections to the GCSP and to Hines's leadership, he asserted, reflected a deeper problem for Episcopalians—"the meaning of mission in Christ's Name . . . [and] the cost we are willing to pay in response to God's call."¹³

From 1968 to 1973, the GCSP, under the leadership of Leon Modeste, made grants totaling more than seven million dollars. In 1973, the GCSP was quickly underfunded at General Convention, receiving only \$650,000 for the triennium, and renamed "Community Action and Human Development." Some emphasis was shifted to much smaller grant programs "for racial and ethnic minorities [which] were combined under the title *Mission Service and Strategy*" (\$2 million for the triennium).¹⁴

The inability of many Episcopalians to understand the dynamics of power and racism, and their own role in these dynamics, continues to prevent TEC from being a church open to all, and open to helping without strings attached or a paternalistic us/them attitude. Calling the GCSP a brief flirtation by the church with self-determination, Kater concludes his 1979 article with a sad assessment regarding this episode in the church:

¹¹ Kater, "Experiment," 75.

¹² Kater, "Experiment," 78–79.

¹³ David L. Holmes, "Presiding Bishop John E. Hines and the General Convention Special Program," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 61, no. 4 (December 1992): 407.

¹⁴ Kater, "Experiment," 80; "Modeste to Produce Permanent Report on GCSP," *Diocesan Press Service*, December 13, 1973 (item 73266) https://episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/ENS/ENSpress_release.pl?pr_number=73266. Modeste's report was never published.

There is little internal impetus towards a substantive role for the Episcopal Church in the social crisis of the present; and it is uncertain whether another period of rapid change would call forth a reassertion of the theological categories of the past for interpreting the Church's place in society.¹⁵

Sadly, the church today is in the place where Kater feared it would be—one of unfulfilled dreams. "The challenge lives on in a world where justice and unity and freedom remain unfulfilled dreams."¹⁶

Although Kater's article is specific to Black Power movements and the GCSP, the GCSP also funded grassroots organizations that sought to empower Latinx persons and communities, and many in the church also frowned upon the ideology and work of some of those organizations. Moreover, other TEC commissions also made grants, after the demise of the GCSP, including the National Commission on Hispanic Affairs (NCHA). The FBI scrutinized several grants and members of the NCHA, which were presumed members of the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional Puertorriqueña (FALN). Several grand juries were empaneled in Chicago and New York in 1976 and from these, Episcopal Church Center staff were subpoenaed in January 1977—Ms. María T. Cueto (Hispanic Missioner since 1973), Ms. Raisa Nemikin, and several NCHA members. All those subpoenaed were incarcerated because they refused to testify, because of conscience. Presiding Bishop Allin's response is emblematic of the distrust that existed then because of the GCSP, and as it functions and continues today.¹⁷ The history of the GCSP and its eventual

¹⁵ Kater, "Experiment," 81

¹⁶ Kater, "Experiment," 81

¹⁷ "Chicago Puerto Rican School Investigated," *Episcopal News Service* (ENS), May 12, 1977 [item 77154]. The Rt. Rev. James W. Montgomery, bishop of Chicago, investigated the allegations and found them to be unfounded. ENS, "Church Center Cooperates in Bombing Investigation," February 17, 1977 [77058]; "Bishop Allin Puts Two Staff on Leave of Absence," March 14, 1977 [77094]; "Former Consultant Jailed for Refusing to Testify," *The Living Church* 175 (September 25, 1977): 5. Luis (Commission member 1975; Consultant 1976), Julio (Commission member 1972–73) and Andrés Rosado, and Pedro Archuleta (Commission member 1972–73); "Three Brothers Jailed in F.A.L.N. Inquiry," August 31, 1977 [77283]; "Church Center Cooperates in Bombing Investigation," February 17, 1977 [item 77058]. Present at a meeting in Puerto Rico in March 1976 were "Lydia Lopez and Carlos Alberto Torres, members of the Theological Development Work Group of the National Commission on Hispanic Affairs; the Rev. Ricardo T. Potter, consultant to NCHA; and Maria T. Cueto, Luis Rosado, and Raisa Nemikin, NCHA staff." ENS, "Hispanic

dismantling, compounded by the FALN incident, continue to inform the direction TEC takes toward ministry to certain communities. It also continues to dictate an ideology (disguised as theology) of control over resources, which only makes the church feel good about engaging certain communities in a certain way, rather than empowering people and communities to seek their own agency and liberation.

