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Abstract: Two hundred years after the first Briton claimed the east coast of Australia in the name of the King, Sydney enjoyed two major “royal” tours. In April 1970, Queen Elizabeth II visited to celebrate the bicentenary of Captain James Cook’s “discovery,” even as Britain was retreating from Empire into Europe. In December, Pope Paul VI made the first papal visit to Australia in the midst of declining sectarianism and the emergence of Roman Catholicism as the nation’s largest denomination. Both tours attracted some controversy and revealed substantial shifts in the relationship between worlds old and new. Drawing particularly on the experience of Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, Sir Marcus Loane, who preached in the presence of the Queen and refused to join in prayer with the Pope, this article explores the religious meaning of these two important tours within the context of the mood of “new nationalism” redefining Australia’s place in the world. It brings into view the spiritual significance of the end of empire and the cultural significance of what Hugh McLeod has termed “the end of Christendom” in the long 1960s.
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Let the reader picture two scenes from Australia’s recent past.

Scene 1. Crowds wait, packed dozens deep, outside a Sydney church. They are waiting to catch a glimpse of royalty. The royals are inside, hearing a sermon from the scriptures, kneeling to say the Lord’s Prayer, and listening to the collects from Archbishop Thomas Cranmer’s sixteenth-century Book of Common Prayer. They sign a copy of the Bible brought out from England by the first clergyman to the colony in 1788. Their forebears’ signatures grace the same page. Of their brief time in the city, the royals spend more than half a day in church. A rather religious affair.

Scene 2. Sydneysiders gather in their tens of thousands, eagerly awaiting sight of the ship making its way up the sparkling harbour. The red carpet has been rolled out as the long- awaited guest makes his first steps on Australian soil. Parliamentarians, dignitaries, and journalists jostle for the prize of proximity. Over half a million people have come to welcome him, waving their souvenirs and welcome posters. It is the first visit of this head of state to this far-flung land. A rather royal affair.

The scenes described were, respectively, the 2014 visit of an heir to the Australian, British, and other crowns, Prince William, Duke of Cambridge, along with his wife Catherine, Duchess of Cambridge, and their son, the infant Prince George, and the 2008 visit of the then heir to the keys of St Peter, Pope Benedict XVI. Yet, in some ways, such scenes could reflect almost any royal figure or global religious leader “on tour” in Australia. This article suggests that royal tours, when read thickly, are in some ways more “religious” than one might assume, and, conversely, religious tours (if one might indulge that phrase) are in many ways more “royal” than they might at first appear.

A case in point is the remarkable visits in 1970 of both members of the Royal Family and the Pope to celebrate the bicentenary of Lieutenant James Cook’s “discovery” of the east coast of Australia. Rich with pageantry, and some measure of controversy, these visits came at the height of two major changes in Australia and the British World more generally. First was...
the so-called “new nationalism,” a period of both excitement and anxiety about the “discovery” of a post–imperial sense of cultural identity independent from Britain. Second, this was also a period of much discussion about the future of the religious character of the nation, with clerics and commentators variously celebrating a new closeness between erstwhile bitterly divided Protestants and Catholics, and worrying about the beginnings of a marked drift away from the churches in the attitudes and habits of many Australians. The old verities of empire and religion, so vividly affirmed in the 1950s by the resounding welcome afforded to Queen Elizabeth II in 1954 and the American evangelist Billy Graham in 1959, had started to come undone.1 Read against the larger backdrop of the end of empire and the end of Christendom, this episode tells us much about the contours of the “New Australia.”

