

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

THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1915.

The Month.

The Royal Lead. THE King's lead is magnificent. While the Government have been debating how best to regulate and control the liquor traffic in relation to its bearing upon the output of munitions of war, His Majesty has come forward and set an example which, if it were generally followed, would not only solve the problem which is baffling the best statesmanship, but would also go far towards removing, for all time, the drink evil from our midst. Yet is it being followed to any appreciable extent? "By the King's command," so ran the Royal Decree, "no wines, spirits, or beer will be consumed in any of His Majesty's houses after to-day (April 6)." When this decree was first made known, we thought it would be followed immediately by a great campaign to secure as many adherents as possible to what may not inaptly be termed the King's pledge; but we have heard of no such movement. Of isolated instances there have been several, and a joint manifesto has been issued, signed by the two Archbishops, Cardinal Bourne, and the President of the Free Church Council; yet these things are not enough. The printed message is all very well in its way; but if this were to be relied on solely, it may be said at once that nothing has yet been written which is half so impressive as the simple terms of the Royal Decree. What is needed is the living word, the personal appeal, and we are simply amazed that so few, comparatively, of the clergy have bestirred themselves to press the King's example upon their people in the most effective way. What, it may be asked, is the Church of England Temperance Society doing in the

matter? It has issued some special pledge cards, and these are duly announced in a very short advertisement in the "Personal" column of *The Times*! But is this all that the Society can do at a time of great emergency such as this? The Society, like many other institutions, has no doubt been hard hit by the war, but the King's lead has given it an opportunity to propagate its principles such as it has never had before and is never likely to have again, and the utmost efforts should be put forth to use it to the fullest possible advantage. But no central body can do its work effectively unless it is adequately supported, and we greatly fear that for a long time past Churchpeople have not given their own temperance organization anything like the support it deserves. No time should be lost, therefore, in strengthening its hands at this important crisis, that the C.E.T.S. may be able to take a strong lead in rousing the country to the paramount importance, alike for our national safety, and our national wellbeing, of following the King's lead in the matter of voluntary abstinence.

But the work ought not to be left entirely to
Clergy and
People. temperance organizations or professed temperance people. It is primarily the duty of the parochial clergy as such to do their utmost to promote the moral welfare of their people; and if they will make known from house to house the Royal Decree, and seek to get all their people to follow the King's example, they will have such success as will astonish them. It ought not to escape notice that the King, in doing what he has done, has been actuated by the very highest motives. Some six days before the decree was issued he wrote by Lord Stamfordham: "If it be deemed advisable, the King will be prepared to set the example by giving up all alcoholic liquor himself, and issuing orders against its consumption in the Royal Household, so that no difference shall be made so far as His Majesty is concerned between the treatment of rich and poor in this question." These are noble words, and recall instinctively the familiar exhortations of St. Paul, "That no

man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way," and "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." The thought of our King thus putting away what might possibly become an occasion of stumbling to others should be an inspiration to us all.

The Bishop of London's Mission to the Front ^{A Bishop in Khaki.} is, in its own way, one of the most memorable incidents of the war. It is not easy to recall an instance of a Bishop, and he the premier Bishop, going out in khaki as a simple Missioner to minister to troops in action, and the precedent now created has struck the imagination of the country even as it was most highly appreciated by the army in the field. Sir John French's tribute to the Bishop's energy and fearlessness deserves to be placed on record. "Personal fatigue," writes the Commander-in-Chief, "and even danger were completely ignored by his Lordship. The Bishop held several services virtually under shell fire, and it was with difficulty that he could be prevented from carrying on his ministrations under rifle fire." The Church has reason to be proud of the Bishop of London in this matter, and to be thankful that he was given a message which appealed to the men. Sir John French records his deep sense of "the good effect produced throughout the Army" by, and his own "very deep indebtedness" for, the Bishop's ministrations.

The Bishop's own narrative, and also that of ^{Secret of Success.} the officer who accompanied him, are most interesting, and they suggest at least one reflection. What was it that so deeply moved those vast thousands of men, and led so many of them, as we may humbly and thankfully believe, to a truer and deeper personal knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ? Was it not the simple preaching of the Gospel? It is impossible to read the Bishop's letter without realizing that it was the story of "the wondrous Cross" that touched men's

hearts. So it will ever be. And yet, at home, is that story told as faithfully and as simply or as often as it should be? It was, we believe, the late Bishop Bickersteth, of Ripon, who once said that every sermon should contain in some form or other the story of the Cross. That was, perhaps, a counsel of perfection; but are we not now in danger of going to the opposite extreme and leaving it out altogether? The matter is one of most pressing importance. We are persuaded that the future spiritual welfare of our country depends upon a revival of evangelistic zeal in the Church of England; and we should like to see a large increase of the spirit which took the Bishop of London to the Front prevailing in more ordinary ministrations of the Church at home.