Someday someone may write a different "what if?" story of The Episcopal Church. What if the hard work of racial reconciliation and "agency," as proposed by Hines, had been fully embarked upon? I suppose that is the nature of prophets—they are often "on point" and timely, before we, the church, are ready to listen and act. One sad fact is that ultimately the failure of the GCSP was connected to the preservation of power structures in TEC and control of the use of resources.

This Conference at Seminary of the Southwest

In addition to the legacy of Presiding Bishop Hines and the GCSP, there are many other things about the conference that are notable: for instance, the "queerness" among the Latinx presenters; and the conference itself, which is in a specific moment and context, and deserves its own presentation. Of note is that the Seminary of the Southwest has had a Latino/Hispanic program since at least 1980, although in the survey conducted of the whole Episcopal Church in 1980, the Diocese of Texas indicated that it had no Hispanic ministry.¹⁸ Latinx Ministry and Studies in the Diocese of Texas and Seminary of the Southwest were unique in that they were top-down developments. For example, for the Diocese of Texas, the vision for Latinx ministries was established by Bishop Maurice Benitez (1980–1995), who started a Hispanic Commission in 1982 with the involvement of the Rev. Al

Task Force Meets in Puerto Rico," March 23, 1976 [76105]. Arnold H. Lubasch, "Two Episcopal Aides Are Ordered to Testify in a Terrorism Case," *The New York Times*, February 6, 1977. All ENS articles found at www.episcopalarchives.org indexed by the bracketed numbers. See also "Maria Cueto, Latina Activist and Lay Minister, Dies at 68," *Episcopal News Service*, July 5, 2012, <https://www.episcopalnewsservice.org/2012/07/05/maria-cueto-latina-activist-and-lay-minister-dies-at-68/>; Prichard, *History of the Episcopal Church*, 346.

¹⁸ National Commission on Hispanic Ministries, "The Report of the Special Task Force of the National Commission on Hispanic Ministries: 'The Hispanic Challenge to the Episcopal Church: Opportunity for Mission in the 80's'" (New York: Episcopal Church Center, 1980).

Rodríguez. Among some very early events, the Seminary sponsored a Hispanic Theological Consultation in 1981, with a keynote address by the Right Reverend Stephen Neill.¹⁹

Another notable aspect of this conference is that, to my knowledge, the last academic conference that could approximate this one was in 1983, some thirty-five years ago: "Latin America in the 80s: A Challenge to Theology."²⁰ The relevance of a Latin American-themed conference was described by Roman Catholic Archbishop Marcos McGrath of Panama as a direct challenge "to itself, to the world, and specifically to the United States," and as "an indirect challenge, through the Hispanic-American community in this country."²¹ Just as it was true then, this challenge continues to hold true for the United States today as, for example, the country struggles with migrant caravans from the northern triangle in Central America. One major difference from the conference thirty-five years ago is that this one is centered around Latinx Episcopal voices.²²

Beyond the 1983 conference, for reasons that are not yet fully clear to me, much of the work that provided theological grounding to Latinx ministries ceased after 1985, with a brief flourish in 1988.²³ There were some glimmers in the 1990s and 2000s, but much of the work since has, in many ways, not been grounded in theology, but, habitually, in the resourcing of the church (pamphlets and other items) and in addressing the growth of Latinx communities in the United States as reflected in the 2000 census (demographics, and since 2009,

¹⁹ Herbert Arrunátegui, ed., "Report of the Hispanic Theological Consultation," Austin, TX, March 23–26, 1981 (New York: National Hispanic Office, Episcopal Church Center, 1981).

²⁰ Herbert Arrunátegui, ed., "Latin America in the 80s: A Challenge to Theology," Meeting in Washington, DC, September 25–27, 1983 (New York: National Hispanic Office, Episcopal Church Center, 1983).

²¹ Arrunátegui, ed. (McGrath presentation), "Latin America in the 80s," 23.

²² Notably the Reverend Canon Juan Oliver, the Reverend Canon Altagracia Pérez-Bullard, Ms. Yuria Rodríguez, and myself.

²³ There were an important series of consultations and evaluations in 1988, which received support and encouragement from Presiding Bishop Edmond Browning. See Herbert Arrunátegui, ed., "Now Is the Time: Report of the National Hispanic Strategy Conference, 9–11 March 1988" (New York: National Hispanic Office, Episcopal Church Center, 1988); "The Celebration of Diversity: Hispanic Ministry in the Episcopal Church: An Evaluation of the Current State of Hispanic Ministries in the Episcopal Church" (New York: National Hispanic Office, Episcopal Church Center, 1988); and "Hispanic Ministries: Recruitment, Training and Deployment" (New York: National Hispanic Office, Episcopal Church Center, 1988).

marketing). This last aspect can be seen in Yuriria Rodríguez's article, which refers to the 2009 *Strategic Plan* (Resolution D038).²⁴ The resourcing of ministry and the development of missional strategies are necessary, yet these cannot function without the proper financing, theological grounding, and leadership development. These last items require a multipronged investment on the part of the church; a prophetic investment will ultimately lead to the sharing of power in the church.