The Bishop

One of the key commentators on these tours, and a chief source of the controversy surrounding them, was Sir Marcus Loane, the first Australian–born Anglican Archbishop of Sydney—the largest and most decidedly evangelical diocese in the nation.3 An interesting subject through which to view the end of empire, Loane exemplified “The Establishment” in the “Age of Aquarius.” An ardent monarchist and conservative evangelical, perhaps more at ease with the sixteenth-century Protestant Reformation martyrs Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley than his ecclesiastical contemporaries, one could position Loane, as in Manning Clark’s dichotomy, firmly on the side of old-world resistance to new-world change, the proverbial “Old Dead Tree” from a “[l]and that belongs to the lord and Queen.”4 Writing after his death in 2009, one English obituarist certainly claimed so, arguing that the evangelical Sydney Diocese, under Loane’s leadership from 1966 to 1982, exhibited a “slavish attachment to the past [which] gave it, in the Australian context, the character of a sect.”5 In a similar vein, some have viewed with rather condescending bemusement the longevity of attachment to Britain within the “Church of England in Australia” more generally (which kept this title, unique in the Anglican Communion, until 1981). For instance, Anglican sociologist Gary Bouma, who migrated to Australia from the United States in 1979, recalled being “stunned by the reality still accorded to the Empire”:

I would point out that since its withdrawal from Singapore in the 1960s Britain had turned its back on Australia and was busy joining Europe. The demise of the Empire was undermining the basis of their position in Australian society, and some of these Australians were in denial. During this transition, some churches provided comfort to these views by offering inexpensive private clubs where the myths of the British Empire could be maintained and providing a collective support network of nostalgia for the former realities that underlie the Britain that has now for many become a giant theme park.6

From the perspective of a relatively new arrival like Bouma, it is hard not to view Loane’s attachment to the past as a symptom of denial about the present. It was all the more easy for Loane and his conservative colleagues to be deemed ‘out of touch’ with the prevailing mood when their emphasis on theological continuity, rather than change, was matched with similar preferences for the preservation of the status quo in matters of politics and culture.

Yet, critically locating Marcus Loane and his response to the end of empire is not quite so easy a task. As The Sydney Morning Herald’s long-time religious affairs writer, Alan Gill, wrote at Loane’s retirement, “there are contradictions about Archbishop Loane which make his personality and ministry hard to assess.” For Gill, one of the most pronounced contradictions was Loane’s sense of national identity. Despite being “fiercely Australian” and “justly proud to have been the first Australian-born Primate,” Gill noted that “he has a near-mystical regard for royalty and is passionately loyal to Britain.” These seeming contradictions made Loane a complex prism through which to understand the cultural significance of the 1970 tours and the changing worlds in which they occurred.

The Queen

The Cook Bicentenary’s planned climax was the visit in April 1970 of the Royal Family. For just over a month, they toured Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania. There were a number of differences from the previous tours. Unlike the 1954 and 1963 tours, “they” were not just the Queen and Prince Philip, but also their two eldest children: Prince Charles, twenty-one, and Princess Anne, nineteen. Similarly, the occasion for their visit was the marking of an Australian anniversary, albeit also one celebrated in other parts of the Commonwealth. But perhaps the most significant difference was in the changed cultural climate. The royals arrived amidst the fervour of the “new nationalism” and a marked cooling towards the old unifying myth of “British race patriotism.” This shift was not, as has been repeatedly claimed by historians and politicians, the overthrowing of long-suppressed “authentic” expressions of Australian national identity, or what Ernest Gellner has called a “sleeping beauty nationalism.” Rather, the search for a “new nationalism” was a largely unexpected and unwanted response to the strategic and sentimental end of the British Empire. Australians, like other White Britons in South Africa, Canada, and New Zealand, were cut loose from the British embrace and struggled, despite the best efforts of politicians and intellectuals from the late 1960s onwards, to fill the symbolic vacuum it had left behind. As The Australian’s inaugural editorial in 1964 reflected, “the burning desire of Mother to leave us to our own affairs was a shock,” “a salutary shock,” which “helped to make us understand that now, as never before in our short history, we stand alone.”

The feeling of aloneness was intensified around the Cook bicentenary by the announcement of the withdrawal of British military forces from Southeast Asia in 1971, and the confirmation that British investment preferences would shift from the Commonwealth to the European Common Market. Just as Cook’s quintessentially expansionary imperial venture was being celebrated, the imperial blanket was being rather abruptly snatched away.