Not all the "Papers for War Time" which are "Bernhardism in England," being issued under the editorship of the Rev. William Temple are of equal merit or of equal importance, and we cannot but regard one of the latest of these, "Bernhardism in England," by Mr. A. Clutton-Brock, as distinctly unfortunate. As we read him, the writer seems to imply that there is a Bernhardism in England just as virulent and just as pagan as Bernhardism in Germany. He finds it "latent in the most unexpected places," and proceeds to show that it occurs in Mozley's memorable sermon on war. He finds it also in the press of to-day, and makes great play with an article in "one of our papers" which talks "Bernhardism as no Englishman could, unless he were possessed by the belief that the Prussian view of international morals is right, and our old English view wrong." Mr. Clutton-Brock anticipates the objection that he makes too much of the passages he quotes, and says that while "they are written by men ignorant and tired," there is more in it than that, for, "as we are all more or less ignorant and often tired, we are all apt to take the line of least resistance both in thought and in action. And Bernhardism is the line of least resistance, like all kinds of Paganism." But this is not all:

"There always has been for all men an allurements, not only in the passions themselves, but also in a glorification of them. That is the allurements of Paganism; and it appeals to us all, like soft turf when we are climbing a mountain. In war, too, we have to make great material efforts, and have therefore the less energy left for spiritual efforts. We are tired and a little afraid: Deprived of many physical luxuries, we want some mental luxury, and we get it in Bernhardism, in a sensuous reaction from all the spiritual effort and the spiritual ideas that trouble us in time of peace. Just as a soldier is most apt to pillage after a hard battle or siege, so we are apt in war-time to free ourselves from arduous hopes and responsibilities, and to enjoy the thought that war gives us that freedom as a perquisite. Then we listen to those who talk most basely and foolishly, as soldiers, when they are out of hand, will follow the worst ruffian among them. The leader of thought is the man who thinks least; the popular prophet is the one who cannot see an inch in front of his nose; the extremest patriot is the most ignorant, the most tired, the most frightened among us."

We hazard the suggestion that Mr. Clutton-Brock was just a little "tired" when he wrote this deplorable passage, for deplorable it is, if it is meant to indicate the attitude of English Christians towards this war. We have seen no evidence—and we have watched carefully—of this "glorification" of "passions" among them, and, frankly, we do not believe that it exists. The whole nation, and especially the Christian portion of it, has exercised and is exercising the utmost restraint in the presence of the attacks of an enemy who, almost daily, is defying all recognized rules of warfare and reverting to sheer barbarism. The heart of the nation is aflame with indignation at the infamies of Germany, and is determined that the power of militarism or Bernhardism shall be crushed beyond all hope of recovery. This, however, is not the "glorification" of "passions"; it is rather the manifestation of a firm resolve that, having entered upon "a spiritual conflict," the sword shall not be sheathed until its full purpose is accomplished.

The publication of two fresh Sunday newspapers raises some very important questions affecting not merely the religious, but also the social and industrial life of the nation. Much as we dislike Sunday newspapers, believing, as we do, that their publication is inimical to the promotion of that spirit of quiet rest and serious meditatio