Before the 2000 census, many were aware of demographics, but they did not see these as the starting or driving point, but rather as a single aspect that could contextualize the call and theological grounding of these particular ministries. In the wider culture of the US, the demographic shift was felt as early as the 1970s, and the 1980s were already seen as the "Decade of the Hispanic."²⁵ Arrunátegui had a keen sense and understanding of the importance of ministry with and among Latinx persons and communities, grounded on dignity and the principles of liberation theologies.

Although I am not sure about the question of the 1980s, I do know that TEC chose a direction that put it on the road that has led us to today—an all-consuming focus on demographics that I call the "Demographic Panic." To put it more clearly, in 1985, Justo González, PhD, having assessed the Diocese of New York and environs, proposed that The Episcopal Church, in its call to ministry among Latinx persons and communities, needed to understand the two foci of the Hispanic challenge: *the challenge of numbers* and *the challenge of the poor*.²⁶ González, like Arrunátegui and McGrath, was deeply immersed in liberation theologies, or *the challenge of the poor*; yet TEC chose to focus increasingly, and finally only, on *the challenge of numbers*. Another consistent voice since the 1980s has been the Right Reverend Wilfredo Ramos-Orench.²⁷

²⁴ See Yuriria Rodríguez, "El Coro Latinoamericano: Redefining the Choral Model for the Latino Congregations of the Episcopal Church," in this issue.

²⁵ The phrase *Decade of the Hispanic* was first used in an article about Latino appointees working in the Carter Administration published by *U.S. News & World Report* in 1978.

²⁶ Justo González, "The Hispanic Ministry of the Episcopal Church in the Metropolitan Area of New York and Environs: A Study Undertaken for the Trinity Grants Board" (New York: Trinity Church, 1985), 1.

²⁷ Wilfredo Ramos-Orench, "The Hispanic Ministry: A Challenging Future," address on April 15, 2005 at Virginia Theological Seminary on the occasion of a National

With this brief outline of the early history of the institutionalization of Latinx ministries in TEC, and the connection to some of the challenges today—hyphenated-ministry, demographic panic, the resourcing of the ministry and power dynamics—there are two more areas of exploration remaining: first, the discourses regarding Latinx persons and communities that need to be dismantled, as exemplified in the long-standing notions of the “Black Legend” and the historical animosity between England and Spain, and second, the various positive and promising areas TEC can build upon with Latinx persons and communities for the success of sharing of the good news.

The Black Legend and Anglicanism

Are Latinx persons responsible for the martyrdom of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury and architect of the Book of Common Prayer (BCP)? Of course not. Are Spaniards responsible for the martyrdom of Thomas Cranmer? Are Roman Catholics? These questions form the context of the relationship between England and Spain during the development of the “official” Church of England in the sixteenth century. Henry VIII was married to Catherine of Aragon (daughter of Spain’s Isabel) in 1509, yet, without a male heir, Henry sought a divorce, which was not granted by Pope Clement VII. Henry’s response was to sever ties with the church in Rome in 1534. Henry VIII was succeeded by Edward VI, during whose reign the Book of Common Prayer, written by Thomas Cranmer, was published in 1549. Edward was abruptly succeeded by Mary I, daughter of Catherine, and the relationship with the church in Rome was restored. Mary also married Philip II of Spain, but after her relatively short reign, she was succeeded by Elizabeth, who restored the Church of England and reigned for a very long time. The connections between England and Spain in the sixteenth century, then, varied widely and influenced many notable events at that time.

Animosity between England and Spain ebbed and flowed during this century, with the balance tilting toward animosity. One emblematic event that shows the relationship between the two realms is the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. And, going back to the question at the outset of this discussion, we understand the death of Thomas Cranmer, heretic, to have happened in 1556 under the reign

of Mary, unless one is Anglican, in which case Cranmer died as a martyr. The question about Thomas Cranmer's demise may initially seem preposterous, but the fact that such a question is preposterous is not as self-evident as one may think, because in the United States today, many do not understand or see a distinction between the categories of Latinx, Spanish, and Roman Catholic. Latinx people are Spanish-speaking, or of Spanish origin, and most definitely Roman Catholic, right?