---

10 For a thorough treatment of the demise of “British race patriotism” and the search for a “new nationalism,” see: James Curran and Stuart Ward, The Unknown Nation: Australia after Empire (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2010). The term “new nationalism” was first used in Australia by Donald Horne in “The New Nationalism?,” The Bulletin, 5 October 1968, 36-38.
This confluence did not escape the notice of several editorialists, *The Sydney Morning Herald* observing that “it is one of the ironies of history that in the year we celebrate Cook’s voyage to our shores the British flag and all it symbolises is being hauled down in our part of the globe.”\(^ {11}\) Into this mood of cultural uncertainty and strategic anxiety stepped those symbols of a deep past in a distant land: the royals.

Steeped as he was in the British history of Anglicanism (he authored several books on the descent of the English church), and well-attuned through his extensive missionary travels to the instability that attended the global retreat of empire, Marcus Loane was deeply concerned at the weakened bonds of “kinship, and culture, and inheritance” that united Australians with the British crown.\(^ {12}\) As might be expected, Anglican bishops, many of whom were English-born, had long shared this stress on the spiritual significance of the monarchy, using royal anniversaries and tours to stimulate renewed reflection on the place of faith in the lives of Australians. Frank Woods, the Archbishop of Melbourne, had preached before the Queen during her 1954 tour, speaking of how “the British way of life” was “written in stone all over the Motherland.”\(^ {13}\) In 1963, on the royals’ second visit to Australia, Hugh Gough, Loane’s predecessor in Sydney, stressed the familiarity Australians experienced with the Queen and Prince Philip as they met for “an ordinary service.” “[S]he was ‘one of us’ in a way in which she could hardly be on any other occasion during her visit to Sydney.”\(^ {14}\) Gough seemed unable to give substance to this sense of affinity Anglicans felt with their Queen. “It may be an enigma, it may be a paradox, it may be illogical and inexplicable,” he wrote in 1961, “but the plain fact of the matter is that neither Great Britain nor the British Commonwealth would be what they are today if it were not for the Monarchy and in my opinion neither would continue long if we abandoned the Crown.”\(^ {15}\)

Come the 1970 tour, Loane was similarly anxious to articulate the spiritual inheritance of the monarchy. In several articles in the diocesan magazine, *Southern Cross* (which took its name from the cruciform constellation visible in the Southern Hemisphere and featured beneath the Union Jack on the Australian flag), Loane reflected on English monarchs and their love for the Bible, aiming to inspire his contemporaries in renewed devotion to God and his word. From Edward VI’s coronation, where he described the Bible as the “sword of the Spirit,” to Elizabeth I’s institution of the Bible in every parish, to Queen Victoria’s determination to “make the Royal Law”—by which Loane meant the Bible—“the pattern for her reign,” and even George V’s reverence for the Bible as “the first of national treasures,” Loane saw a lineage of British rulers preserving the prized place of the Scriptures.\(^ {16}\) He had devoted three pages of the December 1969 issue of *Southern Cross* to extolling the virtues of the Bible as “the greatest single creative force” in the formation of the “national character” of “English-speaking people”—a striking allusion to the shared “national character” of English speakers spread far beyond Britain’s shores and members of other “nations” such as Australia with a putatively distinct “national character.”\(^ {17}\)

Lest such language be seen as purely the preserve of those like an Anglican Archbishop who might be expected to be Anglophiles, it ought to be recalled that a succession of Prime Ministers usually held up as defiantly Australian also expressed their attachment to Britain in similar terms. John Curtin, the great wartime Labor leader who so

---

famously turned for help to the United States, “free of any pangs as to our traditional links or kinship with the United Kingdom,” spoke of Australia in 1944 as a “bastion of the British-speaking [sic] race.” Loane was thus not markedly out of step with his contemporaries in calling on his compatriots to welcome Elizabeth II by taking the Bible “into our hearts and homes” as, to quote the words with which the Queen had been presented a Bible at her own coronation, “the Royal Law and the Lively Oracles of God.” The linking of British history with the inheritance of the Reformation was central to Loane’s Protestant identity, as it was to many others in the Sydney Diocese.

