

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Christian Imperialism.

By MRS. ASHLEY CARUS-WILSON, B.A.

SIX weeks hence the Pan-Anglican Congress will meet in London. For over five years preparations have been made for this muster of the Church's forces at the heart of the Empire, and the general public are now giving thought to its meaning and learning something about its programme.

In one sense this year's gatherings will be the fifth of a series; in another sense they will be unprecedented. For the first Pan-Anglican Conference there came to Lambeth, in the year 1867, at the invitation of Archbishop Longley, 76 Bishops. For the second there came, in the year 1878, at the invitation of Archbishop Tait, 100 Bishops. For the third there came, in the year 1888, at the invitation of Archbishop Benson, 145 Bishops—as many as there had been to invite twenty years earlier. For the fourth there came, in the year 1897, at the invitation of Archbishop Temple, 194 Bishops; and the evangelization of the world, concerning which previous Conferences had been almost, if not altogether, silent, was described officially as “the work that at the present stands first in rank of all the tasks we have to do.” For July, 1908, the invitation of Archbishop Davidson goes to 300 Bishops, the Episcopate having doubled in the forty years since 1867.

Their deliberations at Lambeth will be preceded by a Congress in June of the whole Anglican communion—public, not private—and comprising clergy, laymen, and women, for whose evening meetings only the Albert Hall will be large enough. The official description of its object begins thus: “It is to give expression to the thoughts and desires and hopes of Churchmen regarding the spread of the Gospel throughout the world; to take counsel as to the co-operation and co-ordination of missions; and the building up of independent churches.” We are further told that, “though not technically a missionary congress, the subjects discussed will necessarily be of a missionary

character, just because the problems of the future are in the main missionary problems."

In preparation for it a deeply interesting and suggestive book has been published, entitled "Church and Empire."¹ Part II., on "The Need of Action," forming three-quarters of the whole book, is contributed by the Archbishops of Brisbane and the West Indies, the Bishops of Lahore, Rangoon, Auckland, and Mashonaland, and two Canadian clergymen. One gains from it a strong conviction that the present opportunity is wonderful, the call most urgent, the response to it quite insignificant; that not in one, but in many places, the Church's efforts to keep the white man Christian and to win the coloured man are put to shame by the zeal of Roman Catholics and Nonconformists; and that of all excuses for doing so little, perhaps the worst is an assertion that attempt to convert the heathen has been made and has failed. Take two testimonies only out of many that might be quoted on this point: "Not infrequently do our Maori clergy minister to the white settler in things spiritual." "Since 1865 all the missionaries of the Pongas Mission in West Africa have been West Indian negroes."

It is, however, Part I., on "Principles of Action," by the Warden of Keble, the Rector of Lambeth, and the Vicar of Windsor, that has stirred debate; that must, as the Archbishop of Canterbury says in his preface to the whole volume, "set men thinking." For in dealing with the generally acknowledged fact that "missionary societies do not touch the nation as a whole," and that "the area from which they draw their support is far too narrow," it proposes that "the vaguely cosmopolitan policy" hitherto pursued should give place to a policy based on the principle that "work in the Empire stands first in obligation." "Each separate Christian Church" is "to carry with it into its work the force and inspiration of its own national life, and to concentrate its efforts upon that portion of the earth's surface

¹ "Church and Empire: a Series of Essays on the Responsibilities of Empire." Edited by the Rev. John Ellison and the Rev. G. H. S. Walpole. (Longmans, Green and Co.)

where a soil congenial to its teaching has already been prepared by the existence of its own Christian government." Thus "missionary sentiment and imperial sentiment" may be brought "into line with one another."

We are already bound to recognize their close connexion, to see that the Pan-Anglican Congress is of national, rather than merely ecclesiastical, importance: for as Christians we hold that man does not live by bread alone; that what individuals or nations believe concerning things unseen matters ultimately more than how they are governed or how they get a living; that the Empire's foremost problems are neither political nor economic, but spiritual.

