

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

by the thought that he works for beings capable, after this life's discipline, of "enjoying Him fully for ever." He labours for man—man on earth—because he loves God in heaven, and because he believes that God made man and redeemed man for an immortality to which time is only the short (though all-important) avenue. In the calmest and most normal Christian periods, accordingly, for the least perilous and heroic forms of faithful Christian service, it is vital to remember that attitude and action of the soul which we call faith. For it is essential both to the victories and the utilities of the Christian life, just so far as that life touches always at its living spring "things hoped for," "things not seen." And at a time like that of the first readers of the Epistle every such necessity was enhanced indefinitely, both by the perils and threatenings which they had to face, and by the majestic illusion to which they were continually exposed—the illusion under which the order of the Law, because it was Divine in origin and magnificent in its visible embodiment, looked as if it must be the permanent, the final, phase of sacred truth and life on earth.

But here we must close for this month. In our next number, please God, we will consider at once the account of faith here given and some main points in the illustration of it by the examples recited in the chapter.



The Clergy and Social Reform.

BY THE REV. W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.

AT the present time the position of clergy in regard to what is termed the Social Movement is one of extreme delicacy. The movement has developed with such rapidity that it is difficult to form an adequate conception either of its present position or of its actual strength. And this difficulty is exaggerated by the treatment of the partisan press. For example, immediately after the last municipal elections, we had in one

class of papers such headlines as "Complete Rout of the Labour Party," "Crushing Defeat of Socialism," etc. ; whereas in another class of papers—that represented by *The Clarion* or *The Labour Leader*—figures were given to show that "Socialism" and "Labour" had actually won more seats than they had lost, and that in many constituencies in which they had failed to carry their candidates they had considerably increased their polls. Again, if we read that section of the press which has recently started a strong anti-Socialist campaign, we find Socialism generally charged with propagating such doctrines as those of "free love" and confiscation. On the other hand, the Socialist organs, while not denying that a few of the wilder spirits of their party (over whom they assert they have no control) have been guilty of uttering extreme views on these subjects, deny that either free love or confiscation are essential tenets of their system ; indeed, they strongly assert that both would be repudiated and condemned by the vast majority of people holding Socialistic views.

At present I believe the position of many of the clergy who take a deep interest in the welfare of the people is this—they cannot shut their eyes to the fact that, between the working classes and the Church (at any rate as represented by attendance at its services), there is a great, and apparently a growing, separation. This may be attributed to a lessening of the influence of the Church upon these classes. Again, they cannot deny that many of the conditions of labour—*e.g.*, as evidenced by the Sweated Industries Exhibition and the recent "Report on Home Work"—are at least inhuman, and demand very considerable measures of improvement. Also they see that many of the aspirations voiced by "Labour" leaders, if sometimes couched in the language of demand, are little more than appeals for simple justice. Lastly, they are obliged to confess to themselves that from its very object—the promotion of righteousness—the Church is bound to help in procuring this simple justice for those to whom at present it seems to be denied.

On the other hand, the more thoughtful, some would say the

more cautious, among the clergy see certain of their brethren—represented at present mainly by the members of the Church Socialist League—throwing themselves, apparently without any reservation, into the arms of the Socialism of the Social Democratic Federation; and they wonder, not only whether such unconditional alliance is wise, but whether it actually will assist in accomplishing what must be the aim of the Church—nothing less than justice all round. They realize that we must be most careful, lest in ill-considered attempts to remove injustice from one section of the community we are actually guilty of inflicting injustice upon another section.

Then, again, some of the clergy—I refer more particularly to those who have had long and wide experience in the co-operative movement, or in various co-operative experiments—feel at least doubtful of the existence at present in sufficient volume of that high moral power which is able to maintain energy in a right direction and towards a right object from a purely altruistic motive. Should they, however, venture to express this, they are told that only by obtaining an opportunity for the exercise of a virtue can you prove whether that virtue exists, and only by this means can you give sufficient scope for its growth or development.

By virtue of our profession of Christianity we are all agreed that altruism is a higher incentive than egoism, and that a community inspired by altruistic motives would be a far happier one, far more prosperous and in accordance with what we believe to be the ideal suggested by the phrase “the Kingdom of Heaven,” than would one governed by motives of self-interest and self-advancement. At the same time, we feel that to set in motion the very revolutionary forces and to employ the very revolutionary methods urged by, *e.g.*, the members of the Church Socialist League would be to take a step which is unwarranted by the evidence of fitness either for self-government or the government of others at present exhibited by those in the van of the Socialistic movement.

We may be accused of timidity, we may even be accused of

the want of courage of our Christian convictions—for there are some who speak as if Christianity and Socialism were synonymous—but surely the wisest course the Church can take is to follow the course which seems to be clearly marked out by our Lord when He said, “Who made Me a judge or a divider over you? Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness.” But if we copy our Lord’s example in this, we must also copy it in teaching far more clearly than perchance we have done in the past the lessons of duty and responsibility, and especially the immense responsibility of those who have great possessions, whether of money, or leisure, or position. To teach thus is neither an easy nor a pleasant task, and it may cost those who try to perform it dear; but it must be done more generally, more plainly, even more sternly and more fearlessly, than it has been done in the past. Not a little of the present social discontent is due to the ostentatious parade of luxurious living, not only by the wealthy, but by the well-to-do, and to the efforts on the part of the latter to make the utmost farthing out of those they employ, or those from whom they purchase, in order to do this. The present rage for cheapness and the growing fierceness of competition in various branches of industry are not wholly unconnected. Our Lord spoke of the danger of riches in a tone in which we rarely speak of this. If we have His spirit we shall speak equally strongly about the evils of wishing to appear richer than we are.

Then, we must take far more trouble than we have hitherto done to learn and to make known the evil conditions, the helplessness and hopelessness in which so many of the workers, especially women and children, are existing (not living) at the present time. We must use every opportunity for preventing the plea of ignorance on the part of those who might do something to mitigate these evil conditions. We must, in season and out, preach the truth of the intrinsic worth of man, even of the poorest, the most oppressed and most degraded. We must preach the responsibility of stewardship, and we must show that the very profession of the Christian name demands real sacrifice

in the way of practical social service. We must relentlessly condemn every form of selfishness and every expression of irresponsibility in conduct. We must protest that these are simply incompatible with the claim to be regarded as a Christian ; we must demand that either the one or the other be renounced.

The primary duty of the clergy to-day is to assist more energetically in forming a healthier public opinion. In doing this they must be better equipped with more complete knowledge of actual evil conditions, and with more of that absolute fearlessness of the consequences of plain-speaking which was so characteristic of the Apostolic teaching.

In this way (which will give the poor no reason for thinking the clergy are satisfied with things as they are—an opinion very widely held among the workers), rather than by throwing themselves unreservedly into ill-considered schemes of economic revolution, will the clergy best promote that much to be desired social reformation which at least the great majority of them have so earnestly at heart.



“Some Results of Modern Criticism of the Old Testament.”—II.

ANOTHER source of error is very similar to the cause of the legal troubles. As with law, so with history. Men who are not trained historians have undertaken the work of historical criticism, and their achievements in this department naturally bear a family resemblance to their legal feats. Something has already been said on this subject in discussing slavery. Room can only be found for one other example, and this will illustrate the higher critical lack of care in collating known facts ; but, to prevent misconceptions, it should be stated that this is only *one* of many reasons for their failure in this department. Thus, a knowledge of human nature is an indispensable requisite for a historical student, but I have repeatedly found instances