The costs of forgetting that identity were subtle, but substantial. For one, the decline in imperial rhetoric left Loane without the metaphors he and other clergy often used in exhorting worship of the King of Kings. To speak of the Church as a “colony of heaven,” as he did in 1972 using a curious translation of Philippians 3:20, grated against the new nationalism of the day. Even the aristocratic Englishman Hugh Gough, using the same metaphor in 1961, had recognised that the word “colony” was “an unpopular word today—especially in Australia!” The quiet removal of “Defender of the Faith” from the Queen’s title on her 1973 visit also severed a visible link with the Christian heritage of the monarchy. Twenty years before, Anglican bishops had successfully persuaded the Australian Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, to reverse his decision to omit “F.D.” (Fidei Defensor) from Australian coinage, condemning it as a disloyal attempt to curry favour with Roman Catholics. Come 1973, however, any protest fell on deaf ears. The Australian Church Record lamented that the title had “disappeared without a whimper,” ending a practice “proudly used by our Protestant sovereigns” since the reign of Henry VIII. That Elizabeth II was now “Queen of Australia, ‘by the grace of God,’” was a small consolation, which could only be enjoyed “as long as British blood runs strongly in Australian veins.”

But even if British blood still ran in the veins of many Australians, their understanding of the monarchy was undergoing profound changes. While Australians were still enamoured of the royals in their 1970 Bicentenary tour, as evinced by large crowds and extensive positive media coverage, this seemed less because of a sense of wonder at sovereign grandeur, and more because of the fascination with British popular culture in the wake of the 1960s. As Janet Hawley noted in The Bulletin, after the advent of “swinging London,” “all things British

19 Bouma, Australian Soul, 109. For an example of the employment of such metaphors, see the Reverend Archibald Morton’s sermon to his Haberfield Church of England congregation on Empire Day 1952. His sermon notes read: “Justly proud of British traditions, ideals, proud of our leaders and of the stock we are citizens—members of the British Empire—of the Commonwealth of Nations.” And yet, his notes went on, “many today (here) are citizens of the City of God—the Kingdom of Heaven. This greatest citizenship of all—to be members of the eternal, changeless King under King of Kings.” Morton Family Papers, State Library of New South Wales, MLMSS 7118, Box 15, Folder 2. See also; Janet West, Inings of Grace: A Life of Bishop W.G. Hilliard (Sydney: Trinity Grammar School, 1987), 135-137.
are generally ‘in’ and loved again.”

Donald Horne, the feted public intellectual and author of the seminal 1964 diagnosis of national identity, *The Lucky Country*, agreed. He suggested that amongst non-British immigrants and young people “the Queen is best thought of as a celebrity. Many come to look, not to cheer.” Much of the interest in press coverage had also shifted to the Queen’s children, Charles and Anne, who were greeted as symbols of “new Royal ideas,” “in touch with the people,” and doing what the monarchy was “all about— to be a unifying agent in a mixed up world.” It was thus all the more difficult for Loane, when he came to preach before the Queen at St Andrew’s Cathedral during her 1973 visit to open the Sydney Opera House, to point his hearers to the “inmost significance” of such a service: “to remind ourselves that there is another Sovereign to whom we owe obedience and another Kingdom to which we ought to belong.” In some ways the “decline in imperial rhetoric” that Geoffrey Serle and others had pointed out had much deeper religious significance than was often observed.29

The Pope

The place of religion and royalty in the “new Australia” was on show again later in the Bicentenary year when Australia enjoyed its first papal visit. On a whirlwind ten-day tour through Asia, the Pontiff, Pope Paul VI, spent four days in Sydney, holding an ecumenical prayer service at the Sydney Town Hall and a Bicentenary Mass at Randwick Racecourse. The welcome afforded him was nothing short of royal. His plane was greeted on the tarmac by the Governor-General, New South Wales Governor, Prime Minister, and Premier. Crowds estimated at ten thousand lined the streets of the city as his open-top car crawled by. Preparations for the Racecourse included a six-foot-high cross and altar made from Queensland maple, six thousand yards of red carpet, seven thousand square feet of yellow chrysanthemums and white petunias (planted to bloom during the Pope’s arrival), and transport arrangements for an anticipated half a million attendees. Newspapers reported how he had received “a tumultuous welcome” and had come in the “role of [an] apostle,” calling out the excesses of Australian culture.32