Looking at the question about Cranmer again: such a question is the (il)logical result of an interpretation of the underlying assumptions regarding Latinx persons and communities that continues to be perpetuated by The Episcopal Church. Furthermore, the failures in ministry with and among Latinx persons and communities may stem, in part, from these very long-standing discourses of animosity between England and Spain, summarized by the so-called discourses of the Black Legend.

The phrase *Black Legend* was coined by Julian Juderías in 1913, and soon became associated with a series of discourses, some dating back to before the sixteenth century, describing Spain and Spaniards as morally and racially "darker" or "blacker" than the rest of Europe and England. Presumably because of its Jewish and Muslim constitutive heritage, Spain, as seen from the outside, is tainted and "blacker." Similarly, because of the Spanish Empire's treatment of indigenous populations in the "new world," they are constructed as morally "darker."²⁸

These discourses pit England (and later the United States) and Spain against each other, privileging Protestantism against Roman Catholicism, and in the context of the United States, creating categories of "off-whiteness" or "nonwhite" or "non-American" (at best hyphenated-American—people not from the British Isles and northern Europe).²⁹ The Episcopal Church, then, as a colonial and imperial church, uses Anglicanism and its English roots in a way that is consonant with the discourses of the Black Legend. Of note are the insidious parallels that put England, the United States, Anglicanism, the

²⁸ For an in-depth exploration of the "Black Legend" and the construction of the *other*, see Carla E. Roland, "Why Can't They Be More Like Us? Baptism and Conversion in Sixteenth-Century Spain" (PhD diss., University of Exeter, 2017), 140ff.

²⁹ Regarding American identity and off-whiteness, see María DeGuzmán, *Spain's Long Shadow: The Black Legend, Off-Whiteness, and Anglo-American Empire* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).

English language, and “white” on one side, and Spain, Latinx, Latin American, Roman Catholicism, the Spanish language, and nonwhite (and off-white) on the other. Or clearer yet: there is The Episcopal Church (white) trying to reach out to something that for centuries has been deemed and constructed as utterly other—Latinx persons and communities and people of “Spanish origin,” as the familiar census category indicates, everything that England (thus Anglicanism and TEC) is not! This means that TEC treats, implicitly, and at times, overtly, Latinx persons and communities as less than other communities, because those other communities are presumably linked to England or northern Europe, and Latinx communities to Spain.

More to the point, TEC functions in a way that buys into and acts as if these discourses were real, thus reified. Some of TEC’s underlying notions about Latinx persons and communities are the following:

- only recent immigrants
- poor and in need of “help” from the church (thus can be ministered to)
- uneducated
- solely Spanish speaking
- of a Roman Catholic background

Latinx persons, then, are at best hyphenated-Americans, and can only be objects of ministry rather than agents of ministry.³⁰ It should now make sense why the history of Latinx ministry in TEC would begin with the sixteenth century, or well before its institutionalization (as traced to the GCSP), and why the dismantling of the discourses of the Black Legend is one step in helping TEC move forward in this endeavor. There is much to be undone.

These connections have not suddenly become self-evident; they have been expressed in the past, as in the conference in 1983, which Presiding Bishop Allin attended, and at which Archbishop McGrath clearly pointed out the connection, stating,

There are some aspects of the United States’ understanding of Latin America which are prior to the theological. . . . One of the problems we face on the inter-American level, a

³⁰ Juan Francisco Martínez, *Walking with the People: Latino Ministry in the United States* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2016), 24.

projection of all we have discussed, both of the “black legend” and of economic colonialism, is the attitude of superiority the North American tends to adopt in face of everything and everyone from Latin America. This is, of course, projected upon the Hispanic community within the United States.³¹

McGrath’s observation and presentation were rooted in pastoral experiences in Panamá, active participation in the Second Vatican Council, involvement with CELAM (Council of Latin American Bishops), and the visionary meetings in Medellín and Puebla. All those experiences were very important because they were rooted in the lives of the disenfranchised in Latin America, leading to the development and enactment of *comunidades eclesiales de base* (CEB: ecclesial base communities) in Latin America, and the theological foundations of liberation theologies. The GCSP in its purest form could be understood as having supported base communities in the US context. The discourses of the Black Legend are easily traced in the historical record, whether sixteenth century or nineteenth century, or even late twentieth century, and there are still many ways these discourses play out in the national imaginary of the United States and in the ministries of The Episcopal Church. These discourses are alive and (dis)functioning.