But the editors of "Church and Empire" not only maintain that imperial sentiment should stimulate missionary sentiment, but that it should dominate it by limiting the scope of missionary effort. In short, the cosmopolitan view that we as Christians have a general obligation to the whole race, since "the field is the world," is to yield to the imperial view that we as Britons have a particular obligation to those within the Empire. The latter view claims, like the former, to have "a wide horizon." We must see how wide that horizon is, and in what respect the views harmonize, ere we can consider in what respects they disagree, and judge between them.

Both lift out of spiritual provincialism, holding that the Divine injunction "Freely have ye received, freely give," applied first of all, not to sharing one's substance with the indigent, but to sharing one's light with the unenlightened. Both mark an advance in the general education of the Christian public as to the paramount obligation to evangelize the heathen. Both recognize that missionary interest is narrow and narrowing when limited to a pet society or a particular small enterprise identified with one's personal regard for an individual friend or a particular set of ideas, and rebuke a tendency on the part of Churchmen of extreme views—either highest of the High, or lowest of the Low—to patronize such enterprises rather than the great and long-accredited Church societies. Both recognize that

the crying need at this moment is for a widened basis of support at home for work whose inevitable expansion abroad has quite outgrown its income.

The idea of Christian Imperialism carries us back to the greatest of the empires that preceded our own. When Christ came the nations had been welded together by a common civilization and a far-reaching rule. The Roman Empire unconsciously prepared the way for the Gospel. From this familiar fact Sir W. M. Ramsay has lately led us on to the idea that St. Paul's own missionary strategy deliberately followed the lines of the great State of which he was proud to own himself a citizen. He first saw a vision of Christianity as the religion of the Empire, and laboured for its realization. It is certainly noteworthy that only one generation ago Professor Freeman could still assert that "Christianity has hardly anywhere taken firm and lasting root except in the countries which either formed part of the Roman Empire or learned their religion and civilization from it."

The twentieth century dawns upon a world-wide Empire, as the first did. But King Edward has more than four times as many subjects as Augustus had when he sent out his decree that all the world should be taxed, for he rules at least a fourth of the 1,500,000,000 inhabitants of this globe. Moreover, the subjects of this State, which is Christian if any State can claim to be so—this State which is the most widely extended of any State to-day—represent all the other eight religions of mankind.¹ Within this Empire are to be found all the Hindus, Sikhs, and Jains; all the Parsis, except a petty handful; the largest Moslem community in the world; and a rapidly growing multitude of Jews. It contains some 10,000,000 Buddhists in Burma, where Buddhism is seen at its best; and not only scattered pagans in North America and Australasia, but also one-third of the massed pagans of Africa. Of its 129,000,000 pagans, 96,000,000 are thus distributed: 25,000,000

¹ Omitting Shintoism, Confucianism, and Taoism, which are not in the strict sense *religions* at all.

independent, over 27,000,000 under French protection, over 43,000,000 under British protection. According to the Blue book of the Local Government Board of March, 1906, there are 330,000,000 non-Christians within the Empire. And among all the lands to be evangelized India takes the front place, whether as Britons we regard it as containing three-quarters of our fellow-subjects, or the Christians recognize it as the cradle of creeds and the citadel of heathendom. Truly our responsibility in any case is vast enough and varied enough to divert us from the paltry ambitions and paltrier controversies that have hitherto absorbed so much of our energy.

The magnitude of both Church and Empire was picturesquely suggested at the annual meeting of the Church Missionary Society last year. On the President's left the claims of the remotest of Western dioceses were pleaded by the Bishop of Selkirk, a typical representative of the young nation developing in the great Dominion which forty years ago had not even a name. On his right the claims of our vast Eastern dependency were pleaded by the Professor of Law in the University of Allahabad, son of a Parsi and a Hindu, typical representative of peoples whose civilization is at least twice as old as our own, yet so absolutely one with us in faith and culture that a blind hearer might well have supposed that he was listening to an unusually eloquent and erudite English gentleman. He is an Oxford M.A. (Balliol College), and proud to be reckoned a British citizen.

Let us, then, confine ourselves to the Empire, concentrate on India, and so ultimately win the whole East. Is this to be the method by which we rise to our whole missionary responsibility, and secure for the Church's work abroad the support of all who care for the higher side of our national life? After all, do the imperial and cosmopolitan views differ from each other only as do the views of Edinburgh from the Castle and the Calton Hill, practically including the same things?