While some commentators conceded that the Cook Bicentenary “seemed an odd pretext” for a papal visit, it was nevertheless welcomed as a timely event in the life of a nation exploring its heritage and destiny. Australian journalist Desmond O’Grady, who lived in Rome and travelled with the Pope, described the visit as “strangely appropriate,” a “voyage of discovery for all concerned.” It had, he suggested, shown Australians the Pope in his endearing humanity, and, as the last continent to which he travelled, exposed him to loyalty and affection at the ends of the earth. *The Sydney Morning Herald*’s editorial argued that the visit was not merely significant for the many Roman Catholics who had immigrated to Australia since the late 1940s. It was also significant “for all Australians who, consciously or

28 Marcus Loane, “Sermon given by the Archbishop of Sydney at the service of Morning Prayer on October 21, 1973,” in *Anglican Historical Society Papers*, Bible House, Macquarie Park, Sydney, Box H: “St Andrew’s.”
30 For the official account of the visit, see: Michael S. Parer, *Four Papal Days* (Sydney: Aella Books, 1970).
unconsciously, have a sense of separation, even isolation, from the civilisation from which we sprung.” “Since the war we have become accustomed,” it went on, to visits by the Royal Family which have reinforced our sense of national origin and inheritance. We have had two visits from a United States President to acknowledge our relationship with the great Western political community. But the Pope’s visit is unique as a potent reminder of our historic, religious and cultural indebtedness to the cradle of all Western civilisation which we represent in this part of the world— the Mediterranean of Judaea, Greece and Rome.\(^{34}\)

This attempt to include the papal visit within a longer narrative of the nation discovering its cultural, political and spiritual roots was remarkable. For while others had urged Australians not to forget their debt to Rome, Athens, and Judaea, this lineage had not been explicitly traced through the Vatican.\(^{35}\) \textit{The Herald} went on to use the Pope’s larger itinerary in the region as “an elegant reminder of our involvement in Asia and Polynesia,” which it termed “other cradles of civilisation.”\(^{36}\) Far from being a figure of division against which Australian Britons defined themselves as they may have in an earlier, more self-consciously Protestant form of British race patriotism, the Pope was now being employed as the symbol of a common past transcending even that of Britain, and a token of the nation’s progress into a cosmopolitan future.\(^{37}\) His visit was a national affair, not merely a Catholic one, so much so that Asher Joel, a member of the Legislative Council of the New South Wales Parliament and the chief organiser of both the papal and royal tours of 1970, though an Orthodox Jew, hailed it as “the greatest spiritual event in Australian history.”\(^{38}\) Of course, such an extravagant claim ought be taken with a grain of salt, given Joel’s interests in promoting the tour. The point, however, is that he felt it worthwhile to make such a claim in the first place, judging the public to be sympathetic to such a view.

This vision of the Pope as a figure with whom all Australians could identify was aided by the near universal appreciation that sectarian tensions, so much a part of the cultural landscape for most of Australia’s white history, had significantly cooled.\(^{39}\) Loane, to the surprise of some, welcomed such rapprochement.\(^{40}\) This was not, in fact, surprising given the good working relationship he had maintained with the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, Cardinal Norman Gilroy. Anticipating the Pope’s arrival on 30 November, \textit{The Sydney Morning Herald}, 3 December 1970, 2.