With the ascendancy of the United States as an imperial power, which includes victory in the Spanish-Cuban-American War, the discourses of the Black Legend were transferred to the imperial battles between the United States and Spain. In fact, over a century later, after 9/11, these discourses are embodied in the discourses surrounding Latinx bodies and the southern border of the United States.³² Moreover, the US victory in 1898 included as the spoils of war the inheritance of “whiteness.”

To summarize, in the sixteenth century, there is an articulation of Protestant and Reformed England as being better, more benevolent, and whiter (more gothic) in contradistinction to the emerging Spanish Empire, which was characterized as barbaric in the new world (Las Casas), and tainted, not only by its Jewish and Muslim inheritances,

³¹ Arrunátegui, ed. (McGrath presentation), “Latin America in the 80s,” 23–24, 26.

³² DeGuzmán, in *Spain’s Long Shadow*, ably states this, and I believe it continues to hold true after the 2016 general election cycle, and informs the 2018–2019 crisis at the southern border of the US.

but also by its continued allegiance to the Church in Rome. England is better than Spain; thus, based on historical relationships, “white” Americans are better than those with a relationship to Spain. Protestantism (Reformed, white) is better than Roman Catholicism (papal, backward, off-white).

The Black Legend, The Episcopal Church, and Other Challenges since 1958

When reading missionary accounts from the nineteenth century, the discourses of the Black Legend are easily recognizable. Juan Francisco Martínez’s history of Protestantism in the Southwest of the United States after the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo offers numerous examples of the discourses of the Black Legend at work in the missionary endeavor. Some missionaries sought to curtail Roman Catholicism, all the while believing the existing population to be less than themselves. Martínez shares the following account:

According to [Abiel Abbott] Livermore, the Mexicans of New Mexico and California were a “mongrel race” who had cheapened the “American birthright” by being given American citizenship. These people had inherited “the cruelty, bigotry, and superstition that have marked the character of Spaniards from the earliest times.”³³

The nineteenth century “missionary” forays of Protestantism into Texas, the Southwest, Mexico, and the rest of Latin America were characterized by a sense of racial superiority and white ethnocentrism, and were anti-Catholic. In Texas and the Southwest, evangelism and assimilation/Americanization went hand in hand.³⁴ Compared to other

³³ Juan Francisco Martínez, *Sea la Luz: The Making of Mexican Protestantism in the American Southwest, 1829–1900* (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2006), 14.

³⁴ John L. Kater, “Through A Glass Darkly: The Episcopal Church’s Responses to the Mexican *Iglesia De Jesús* 1864–1904,” *Anglican and Episcopal History* 85, no. 2 (June 2016): 197. Martínez, *Walking with the People*, 31; Martínez, *Sea la Luz*, 15, 21, 44, 46, 106; Juan Francisco Martínez, *Los Protestantes: An Introduction to Latino Protestantism in the United States* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011), 2. Mark T. Mulder, Aida I. Ramos, and Gerardo Martí, *Latino Protestants in America: Growing and Diverse* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017), 27–28.

denominations, The Episcopal Church had a very small footprint in this evangelistic endeavor. This was also true in Latin America.

In Latin America, prior to 1958, the evangelistic and missionary strategy of The Episcopal Church or the Church of England was to have chaplaincies that served English-speaking foreigners, whether British or from the United States. Reasons for this included the idea that Latin America was already Roman Catholic and Spanish, and backward: sentiments consonant with the discourses of the Black Legend.³⁵

The Lambeth Conference in 1958 marked a watershed moment: the issue of Latin America as the "neglected continent" arose, and using tools already in the Anglican ethos, Article 34 (*Of the Traditions of the Church*) was invoked, and Latin America was opened up to the development of an autochthonous, Spanish-speaking, and autonomous evangelistic and missionary field.³⁶ Anglicanism in Latin America sought to move away from a chaplaincy model and to begin working among the people of, and in the context relevant to, their respective countries, as well as away from a colonial model.³⁷

It was understood that Anglicanism in Latin America "on no account could be seen as a colony of North America or Europe." The proposal, by Latin American bishops at the 1968 Lambeth Conference, was of "an indigenous Church in each nation of the region, priority to be given to urban evangelism, a special emphasis on ministry in institutions of higher education, and ecumenical witness."³⁸ In short, a process of contextualization was started. As a further point of reference, Province IX of TEC was created in 1964.³⁹

³⁵ John L. Kater Jr., "At Home in Latin America: Anglicanism in a New Context," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 57, no. 1 (1988): 5.