From both points of view we might leave South America as

outside the Empire, and as containing at most but one heathen to twenty-four heathen in India. From both we might omit French and German spheres of influence in and about Africa, with independent States like the Moslem lands of Persia, and Morocco, Arabia, and Afghanistan, or the Buddhist lands of Siam and Tibet ; for either by the jealousies of European neighbours or through the intolerance of their own authorities, these lands are wholly, or to a great extent, closed to the missionary ; while, from the cosmopolitan point of view, as well as from the imperial, we may, if we choose to do so, urge the duty of entering in by many open doors, instead of more or less vainly knocking at closed doors.

The question at issue cannot, however, be so easily disposed of ; for outside the Empire, and never likely to be inside it, lie two fields second only in importance—if second—to India itself, and their doors (to quote the phrase of Bishop Taylor Smith) are not only open, but taken off their hinges. "Church and Empire" does indeed qualify its contention that "imperial duty" is the "ideal put before us," by adding : "No one would, of course, propose that existing work should be abandoned." But this could not cover the present conditions in China and Japan. They claim from Christendom not merely sustained, but immediately increased, missionary activity. Some thinkers are, indeed, of opinion that their evangelization may be the most important strategic step in the whole campaign.

They are seeking for Christian teaching as for hid treasure. Take one incident more suggestive than statistics. Side by side in Manchuria were two young men, both of good social position—a Japanese officer and a British attaché. Presently the Japanese asked, "Are you a Christian?" and when the Englishman, somewhat taken aback, replied, "I hope I am," his companion produced a pocket Bible and begged him then and there to explain a hard passage. He had been lately won to the faith when lying wounded in hospital, and represents a large class of eager inquirers and new converts. The accounts of the cordial reception which the World's Student Christian Federation Con-

ference had at Tokyo in April, 1907, thrill us. Between 600 and 700 delegates, from twenty-five lands, met there for the first International Christian Conference that has ever met in Asia—the first International Conference that has ever met in Japan; and the *Japan Times* wrote a leading article of welcome, not as “an organ of Christianity, or of any other religion, but as gladly giving their support to any spiritual movement that aims at social reformation and purification.” Lately, also, Japan has sent two ministers, an Anglican and a Congregationalist, to preach Christianity *in English* to educated natives of India. And China is *buying* Scriptures from the British and Foreign Bible Society at the rate of over a million copies a year, and sending her most promising young men in thousands to Japan, to acquire from her neighbours, who have already assimilated it, the culture and the science of the West. The influences that mould the island empire must ultimately mould the mainland of Asia also. Whither, then, shall Japan lead the East?

Our own connexion with these two fields is not, as in the case of South America, for instance, a matter of British capital and commerce entering them through the action of private individuals. Great Britain had at least as large a share as the United States in compelling Japan to emerge from the seclusion of two centuries and a half; Great Britain not only insisted upon commercial relations with China, but forced opium upon the Chinese with the bayonet.

How, then, are we as a Church aiding their quest for a religion that their intellectual renaissance will not discredit? Some readers will recall Mr. Kanzo Uchimura in his autobiography describing how the type of Christian teaching evolved in our old historic Church appealed to him. Won to Christ in Japan by American Congregationalists, and confronted with many “isms” during his travels in the States, he learns at last from an Episcopalian that there is such a thing as chivalric Christianity, a thing very much to his national heart, and without weakening in his attachment to Puritanic truths, commits much of the Prayer Book to memory. Our apathy, therefore, rather

than predilection of these ancient peoples for another form of Christianity, must account for the fact that in Japan Presbyterian, Congregationalist, and Methodist Christians outnumber Anglicans; while in China, out of fifty societies or more, it is the interdenominational China Inland Mission that stands first in number of missionaries, the Church Missionary Society taking the second place.

Moreover, we are here confronted with a further difficulty in "laying down the outlines of a policy in 1908 which shall have for its aim the Christianization of the British Empire." The Anglican Communion, which has grown out of the Church of England, is not co-extensive with the British Empire, which has grown out of England, and of this fact China and Japan are the most striking illustration.