\(^{35}\) For example, see the heated response to the 1969 proposal by Minister for the Interior Peter Nixon to dispense with European languages in favour of Asian ones: “We are a European outpost whose roots go back through Britain to medieval Europe and beyond to Rome and Athens and Judaea. If we cut those roots completely, our own culture will wither and die.” \textit{The Sydney Morning Herald}, 25 January 1969, quoted in Curran and Ward, \textit{The Unknown Nation}, 156. See also Loane’s later call for the education system to avoid being preoccupied with functionalist vocational training and return to “the springs of Hellas and the songs of Zion,” in his “Presidential Address to Sydney Synod, 1975,” in \textit{Year Book of the Diocese of Sydney}, 1975 (Sydney: Anglican Information Office, 1976), 223.

\(^{36}\) “Pope Paul’s visit,” 2.


\(^{38}\) Asher Joel, quoted in Ken Hooper, “Ecumenism at work,” \textit{The Age}, 30 November 1970, 4. Joel had managed public relations for the coronation of George VI in 1937, the celebrations of Australia’s sesquicentenary in 1938, the 1967 tour by President Johnson, and the Cook Bicentenary Royal tour earlier that year.


Canberra Times predicted that the “vast majority of Australians will welcome him” as simply “a messenger of Jesus Christ.” It added its hope that “the few who affect to be displeased by his presence here will have enough good sense to respect the feelings of those who think otherwise.”  

Evidently, in its opinion, ecumenism was ascendant and those who had reservations were an awkward minority who should keep their beliefs to themselves.

Marcus Loane found himself in this supposed minority. In his October letter in Southern Cross, the Archbishop had stated that he could not, in good conscience, attend the planned ecumenical service in the Sydney Town Hall at which the Pope would lead prayers. Though he gave clergy in the diocese freedom to go, he would not. The Roman Catholic Church’s official teachings about papal headship, transubstantiation, the Virgin Mary’s mediation, and justification by works as well as faith were doctrines “radically inconsistent with the New Testament as well as the Reformation Settlement of the Church of England in the reign of Elizabeth I.” While he was thankful that the bitter hostilities that once marked the Protestant-Catholic divide had abated, Loane concluded that “one cannot pretend that the barriers have all disappeared.”

The costly heritage of Reformation martyrs that gave birth to British Protestantism was so keenly appreciated by Loane (as a historian) that it was impossible for him to compromise his conscience and bow to the pressure of ecumenism. That the papal visit overlapped with the 400th anniversary of Pius V’s excommunication of Elizabeth I was a coincidence not overlooked by his colleague the Vice-Principal of Moore Theological College, Canon Donald Robinson, writing about “Protestants and the Pope” in defence of Loane, especially as Paul VI had recently canonised forty of the English Catholics martyred under her rule.

It is no small irony that while both the Pope and Loane were deeply conscious of their divided heritage, the former was hailed as a unifying figure of progress, while the latter was derided as obstinate and sectarian.

Loane’s measured refusal to attend the service generated a small storm of controversy. Along with the much more public protest of the Reverend Fred Channing, pastor of the sectarian Bible Presbyterian Church in Palmerston North, New Zealand, it was reported as far away as Alabama and New York. The Brisbane Diocese’s official newspaper, The Church Chronicle, reprinted a parish paper’s scathing attack on Loane and Sydney evangelical Anglicanism as a whole. “It is the genius and the pain of Anglicanism that it has always put up with groups like that in the Diocese of Sydney,” the author lamented, calling it “a sect on the fringe of the Anglican Communion.” It is no small irony that while both the Pope and Loane were deeply conscious of their divided heritage, the former was hailed as a unifying figure of progress, while the latter was derided as obstinate and sectarian.

In response to these charges, Loane reflected on the unpopularity of his attention to heritage:

It is true that we live in an age when people like to be thought broad-minded and tolerant. They draw away from strong convictions and brand them as bigotry. They are inclined to think that those who try to learn from the past are fanatics. They argue that by-gones should be by-gones.