upon the things that are eternal which should characterize the Lord's Day, we fear it is too late now to object to the Sunday newspaper *per se*. But we have a right to object, and the nation has a right to object, on social and on industrial grounds to the introduction of the seven-days' newspaper. We do not say—for at present we have no means of knowing—that the two fresh newspapers which have just entered the lists come under that category, but they so closely resemble two of the illustrated dailies as at least to make it worth while to ask those under whose auspices they are being brought out for an assurance that their publication is independent, and will not involve either the editorial or the publishing staff of the corresponding dailies in seven days' labour. The principle of one day's rest in seven is the most precious heritage of working people, and it is to their interest, as much as to that of the community at large, that it should be most sacredly guarded. This particular aspect of the case is of the utmost importance, for we fear that the appearance of these two new Sunday journals will raise afresh the question of the publication of Sunday editions of some of our dailies. Many years ago such a project was mooted, and it was strangled at the birth by the strong grip of public opinion. On the outbreak of war no fewer than three daily papers published Sunday editions, and so became seven-day newspapers; but in this case also the pressure of public opinion again proved effective. We should hope that, if the experiment is repeated on any pretext whatever, it may once more be doomed to failure; but the phenomenal success of the first copies of these new Sunday papers makes us anxious. We trust that the Institute of Journalists will make rigid inquiry into the question whether in any case the publication of a Sunday newspaper involves a seven-day working week for journalists, and if they find that it does, will take whatever action they feel to be desirable. The newspaper distributors and newspaper agents are in a still worse position, for it is difficult to see where relief can come from for them. Their Sunday labour is already sufficiently hard, and it is a serious matter that it should be increased.

It may be argued that these two new Sunday ^{Pure} ~~Newspapers.~~ journals will at least be clean, and that their competition may lessen the sale of some others which can hardly be so described. We cannot admit the force of the argument. Our view is that steps should be taken to compel any paper that is not wholly pure to adopt a higher standard. How can this be done? Simply by the force of moral pressure. Public opinion has greatly improved the tone of music-halls, and it could do much for Sunday newspapers if only it could find the means of voicing its views. We ought to be able to look for help to the societies which exist for the protection of Sunday, but they are so hopelessly divided among themselves—as the wrangles over the Weekly Rest-Day Bill showed—that not much assistance may be expected from that quarter. Yet the question is one of great importance.

While we are waiting for the Archbishop of ^{Bishop Weston} ~~Again.~~ Canterbury's decision on the Kikuyu affair, the Bishop of Zanzibar has provided the Church with another topic for its consideration. The Bishop of Hereford lately promoted the Rev. H. B. Streeter to a Canonry of the Cathedral. Now, Mr. Streeter was the author of an essay which Bishop Weston strongly condemned as unsound. Those who remember his lordship's "Ecclesia Anglicana: for what does she stand?" will readily recall the nature of his criticism. The news of this promotion seems to have travelled to East Africa, and has so distressed the Bishop of Zanzibar that he has issued a formal declaration, in which, after setting out the ground of his complaint, he pronounces that so long as it remains, "there can be, and from this day forward there is, no Communion in sacred things between ourselves and the Right Reverend John, Lord Bishop of Hereford, nor between ourselves and any priest within his jurisdiction who shall make known his approval of the false doctrines now officially authorized within the Diocese of Hereford." This declaration must not be taken too seriously, but it raises some interesting questions. How far is an individual

Bishop entitled to separate himself from another Bishop of the same Communion, and under what circumstances and when? In the first Appendix to Bishop Weston's own pamphlet, "The Case against Kikuyu," there is a passage which seems to tell against his present contention: "No man is permitted to separate himself from communion with his Bishop until he has been officially deposed by his fellow-Bishops. Otherwise the Church would have no order at all." This was written, no doubt, concerning the relations between priest and Bishop; but if it is a valid argument at all, its validity is doubly as strong, one would think, as between Bishop and Bishop. But neither the Bishop of Hereford nor his nominee has been even arraigned, much less condemned, by any ecclesiastical authority; and it does seem to be an extraordinary action for a junior Bishop in a far-off diocese in Africa to take upon himself to withdraw from "communion in sacred things" with one of the oldest members of the home episcopate.

**Episcopal
Isolation.**

The Bishop of Zanzibar's action, if followed to its logical conclusion, would lead him into a position of absolute isolation. A correspondent of the *Church Times* puts the case in this way: "Are not the grounds upon which he withdraws from communion with the Bishop of Hereford such as virtually involve withdrawal from communion with the English Episcopate? A Bishop who excommunicates a brother Bishop on the ground of tolerating heresy would seem inferentially to excommunicate all who tolerate the toleration. From the point of view of the Bishop of Zanzibar, every Bishop remaining in communion with the Bishop of Hereford becomes thereby *particeps criminis*, and the Bishop should no longer know a Catholic Church in England, but only the Catholic Church of Zanzibar." The correspondent seems to have caught the Bishop of Zanzibar on the horns of a dilemma. But perhaps his lordship is really seeking after some way of escape from the position in which the Kikuyu incident has placed him, and "the Catholic Church of Zanzibar" may provide it.