³⁶ *The Book of Common Prayer: And Administrations of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; According to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 874. John L. Kater, "Latin American Anglicanism in the Twentieth Century," in the *Oxford History of Anglicanism*, vol. 5, *Global Anglicanism, c. 1910–2000*, ed. William L. Sachs (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 103, 114.

³⁷ Kater, "Latin American Anglicanism," 106.

³⁸ Kater, "Latin American Anglicanism," 106. "Ask for Support for the Church," *The Living Church*, July 21, 1968, 8. Resolution 64 of the Lambeth Conference of 1968, <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/127743/1968.pdf>.

³⁹ Prichard, *History of the Episcopal Church*, 239.

Thus, the question remains: What does this have to do with TEC and ministry with Latinx persons? In TEC, this functions in a dual and contradictory manner, perhaps analogous to the religious studies idea by Rudolph Otto of the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans* of both attraction and repulsion. In other words, “although we want them, unless they become like us, we really don’t,” or “they are not capable, because of who they are ontologically/indelibly, of being Anglican/Episcopalian.” It is about them and not us.

The Episcopal Church needs to face the challenge embodied in its sins of racism and xenophobia and avoidance. As exemplified in the GCSP, racism continues to permeate many aspects of the (dis)functioning of TEC, including the (dis)functioning of Latinx ministries as a program or project of the church. The specific issue of racism deserves, and requires, its own analysis and full-length monograph.

What are the Black Legend-type notions that underlie Latinx ministries in TEC?

One of the issues that always comes up is about the proficiency needed in the Spanish language to embark in this ministry. There are several answers to this concern. The bluntest is that it is not about language, especially if language is used as an a priori barrier to ministry with Latinx persons and communities. Frequently, Spanish-language aptitude is a made-up barrier, an excuse used by white people, often in leadership, who cannot wrap their heads around this ministry and feel impotent to embark on it. In other words, “since I don’t know Spanish, I don’t have to do it.” The reality is that two-thirds of Latinx persons are English-language dominant. We need leadership that is bilingual and multi(bi)cultural, that can work in transgenerational settings where there may be various levels of monolingualism (English and Spanish) and bilingualism (English and Spanish), whether the ear, the eye, and the mouth.⁴⁰

Another barrier is the belief that all Latinx persons are immigrants, and especially recent immigrants. This is related to the belief, as seen above, of Latinx persons being mostly monolingual Spanish speakers. Latinx persons and communities are forever treated as foreign in the US context, or as an “eternal first generation.”⁴¹ Yet, the

⁴⁰ *Transgenerational* is about how persons of various generations since immigration may co-exist in families and congregations. This is a concept evaluated and expanded upon by the Rev. Al Rodriguez.

⁴¹ Juan Francisco Martínez, *Walk with the People: Latino Ministry in the United States* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2008), 26.

2016 US Census Bureau estimates indicate that 64.9 percent of Latinx persons in the US are native born and 77.1 percent are citizens.⁴²

Latinx persons, being of Spanish origin, are generally identified as Roman Catholic, one of the most insidious discourses of the Black Legend.⁴³ This has two effects: first, not reaching out to these persons or communities because they are part of a different faith community, as seen in the Southwest and Latin American strategies, and second, Episcopal churches compromising their catholic and Protestant heritage by relying on a Roman Catholic veneer to attract Latinx persons to their churches. These churches would benefit from reflecting on the question of how many persons attend their Episcopal Church and think it is “no different than a Roman Catholic church” or don’t even know that they are not in a Roman Catholic church. Pew data from 2013 indicates that 55 percent of Latinx persons identify as Roman Catholic, 22 percent as Protestant (broadly), and 16 percent as “nones.”⁴⁴

An assumption about education is another issue that influences the discourses about Latinx persons and communities. This opens churches to only “minister to” these communities and offer educational opportunities such as English as a second language (ESL). Without going fully into all the oppressive structures that contribute to Latinx persons and communities lagging in educational opportunities, especially postsecondary education, the idea that there is a problem with the “pipeline” for leadership development is actually, in essence, a lack of vision and willingness to resource leadership education and seminary training properly. There are many things the church could do. The easiest, impacting the whole church, is the identification of leaders before they enter college, followed by mentoring and support until they are in leadership positions in the church. The other is a significant investment. Two very important examples of the promise and concrete results of proper investment can be seen in the implementation of prophetic and visionary programs by persons like Justo

⁴² “The Hispanic Population in the United States: 2016,” United States Census Bureau, <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2016/demo/hispanic-origin/2016-cpshtml>.

⁴³ Curiously, people already involved in this ministry overwhelmingly do not agree with this discourse. Arrunátegui, “A Celebration of Diversity,” 23, 82.