---

The Archbishop was making a case for the historic legitimacy and contemporary relevance of an Anglicanism that was deeply conscious of the past. Yet, as the wide embrace of the papal visit demonstrated, and the reaction against Loane’s quiet protest of conscience, the case for continuity was often drowned out by the pressure for change. Wider realignments were also forcing a reconsideration of the posture evangelicals ought to take towards the Roman Catholic Church. Vatican II had made way for such latitude of conscience that a theologian as prominent as Hans Küng could describe himself as “Catholic” but not “Roman,” a believer in the Church’s teaching but not a follower of the Pope—a position even the conservative evangelical periodical *The Australian Church Record* obliquely welcomed. The decision of the government of Prime Minister Gough Whitlam, despite Protestant protests, to appoint Australia’s first Ambassador to the Holy See in early 1973 (Lloyd Thomson, who happened to also be “a devout Anglican”) further confirmed the way “Roman” Catholicism was no longer seen as a challenge to national loyalty. Perhaps the changed circumstances at home were most clearly illustrated in the honours conferred on Cardinal Gilroy, Catholic Archbishop of Sydney from 1940 to 1971. In April 1969 this “prince of the Church” was made a Knight of the British Empire (seven years before Loane was made a KBE in 1976), the first Catholic Cardinal in the world to be knighted since the Reformation. Indeed, in the Cook Bicentenary year itself, Gilroy was named “Australian of the Year,” the first cleric to receive this award.

**Conclusion**

In coming to Australia to mark the somewhat inauspicious beginnings of European settlement in Australia amid the frenzied search for a post-imperial “new nationalism,” the visit of the Queen and the Pope to Australia in 1970 signalled the complex relationship between a civic Protestant British race patriot past, and a more ecumenical and cosmopolitan (if less self-confident) future. If the visit of overseas dignitaries serves to force greater collective self-reflection on the identity of the nation to which they are welcomed, the arrival of two figures who represented such deep traditions put into relief the paucity of Australian forms of “new nationalism” that were being advanced to take their place. As a lens through which to bring into relief these changes, the contradictions and struggles of Marcus Loane ought be more seriously weighed. Just as, in Mark McKenna’s words, the monarchy has been “more often pilloried than understood,” so too have religious conservatives like Loane. He is easy to caricature, in the words of one journalist, as one of a number of Anglican “doddering old gas-and-gaiters relic of Empire,” or as “a good seventeenth century man.” Loane’s attachment to the symbols of Britishness and the inheritance of the English Reformation, and his insistence that their relegation would leave Australians without a heritage from which to form a new identity, may have had more substance than is otherwise assumed.

Dying in 2009, a curious development Loane lived to observe was the enduring popularity of these “royal” visitors long after Australian national public culture became

---

50 John Luttrell, “‘Australianizing’ the Local Catholic Church: Polding to Gilroy,” *Journal of Religious History* 36, no. 3 (September 2012): 349-350. It is worth putting Gilroy’s receipt of the Australian of the Year Award in perspective. The Award was only inaugurated in 1960 and had a rather chequered journey to the prominence it holds today. Indeed, it was not until 1973 that newspapers featured the recipient (Shane Gould) on the front page—and then, only in Melbourne (Curran and Ward, *The Unknown Nation,* 191-194). The only other cleric to have been named Australian of the Year was Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane and social justice advocate Peter Hollingworth in 1991, who later served as Governor-General from 2001 to 2003.
51 McKenna, “Monarchy,” 264.
putatively post-British and post-Christian. The crowds that jostled to welcome the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge in 2014 and Pope Benedict in 2008 are only the most recent examples of the surprising longevity and vitality of the popular fascination with religion and royalty. Admittedly, much of that popular fascination today may seem more about the celebrity status of the individuals rather than the heritage of the institutions. Even after recognising the contested nature of this interpretation of the continued attachment to royalty, explaining the ongoing phenomena of such visits still requires a more textured understanding of the interplay between the “religious” and the “political” in the construction of national public culture, not least because the content of these domains has become less opaque as Australians have become less self-consciously attached to either of these sources of identity. Perhaps, as poet Rex Ingamells wrote at the time of the Queen’s first visit to Australia in 1954, more attention needs to be paid to the continuing sense in which “each Royal visit here is for us a firing and tempering anew of those real and spiritual links.”