

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

to possess? Are not the five hundred millions of India and China as much part of the Empire as the four millions of London? Is not rebellion in the East as dangerous as revolt in the West? And how stands the fight? There are twice as many clergy of the Church of England working in London with its four millions as there are in all the heathen and Mohammedan world with their one thousand millions of rebels. The British Isles, that little corner, albeit the citadel of Christendom, possesses twenty-three thousand clergy of the Established Church; the vast world for which the Church's Lord lived and died only five hundred. I am convinced that more zeal for foreign missionary enterprise will react at home. Send us one thousand men to reinforce your army abroad. Strike boldly, and infidels at home will believe that we are in earnest. Unkind critics cannot help making merry over the idea of "war undertaken in the interests of peace." But surely the Church's war is such; for its sure result will be the setting up of the Kingdom of the Prince of Peace.

Apologizing to you, sir, for the length of this letter, and to Mr. Browne for the freedom of my critique on his important and timely article, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

A. E. MOULE.

We have sent a proof of this letter to Mr. BROWNE, who replies as follows:

SIR,—With regard to the points raised by Archdeacon Moule in his very interesting letter (the kindly feeling of which I fully appreciate), the truth or falsehood of what is known as evolution is much too wide to be discussed on this occasion. Archdeacon Moule, seems, however, to share in the prevalent error of confounding together the doctrine of evolution (which teaches simply that existing species are developed by natural descent from pre-existing species) with the theory of natural selection, by which Mr. Darwin sought to account for that development. The evidence for the former grows daily wider and deeper, and it is now accepted, at least within wide limits, by almost every naturalist of repute, while it is only a misconception which sees in it anything contrary to Holy Writ. The doctrine of natural selection, on the other hand, is becoming daily more and more discredited; and we now hear thorough-going partisans like Dr. Romanes admitting (as Mr. Darwin himself admitted) that other principles must be likewise at work. It is a signal instance of the want of organized intercourse between religion and science that this confusion should still be prevalent.

But whether evolution is true or not, I must adhere to my statement that the Victoria Institute (in whose objects I most fully sympathize, and much of whose work I can admire) has obtained the reputation of holding a brief, so to speak, against evolution; and whatever it may have gained by assuming the functions of an advocate, it has lost that credit for impartiality which can only attach to a judge. I think it probable that this fact has had a serious effect in impairing the estimation which might have attached to papers on other subjects, read before the same Society.

With regard to the second part of the letter, I deeply regret that a passing metaphor should have led Archdeacon Moule to suppose that I fail to appreciate the noble efforts made in the cause of foreign missions by the Christian Church, or would for one moment suggest that those efforts should be relaxed. The surest mode, however, of ruining foreign missions would be to allow a spirit of secularism and infidelity to prevail in the nation at home. The duty of meeting these home heathen on their own ground has a double claim upon us; it is not only a contention for rightful supremacy; it is a struggle for existence itself.

WALTER R. BROWNE.



THE MONTH.

THE Report of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences for 1882 contains much that will interest those of our readers who are inclined to look upon this movement with regard and hope. The Executive Committee of the Council

report that there were two general meetings of the Council in 1882, following the first one held in July, 1881, which was in many respects necessarily experimental and tentative :

Judging by the increased support which the Council has of late received, the Committee venture to hope that the plan and working of this new Church organization are on the whole approved. Full reports of the constitution and bye-laws, and of the doings of the three past meetings, have been widely circulated. They have been embodied also in the history of the Council, to be found in the Official Year-Book of the Church of England, recently published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The papers read at the London Diocesan Conference, and the speeches made, were in some respects rather disappointing.

Dr. Benson has been "confirmed" at Bow Church, and as Archbishop has done homage at Windsor Castle. He will be enthroned in Canterbury Cathedral on the 29th.

Mr. Enraght, deprived (and inhibited by his Bishop), gave way to the Vicar duly appointed by the Trustees. A mob of Ritualists caused scandal on the first Sunday (March 11th).

Great portion of the time in the House of Commons has been absorbed, as usual, in debates on Irish affairs. Much precious time has been wasted. The most noteworthy event was the demonstration by Mr. Forster of Mr. Parnell's position as regards the deplorable agitation in Ireland during the last year or two. The right hon. gentleman made a most vigorous and effective speech.

One of those charged in Dublin with complicity in the Phoenix Park murders has become a Crown witness, and his information is important.

On his reappearance in the House on the 5th, the Prime Minister, whose health seems now restored, was warmly welcomed. In the absence of Mr. Gladstone, the Government introduced an Affirmation Bill; it will be strongly, and we hope successfully, opposed.

Three men have been convicted at the Old Bailey of the publication of blasphemy; in the Christmas number of the *Freethinker* Scriptural scenes were grossly caricatured by woodcuts and comments.¹

¹ In the first trial the jury were unable to agree. The sentence on Foote, the editor, was imprisonment for a year with hard labour, on Ramsey for nine months, and on Kemp for three; a newsagent of Fleet Street, who had sold the periodical, being liberated on his recognisances. The definition given to blasphemy by Mr. Justice North, was that of "any contumelious reproach or profane scoffing against the Christian religion or the Holy Scriptures, or any act exposing the Holy Scriptures and the Christian religion to ridicule, contempt, or derision."