⁴⁴ Pew Research Center, “The Shifting Religious Identity of Latinos in the United States,” <http://www.pewforum.org/2014/05/07/the-shifting-religious-identity-of-latinos-in-the-united-states/>. Martínez, *The Story of Latino Protestants*, 6.

González: the Hispanic Summer Program (1989) and the Hispanic Theological Initiative (1995).⁴⁵

Similar to the bias that Latinx persons can, at best, only be hyphenated-Americans is the belief that they can only be hyphenated-Episcopalians. Several things are at work here, including the failure in understanding that Anglicanism can accommodate a breath of expressions, as expressed in Article 34, rather than one normative white colonial church. While there continue to be hyphenated-ministries based on identity, the future of the church is in danger of forgetting what the roots of ministry truly are: ministry. Hyphenated-ministry ensures that it remains other, allowing the mainstream to feel good that it exists but not have to do anything to dismantle the legacies of the Black Legend that it continues to perpetuate, or to open themselves up to sharing power. Another curious consequence of this hyphenated-Episcopalianism is that it also erases all Latinx persons who have been long-standing Episcopalians in congregations that are not specifically designated as Latinx, many of whom are bilingual and multi(bi)cultural.⁴⁶

Most Episcopalians feel more comfortable with helping the other than with having the other in their midst. Because of this, Latinx ministry is often “ministry to” Latinx people and communities, rather than with or among. Many Episcopal churches work from what Martínez calls a “deficiency perspective,” seeing Latinx persons and communities as materially needing from the church.⁴⁷ This is also seen in the education assumptions above and in the supposed challenges to leadership development. Ministry with and among the other requires valuing the kingdom rather than individual comfort.

Since we have spent so many decades in practical terms avoiding theology and dismantling the colonial structures that have shackled our ministries, before getting to the middle of the twenty-first century, we need to dismantle much of what has come before. Therefore, Latinx studies for a twenty-first-century church must understand the presuppositions that have historically undergirded ministry with and among Latinx persons and communities and remove the veneer of traditions that are false entry points into our tradition. The church must offer specialized hyphenated-studies, while at the same time

⁴⁵ “Who We Are, and What We Do,” Hispanic Summer Program, <https://hispanicsummerprogram.org/whoweare/>; “The HTI Story,” Hispanic Theological Initiative, <http://hti.ptsem.edu/about/history/>.

⁴⁶ Martínez, *The Story of Latino Protestants*, 10.

⁴⁷ Martínez, *Walk with the People* (2008), 34; *Walking with the People* (2016), 37.

understanding that these are also theological studies and ministry studies and can benefit anyone, regardless of whether their ministry is considered “Latinx.” Latinx persons and communities have much to offer to The Episcopal Church, and The Episcopal Church has much to offer Latinx persons and communities. This is not about demographics or survival; it is about compatible ethos and value systems. Both sides already have resources in their tool kits that are and will be mutually beneficial. One of the challenges for The Episcopal Church is creating a deeper understanding and recovery of our very own history, tradition, and theology, and among the elements that the church brings to the table are the ideas enshrined in Article 34, the ability to synthesize and live in the both/and.

Are There Ways Forward? What Is the Good News from The Episcopal Church and from Latinx Persons and Communities?

There is no one way to do Latinx ministry, just as there is no one way to do ministry and no one way to be Episcopalian. Although treated as one community, Latinx persons belong to many different communities. This means that often Latinx churches reflect this complexity and are indeed more than just “Latinx”: they are multicultural. In the minoritized context of the United States, Latinx churches also must deal with the “intercultural dynamics of the United States.”⁴⁸

In The Episcopal Church, our ecclesiology is constantly challenged by the pull of congregationalism. As a denomination, we allow this to happen by not fully resourcing solutions to challenges, which in the end only benefits existing structures, rather than transforming them. This is, in part, because it is easier to work within mostly monolithic paradigms than within polycentric ones. I serve a congregation that is multicultural and bilingual, and this is hard work. Are we as diverse as the kingdom? No. Should we strive to reflect the reign? Yes. A multicultural church that lifts both intercultural and intracultural values is hard to model, but much needed. The fact that Latinx congregations are multicultural can be a gift that they bring to TEC.⁴⁹ This is consonant with our Anglican ethos, as seen in the idea of both unity and diversity.

We must recover and understand our historical commitment, as The Episcopal Church, to the marginalized and to social justice. The Episcopal Church must draw on this history and lift it up again in a

⁴⁸ Martínez, *Walking with the People* (2016), 32; *Walk with the People* (2008), 47.