First, the Anglican Communion includes more than the Empire. Four independent Churches now rapidly growing up within it would, as Bishop Montgomery points out, still remain an integral part of the Anglican Communion in the deplorable, and we may trust improbable, event of Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand being severed from the Empire. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America has been independent and outside British territory for over a century; the Nippon Sei Kokwai is already fully organized and independent, and its sister Church in China will become so ere long.

Secondly, the Anglican Communion includes less than the British Empire. Let us suppose that next year the Lambeth Conference were to affirm strongly the principle of National Churches, and limit the work of our own Church, or at least its further developments, by the confines of our Empire. Suppose, further, that all the Anglican societies, including the South American Missionary Society and the Universities' Mission, whose spheres lie wholly without the Empire, were loyally to bow to this decision. Would the Presbyterians in China and Japan, or the Baptist leaders of the China Inland Mission and the Congo-Balolo Mission, arrest their successful work;

or the London Missionary Society withdraw from Lake Tanganyika ; or the North African Mission from Morocco and Algiers? Still less can we imagine American missionary activity confined to Cuba and the Philippines. As things stand Britain and the States contribute 85 per cent. of the total funds for Protestant missionary enterprise all over the world.

And even if practically impossible, is such a policy theoretically desirable? What of the lands quite independent of any Christian Power? All of these are now wide open to the Gospel except Arabia, Afghanistan, and Tibet. Moreover, the melancholy story of Dutch Christianity in Ceylon and the happy story of the Church built up in Uganda before the British Protectorate existed are two out of many illustrations of the fact that advantage may lie with the missionary who has nothing to do with the ruling Power. For that reason alone our missionaries in India may well be glad that so many Americans work beside them.

In this the great missionary age of the world's history we need wider vision of a privilege not of our seeking, of a responsibility which we should thrust aside to our loss and shame. For as Britons we belong to an Empire which cannot, like heathen Rome, remain unconscious of her place in God's high purpose ; and as Anglicans we want (as Bishop Gaul says) "an Anglican Communion thrilled through and through with the imperial ideals of St. Paul." We are far from this as yet. Our two great Anglican societies—the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society—have together received in the last five years £2,700,000, which means that the Church of England contributes annually less than one halfpenny for every heathen within the Empire. The Church Missionary Society had in June, 1907, 130 posts to fill, fifty candidates ready for them, and funds to send out ten of these.

And besides wide vision, we need a plan of campaign, that effort may be systematic, not spasmodic. But here we are in danger of pressing too far the imperial strategy of St. Paul, to whom the Roman Empire really was "the world," since all

beyond it lay unknown and inaccessible. For great and inspiring as was his vision of a Gentile Church and of a Christian Empire, it gives place as the New Testament closes to the greater and even more inspiring vision of St. John—of a Catholic Church of every nation, kingdom, and tongue. St. Paul's vision must have seemed further from realization to his contemporaries than St. John's ought to seem to our generation and to our Empire, whose social and commercial, intellectual and spiritual influence extends far beyond her political boundaries.

We need, above all, a compelling sense of our individual responsibility and obligation laid anew on every member of our Church, and we may well pray for and labour towards such a result from the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908.



The Licensing Bill.

BY SIR THOMAS P. WHITTAKER, M.P.

I HAVE been asked to reply to Canon Ford's article on the Licensing Bill in last month's issue of this Review. I do so with pleasure because it is a reasonable statement of the views of a much-respected critic. I must be brief, and therefore I will at once join issue on one or two points.

In reply to the argument that licence-holders have no right to require that an additional number of licences shall not be granted, and that the State has the right to establish free trade in drink, and that if it did the monopoly value of existing licences would disappear, the Canon says—(1) That investors are justified in "reckoning" that the Legislature will not do anything so foolish, and (2) that free trade in drink would so enormously increase the output of beer that brewery shareholders would make as much profit as ever.

Upon this I would remark that there is all the difference in the world between a "right" and an "expectation." A man may "reckon" that this, that, or the other will occur, but that