⁴⁹ Martínez, *Walking with the People* (2016), 32, 44, 45, 51, 62, 64.

renewed evangelism strategy that works in ways that are consonant to the foundations of ecclesial base communities. This will be an area that will help recover ecclesial base communities for The Episcopal Church, a Latinx and Latin American gift.

Our tradition is very flexible, and this is enshrined in Article 34. A deeper understanding of what it means to have autochthonous expressions is very important, and a way to move forward. Article 34 has never been about “assimilation.” Therefore, tying together of Protestantism and “Americanization” only responds to the ugly discourses of the Black Legend as appropriated by white Episcopalians, rather than living into the reality of the Anglican heritage as enshrined in Article 34.

When talking about Latinx persons and TEC, I have often said that Latinx persons and communities in the United States context are already inherently Anglican or Episcopalian. Latinx persons know how to live in the both/and. For me, that means listening to NPR and One Republic, and switching to Ricky Martin in English, or listening to Marc Anthony in Spanish. You get the point: many Latinx persons do not see contradictions in these actions, but, rather, enrichment. In The Episcopal Church, we have diversity that is mutually enriching.

This idea of both/and can also be seen through the lenses of intersectionality. The Episcopal Church can speak to the polycentric nature of Latinx identities. Both/and can be understood as a third space of creativity, as described by Homi Bhabha.⁵⁰ Both/and and diversity/unity can also be seen as synthesis, “a complex whole formed by combining,”⁵¹ something found in the making of the BCP. An example that is alive in our weekly liturgy is the invitation to communion, when the longer version is chosen:

“The Gifts of God for the People of God. May add. Take them in remembrance that Christ died for you, and feed on him in your hearts by faith, with thanksgiving.”

As Arrunátegui wrote in the 1980s and reiterated in 1998, the enrichment is mutual, diverse, with value added for both sides.⁵²

⁵⁰ Homi K. Bhabha, *Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

⁵¹ “Synthesis,” Dictionary.com.

⁵² Herbert Arrunátegui, “Evaluation of the Development and Implementation of Hispanic Ministries Programs in the Episcopal Church and the Role of the National Hispanic Officer,” (DMin thesis, Drew University, 1985), 33–34, 65.

Latinx persons/communities offer TEC the following:

- Faith: their lived experiences, "joy in times of adversity and thankfulness in the face of extreme necessity"
- Fellowship and community: a rediscovery of ecclesial base communities (CEBs) and the embrace of an extended family
- Sacraments: A lively liturgy that extends outside the church into the streets and homes
- Prayers: personal piety, devotion, and understanding of the cross

TEC offers Latinx persons and communities the following:

- Faith: that is both Catholic and Protestant, understood through Scripture, tradition, and reason, through a via media approach
- Community: Inclusive, pastoral, familial, democratic
- Sacraments: Varied liturgies and participation by all orders
- Prayers: the BCP with all its flexibility; corporate and individual prayer

Perhaps one of the most important aspects moving forward is to develop and recover a liberative Anglican theologies from a Latinx perspective that considers and adapts what we understand of liberation theologies and CEBs. This is clear from the definition of CEBs: they are community-based opportunities for *concientización* and agency and offer mutual support to those gathered. CEBs are connected to the church, its sacraments, liturgies, and structure. They are evangelical and bring the good news into the world.⁵³

Aren't all these aspects of our life together that we already see and can envision as part of our idiosyncratic way of being part of the Jesus movement? We must grapple with taking what is strong in Anglicanism(s) and understand how it becomes stronger when it is more reflective of the kingdom of God as we strive to build it here on

⁵³ Gustavo Gutiérrez, *Teología de la liberación: Perspectivas. Con una nueva introducción, "Mirar Lejos"* (Lima, Perú: Centro de Estudios y Publicaciones, 1991). CELAM, *La iglesia en la actual transformación de América Latina a la luz del Concilio II*, Segunda Conferencia General del Episcopado Latinoamericano 1968: Bogotá and Medellín, Colombia, 3rd ed. (Bogotá, Colombia: Secretariado General del CELAM, 1969).

earth by living into our baptismal covenant. It is a dialogical conversation that is mutually enriching and not mutually exclusive. Yet it must be prophetic, and we must be willing to share resources and power.

Imagine for a moment that all of this may just boil down to something as simple as remembering that this is about Jesus, and that The Episcopal Church is not England, and Latinx persons are not Spain—therefore, there is no need to replicate the discourses of us/them. It is time to work on the discourses of both/and, as well as, us/us.